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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The release of the report, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, on April 26, 1983 attracted the attention of the nation. This report set off a wave of activity aimed at improving the nation's schools and established a national agenda for educational renewal that continues today, nearly 12 years later. The dire language used in the report emphasized the scope of the nation's problems caused by, "educational foundations of our society . . . being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people" (p. 5). The underlying problem besetting America's educational system was identified by futurist Alvin Toffler in *Future Shock* (1970), in which the author noted that, "our schools face backward toward a dying system, rather than forward to the emerging new society . . . " (p. 343). The 1983 report focused attention on the need to change the way we look at schools. As futurist, educator and businessman, Joel Barker pointed out, "whether it is in business or education or politics or personal life, a paradigm change, by definition, alters the basic rules of the game. And when the rules change, the whole world can change" (pp. 17-18).
Ohio, like the rest of the nation, was caught up in the reform activity that followed the release of *A Nation at Risk* (1983). The initial efforts at improving the state's schools focused upon relatively quick and simple solutions to improve the educational system. In the Ohio Commission On Educational Excellence report, *Responsible Reform: Focusing On The Future* (1983), commissioned by then State Superintendent for Public Instruction, Dr. Franklin B. Walter, the state delineated how it would respond to reform. Increased minimum standards requiring additional course work in mathematics for graduation and developing competency based educational programs were the starting point. Additionally, the state encouraged Ohio Universities and Colleges to increase admittance requirements and initiated the implementation of a teacher competency test. The primary focus in 1983 was to refine and increase the time requirements for students within the existing educational system. Other components included increasing teacher pay while attempting to change tenure laws making it easier to remove poor teachers. The school building principal was the focal point for instructional leadership, while district administration was charged with tightening fiscal controls and expanding local public relations efforts. A caveat held that there should be no change for change's sake.

Six years later, state level interest in education remained high. In his "State Of The State" address (1989) then Governor Richard Celeste devoted a large amount of his speech to education in Ohio.
Celeste spoke of the state having been in crisis six years earlier, but that the state had made a significant economic recovery. However, the Governor emphasized that Ohio was at a crossroads and that educational excellence was at the center of that crossroads. Celeste stated that education was critical for a strong and competitive economy, as well as, to prevent future state budgets from becoming overwhelmed by the increasing costs of welfare and crime. Governor Celeste called for educational excellence to be part of Ohio's law exceeding the thorough and efficient requirements of the Ohio Constitution. The basic components to Celeste's vision involved stable financing of education, a new system of accountability for education and the deregulation of the education process, while also allowing for open enrollment. Many of the fiscal aspects of Celeste's plan did not take place; but, the calls for accountability and deregulation did receive attention. Incentives for schools meeting high goals did not materialize; but, the state did acquire the authority to take control of educationally bankrupt school systems.

Edward B. Fiske in Smart Schools, Smart Kids (1991), in describing national events, accurately described Ohio's experiences and renewal status in early 1993, as he stated,

After a decade of trying to make the system work better by such means as more testing, higher salaries, and tighter curriculums, we must now face up to the fact that anything short of fundamental structural change is futile. We are trying to use a nineteenth-century
institution to prepare young people for life in the twenty-first century (p. 14).

In an effort to help Ohio break out of the existing educational system, current State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Ted Sanders, released the report, *Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal* in July, 1993 (Appendix A). The purpose of this document was to "initiate a dialogue about school improvement efforts which have the greatest potential for enhancing the ability of educators to improve student learning . . . to 'spark' school renewal efforts and to encourage risk-takers who want to create a new kind of educational system" (p. 1). Dr. Sanders supported this commitment through a competitive grant process that was entitled Venture Capital. The state's commitment, through funding from the Ohio Legislature, was for a five year commitment of $25,000 each year per school building for a total of $125,000. The primary use of these monies was to invest in professional development around new models of teaching, learning, and schooling to support individual school buildings'. The Venture Capital concept initially served as the catalyst for "breaking the mold" activities. As stated in *Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal* (1993), "The most significant contribution of this monograph is the invitation it offers: the opportunity for the learning community to adopt existing school improvement models or the challenge to invent something that might be better" (p. 1).

How do superintendents of districts with buildings receiving venture capital grants react to an entrepreneurial approach to
educational reform? Do superintendents perceive a long term investment in professional development as an appropriate issue of state policy?

This study was designed to specifically identify and describe how local school superintendents in Ohio viewed: the efficacy of the venture capital process; the impact of the proposal process; and the effects of the venture capital process on the school community.

**Background to Venture Capital**

In August, 1991, Dr. Ted Sanders, serving as Under Secretary of Education in President Bush's administration, was appointed Superintendent of Public Instruction for Ohio by the State Board of Education. Dr. Sanders replaced retiring State Superintendent, Dr. Franklin Walter. At his appointment, Dr. Sanders was charged with reviewing and making recommendations to Governor Voinovich's Task Force on Education's "Model for the Future", an organizational study of the Department of Education. In his response, Department Restructuring: A Report to the State Board of Education (1992), Dr. Sanders prefaced the report by stating that,

Although these actions are important, they need to be examined in the context of previous actions of the board . . . . . The essence of your actions is a call for a transformation of education in Ohio; one that would give communities and their schools the flexibility to
make decisions, providing they are willing to accept responsibility for the results of student learning (p. ii).

In Dr. Sander's specific response to the findings of the Task Force on Education, 41 recommendations were assigned to various education leaders for action. Included in those recommendations were the precursors of the Venture Capital commitment (Sanders, 1992, pp. 11-18). Of specific significance is Dr. Sander's response to recommendation four, which set out an agenda of state supported local renewal initiatives. He accepted the task force's recommendation and stated, "The Department of Education will support and sponsor innovation and experimentation by school districts in the transformation and improvement of education in Ohio" (Sanders, 1992, p. 12).

The Venture Capital grant process was subsequently developed by the Ohio Department of Education to address Dr. Sander's response to recommendation four. In language similar to that of Dr. Sander's response to the governor's task force, Venture Capital's effect is described in Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal as, "Educators are not asked merely to adjust the structures of conventional schooling, but over their five-year commitment attempt fresh approaches and active explorations of fundamental change in teaching and learning, assessment, governance, organization, and professional development" (Ohio Department of Education, 1993, p. 1).
Venture Capital

In Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal (1993) educational reform is described in terms of school improvement and restructuring. Near the beginning, the document reads, "Funding from the state legislature has made venture capital grants available to support school improvement" (p. 1). Later, the monograph reads, "School improvement applies to efforts to change the fundamental structure of the educational system to create conditions in which all can achieve at higher levels . . . . School improvement can only be achieved if there is a willingness to fundamentally restructure Ohio's education system" (p. 6). As employed in the monograph, school or educational renewal, improvement, change, and restructuring are interchangeable terms.

In defining school improvement, the venture capital monograph, Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal (1993), references the State Board of Education's mission statement that, "begins with a commitment to the belief that all students will learn if the conditions are right" (p. 6). From this belief the monograph then provides a basis that, "New systems and structures must be developed to ensure that learning communities have the flexibility and support to redesign teaching and learning, assessment, governance, organization, and professional development" (p. 6).

The new systems and structures called for are then connected to the State Board's mission statement. The flexibility required for the redesign described above is to be guided by a common belief
system of four elements: 1. All students can learn; 2. Learners possess multiple intelligences; 3. Participation in a learning community fosters social, civic, emotional, and intellectual growth; and 4. Diverse instructional strategies and environments enhance learning (Ohio Department of Education, 1993, p. 6).

The monograph then details the knowledge we have about school renewal and establishes the expectations of the Venture Capital school reform process. The delineation of expectations is important, because the selection of school proposals for Venture Capital funding is through a competitive grant process. Further, the Venture Capital concept centers on the assumption that a multiyear commitment of state monies, dedicated exclusively to professional development, will enhance the prospect of fundamental change in schools and schooling. The expectations of the Venture Capital concept comprise the specific areas in which professional development will support fundamental change.

Additionally, the expectations of the Venture Capital concept are to be addressed through a systemic process using continuous improvement. The process must then simultaneously focus on the development of all main components of the culture of the system -- teaching and learning, assessment, governance, organization, and professional development. To support such a systemic process, the school district may seek exemption from specific state statutory provisions and rules.
Purpose of the Study

With the changes supported by the Venture Capital process, the shift of traditional authority and responsibility from central office administration to the building level will significantly impact the role of the local superintendent. As the statutory and organizational head of the school district's administration, a change to site-based management will have significant ramifications for the local superintendent's role.

Do local superintendents in districts that have received Venture Capital support the idea of this entrepreneurial change process? Because of the local superintendents' statutory administrative and organizational position within the local district, the superintendents' beliefs and actions concerning Venture Capital have a great influence on the process. However, within the Ohio Venture Capital process the minimal specific requirements of the superintendent were: to nominate buildings and to write a statement of support for each district applicant building's Venture Capital grant proposal. Formally, the local district superintendent had little required direct involvement in the Venture Capital application process.

The problem under investigation was to identify and describe how local school district superintendents in Ohio viewed: the efficacy of the Venture Capital process; the impact of the proposal process; and the effects of the Venture Capital process on the school community.
Specifically, this study addressed the following:

1. To what extent did local superintendents in this study agree with the four common school improvement beliefs delineated by the Ohio Department of Education?

2. What are common leadership characteristics of local superintendents with Venture Capital schools in their school districts?

3. What kind of professional development has been identified as needed by the local superintendents to implement Venture Capital effectively?

4. How did Venture Capital grants change the way local superintendents perceive the state role in local school improvement?

5. To what extent did local superintendents believe the Venture Capital proposal process diverted attention from existing local school improvement activities?

6. Did the local superintendents find the Venture Capital application process valuable for local school improvement?

These questions address the important issues underlying fundamental educational reform in Ohio through the Venture Capital process. Venture Capital has a unique process structure that does not endorse a top down restructuring approach that emanates from the state through the district school board and its highest ranking administrator, the superintendent. The school building is the site for implementation of the Venture Capital funding, although
Venture Capital does not endorse a specifically bottom up approach that focuses upon the building staff to the exclusion of other elements of the school community. Rather, Venture Capital utilizes a combination of both approaches to the school renewal process. This combination design ensures a systemic approach to educational renewal which is also a specific requirement for the applicant schools.

Senge (1990, 1994) and Peters (1994) address the concept of restructuring the entire organization to bring about fundamental organizational change. Sarason (1990), Branson (1990) and Schlechty (1991) add that the entire educational organization must be restructured if education is to be changed for the better. Schlecty (1987, 1991), Woehl (1989), Fullan (1982), Lezotte and Jacoby (1992), and Gee (1988) all emphasize the critical significance of the local superintendent in school reform and change. The significance of the local district superintendent is even more noteworthy when consideration is given to the change necessary to effectively support a Venture Capital school building within a school system (McLaughlin, 1990).

Further, according to Ron Rapp, policy analyst for the Educational Commission of the States (1995), Ohio's Venture Capital systemic strategy for school renewal is unique to the nation, because of the comprehensiveness of its structural approach. In this study of Venture Capital, the role of the district superintendent was an important factor in the unique systemic nature of school renewal in Ohio and more generally across the nation. While the district
superintendency has some differences across the country, the fundamental aspect of the superintendent in power relationships is comparable across most of the nation (Sergiovanni and Moore, 1989; Konnert and Augenstein, 1990). This study contributes to the knowledge we have about the role of local district superintendents in a systemic restructuring program for educational reform. As the equivalent to the business Chief Executive Officer, this study adds to the knowledge we have about executive leadership in public, private, and quasi-public organizations undergoing restructuring.

Definition of Terms

Chief Executive Officer - The highest administrative position in the organization, usually used to denote a private business sector organization.

Superintendent - The highest administrative position in a public school system in Ohio. The position was created by Ohio statute and the local elected board of education directly hires and supervises the superintendent.

School Board - local lay persons who are elected to serve a term of office and to provide management of school districts. These boards were created by Ohio statute.

Venture Capital - A competitive grant process developed by the Ohio Department of Education to foster and promote individual Venture Capital schools may receive $25,000 per year over five years to support their efforts. The current biennial
funding has been provided by the Ohio Legislature and approved by the Ohio Governor.

Site-based Management - A process in which people have the authority to make decisions at the site of program delivery. In venture capital terms it also includes the school building's learning community.

Learning Community - The entire range of individuals and groups who interact with the activities that are part of the operation of that school building.

Limitations

This study of Ohio school district superintendents is limited to those superintendents who had one or more school buildings from their school district receive a venture capital grant in the initial funding cycle. All superintendents from across Ohio, who directed districts receiving these building level grants made up the population for this study (N= 113). These superintendents represent city, county, local, joint vocational, and exempted village districts and comprise 15% of the 747 Venture Capital eligible superintendencies in Ohio.

Further limitations to this study include the following: the largely descriptive nature of the study which utilized self reported attitudes at particular points in time that may limit efficacy of response due to potential vested interest bias; and the possibility
that data collection early in multi-round selection process can be subject to subsequent attitudinal changes.

**Reporting**

This study is divided into five chapters. Chapter I, Introduction, includes background information to the statement of the problem, definition of terms, the purpose of the study, limitations of the study, and an overview of the study.

Chapter II, Literature Review, presents a review of related literature focusing on: the modern history of educational reform; the role of the local district superintendent in school renewal; and the role of state policy in school renewal.

Chapter III, Procedures, provides a description of the research procedures used in this study including: the survey research design; population selected; instrument development and testing; instrument administration; and data analysis.

Chapter IV, Findings, consists of the findings of the data gathered through the survey research methods detailed in Chapter III. Included is descriptive data and an analysis of the significant frequency distributions and correlation coefficients of the responses.

Chapter V, Summary, Discussion, and Implications, provides a summary and discussion of the findings of this study. Potential uses and implications for this study, as well as, additional studies are considered.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The review of literature in this chapter is presented in three parts, reflecting the three related areas under consideration in this study: a history of reform since A Nation At Risk (1983); the role of state policy in school renewal; and the executive leadership role of the district superintendent in school renewal. Included in this summary review are references which range from the release of A Nation At Risk (1983) to the most current organization of theory in the area of school renewal. Sources related to the roles of business in restructuring and leadership roles in business restructuring are incorporated. Also included is information pertinent to Ohio's school renewal status from 1983 to the present. The sources of information in all three areas represent a survey of relevant and timely literature including books, journals, federal and state reports, unpublished dissertations, personal interviews, and personal notes from state educational meetings.
On April 26, 1983, David Pierpont Gardner, Chairman of the National Commission on Excellence in Education transmitted the report, *A Nation At Risk: The Imperative For Educational Reform*, to Secretary of Education T. H. Bell. The subsequent release to the public of this report's findings became a basepoint in an ensuing malestrom of analysis, accusation and action that continues today. The report set out the parts of society most at risk and gravely addressed the severity of the situation in unequivocal terms. Most notable about *A Nation At Risk* (1983) is that it set the agenda for educational reform (Wirt and Kirst, 1989, p. 304). The language utilized was dire and foretold of the erosion of the United States' position in the world. The second sentence of the report specified that the focus of the report's concern was education's negative impact upon "commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation . . ." (p. 5).

Subsequent to *A Nation At Risk* (1983) came a spate of reports echoing the crisis tone set earlier. Wirt and Kirst (1989) noted that, "the 1980s offered an intense use of blue ribbon committees and national studies as a springboard for reshaping school politics and policy and that (t)he Educational Commission of the States tallied 275 special state level task forces or commissions between 1983 - 87" (pp. 3-4). Harold Howe (1983), a former U.S. Commissioner of Education, examined the major gaps and unattended issues that
remained in the of schooling studies that appeared in 1983 alone and addressed the:

frustration over the diminishing capacity of the U.S. to compete in worldwide markets [which] has awakened new interest in the old idea that the quality of human resources is a key element in the efficiency of the nation's economy. Better schools that produce better educated workers are thought to be the way to outsell the Japanese and the Germans (p. 168).

Howe added that the same ideas about better educated workers also apply to our defense establishment and to national security. Goodlad (1988) and Passow (1989) echo Howe by pointing out that the reaction to A Nation At Risk and the other educational reports of the early to mid-1980s parallels the outpouring of federal, state, and local activity for the period immediately following the launching of Sputnik in October, 1957.

Larry Cuban (1990) speaks of the reforms initiated since the release of A Nation At Risk (1983) as being state-engineered to seek a regeneration of the American economy. Cuban compares this to the school improvement efforts of the 50s, 60s and 70s, when educators supposedly had permitted academic standards to slip from their position in earlier decades. Cuban further addresses, the recurring nature of school reform efforts in the United States with the critical focus relating to questions about why reforms failed in the past and why they return. These questions go to the heart of present policy debates over whether ederal, state, and district
mandates do alter schooling and will ever get past the classroom door. Cuban continued:

reforms return because policymakers fail to diagnose problems and promote correct solutions; reforms return because policymakers cave in to the politics of a problem rather than the problem itself; reforms do return again, again, and again and it is important to policymakers, practitioners, administrators, and researchers to understand why reforms return but seldom substantially alter the regularities of schooling (p.3).

Cuban added that, "the risks involved with a lack of understanding include pursuing problems with mismatched solutions, spending energies needlessly, and accumulating despair" (p. 12).

A supporting view of the cause of the recurring nature of reform is raised by Peter Senge in The Fifth Discipline (1990). Senge notes the basic issue requiring change is difficult for people to address, since it is usually unclear or expensive to meet. People then shift to other solutions, easy fixes which appear to be efficient. However, the easier fixes only look to the symptoms. The fundamental problem is left unchanged. Senge (1990) cautions people to be wary "of the symptomatic solution for solutions that address only the symptoms of a problem, not fundamental causes.... In the long term, the problem resurfaces and there is increased pressure for symptomatic response" (p. 104). Senge's view is shared by Branson in his article, Issues in the Design of Schooling: Changing the Paradigm (1990), in which he points out
that traditional fixes, which are acceptable to the establishment and easy to implement, cannot yield significant improvements. Further, the costs will increase, but the quality will improve little.

As a result of *A Nation At Risk* (1983) and its attendant educational debit reports, a first wave of reform was initiated. These recommended reforms carried common themes and were similar in emphasis. According to A. Harry Passow (1989), this first wave of educational reform in the 1980s focused on educational excellence through increased standards to rebuild public confidence in the quality of American education. Excellence became understood to mean higher standards for tougher academic requirements. Additionally, rigid scheduling of substantial academic courses in mathematics and science was promoted along with more homework, testing, and discipline. Longer school days and longer school years were also considered vital to repairing the nation's schools.

In this early stage of educational reform the states took the lead in passing and implementing sweeping legislative mandates. Then, by the end of 1986, a National Educational Commission of the States survey found two unifying themes of state reform: increased rigorous academic student standards and enhanced recognition with higher standards for teachers (Pipho, 1986). Kemmerer and Wagner conducted a survey of state educational reform activities in the fall of 1985. The conclusion of this 1985 survey supports Cuban and Senge's contentions, as Kemmerer and Wagner noted the states have generally focused on low cost, high visibility activities while
ignoring the more complex, expensive, and less visible ones more likely to produce significant student performance improvements. 


This second wave moved educational reform from the first wave's primary focus on the secondary school to a focus which included the elementary level and the undergraduate institution (Passow, 1989). The work of then U. S. Secretary of Education Bennett (First Lessons: A Report on Elementary Education in America, 1986) and Ernest Boyer's (College: The Undergraduate Experience in America, 1987) aided in the extension of reform beyond the first wave's secondary school focus. Further, the second wave also provided the nation's governors the opportunity to clearly take the lead in school reform. In their August, 1986 report, Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education, the National Governors' Association's Chairman, Lamar Alexander, specifically said that the Governors were ready to spearhead the second wave of American public education's reform. Alexander (1986) cited
economic realities and the need for quality jobs as the reason for educational reform, the same reason as that given in *A Nation At Risk* (1983).

The second wave of educational reform broadened focus areas and extended increased leadership to state governors. State-level authority and mandates became a significant state educational reform tool. Passow (1989) commented that in the Governor's Association Report the governor's would pay for school reform, but, "only if 'results' were forthcoming" (p. 24). Passow also noted that U. S. Secretary of Education Bennett believed that achievement, assessment, and accountability remained the fundamental principles of educational reform.

However, in 1989 Passow also noted that some educators were coming to the realization that state-wide top-down mandates can have unanticipated negative consequences. McNeil (1987) found that the applying of reductive state standardized formulas to teaching and curricular content exacerbated the disconnection of the teacher from the curricula and teaching. In effect, by prescribing what was to be taught and tested through state-wide proficiency examinations, teachers were having their professionalism reduced. By losing authority and discretion, teachers were facing a loss of professionalization. Meanwhile, the redefinition of teaching was moving away from that espoused by the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy in 1986. To offset the unanticipated fragmentation flowing from top-down prescriptive state legislation, educational reformers' focus then
shifted to site-based management strategies for actual delivery of educational reform programs. Sedlak (1986), Ravitch (1985), Goodlad (1984), and Shanker (1986) noted the necessity for site-based differentiated delivery that supports the expertise and professionalism of teachers.

Smith and O'Day (1991) said that the flaw in the first wave of educational reform was that top-down state mandates did not get into the classroom and affect teaching and learning. The second wave then evolved in response to the first wave with a focus on bottom-up reform with a decentralized focus. However, the second wave also lacked coherence even as it maintained the first wave's preoccupation with mandated basic skills and rigid centralized accountability systems. Again, Smith and O'Day (1991) saw the major problem with the reform effort was that it still did not really get to the heart of the educational mission. The actual teaching and learning in the classroom remained largely unaffected. In the second wave, a fragmented project mentality arose as a response to increasing political visibility. Individuals within and outside of education noted that political gain was possible with quick, visible successes (Fullan and Miles, 1991). Firestone, Fuhrman and Kirst (1989) note that while centralized models of learning are inadequate, fragmented policies of bottom-up reform make substantial, widespread change impossible. Between these two waves of school reform, local school leaders became confused by the contradictions. Smith and O'Day (1991) stated that this confusion led to an ignoring of policy directives and even cynical subversion of
policies. As Chance (1986) also observed, the problem with these waves of reform was that they avoided the classroom. The question became was this really reform or was it merely incremental improvement? Plank (1987) noted that these early reforms supported the status quo.

What was becoming increasingly evident was that there were two competing trends in implementing educational reform (Passow, 1989). On the one hand were the state mandated accountability standards initiated in the first wave of reform. The competing trend was that of providing flexibility and support for implementation of educational reform at the school site. In many ways the flexible site-based delivery trend was the antithesis of the state mandated accountability standards continuing from the first wave of responses to *A Nation At Risk* (1983).

Fuhrman (1993) notes that developing coherent educational policy is extremely challenging. Political factors tend to promote a fragmentation that ignores important inconsistencies that are in the historical make-up of local schools and that serve to inhibit coherency efforts. Fuhrman continues that there are four elements to centralized policy generating fragmentation. The elements include: structural layers; politician's re-election focus; educational policy overload on the school site; and complexity driven specialization. As our political system functions, it is difficult to achieve integrated policy from specific deliberate goals, decisiveness and coordination at the delivery level. Yet, Firestone, Fuhrman and Kirst (1989) also recognized that delivery-based,
decentralized educational reform efforts cannot generate substantitive change across an entire state organizational system. Between the problems of singularly top-down policy and equally focused bottom-up policy strategy, school reform's two waves have not achieved the expectations as expected by their respective advocates.

The recurring nature of the calls for school reform continues today, almost 12 years since the release of *A Nation At Risk* (1983). The current focus remains centered on the United State's economic competitiveness. However, as Branson (1990), Cuban (1990), and Senge (1990) point out, the basic cause of the recursive nature of school reform is the failure to address the fundamental causes necessitating the change desired. Finally, as pointed out in the Executive Summary of *Voices From The Inside* (The Institute for Education in Transformation, 1992):

> our data strongly suggest that the heretofore identified problems of schooling are rather consequences of much deeper and more fundamental problems, and the problems of public education in the U.S. look vastly different than those issues debated by experts, policy makers, academicians and the media (p.11).

What then is the underlying problem that has been avoided? Toffler addressed the core issue in *Future Shock* (1970) in which he states, "our schools face backward toward a dying system, rather than forward to the emerging new society. . . . To help avert future shock. . . we must search for our objectives and methods in the
future, rather than the past" (p. 343). Another futurist, Joel Barker (1985, 1992), carries Toffler's work further and provides the explanation of a changing educational paradigm. This changing set of rules, or paradigm, governs educators and ties Toffler's backward facing schools to the current waves of school reform. This provides insight into the underlying problem facing schools and American society. Barker's work builds from Thomas Kuhn's, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962). Barker argues that the position Kuhn holds for scientific rule (paradigm) shifts is true for any situation of strongly held rules and regulations. Barker further states that, "whether it is in business or education or politics or personal life, a paradigm change, by definition, alters the basic rules of the game. And, when the rules change, the whole world can change" (pp.17-18).

The change that is now in process in the U.S. is from the routinized assemblyline business and educational organizational model of industrial America as identified by Toffler (1970) to Ferguson's (1980) more individualized model. Branson (1990) specifically states in *Educational Technology* that, "the immense educational challenge of the future requires a new paradigm... (since) the traditional paradigm... cannot address contemporary needs" (p.8). This same analysis has been affirmed in works by Kearns & Doyle (1988), Goodlad (1988, 1989), Heshusius (1989), Finn (1990), and Fiske (1991).

A further review of the Toffler (1970, 1980, 1990), Kuhn (1962), and Barker (1985, 1992) paradigm/change analyses leads us
to further understandings of the current status of educational reform in the United States. To help determine that a paradigm change or shift is occurring is to observe the type of language employed in describing problems. The dire words employed in *A Nation At Risk* (1983) and echoed in *America 2000* (1991) provide evidence, of such a paradigm change through the frustration and lack of trust in which the greater community holds the education establishment. The depth of concern evidenced by the wording of the above reports displays the ineffectiveness if not the understanding of the limitations of the current educational paradigm in solving the educational problems of today's American society.

The extent of national dissatisfaction led then Under Secretary Ted Sanders (1990), United States Department of Education, to state, "the President (of the United States) said that the American people are ready for radical reform of their schools" (p.1). The cause of the President's statement can be seen in Kuhn's (1962) terms, for as Kuhn noted, "In both political and scientific development the sense of malfunction that can lead to crisis is prerequisite to revolution" (p. 92).

Some examples of such dramatic desires for change can be gained by looking at some of the restructuring efforts undertaken by U.S. businesses. As addressed earlier, much of the concern about American education is related to the declining international competitiveness of U.S. business. The same futurists who have

Further, Kearns (1988), former Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Xerox and former Deputy Secretary of Education addressed the changes today's successful companies have undergone, explaining how they have, "discarded the archaic, outmoded, and thoroughly discredited practices that are still in place in most of our school districts" (p.8). Kearns spoke of what the business world has to offer schools in the way of experience with massive restructuring. Kearns pointed out that Xerox didn't change massively for the fun of it; rather, "we did it because we had to. It was change or die" (p.11). Kearns's same belief in restructuring extends to education. Kearns stated that he cares for education for hardheaded reasons, "because profits depend upon it" (p.5). Similarly, Toffler (1990) and Drucker (1992) echo Kearns.
However, in 1989 Passow saw reason for optimism as the forces for educational reform started to coalesce around emphasizing pedagogy, curriculum, teacher professionalism, educational governance, and structural aspects of school reform. What Passow identified in 1989 was the educational restructuring movement that developed out of the limitations of the first two waves of educational reform (Plank, 1987).

David (1991) pointed out that the reforms of the 1980s tried with little success to change interconnected educational systems of many parts, one part at a time. As an alternative to the reforms of the 1980s, David supported the intrinsic strength behind restructuring and cited the two main differences between restructuring and prior reforms. David noted that restructuring was driven by a focus on student performance and that it was a long-term commitment to basic, systemic change. An added corollary to the educational restructuring movement was a fundamental belief that all students can and must learn at higher levels.

David (1991) adds that there is growing consensus around what we want students to know and to be able to do, as well as the types of learning experiences that result in these student outcomes. David says that we must answer the question of what does it take to transform schools into places where such learning experiences occur. Finally, David points out that we must also find out what is required at every level of the educational system and can accountability be distributed accordingly?
What needs to be involved in the restructuring of schools to meet the social and economic demands of today? First, as David (1991) and Barth (1991) agree, restructuring means the systemic change of the organization from the state policy and regulatory level to the specific interaction between the teacher and the learner. As all of the encompassed relationships are interrelated, all must be aligned if true restructuring is to occur. Otherwise, what will be accomplished is merely additional tinkering with the existing system while keeping the fragmentation already noted. David (1991) adds that the challenge to the system is to restructure the many pieces of the system at multiple levels simultaneously. Barth (1991) likens it to, "redesigning a 747 . . . in flight" (p. 126).

Eisener (1988) discusses what happens within organizations when change is piecemeal. Eisener compares schools to ecological systems where what one does in one area has an influence in other areas. Of great importance to educational reformers is Eisener's additional observation that when changes occur in isolation and when the mass of change is not critical, the changes that occur in the one area are returned to their starting point by the other unaltered parts of the organizational system. Eisener concludes that for significant changes to take place in our schools, the educational system must be taken as a whole.

There are some common understandings that are surfacing today around educational systemic restructuring. As Michael Holzman (1993) points out, systemic change refers to fundamental change for improving teaching and learning for all students, that
affects every aspect of every school, and that flows from the statehouse to the classroom and back again. David (1991), Slotnik (1993), Elmore (1992), and O'Nell (1990) all caution against allowing the focus to hold on specific pieces of the restructuring puzzle, such as site-based management, and then considering those specific pieces the only elements involved in educational restructuring.

The common understandings around educational systemic restructuring begin with Smith and O'Day's (1991) primary point that restructuring must revolve around the teaching and learning that actually occurs in the classroom. As Schlechty (1993) sees it, this interaction is the work of the schools, for the teacher and for the student. Anderson (1993), supported by Fullan, Bennett and Rolheiser-Bennett (1990), David (1991), Smith and O'Day (1991), Darling-Hammond (1992), Slotnik (1993), Elmore (1992), Fuhman (1993), and O'Neill (1993), holds that if changes are not happening with teaching and learning then what change that does occur is of questionable value. Additionally, for changes to be meaningful they must occur cohesively across the entire system, supporting the changes taking place with teaching and learning.

According to the above authors, the changes necessary to support teaching and learning include a request or invitation to change. This request is from the leadership at the school, district, and state levels and carries with it the invitation that risk taking, experimentation and possible failures are expected and encouraged. Another necessary factor is providing the organization's delivery
level, school site, the flexibility to make decisions and to respond to situations necessary to support teaching and learning. This authority and flexibility includes relief from constraining regulations and a strong degree of fiscal control.

A third aspect of support for educational restructuring is to support access to information. Networking and needed levels of professional development are among the ways teaching and learning must be supported by knowledge and skill growth. Progress will not occur and be sustained by individuals working alone.

A fourth scaffold for the changes needed to systemically support changing teaching and learning is the restructuring of time. While seemingly a simple concept, the issue of time is as difficult as any of the other changes to reconcile with the requirements of changed teaching and learning. The issue of time also demonstrates the interrelated nature of these pieces to restructuring.

Teacher work time is seen traditionally as time spent with students. Time for professional development, conferencing, meeting with peers and other learning community members to address restructuring issues are all seen as released time in the traditional view. Time utilized in such ways to support educational restructuring is critical, not only to support changing teaching and learning, but also all of the other aspects of educational restructuring. This consideration of time can be a political issue which necessitates addressing another piece to the restructuring puzzle. This piece involves including the school's learning community, or public, that surrounds or is connected to the school or
the system, depending upon the scope of the restructuring focus. Again, the affected levels flow from the statehouse to the classroom and back again, while including each level's publics.

Deal (1990) summarizes where we are currently located on this moving and changing mosaic of educational reform that has followed *A Nation At Risk* (1983). Deal holds that transformation calls for the reshuffling the basic rules of the game and that schools will only be fundamentally different when the focus becomes a collective renegotiation of historical myths, metaphors, and meaning. That renegotiation will lead the focus from the initial preoccupation with superficial, specific deficiencies and to the root problems of the entire system. Deal notes that such a process follows some specific phases. The first phase is a period of changes that are superficial and have little significant results. The second phase is reached when an awareness develops around the nature of the crisis along with a growing realization of the possibilities that could transform the system. Then for the third phase, Deal uses a trapeze metaphor to describe a reordering stage, as people drop old practices and start experimenting with the new.

In Ohio the Venture Capital process provides a next step in the educational reform journey. Venture Capital employs systems approaches to educational reform that start at the state level and connect to the individual teacher and student in the local school. Rapp (1995) believes that Ohio's Venture Capital initiative is the most comprehensive educational restructuring effort now taking place in the United States. Because of Venture Capital's pacesetting
nature, the Educational Commission of the States is studying this Ohio initiative (Rapp, 1995). Further, Venture Capital utilizes the strengths of the top-down and bottom-up approaches to policy implementation. William Lowe Boyd (1987) of Pennsylvania State University recommended such a simultaneous loose-tight knit kind of policy creation and implementation. Following such a top-down and bottom-up process can serve to balance professionalism and bureaucratization if sufficient time is allowed for the restructuring to be completed. These views are supported by the organizational work of Senge (1991).
State Policy and School Renewal

Historically, the states are the constitutional center for education in the United States. Education was not one of the expressed powers granted the federal government, therefore it was one of the powers constitutionally reserved to the states. The states in turn delegated education to the local level. The fundamental governance agencies for education across the United States have been the local districts by tradition and practice (Cohen and Spillane, 1993). Since 1983, states have boosted school aid by more than 25% after inflation and have greatly increased their control over education (Wirt and Kirst, 1989).

However, it was the federal government that initiated the study that resulted in A Nation At Risk (1983). While the states' response was to increase funding to public education, the federal authorities maintained level funding for education. Federal funding remained at 6% of the average local district budget (Cohen and Spillane, 1993). Under President Reagan, the federal role was restricted to the bully pulpit (Kirst, 1989). The federal response in 1983 was markedly different from that of the federal response following Russia's orbiting of Sputnik in October, 1957 (Passow, 1989). The significant federal role following Sputnik was defined through the National Defense Education Act that permitted the flow of federal funds through national defense, a power expressly held by the federal government (Passow, 1989). Yet, Passow (1989) stated that even the frenzied efforts that followed Sputnik
cannot compare to the educational reform activity of the 1980s.

President Bush used the national "agenda setting" perogative of the presidency when he convened the 1989 Charlottesville Education Summit. This meeting offered the nation's governors the opportunity to attend and to establish national goals to achieve greater educational accountability (United States Department of Education, 1991). President Bush also directed Secretary of Education Alexander's 1991 release of America 2000: An Education Strategy (1991) that set six national goals for each school across the country. The development of these national goals elaborated upon President Reagan's position that it was the state's responsibility to fund schools, rather than a federal role (Pipho, 1986). The national goals as presented did not include a large infusion of federal education funding, because, as noted in America 2000, "The answer does not lie in spending more money on old ways-but to direct our resources and our energies to new approaches" (United States Department of Education, 1991, p. 39).

While the federal leaders used the bully pulpit to address the need for educational reform in the United States, Phillips and Finn (1990) noted that it was the states who undertook action. The initial response to A Nation At Risk (1983) was for State Educational Agencies (SEA) to implement more demanding accountability systems that treated all school systems the same (The SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education, 1994). The public policy response to forcing schools to improve has been to mandate and regulate
performance. Along with these top-down mandates came the addition of state sanctions for school districts failing to meet state mandated accountability standards. The sanctions often provided for state takeover and/or intervention of districts failing to meet the state's accountability standards (The SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education, 1994). These steps were taken because the state authorities had little confidence in the restructuring efforts of local authorities. Further, discontent with local academic standards led states to mandate stricter, more uniform standards for teachers and students (Kirst, 1989).

As noted by CREF, the University of Southern California's Center for Research in Education Finance (1981), state policymakers primarily have two options for directly influencing local school districts. The first is through mandates that lead to fragmentation and a lack of decisionmaking and decisiveness at the delivery level (McNeill, 1987; Smith and O'Day, 1991). The second option is through intergovernmental grants to influence local behavior.

The University of Southern California's Center for Research in Education Research (1991) points out that two forms of grants are used: general grants and categorical grants. The unrestricted nature of general grants does not promote the specific local action desired by state policymakers. Categorical grants are provided for definite reasons and often have attached application and reporting requirements. Categorical grants are used to ensure that local schools provide services or meet performance standards that state policymakers believe important. Further, the categorical or
incentive grants can be directed toward districts or schools and can reward inputs (expectations) and/or outputs (results).

CREF noted that as of 1991 most states focused on rewarding results and that there is little empirical evidence on incentive grants' effectiveness. According to Rapp (1995), there are still few incentive grants that focus on structural changes. In 1993 Cornett and Gaines cited an increase in the number of school incentive grants across the states; however, the authors also note that incentive programs that require increased workloads for teachers may not reach their full potential due to insufficient available time and training.

What has transpired in the state reforms that soon followed A Nation At Risk (1983) is that state policymakers did not foresee that their hope for better schools exceeded the capacity of some districts to overcome long histories of inadequate performance. What developed was a gap between state expectations and local capacity. The response at the local level to state intervention has often been that of anger and frustration. While superintendents have come to accept accountability and speak the language of reform, the building principals are those most responsible for implementing shifts in policy. Further, teachers, who have seen reforms come and go, are cynical. One teacher in the Southeast exclaimed, "If the state has an answer for us, tell us! Show us! Don't just put on a show" (The SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education, 1994, p. 9).

Kirst (1989) notes that during the 1980s, the most obvious feature of local/state educational relations has been the tremendous
growth in state control. Kirst (1989) expects that local district autonomy will continue to decline as the reliance on state funding increases. What this decline translates into is less involvement in setting the policy agenda for local administrators and boards of education. But this loss of local control to more centralized control leads to fragmentation (Smith and O'Day, 1990) and conflicts with the effective schools research that suggests that the most important educational changes are increased through expanded school site responsibility (Finn, 1983).

The dilemma that policymakers face is that the mandates of top-down uniform direction conflict with the benefits of the professionalism that is generated from bottom-up reform (Smith and O'Day, 1991). However, as Boyd (1987) suggests, a combination of top-down and bottom-up restructuring processes may provide some answers to the policymakers dilemma. Such a combined process becomes even more insightful when the tenets of educational restructuring, as presented by David (1991), Smith and O'Day (1991), and Senge (1990), are considered.

In educational restructuring, the systemic support for changed teaching and learning at the classroom level is the central focus. Support for this basic change, which Schlecty (1993) says is the primary work of teachers and students in the schools, requires the state to offer an invitation to take risks and to experiment (Anderson, 1993). Further, David (1991) cites the need for the school site to have flexibility to make decisions in response to individual situations that must be addressed to support teaching
and learning. With this state-local combination, the state role is to set the high expectations for the schools while the schools find the way to meet those expectations based on their local realities. However, for this to work, the entire system must be aligned to change together (Senge, 1990).

In this state-local connection the role of the local district must be specifically addressed. Tucker (1988), in an analysis of Peter Drucker's work, notes that the main thesis concerned the management of "knowledge workers" for high productivity. To bring about the changes necessary to implement a successful and challenging system of "knowledge workers" is the challenge faced by virtually every corporation in the United States. For school systems, Tucker (1988) holds that the leadership for redesigning the system falls to the school board and the superintendent. The focus is to manage people who think for a living, instead of people who are told what to do. Tucker's (1988) analysis is supported by Schlecty's (1990) contention that the core work of schools surrounds and eminates from that of the student's work role of actively learning and the teacher's work role of actively teaching. Anne Lewis (1989) adds that it is the local school district that sets the context in which the restructuring of education occurs, as it bridges state policy and classroom implementation. The district enhances, enables, or stands in the way of the local school building's efforts.

Michael Cohen (1988) of the National Governor's Association points out that the traditional role for district level administration has been to reward following district guidelines instead of
improving performance through achieving district goals. Jane David (1988) found three common themes in a study that explored the work of restructuring districts. The first theme addressed fundamental change as a long-term, comprehensive process in which schools were envisioned as stimulating working and learning environments. The second theme involved building the capacity of the school staffs to meet the needs created by their developing new roles and environments. Theme three included developing new support coalitions and new beliefs about assessment and accountability.

To the above three themes, David (1988) added that restructuring districts must communicate goals and directions, encourage risk-taking and experimentation, promote and display shared decisionmaking. Such districts also are active in creating new structures to support local school restructuring. These structures include building new alliances, devolving authority to schools and teachers, supporting new role expectations, and strongly promoting new processes of accountability that connect to the local school's endeavors. Finally, districts also support and assist a range of opportunities for professional development to build the staff's capacity to assume new roles and meet new expectations. These professional development aspects have developed to offset the problem in the first wave of educational reform - the gap between legislative expectations and the schools capacity to improve (Passow, 1989).
In another study of school district reform, Project Education Reform (1988) identified persistent barriers to reform. The most notable of the barriers were: a shortage of time, exacerbated by the lack of comprehensive planning, yielding piecemeal reform; the unrealistic belief that change would have no cost; inhibitions from federal and state regulations and laws; outdated assessment and accountability processes; and negative community and staff attitudes about reforms leading to resistance and rejection of those efforts.

Lewis (1988) recognized that major school restructuring occurred most often in large, urban districts, as this is where the most difficult problems exist. As Kuhn (1962) recognized, the need for change is most evident where the existing paradigm is the least effective and can no longer answer those problems. The Carnegie Foundation (1988) held four priorities, gained from analyzing urban schools, to be met in restructuring. These priorities affirmed the belief that all students can succeed, saw the necessity for a comprehensive renewal program in every school, identified the need for effective governance arrangements, and foretold the necessity of creating networks of support that extend beyond the school.

As Cuban (1990) has pointed out, mandates rarely get past the classroom door, because those mandates fail to accurately diagnose the problems faced at the local level. Accordingly, the mandates also fail to provide correct solutions to the problems that do exist at the local level. Sarason (1990, 1993) notes that much of the
problem with the mandates is the lack of connection with the realities that exist at the specific local site. Those developing the mandates do so at a level that will impact schools with requirements that do not meet the specific needs of all those schools that fall within the mandate. The problems faced are extremely complex and necessitate solutions incorporating the school's social setting. To have a chance of succeeding school renewal must be approached as incorporating the capacity of the entire system that impacts schooling. Senge (1990), Senge, Roberts, Ross, Smith, and Kleiner (1994), and Schlechty (1990, 1993) among others all emphasize the necessity to address school renewal in a holistic or systemic fashion. Attacking pieces and parts of the school renewal puzzle will not suffice, given the interconnectedness of those parts.

Sarason (1990) speaks to the power relationships within schools changing as various parts of the relationships change. The organization being changed is a dynamic, living entity continuously adapting to its internal and external environments. To focus on a specific part of the school with the intention to improve that part and to then move on to other parts does not work. Even as the part of the organization under scrutiny changes, the other portions of the organization change in relation to the intended changes. The work of Warfield (1976) and Darling-Hammond (1992) supports the complexity and interrelatedness issues discussed above.

In studies about federal and state policy implementation at the local level, the results have been relatively consistent. Much of the record recounts programs and mandates of limited lasting value
that are too general in nature and are not flexible enough to allow the organization to specifically address the problems of the immediate local delivery sites (Downs, 1967, Berman and McLaughlin, 1978, and Kogan and Atkin, 1982).

However, in the current literature, the belief exists that if the initiative allows for general top down guidance delineating expectations, while allowing for maximum local flexibility to meet state expectations, the initiative can be successful. However, states need to develop the capacity to support restructuring to avoid the dissonance between expectations and capabilities that occurred with the first wave reforms. The problem with top-down initiatives is the belief that one reform process fits all. Local needs and realities do not fit into one common process. For success to be possible, the local site must be provided maximum flexibility to implement the initiative. Wilson and Daviss (1994), Ogden and Germinario (1994), Conley (1994), and Sarason (1990) agree on the potential for these top down and bottom up initiative processes that cohesively include the entire system changing together to support teaching and learning in the local school classroom.

Ohio's Venture Capital school renewal process is an endeavor to bridge the gaps between state mandates and local initiative through a systemic, incentive supported, capacity building effort. The history of educational reform in Ohio was typical of that occurring across the United States in response to A Nation At Risk (1983). However, Rapp (1995) notes that Ohio currently has one of the most comprehensive educational restructuring effort underway
in the nation. Ohio's Venture Capital process can add to our knowledge and understanding about bridging top-down and bottom-up reform perspectives.

Just as the *A Nation At Risk* (1983) report had a basis in concern about the nation's economic success, so too is the driving force behind Ohio's educational renewal efforts rooted in economic well-being. At a meeting of Ohio's Regional Professional Development Center Directors on May 16, 1994 held at Ashland University, Columbus Campus, State Senator Cooper Snyder shared that much of the restructuring and reform effort in education today is being driven by the business community. Senator Snyder said that, "Education today must reflect a philosophy that values workplace skills and prepares students for continually evolving demands of the labor market" (1994). As the Chairman of the Ohio Senate's Education Committee, Senator Cooper Snyder is at the political and governmental center of Ohio's reform legislation and action.

In 1993, Ohio House Bill #152 connected the Governor's Education Management (GEM) Council to Ohio's Family First and Children's Cabinet Council to direct interagency collaboration efforts within the state. The significance of this is the power positioning of the GEM council, which consists of leaders from the Ohio business community (ECS, p.39, 1994), in the operation and policy development of state government. In the Ohio State Board of Education Annual Report for 1993 - 1994, *Pathway to the Future: Ohio's Shared Vision for Schools* it was noted that Ohio House Bill
#152 also provided $16.7 million dollars for venture capital grants to specifically improve teaching and learning by empowering principals and faculties to redesign or restructure their schools. The next phase for increasing statewide capacity has been to support school restructuring by forming an extensive technical assistance and professional development infrastructure. This effort can be described as a system to create continuous improvement and to meet the educational needs of all students.

The basis for educational renewal in Ohio tends to mirror that of the nation. States are responding in many cases to changing economic and demographic forces by "looking ahead to new and challenging economies of the 21st century, attempting to create education systems that will provide their residents with the skills and knowledge they will need to succeed in the workforce and in their future lives" (ECS, p.1, 1994).

In September, 1994, Governor George Voinovich released *Expanding Opportunities for Success: Ohio's Fourth Annual Progress Report on Education*. In this document the Governor reported on Ohio's results in meeting the eight goals of the amended *America 2000* (1991). New Goals 4 and 8 focusing attention on teachers and their professional development were incorporated in *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* (1994). The Governor also reported on Ohio's Proficiency and Standardized Test results and referred to Venture Capital as part of Ohio's response to Goals 3 and 4. Then, in the Ohio State Board of Education's *Policy and Budget Recommendations of the State Board of Education to the Governor and Members of the*
121st General Assembly (1994), State Board of Education President Oliver Ocasek speaks of Venture Capital as providing, "solid evidence that a climate for change and enhancing educational results has been created in Ohio" (p. 2). The document then recommends Venture Capital funding for an additional 400 schools while continuing support for the state's current 340 Venture capital schools.

In Ohio, the state level forces for school renewal are positioned to provide coordinated and consistent education policy. As of the November, 1994 elections, the governor's office and both houses of the legislature are controlled by Republicans. Governor Voinovich is entering his second term; Senator Cooper Snyder, a Republican, remains in the Ohio Senate, as chairman of the Senate Education Committee; Republicans are assuming the leadership of the Ohio House of Representatives; and State Superintendent Sanders continues in his position. Of further note is the fact that Dr. Sanders was part of President George Bush's Republican administration and served as Under Secretary of Education prior to his appointment as Ohio's State Superintendent.

The importance of the state's role in restructuring cannot be overlooked. Conley (1994) points out, "there is evidence that for restructuring to succeed, there must be consistent educational policy that is initiated and coordinated at the state level." In Conley's Roadmap to Restructuring (1994), he notes the work of Smith and O'Day who assert that "the states are in a unique position
to provide coherent leadership, resources, and support to the reform efforts in the schools" (1991, pp. 245-246).

Currently, Ohio has the state level commitment that Conley (1994) sees as necessary for fundamental change instead of the, ". . . episodic innovations. . . (that) have tended to come and go without leaving much of a mark on schools" (p. 12). What is most significant about Ohio's educational renewal effort is that is has included the united interests of business and of elected state government. However, cohesion and agreement at the state level is only part of the equation. The changes called for do not only occur at the state level. Rather, the great majority of people and organizations to be affected are at the local level. As Cuban (1990) has noted, reform efforts seldom pass the top-down mandate stage. At issue is how to deliver the mandate to the levels below the state level and to have the mandate accepted and institutionalized in the local system. The acceptance, adoption, and implementation at the local level in the individual classroom is the critical threshold to meet for school renewal.
Executive Leadership for Renewal

In the literature about business restructuring and that of educational change, the critical nature of organizational leadership was evident. Since business restructuring is occurring on a time frame ahead of that of education in the U.S. and because much of the push for educational reform comes from the business sector, it is valuable to determine what can be learned from business that can be useful in education's own restructuring efforts. Woehl (1989) in E R S Spectrum states that, "an understanding of the research on effective change practices in business and industry as they apply to change in school operations can be useful to superintendents as they deal with the new challenges in the decade ahead" (p.33). Woehl then proceeds to state that throughout the (business) literature the prime mover in organizational change is top management, the chief executive officer or CEO.

Bennis (1987, 1989), Peters (1982, 1985, 1987, 1994) and Drucker (1992) support Woehl's contention. In fact, Bennis (1989) goes to the extent of referring to America's continuing crises across all aspects of society, specifically including business and education, and says that, "If America is to regain its edge, and face and solve its myriad problems, leaders - the real thing, not copies - must show the way" (p.190). In his preface to Harvard Business Review's, Leaders on Leadership (1987), Bennis points out that each CEO interviewed for Bennis' work had become the chief transformational officer for his organization. Bennis completes the parallel
comparason of business to education by citing Waterman's work, *Adhocracy: The Power to Change* (1991) in which Waterman shares that the ideas of Henry Ford, Frederick Taylor, and Max Weber are those of an obsolete paradigm of control, order and prediction that, "haunt our halls of management" (Preface, p. x). Business, like education, is changing paradigms to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow. In business it is the CEO who is critical to transforming the organization.

In the educational change literature the thrust concerning the critical nature of leadership is the same as it is in business. However, as David Gee (1988) found in his work, *The Superintendent: The Missing Link in School Improvement*, the locus of school leadership change has been focused on the individual local school site and on the building principal and teachers, not on the educational CEO, or superintendent. In much of the educational reform and restructuring work the principal is noted as the key player and when administrative leadership is addressed it is in terms of building level administration. Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan and Lee (1982), Edmonds (1982), Mann (1978), and Robinson (1985) were among those who specifically addressed the primacy of the principal in school improvement. Intertwined with this building level focus is the significant role of teacher leadership. Nyberg (1981), Robinson (1985), and the *1986 Carnegie Report* present the literature on the understanding of the crucial role the teacher plays in school reform.
Given that the primary intent of the educational renewal/restructuring movement is to improve the quality of education for students, it is understandable that the initial spotlight of educational change would be on the school site. The school is where education traditionally occurs. Just as in the factory, upon which the assembly-line model of education was developed, the work to develop the product happened on-site. Subsequently, on-site is where the focus for educational improvement has focused. Yet, the locus of leadership differs between business' focus on the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and education's focus on the building principal.

If the business to education comparison were to be maintained, the educational leadership focus should be on the educational CEO, the superintendent. As Gee (1988), noted, "very little attention has been paid to the role of the superintendent and the pivotal role he/she plays in instituting reform efforts" (p.4). Woehl (1989) and Schlechty (1987, 1991) also spoke of the significance of the role of the superintendent and the need that exists for additional exploration into the superintendent's impact on restructuring.

Rather than present an either/or argument in support of the role of the superintendent over that of the principal as the primary agent for reform, we would do better to look at educational improvement as part of change within a system. Fullan (1982) and Sarason (1990) are the most assertive in their belief that no one facet can change an entire organization, but the interactions of the
various roles within a system are crucial in effecting change. Senge (1990) points out that his work is to destroy the belief that the world is created of separate, unrelated forces; rather, he holds that human endeavors are systems of interrelated actions.

As the traditional paradigm focused upon the specific task at a place on the assembly-line, the emerging rule appears to be that of relationships of interaction across the whole system. Echoing the views of Kuhn (1962) and Barker (1985, 1992) about the difficult and troubling aspects of paradigm shifts, Senge (1990) points out that, "since we are part of that lacework ourselves, it's doubly hard to see the whole pattern of change. Instead, we tend to focus on snapshots of isolated parts of the system, and wonder why our deepest problems never seem to get solved" (p. 7).

While it is true that good principals are important to good schools (Edmonds, 1978), it is also true that teachers must be participants as well (Nyberg, 1981). Scrutinizing the role of the superintendent as another part of the wholeness of school reform is valuable. If we are, in fact, in the process of moving beyond tinkering and into fundamental restructuring of schooling organizations, the examples of business transformation can be very instructive. That is not to say that business provides a simple solution for success model to follow. Rather, what it can provide is a process for adaptation of business's experiences to education's realities.

As a gatekeeper, the superintendent is in a fundamentally powerful position. While the superintendent's position is changing
In regard to pure power (Sergiovanni and Moore, 1989; Konnert and Augenstei
1990), the fact remains that legally, organizationally, budgetarily and politically, the superinten
dent holds an important place in the educational hierarchy. As Lewis (1989) points out, adding to the
importance of the superintendent's position is as much what the superintendent can prevent from
taking place as much as what the superintendent can facilitate.

In his works on educational change, Fullan (1982, 1991) notes the importance of the superinten
dent. Fullan holds that just as the principal is important in building level change, the superin
tendent is crucial for district-wide change. Fullan adds that if the superintendent doesn't take the
change seriously, "It has little chance of going beyond the odd classroom or school" (1982, p.165).
Nine years later Fullan extended his findings on the superintendent to include his view that the superin
tendent, "is the single most important individual for setting the expectations and tone of the
pattern of change within the local district" (1991, p. 191). Lezotte and Jacoby (1992) note that the superin
tendent's efforts are usually those that are most critical in the initiation and support of renewal
efforts. The superintendent's importance emanates from the influence on change that the superinten
dent controls in advancing or blocking progress of renewal initiatives. Significant support and
direction are the usual requirements from the superintendent for renewal success.

Further recognition of the importance of the superintendent's role in educational renewal is provided by Fullan (1985),
Sergiovanni (1989), Pajak and Glickman (1989), Schlechty (1987, 1990), Cuban (1989), and Gerstner, Semerad, Doyle, and Johnston (1994). The importance of the school superintendent's role in school renewal is underscored by Cuban (1989) who warned that for those who are involved in improving schools, a clearer understanding of the superintendent's role in changing the school structure is necessary. Additionally, in The Rand Change Agent Study Revisited: Macro Perspectives and Micro Realities (1990), McLaughlin reports that, "without the active support of... the superintendent and principals in project schools, individuals... did not put forth the effort necessary for successful implementation" (p. 12).

In what could serve as a further connection with the business reform model, educational change and systems theorists, Harvey, Frase and Larick (1992) address what they expect of superintendents in the 1990s. They see the '90s superintendent as possessing the insight and skills to invent new school systems to meet the needs of all students. They expect these superintendents to," become leaders of a fundamental revolution in public education" (p. 9), if schools and their leaders are to achieve excellence in learning. The structural position of the superintendent in the organization establishes, as does the CEO's position in business, that this position is the primary one to assume the role of effecting system change. Achieving change across an entire district requires the superintendent's involvement. Otherwise, the change, if it takes hold at all, will be only piecemeal. Peters (1994) emphasizes the importance of executive leadership in reform in all
types of organizations. Peters (1994) adds that mere change is not enough, that the organization must embrace their own revolution to be successful. Strong executive leadership is vital if the organization is to totally change itself to meet the quantum changes occurring in today's society.

Professional career advisor, G. Edward Miller (1995) holds that business today must have leaders, not managers. Miller (1995) elaborates that for an executive to have the opportunity for career advancement today, an understanding of the differences between leadership and management is necessary. Leaders listen, empower, find exceptions to the rules, use meetings for preparation, promote change to improve organizational quality, and use positives and encouragement to promote people.

If the focus on educational renewal is to remain at the building level without an extension to include the superintendent and the district, then the challenge the nation faces is monumental. As Ogden and Germinario (1994) note, there are more than 110,000 schools in the nation, while there are but 16,000 districts. The authors acknowledge that effective instruction takes place in the classroom in the school, but recognize the necessary district role in providing a unified mission, instructional leadership, and support for the effective instruction to take place. They believe it unrealistic to expect 110,000 schools to automatically meet renewal standards without central district organizational support. Smith and O'Day (1993) note that the history of school reform is replete with
promising but eventually failed instances of school-by-school change.

The challenge facing the U.S. in restructuring its educational system to meet the needs of its changing society is immense. Even following nearly 12 years of focus, since the release of the *A Nation At Risk* (1983), America's schools continue to be beset by demands for improvement. Nationally, nearly all parts of society agree on the need for school improvements to meet current and future expectations. Kuhn (1962) and Barker (1985, 1992) would note this agreement for change as evidence of the need for a new paradigm that can address the needed improvements. Branson (1990) points out:

the majority of current teaching practice evolved through non-documented and non-accumulative experience, rather than on principled research . . . most existing practices have been in place for more than a hundred years, long before the first experiments on learning were conducted or verifiable principles of instructional design developed (p.9).

Ferguson (1980) writes in *The Aquarian Conspiracy* that "our interventions in the learning process to date have been crude. It is high time we free ourselves of attachment to old forms and eased the flight of the unfettered human mind" (p. 321). The breaking of attachments to old forms is critical to the renewal of education. According to Kuhn (1962), Barker (1985, 1992), and Branson (1990),
the breaking of the old forms Ferguson (1980) talks about is the change from the old forms of the assembly-line paradigm to the new emerging individual quality oriented paradigm as identified by Siegel and Byrne (1994). Siegel and Byrne (1994) connect the role of system leadership to that of quality change as they cite John Kelsch of Xerox. Kelsch states:

Leaders have to play three roles for Quality implementation to succeed. They have to (1) take ownership of the strategy, (2) lead by example, and (3) make it happen. Leaders can be anywhere in the organization, but only those at the top can impact the entire organization and drive change through" (pp. 50-51).

In the public schools the executive leader of the district is the superintendent and the renewal roles required for this position involve promoting change, even revolution (Peters, 1994).

However, the leadership for change expected of the superintendent is much greater than simply being a change agent for the system. Given the history of the superintendency and the governance structure the superintendent operates within, the change that renewal requires goes to the core of how superintendents see themselves and their work roles. Ogden and Germinario (1994), Siegel and Byrne (1994), Wilson and Daviss (1994), Schlechty (1987, 1991), and Shedd and Bacharach (1991) make note of the need for the individual in the leadership position to be part of the change.
These leaders must more than parrot the changes necessary, these leaders must embrace and live them. Shedd and Bacharach (1991) cite the work of Linda McNeill (1986) which she based on a set of case studies of educational consistency of ends and means. McNeill noted that how administrators treat teachers and how teachers treat students are intermeshed. McNeill points out, "If schools are to teach creativity and problem solving and cooperation and involvement, then they must practice them, not just in the classroom but at all levels of the system" (in Shedd and Bacharach, 1991, p. 194). Peters (1994) and Goldman, Nagel, and Preiss (1995) hold that creativity is the currency of the future. Further reinforcing the power of creativity, Innovation's Adam Smith (Levinson, 1995) relates that according to economist Paul Romer it is ideas that drive economic growth. Romer adds, according to Levinson, that the most important policies of government are those that speed the pace of innovation.

Because they too are a part of the system that they are to lead, superintendents have their own vested interests in the operation of their districts. Superintendents also work within a structure in which they are answerable to those who hire them. As a result, these leaders do not work in a situation where they have total authority and control. Indeed, the expectations of the elected Board of Education, that they work for, have significant implications about how superintendents conduct their work (Konnert and Augenstein, 1990; Schlechty, 1987, 1991; Wilson and Daviss, 1994; and Ogden and Germinario, 1994).
Ogden and Germinario (1994) note that school districts operate consistent with their beliefs and also point out that the clear majority of districts in the United States are conventional. Conventional systems are always the sum of their parts at all times, no more. Any changes must come from the outside. The authors explain, "the response to outside forces that cannot be ignored is usually the 'quick fix', the solution that will impact least on the staff and business as usual" (Ogden and Germinario, 1994, p. 244). Fullan (1991) says that the superintendent is the most important factor in a district in setting the expectations, patterns, and tone of change within the district. However, if acting at cross purposes to the board, the superintendent's tenure will be in jeopardy (Konnert and Augenstein, 1991). Indeed, The SouthEastern Vision for Education (SERVE) reported in 1994 that one of the greatest barriers to school reform was the change of leadership at the local level. Further, SERVE noted that most teachers and principals will outlast state initiatives and local superintendents, creating a belief that "this too will pass" (1994).

Given the expectations of the organization and the political nature of its top governing power, the elected board of education (Wilson and Daviss, 1994), the superintendent is often faced with a who benefits question (Allison, 1971; Black and English, 1986). Conventional districts, according to Ogden and Germinario (1994), have leadership that focuses on operational activities with performance judgements based on operational efficiency, while effective school districts are those focused on supporting schools
that are either effective and still improving or not yet effective, but improving.

The difference between effective and conventional schools is that of process emphasis over student achievement (Ogden and Germinario, 1994). Operational efficiency is the hallmark of the assembly-line model of education. Educating the most for the least cost while meeting minimum standards is the conventional schools' credo. The effective school turns the focus to quality for meeting the individual needs of students.

The type of leadership desired at a conventional school is that of maintaining the status quo, while effective schools require leadership that supports effective school characteristics (Ogden and Germinario, 1994). According to Lezotte (1992, in Ogden and Germinario, 1994, p. 244) effective school district components are very similar to those of the effective school:

* strong instructional leadership
* a clear and focused mission
* a climate of high expectations for success of all students
* a safe, orderly environment
* the opportunity to learn and adequate time spent on academic tasks
* frequent monitoring of student progress
* positive home-school relations

According to Lezotte (1992), Ogden and Germinario (1994), and Schlechty (1987, 1991), the role of the superintendent as change
agent includes understanding, promoting, and living the renewal process of the school district.

Cuban (1989) writes that we need to look at the history of the position, the varied roles of the local superintendent, as well as the nature of leadership and school change to see that local superintendents are in a position to restructure schooling. Cuban ascertained that conflict was always the *sine que non* of the superintendency. From the mid-nineteenth century, much of the focus of the local superintendency was on managerial functions. As state funds began to be appropriated for schooling, legislators wanted an accounting of those funds. This desire for accountability led to the formation of state education managers and local volunteer committees, which ultimately evolved into school boards.

Further growth of the educational bureaucracy developed as more schools were needed for the nation's increasing population. This growth in schools, supported by state funds, led to full time state superintendents, county superintendents and local superintendents. While the state and county superintendencies were formed by statute, the local superintendency arose from the local level to meet local schooling needs. Even to present times, the position of the local superintendent, in statute since the mid-1870s, remained nebulous, left to the discretion of local boards of education (Nolte, 1971). Konnert and Augenstein (1990) note that the history of the local superintendency serves to increase the difficulty for superintendents to assume leadership and change functions.
By the 1920's the superintendent's managerial expectations increased as progressive school reformers, who wanted the schools to function like successful businesses, determined that superintendents should be experts. But that expertise was to be engineers to design educational blueprints, again managerial tasks (Cuban, 1989).

From the 1920s through the 1950s superintendents were removed from party politics as school boards became non partisan positions and professional training became expected for superintendents. During this time period expectations of political favors were removed from the superintendent's table; but, disagreements arose as these expert superintendents conflicted with teachers, principals, and school boards over who would control the schools' agenda (Wirt and Kirst, 1989).

During the 1960s and 1970s social turmoil and economic retrenchments buffeted superintendents. Producing the highest turnover rates since World War I. While the rate has slowed, casualties persist in the 1980s. Cuban (1989) suggests that since schooling is public business, school boards and their superintendents must have public funds to exist. The continual quest for adequate funding to meet the complex goals expected of schools forces school boards and superintendents to gain friends and avoid conflict within and outside of the school community. The impact of social legislation upon schools, most notably desegregation, can generate significant unrest within school districts.
Cuban (1989) adds that schooling in America is public business with competing claims on how tax dollars need to be spent across the community. When shifts occur in social expectations, like with the economy, there can be significant impact on the public schools and on the superintendency. According to Konnert and Augenstein (1990) the early superintendents were not expected to be leaders, rather they were to be managers and reporters. That expectation continues to a large extent today.

To address the shifts in social expectations cited by Cuban, the superintendent is required to possess leadership acumen, change process knowledge, and patience if the superintendent is to function as the instructional leader of the school district. Yet, citizens and parents tend not to see the superintendent as an educational authority. These community members often develop their own beliefs. These people then often bring considerable political pressure on the locally elected and funded board to have their views implemented (Konnert and Augenstein, 1990).

The task of the superintendency becomes increasingly difficult when state reform is adopted with too little input from educational professionals and with inadequate attention to research findings (Chance, 1986). Without the input from the educational professionals, state laws were designed to be managed effectively through a top-down regulatory process. The lack of attention to research findings meant that reforms were based on assumptions that might be politically expedient but otherwise might not work as presumed. Yet, as more problems beset the schools, the more
outside authorities imposed remedial or mandated policies. This created further problems. as Chubb (1987) found, local autonomy was second only to student aptitude for impact on student learning. The superintendent was often caught between state mandates that had little likelihood for success and the local community that exerts the greatest immediate pressure and influence on the school system. The superintendent is then called upon to balance local, often parochial demands, against state level mandates that, due to their general design, often don’t apply to the local situation (Konnert and Augenstein, 1990). This balancing was especially difficult during the first wave of reform, as a lack of local capacity led to a gap between state and local expectations and what the school system was equipped to deliver (Passow, 1989).

However, as Wirt and Kirst (1989) noted from Chubb's work (1987), the usurping of local autonomy by state mandates would weaken system effectiveness and thus student performance which would then lead to further state mandates for increased state control. The point is then raised that faced with such a cycle, administrators often respond with symbolic reform through procedural compliance. In effect state control can reinforce managerial role responses from superintendents as local autonomy is removed from school districts.

Chubb (1987) studied the effect of the school organization on student performance in a national study of over 25,000 students. The data from this study was supplemented with administrator-teacher studies of the school organization. The results showed a
positive correlation between local autonomy and student achievement. Further, within the local autonomy findings, Chubb (1987) noted that the leadership style for this organizational format was democratic and not authoritarian. The team approach works best in the educational organization. The implication for superintendents and educational policy makers is that the role of the superintendent should shift from that of autocrat, utilizing top-down leadership to that of capacity builder, supporting bottom-up leadership.

Wirt and Kirst (1989) note that this difference of leadership roles must confuse superintendents caught in the new politics of education. Another piece for understanding leadership function is to review how the current best practice role of the local superintendency has evolved from manager to power-sharing leader, who actively supports the instructional program. Of additional significance is that individuals in the superintendency are still perceived, accurately or not, as needing to fulfill their role from any of a number of leadership theories (Wirt and Kirst, 1989).

Leadership theories are used in an attempt to explain the results of the consequences of leadership or the factors that emerge as the leader materializes. The following five models are well established in research. These models are descriptions of the theory to be used for study. These leadership theories include: the Great Man Theories; Trait Theory; Environmental/Situational Theories; Personal/Situational Theories; and Psychoanalytic Theories.
F. A. Woods researched the Great Man Theory and determined that the leadership of great men shaped history (Bass, 1981). Woods noted the impact of Moses, Churchill, and Lenin, for example, in determining that the man shapes the nation in accordance to his abilities. Wiggam (1931) extended this theory to include survival of the fittest by holding that superior leaders are a function of high birth rates among the abler classes. Wiggam's theory stresses that individuals will always be led by the superior leader, regardless of the direction taken.

The Great Man Theory supports the Trait Theory in that leaders are empowered with superior intelligence, energy, and moral strength differentiating the leader from the masses. But Gouldner (1964) reported that reliable evidence does not exist supporting universal leadership traits.

The Environmental/Situational Theory is an extension of the Great Man Theory. Pearson (1928) held that leadership can be accounted for by the particular situation which determines the leader and the leadership qualities needed for that situation. Further, Pearson also postulated that the individual qualities that are situationally determined as necessary leadership qualities are in fact the result of prior leadership situations that formed the individual's leadership qualities. The leader is the locus for solution which consists of the interaction of the leader and the situation.

The Personal/Situational Theory (Bass, 1981) holds that the Great Man and Situational do not stand alone. Rather, the interaction of situational and individual factors make up the
leadership factors employed. There are three factors to leadership that produce effective results according to this theory: the nature of the group; the problem confronting the group; and the personality traits of the individual. The relationship between the leader's traits and the characteristics of the group must have a relevant connection (Stogdill, 1948). Bennis (1961) suggested including interpersonal bureaucracy, informal organization, interpersonal relations, benevolent autocracy, self-actualization, participatory management, and joint consultation to this theory of leadership. Bass (1981) adds that relevant concerns are the motives of the leader, the perceptions different publics have of the leader, the types of roles the leader employs, and the context of the situation. The interaction of the leader's goals and the needs and goals of the followers makes up the dynamics of the Personal/Situational Theory.

The leader is viewed as a source of love or fear in the Psychoanalytic Theory. The leader is held to superhuman standards by followers, who are unaware of these subliminal projections. Devries (1977) determined that leaders in this charismatic theory can serve the group well depending on whether the leader can focus the paranoid potential and sense of omnipotence into the group's reality.

In addition to the five theories already presented there are other, more current theories, which also shed some light on leadership positions. Bass (1981) delineates the circumstances in which Interaction/Expectation Theories, Humanistic Theories, Exchange Theories, Behavioral Theories, and Perceptual and
Cognitive Theories are used to determine the individual's characteristics as they blend with situational demands. Leader Role Theory is one of the seven categories comprising the Interaction/ Expectation Theories (Bass, 1981). Leader Role Theory defines leadership as the origination of interaction that facilitates goal attainment while strengthening relationships within the group. Role Attainment Theory developed from Stogdill's (1959) finding that leadership potential is defined through mutual goal settings in which the individual initiates and maintains interactions. Bass (1960) relates that Reinforced Change Leadership Theory defines leadership as the ability to enable a group to achieve expected goals. The leader gets the group to change the motivation, understanding and/or the behavior of group members. Path/ Goal Leadership Theory occurs when the leader clarifies the follower's goals and paths necessary to reach expected goals. In Path/Goal Leadership Theory the leader controls the group's values, while the circumstances of the situation determine what leader behavior, as determined by the leader, will achieve the goals. The followers skills and motivations improve the leader's effectiveness in the Two Stage Model (Bass, 1960). Fiedler (1967) in the Contingency Theory holds that the leader's effectiveness is contingent on situational demands. The Multiple Screen Model, developed by Fiedler and Leister (1977), consists of the belief that there are personal and/or interpersonal relationships that halts the group's performance from connecting to the leader's intelligence. However, when there are
good leader/boss and leader/group relations and the leader is motivated, the relationship is strong.

It is the function of the leader in Humanistic Theories of leadership (Bass, 1981) to enable individuals to meet their own needs while also contributing to the fulfillment of organizational goals. McGregor (1966) found that there were two types of organizational leadership. Theory X holds that people passively resist organizational needs, while Theory Y is based on the belief that people desire responsibility and are highly motivated.

Exchange Theory is based on the assumption that interaction among group members represents an exchange in which members make contributions and receive resultant benefits from the group. Blau (1964) explains that the leader's actions benefit the leader as much as the group and results in a surplus leadership profit.

Rewarding certain behaviors reinforces the leader's position in Behavior Theory (Bass, 1981). This situation exists when the leader's delivery of rewards is contingent on group member's behavior.

Attribution Theory, Leadership as Human Problem Solving Theory, Systems Analysis Theory, and Rational/Deductive Approaches Theory comprise the Perceptual and Cognitive Theories (Bass, 1981). Attribution Theory is viewed as a study in how the term leadership is used, when it is used, and includes assumptions about the nature of leadership. Human Problem Solving Leadership describes instances when initiative was taken by the leader and the group and the specific task had no structure. Sensitivity to the
organization within the larger environment sets out the Systems Analysis Theory. In this theory the entire organization including the group and the leader are open systems sensitive to the larger environment's constraints and benefits. In participatory processes all in the system are involved in the give and take sensitivity of the organization to and from the larger environment. If the leader does the give and take alone, the process is directive. The Rational/Deductive Approach Theory suggests that the leader should be directive when the leader is confident that he knows what needs to be done and the group's subordinates lack the same understanding and/or knowledge (Vroom and Yetton in Bass, 1981).

What is most instructive about this plethora of leadership theories is that there has never been a single viewpoint about how leaders operate nor why they lead in the fashion they choose, whether by choice or by instinct. Indeed, across the leadership opportunities in the United States, each of these theories can be found today, for as Peters (1994) notes, most organizations operate out of outdated management theories. While some theories fit the majority of situations at one time or another, the history of leadership is one of constant change.

The evolution of the theories themselves are evidence that change is the *sine que non* of leadership (Cuban, 1989). The common message that Toffler (1970), Main (1987), Senge (1990), Barker (1992), and Peters (1994) offer most strongly is that the only thing that a leader, or anyone, can be sure of is that change will
occur. In such a volatile environment leadership requires people who can survive and prosper in situations that are ambiguous and lack certainty (Peters, 1994). Harvey, Frase, and Larick in 8 Tasks for Superintendents of the '90s (1992) hold that, "The "New Age" school superintendent must possess creative insight into the twenty-first century and skills to invent new school systems capable of preparing all people for life in the learning society" (p. 9). These authors continue that there are eight themes or indicators of what must happen if leaders and schools are to reach excellence in learning. These eight themes consist of projecting passion, recapturing the focus, coordinating services, redefining success, encouraging professional freedom, utilizing performance rewards, ensuring the hiring of quality staff, and maintaining personal physical and mental health.

Harvey, Frase, and Larick (1992) detail these eight themes as follows. In projecting passion the superintendent as an instructional leader must project clear priorities focusing on student learning. The superintendent projects a passion for high achievement with a commitment to support the entire organization. The superintendent must lead a recapturing of organizational focus that promotes student learning. To support this learning focus others must be brought into the organization from the environment to perform social services. By bringing outside services into the schools, a significant administrative role will be coordinating these services with the learning focus. Superintendents must promote sound assessment systems that focus on essential learning. Appropriate
authority must be spread through the district to enable the system to closely match expected outcomes with performance. This match occurs through practices chosen at the delivery site to best meet individual student needs. It is the superintendent's responsibility to promote freedom within the organization to do the job promoting student learning. The redefinition of roles within the school system is part of the job for the superintendent to oversee. It will be critical for the superintendent to support the development of an organizational culture that honors, inspires, and rewards outstanding performance. A major priority in the '90s is to ensure that only the best personnel work with students with the resources needed to succeed. The superintendendency today exacts too great a toll on the individual. Quality leadership will continue to require stamina and high energy through excellent mental and physical health. Formal and informal structures must be built to support superintendents. Further, the superintendent must attend to his/her own well-being.

**Summary**

In summary, the research suggests that educational renewal continues to be a dynamic enterprise through the nearly 12 years that have followed the release of *A Nation At Risk* (1983). A review of the literature brings an understanding that educational renewal is moving into a time of systemic change following earlier waves of educational reform. The first wave reforms were state mandated
symptomatic responses. Second wave reforms focused on local responses to state mandates and promoted local building autonomy in determining the next steps for educational renewal. The authors of current research recommend a systemic, aligned state and local approach to educational renewal. Goals and directions are set at the state level while local building flexibility, supported by school district services, is provided to meet individual student learning requirements. Facilitating such a systemic reform structure requires executive leadership from the school district superintendent. The superintendent's leadership bridges state expectations to local school building capabilities.

There is a need to explore the effects of the local superintendent's executive leadership on an educational restructuring process that actively promotes systemic approaches to educational renewal. As one of the nation's most comprehensive systemic approaches to educational renewal, Ohio's Venture Capital process provides an opportunity to explore the local superintendent's role within such a restructuring endeavor.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES

The Ohio State Department of Education under State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Ted Sanders, developed Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal (1993) to act as a vehicle to initiate and support school renewal in Ohio's public school buildings. This initiative was developed in response to a Governor's Task Force on Education organizational study of the Ohio Department of Education. One of the items recommended by the Task Force was an agenda for state supported and sponsored innovation and experimentation by school districts across Ohio.

The specific project that became the vehicle for transformation of schools in Ohio is known as Venture Capital. The purpose of Venture Capital was to initiate and support building level explorations of fundamental change in teaching and learning, assessment, governance, organization, and professional development. The Ohio Legislature funded the first two years of Venture Capital through the biennial budget process, which is the time limit of their budgeting and general fund state funding authority.

Venture Capital was initiated in the summer of 1993 with the statewide presentation of Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal. The
Venture Capital initiative was launched with the support of the Ohio Department of Education, the Ohio Governor, and the Ohio Legislature. Additionally, the Ohio business community, through the Governor's Education Management (GEM) Council, has been very involved in the development of Ohio's statewide renewal initiatives.

At the state level the government and the business community are working together for the renewal of Ohio's schools. Since the focus of Venture Capital is at the local school community level, what needs to be determined is the local school community view of Venture Capital.

This study examined the beliefs about the Ohio school district superintendent's role in school renewal through the vehicle of the Venture Capital process. In concert with this study are two other pending studies that are examining the Ohio Venture Capital process from the perspective of the elementary level building principals and of the secondary level building principals. When completed, the three studies will encompass the district level executive administrator through the building level administrator. The three researchers' combined efforts and expertise were employed whenever possible, and supported by Dr. Brad L. Mitchell, advisor and Principal Investigator of the studies.

The results of this study of Ohio superintendents were intended to expand the understanding about the role of the district superintendent in the application and initial implementation process of a state level initiated educational renewal project, Venture Capital. An increase in the understanding of the roles within the
educational organization can aid in the success of Venture Capital and other state educational renewal efforts. The district superintendent as executive administrator is an important part of the organization's structure.

Data Collection

The investigator utilized two sources of data collection. The major source of information used in this study was a questionnaire mailed to each of the Ohio district superintendents who had one or more school buildings that were awarded a Venture Capital grant during the first round of such awards. The first round schools submitted their applications during the summer of 1993; received notice of a required endorsing interview in January, 1994; were interviewed in late winter, 1994; and were awarded the $25,000 first year funding in early spring, 1994.

The survey's mailing was timed to be received by superintendents in early August, 1994. The intent was to get the survey to the superintendents after most had returned from vacation but before job demands of the coming school year limited their time.

The initial group of 197 schools receiving Venture Capital resulted in a population of 113 Ohio district superintendents. The source of information for these 113 superintendents was the Ohio Department of Education, Division of School Improvement. In addition to the names of the 113 district Venture Capital recipient
superintendents, the Ohio Department of Education, Division of School Improvement provided multiple sets of mailing labels. The multiple mailing label sets were necessary because the Dillman Total Design Method (Dillman, 1978) employed multiple mailings to ensure a high survey response rate from these superintendents.

While a sample of the 113 Venture Capital superintendents could have been selected for personal interviews it was determined that it would be more important to survey the entire population of Venture Capital superintendents. Upon reviewing Rossi, Wright, and Anderson's *Handbook of Survey Research* (1983) and Dillman's *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method* (1978), the researcher determined that surveying the entire population of Venture Capital superintendents through a mail survey would provide the most valuable information for this study. Additionally, the researcher had consulted with other researchers including Dr. Raymond H. Swassing, graduate committee member, who had often successfully utilized the Dillman Total Design Method when responses from large samples or whole populations were sought.

The Total Design Method (TDM) developed by Dillman (1983) consists of two parts: (a) identifying and designing each aspect of the survey process that may affect response in a way that maximizes response rates; and (b) organizing the survey effort in a way that assures that the design intentions are carried out in complete detail. To build upon the Dillman recommendations for maximizing response rates and upon the recommendation of major advisor, Dr. Brad Mitchell, the services of Polimetrics: Laboratory
for Political and Social Research at The Ohio State University was employed to ensure the strongest possible implementation of Dillman's parts (a) and (b).

The Total Design Method survey procedure is further divided into two additional parts: (1) questionnaire construction; and (2) survey implementation. Each part consists of a number of precise steps (Dillman, 1983) that were utilized by the researcher in this study.

Following the Total Design Method for constructing the questionnaire (Dillman, 1983), the design process employed by the researcher and supported by the Polimetrics Laboratory was as follows:

1. The questionnaire was designed as a booklet, the size being 6 1/2 by 8 1/2 inches. It was typed on white paper 8 1/2 by 11 inches and reduced to booklet size and printed on light gray paper consistent to one of the colors of The Ohio State University. The color change was utilized to cause the survey to stand out from white.
2. The first page contained an illustration and a title.
3. No questions were printed on the last page (the back cover) as it served to invite respondents to add additional comments regarding the subject of the survey.

Before the survey booklets were mailed, the questionnaires were coded individually to represent the individual and the district.
The coding was placed on the back of the envelope that contained the questionnaire packet. The code was placed in the lower right corner of the envelope and was transposed to the survey form upon receipt for the ease of recording and record keeping order. In three instances respondents inked out the code. In two instances the code was retrievable. For the third a dummy case code was entered to allow the data to be compiled with the other responses. Subsequently, this respondent, whose response was placed into the dummy case, was contacted in the follow-up steps to the process, as without the coding the researcher could not determine that the respondent had returned the survey. Returned questionnaires were recorded by date of return with a determination if the respondent had included additional written comments, and to note if the respondent had requested results of the study.

On July 29, 1994 the 113 Venture Capital superintendents across Ohio were mailed an initial letter from the study's Principal Investigator, Dr. Brad Mitchell (Appendix C). This letter was prepared on Department of Educational Policy and Leadership, The Ohio State University, stationary and congratulated the superintendent for receiving Venture Capital monies. Further, Dr. Mitchell addressed the importance of the superintendent's response to the survey and then explained what would be in the survey packet the superintendent would receive the following week. The letter concluded with an assurance of confidentiality and the opportunity to call Dr. Mitchell if the superintendent had any questions. These letters and their envelopes were individually
addressed to each superintendent. The letters also included Dr. Mitchell's signature.

On the following August 5, 1994, the survey questionnaire booklet (Appendix B) was mailed to each of the 113 Venture Capital superintendents. With the survey document was a cover letter from Dr. Kathleen Carr, Associate Director and Senior Research Associate of the Polimetrics Laboratory for Political and Social Research (Appendix C), which covered the exact same items as Dr. Mitchell's letter. Additionally, a letter of project support was included from Dr. James Hyre (Appendix C). Dr. Hyre, Superintendent of the Hamilton County School System, Ohio was then also President of the Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Ohio's superintendent's professional association. A stamped, return address envelope was also enclosed.

Seven days after the survey packet was mailed, a postcard was mailed to each Venture Capital superintendent. The postcards were reminders for completing the survey. One month after the first mailing, a second questionnaire packet was sent to those participants who had not responded by August 29, 1994. This packet included all the materials in the first mailing including a stamped return envelope. Between September 26, 1994 and October 7, 1994 telephone calls were made to the 56 non-respondents. Each of the non-respondents were contacted directly except for one individual who had retired, was traveling across the United States, and could not be reached. Five of the non-respondents said that they would not respond and gave
specific reasons for their non-response. This information will be addressed in Chapter IV as it does shed some light on the beliefs of at least one superintendent. Subsequently, all but sixteen questionnaires were returned by October 13, 1994, the date set to close the questionnaire process and to start compiling the data from all the returned surveys. After the closing date one questionnaire was returned, but it was not included in the totals. The 97 responses represented a nearly 86% response rate from the population of 113 Venture Capital Superintendents.

The second source of information consisted of personal interviews. One interview was conducted by telephone with Ron Rapp, a national educational policy analyst for the Education Commission of the States (ECS) in Denver, Colorado on January 26, 1995. Mr. Rapp's information provided the most current information available from a national perspective to determine if there were any similar projects in the country. Further, because of ECS's interest in Venture Capital, Mr. Rapp was able to provide a national perspective as to how ECS was comparing Venture Capital to other state educational restructuring initiatives across the nation.

A second interview was with Mr. Warren Russell, Director of Legislative Services for the Ohio School Boards Association on February 20, 1995. Prior to assuming his current position, Mr. Russell was the Director of Legislative Services for the Ohio Department of Education. It was Mr. Russell's responsibility to lead the State Board of Education's budget proposal through the Ohio
legislative process. Mr. Russell was privy to information, second only to Dr. Sanders, concerning the creation of Ohio's Venture Capital process. The information from the Warren Russell interview was critical about Ohio's intentional systemic approach to school renewal including Venture Capital. Scheduled interviews with Dr. Ted Sanders, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, were cancelled, because of necessary budget meetings with the Ohio legislative leadership for the 1995 - 1997 budget.

**The Survey Instrument**

The 53 item questionnaire (Appendix B) was divided into eight subsets of questions that addressed the following about the Venture Capital superintendent: leadership role within school renewal; professional development needed to support the superintendent's leadership role in school renewal; agreement with basic renewal principals; view of the impact of the Venture Capital application on the school district; view of the level of district support and improvement since the Venture Capital application, but before the award was known; valuing of the structural components of the Venture Capital renewal process; beliefs about changes needed in the Venture Capital process; and personal information.

The first subset of fourteen (14) items concerned the specific components that make up the school renewal aspects of the Venture Capital process and the importance of the superintendent's leadership role in regard to these items. These elements were
identified in the literature on school renewal and were also identified in the Venture Capital monograph, *Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal* (Ohio Department of Education, 1993).

The second subset of the same fourteen (14) items focused on the personal professional development needs of the superintendents. The superintendents' beliefs about their skill levels in support of their leadership role with school renewal were examined. These questions were included to provide information regarding the importance of professional development, as noted in the renewal literature and the Venture Capital monograph.

Subset three consisted of four (4) items which formed the basic beliefs of Venture Capital. These items were found in the monograph and were evident in the educational restructuring literature. The depth of the superintendents' agreement with these principles was sought.

The fourth subset consisted of ten (10) items that sought the superintendents' responses to the actions that the Venture Capital proposal process precipitated in the district while the application was under development. The literature review addressed various challenges that leaders of school renewal faced.

The five (5) items of subset five also sought additional information about the various challenges that faced school renewal leaders. However, this group of questions looked at the time period following the application's submission, but before notice of award was known.
As an overview of the Venture Capital grant process itself, superintendents were to respond to six (6) items in subset six about procedural aspects. These questions were founded in the renewal literature and the monograph.

Subset seven was concerned with the superintendents' views about the individual superintendent's and the school board's levels of involvement in Venture Capital. One of the four (4) questions asked was if the application process was worth doing and, if there were the opportunity, would the superintendent support the process again. Two of the questions also provided space for written responses.

The last subset, subset eight, consisted of ten (10) items of personal information. This information was requested to gather descriptive information to develop a profile of Venture Capital Superintendents.

In subsets one through six, Likert-type scales were used (Mclver and Carmines, 1981). Subscale one demanded the greatest degree of specificity, given the nature of the questions. As a result, a seven point scale was utilized with the opposing anchors consisting of "extremely important" and ranging to "extremely unimportant". Subset two incorporated a three point scale ranging from "great need" to "some need" to "none". Subsets three through six had five point scales ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". However, these subsets also included another response, #9, that included the response "don't know or not applicable". In responding
to these scales, the respondent superintendent was to circle the appropriate response.

For the seventh subset a different format was used. With the first two of the four questions of this section, the superintendents were to determine if levels of involvement should have been "increased, decreased, or stayed the same". If "stayed the same" was selected, the respondent was to skip question three and go to the fourth question. Question three asked for a written response to the changes checked in questions one and two. Question four asked a "yes" or "no" question that was to be checked, as questions one and two were to be answered. Additionally, question four had space for a written response to explain their "yes" or "no" answer more completely.

The last subset, concerning ten personal profile questions, provided spaces for responses to eight of the questions and allowed for checks for the other two questions.

Finally, a prompt for comments followed with space available at the bottom half of that page and on the back cover. All of the parts that went into the questionnaire were developed utilizing the Total Design Method (Dillman, 1978). Additionally, recommendations of the Polimetrics Lab staff and Dr. Mitchell were incorporated into the survey's design to ensure a high response rate.
Instrument Validity and Reliability

To assess the content validity of the questionnaire, a panel of experts, who had experience as district superintendents and who also were knowledgeable about school renewal, were solicited to review the questionnaire. These individuals could not be selected from the population being surveyed. The panel consisted of: Dr. Jim Hyre, Superintendent of the Hamilton County Schools; Dr. Dave Distel, Assistant Superintendent of the Hamilton County Schools and a former local superintendent; Dr. Don McIntyre, retired Superintendent of the Franklin County Schools; and Dr. Judy Hummell, Co-Director of the Central Ohio Regional Professional Development Center and a former district superintendent. In addition to the other listed criteria, these people were chosen because they were dependable, accessible, forthright, and trustworthy.

Additionally, the Polimetrics Laboratory at The Ohio State University reviewed the questionnaire prior to its administration and made structural recommendations supporting Dillman's Total Design Method (1978). The Polimetrics Laboratory staff recommended the increase in scale responses for the first subset of survey questions from five choices to seven. Further, a recommendation was made to add a sixth choice of "don't know/not applicable" to the five scale responses employed. These changes were made.
The superintendent/renewal expert panel had no trouble with the wording of the questionnaire. They found the instrument to be clear with understandable directions and phrasing. The clarity of wording, directions, and phrasing was one of the areas where the Polimetrics Laboratory provided expertise to the researcher to strengthen instrument validity and reliability (Converse and Presser, 1986). However, the expert panel strongly expressed a need to reduce the length of the questionnaire. As one of the panel members stated, "It is too damn long, superintendents will not do it!" Accordingly, any question not absolutely fundamental to the instrument was removed and the questionnaire was significantly shortened. Upon further review the panel agreed to the deletions and believed that no important questions were lost.

The largest question reduction came from the personal information section. The superintendent panel believed that the removed questions were not critical. They also suggested checking with The Ohio Department of Education to determine if the information could be provided from state sources. The investigator received assurances from the Ohio Department of Education, Division of School Improvement, that the information would be provided. However, when the information was formally requested, those individuals who had made the assurances informed the investigator that their system could not provide the information requested as promised. This did not affect the results of this study since the expert panel had determined that the information sought was not
vital; rather, the panel suggested that it would be helpful for follow-up studies that would emanate from this initial work.

The reliability of the instrument was addressed throughout the development of the survey in collaboration with the Polimetrics Laboratory. The focus during the survey's construction and the piloting by the expert panel was to ensure clarity that would support the reliability and validity of the instrument (Converse and Presser, 1986).

To test for reliability, the researcher in consultation with the Polimetrics Laboratory staff determined that, because survey subsets one, two, and three each had a single underlying measurable basis to the sub-section, a Cronbach Alpha test could be applied (Bohrnstedt, 1983). The results of the Cronbach Alpha test (Table 1) to subsets one, two, and three strongly demonstrated that the survey construction provided for a high level of reliability for those three subsets. The coefficient alpha ranged from .9715 for subset one, to .8472 for subset two, and .9701 for subset three. The other subsets of the survey instrument, while developed with the same emphasis on clear wording, directions, and phrasing, were not constructed on a single measurable underlying basis, because the layout employed was temporal. The focus in those sections, as they were developed, was to support the recall of the respondent. Due to the sequential nature of the instrument's subsets, the likelihood of accurate recall was increased.

In consultation with the staff of the Polimetrics Laboratory, the researcher determined that the clarity of the survey
instrument's wording, the use of an expert panel, and the provision for 5 point scale responses with a sixth choice for "don't know or not applicable" provided adequate validity, internal consistency, and reliability to the survey instrument. Given the concern about increasing the accuracy of the respondent's memory, focusing the sub-sections that followed sub-sections one, two, and three on a temporal layout best met the criteria set out in the Total Design Method (Dillman, 1978).

**Analysis of Data**

Descriptive statistics were used to present and analyze the data on the respondents and their responses. Frequencies and means of response were provided through the SPSS-X computer statistics program that was used on the mainframe computer at the Ohio State University.

In analyzing the data a two-tailed t-test was used rather than employing an inferential hypothesis. A number of factors led to this choice. First, Venture Capital is a unique program. In reviewing the literature about state educational incentive programs that are of a systemic nature, there are no examples that are like Venture Capital. Additionally, in an interview with a policy analyst from the Education Commission of the States, who has been assigned to research Ohio's Venture Capital program, it became evident that Ohio's program is unlike any other state program. What sets Ohio apart is the comprehensive nature of the state system that includes
Venture Capital. To use an inferential hypothesis, the reform effort used for prediction must occur within a framework that incorporates the entire restructuring system. Because no other system is as comprehensive as Ohio's, there is no existing model to predict what to expect from such a comprehensive program. Given that this is one of the first studies of a systemic change program for an entire state restructuring process, making an inferential hypothesis would be based on guesswork rather than upon an information based assumption. In such a situation we really cannot predict the direction in which the unusual results may occur (Blalock, 1972).

The two-tailed t-test allows for determining where the coefficient p value falls on the cumulative distribution frequency on both the far left and far right away from the middle of the probability distribution (Elifson, 1982; Blalock, 1972). In looking at significance, levels up to .05 for sample survey results, and somewhat higher for census of population surveys are acceptable. Further, this test allows observation of the probability distributions at both the extremes rather than to only one direction as with the inferential hypothesis. Building upon this research's findings would provide the basis for employing an inferential hypothesis. In discussions with the Polimetrics Laboratory staff, the researcher determined that the 2-tailed t-test results would be significant up to the .12 level. Because a population rather than a sample has been surveyed the results for significance can be relaxed from the .05 level. This means that on either side of the distribution, .06 is
within the range for significance. However, it is important to keep in mind that the smaller the p value the stronger the significance.

In the 97 responses analyzed there were occasions where the respondents did not respond to every question in the survey instrument. Upon reviewing the literature about such missing data (McIver and Carmines, 1981; Anderson, Basilevsky, and Hum, 1983; Foreman, 1991) and discussing the issue with the Polimetrics Laboratory staff, the researcher determined that the missing data was random in nature and that the data analysis would not be improved by any further manipulation of existing data. Attempting to generate responses from inferences made from other responses would not significantly improve data analysis. Also, to remove all the responses from respondents who randomly left a question unanswered would not significantly improve the data. The data was then analyzed based upon the actual number of responses that occurred for each question.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe how local school district superintendents in Ohio viewed: the efficacy of the Venture Capital process; the impact of the proposal process; and the effects of the Venture Capital process on the school community. The Venture Capital process circumvented traditional central office administration authority by focusing process decisions and budget control at the building level. Did local school superintendents in districts that received Venture Capital grants support the notion of building-level empowerment? Specifically, this study addressed:

1. To what extent did local superintendents in this study agree with the four common school improvement beliefs delineated by the Ohio Department of Education?

2. What are common leadership characteristics of local superintendents with Venture Capital schools in their districts?

3. What kind of professional development has been identified as needed by local superintendents to implement Venture Capital effectively?
4. How did Venture Capital grants change the way local superintendents perceive the state role in local school improvement?

5. To what extent did local superintendents believe the Venture Capital proposal process diverted attention from existing local school improvement activities?

6. Did the local superintendents find the Venture Capital application process valuable for local school improvement?

The results reported in this chapter are based on data obtained from 97 of the 113 first round Venture Capital Superintendents in Ohio.

Demographic Data

The 97 superintendents who responded to the survey comprised nearly 86% of the 113 districts that received Venture Capital grants in the first round of selections. Further, there were telephone responses from five superintendents who refused to take the time to respond to the survey instrument. Of the five who specifically refused to participate, one had retired, sold his home, and was traveling around the world. The second and third refusals occurred because these superintendents were not interested in the process. Further, they said that they had no involvement in developing the Venture Capital process, that following development
the Venture Capital program was put into effect with no opportunity for input from superintendents. The fourth refusal was because the superintendent had an extensive illness and could not complete the survey. The fifth refusal was specifically because the superintendent was too busy with a school levy campaign to take the time to respond to the survey. Four of the refusals were from city school district superintendents from the Northeastern portion of Ohio. The fifth refusal was a local district superintendent also from the Northeast.

Of the other 11 superintendents who did not complete the survey instrument and return it to the researcher, one sent his in after the deadline. The other ten had promised to respond in the reminder phone calls, but did not follow through in returning the completed survey instruments. These 11 non-respondents consisted of four City superintendents, four were superintendents in Exempted Village Districts, and three were Local superintendents. Total non-respondents were made up of eight City superintendents, four Local superintendents, and four Exempted Village superintendents.

For those superintendents who made up the 97 respondents; 51 were City superintendents, 36 were Local superintendents, six were Exempted Village superintendents, and four were Joint Vocational School superintendents. Of the 86% responding superintendents (n = 97), 90 of those responding were male and 6 were female with one non-response about gender. Additionally, of those responding; four superintendents classified themselves as
African-American, 89 classified themselves as Caucasian, and 2 classified themselves as Native-American with two non-responses about race.

The superintendents responding ranged in age from 64 years old (born in 1931) to 38 years old (born in 1957). The mean for these superintendents was a birth date in 1944, which would make them 50 to 51 years old. Administrative experience ranged from seven years to 32 years with 3 non-responses, while the mean for administrative experience was nearly 20 years. For the majority of these superintendents this was their first superintendency (n = 49 or 51%). Specific superintendent experience ranged from the first superintendency through the seventh with one non-respondent. The mean of superintendencies was 1.75.

The teaching experience ranged from two years to 25 years with a mean of nearly seven years. The terminal degree status consisted of 46 Masters Degrees, 43 Doctorates, and 6 other types of terminal degrees. The average responding superintendent's tenure in their current district was almost 5 1/2 years. Over half of these superintendents (n = 52 or 54.2%) had 4 or fewer years in their current position. Experience in their current superintendency ranged from one year (n = 14 or 14.6%) through 21 years (n = 1 or 1%). 65.7% (n = 63) of the superintendents had five or fewer years at their current position and by the tenth year of experience 89.6% (n = 86) of the superintendents were accounted for. Only 10.4% (n = 10) of the superintendents responding had more than ten years as superintendent in their current district.
The mean for the responding superintendents was 7 years of experience as a Local Superintendent (n = 49). For City Superintendency experience the mean was 6.3 years (n = 49). Exempted Village Superintendent experience had a 5 year mean (n = 9). County Superintendent experience had a 5.8 year mean (n = 5). The mean for Joint Vocational School Superintendent experience was 7.8 years (n = 5). The mean of total superintendent experience across the 87 respondents was nearly 9 total years with total experience ranging from one year through 26 years.

Some additional demographic information is presented in Appendix D. Through a comparison of superintendents in their first superintendency and those in their second through fourth, additional differences surfaced. Superintendents in their first superintendency had a mean of 18.5 years of administrative experience, while those in their second through fourth superintendency had a mean of 21.4 years of administrative experience. However, in reviewing teaching experience, those in their first superintendency had a mean of 7.8 years of teaching experience, while those in their second through fourth superintendency had only a 5.6 year mean for teaching experience. When urban superintendents were compared to non-urban superintendents, the urban superintendents had a mean of only 4.3 years teaching experience, while non-urban superintendents had a mean of 6.8 years teaching experience.

When examining the terminal degree status of superintendents, 55% (n = 49) of City Superintendents held
doctorates compared to 33% (n = 36) of Local Superintendents and 33% (n = 6) Exempted Village Superintendents and 50% (n = 4) of Joint Vocational Superintendents. Further, for first time superintendents the mean (2 = masters; 3 = doctorate) was 2.4, while for superintendents in their second through fourth superintendency the mean was 2.8.

In summarizing the demographic data, there were a number of findings that enabled the researcher to formulate a profile of Venture Capital superintendents. The first round Venture Capital superintendent was a Caucasian male between 50 and 51 years old and had 20 years of total administrative experience. Additionally, he was in the fourth year of his first superintendency in a non-urban city. The Venture Capital superintendent had a Master's Degree (although only three more superintendents had Masters than Doctorates) and had taught for nearly seven years before entering school administration.

Research Questions

A 1. To what extent did local district superintendents in this study agree with the four common school improvement beliefs delineated by the Ohio Department of Education?

The first research question to be addressed by the survey instrument correlated directly to the second section (A. 1 - A. 4) of the instrument (Appendix B). Table 1 delineates the specific responses to the four items of the Ohio State Department of
Table 1

Responses by Superintendents Agreeing with Common Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Belief 1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Belief 2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Belief 3&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Belief 4&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number not responding

| Missing responses | 2  | 3  | 2  | 2  |

Scaled response

| M  | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.7 |
| SD | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.1 |

Note: Judgments were made on a five point scale with a sixth category, #9, designated as don’t know/not applicable. (1 = strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree).

<sup>a</sup>Belief 1 = All students can learn.
<sup>b</sup>Belief 2 = Multiple intelligences.
<sup>c</sup>Belief 3 = Learning community fosters growth.
<sup>d</sup>Belief 4 = Diverse learning strategies.
Education’s common belief system that are believed necessary for the flexibility to redesign all the main components of the educational system simultaneously (Ohio Department of Education, 1993). The main components are: redesigning teaching and learning, assessment, governance, organization, and professional development. The four parts to the belief system are: 1. All students can learn; 2. Learners possess multiple intelligences; 3. Participation in a learning community fosters social, emotional, and intellectual growth; and 4. Diverse instructional strategies and environments enhance learning.

In responding to the first item in the second section (A) of the survey instrument, 54.7% of the 95 respondents strongly agreed that all students can learn, while an additional 24.2% agreed with this belief. 10.5% hold no position agreeing or disagreeing with the belief. 6.3% of the respondents strongly disagree that all students can learn and 4.2% disagree with the belief. Taken together 78.9% of the respondents agree with this belief statement, while 10.5% disagree. The mean response to this belief was 1.8 on a five-point scale with one (1) representing strongly agreeing and five (5) strongly disagreeing.

The second item in the second section of the survey instrument, learners possess multiple intelligences, garnered a mean of 1.8 on the same five-point scale described above. This mean was generated from 94 respondents to this item. 60.6% of the superintendents strongly agreed with this belief, while 16% agreed
for a total agreement of 76.6% agreement with this State belief statement. 12.8% of those responding neither agreed nor disagreed with the belief statement. A total of 10.6% of the responding superintendents did not agree with the statement. 5.3% strongly disagreed and 5.3% disagreed.

The third item in the second section (A) of the survey instrument, participation in a learning community fosters social, civic, emotional, and intellectual growth, had the second highest mean of 1.7 on the five point scale with one (1) representing strong agreement and five (5) strong disagreement. Yet, because of the response distribution, the disagreement percentage was only 9.3% with 6.2% strongly disagreeing and 3.1% disagreeing. Of the 95 respondents 7.2% did not distinguish between agreeing and disagreeing. 78.4% of the respondent superintendents favored the State's belief statement. 52.6% strongly agreed and 25.8% agreed with the learning community's value.

Item four in the second section (A) of the survey instrument comprised the fourth belief statement of the Ohio Department of Education, diverse instructional strategies and environments enhance learning, and had the strongest agreement from the responding 95 superintendents. The mean for this item was 1.7 on the five point scale used in this section. 60.8% of the respondents strongly agreed and 19.6% agreed with this belief statement. 5.2% strongly disagreed and 5.2% disagreed with this statement. 7.2% chose the "neither" category.
Overall, across the four items in the second section (A) of the survey instrument the means ranged from 1.7 to 1.8 on a five point scale with 1 representing strongly agree and 5 representing strongly disagree. All the means fell in the range between strongly agree and agree with the direction closer to agree. Across the responding superintendents the strong tendency was agreement with the four belief statements. However, between 9.3 % and 10.4 % of the responding superintendents disagreed with the State's beliefs. Taken across the 197 first round Venture Capital schools, roughly 10 % or approximately 20 districts could have superintendents who disagree with one or more of the State belief statements that underlay the Venture Capital process.

Tables in Appendix D compared urban and non-urban Venture Capital superintendents with each other regarding the four common beliefs that were addressed in the second section (A) of the survey instrument (Appendix B). Each of the four belief items showed significance in the urban to non-urban superintendency comparison. In each of the four common belief items the urban superintendents had a mean of 1.0 with a standard deviation of 0.0. However, non-urban superintendents ranged from a mean of 1.9 for all students can learn, through a 1.8 mean for multiple types of intelligence, with 1.9 as the mean for learning community fosters growth, and a 1.8 mean for diverse learning strategies. Five of the possible six urban superintendents eligible to respond to this survey did so, out of seven urban districts in Ohio, and each of the five responded uniformly to these items. While there is a difference in responses
between urban and non-urban superintendents, the relatively small number of urban districts still represents a large portion of students in the state of Ohio who would be affected by Venture Capital beliefs.

Of the four common beliefs, only diverse teaching strategies had significance when compared across the superintendents studied by first verses second through fourth superintendency (Appendix D). Superintendents in their first superintendency had a mean of 1.5 on a five point scale with one (1) as strongly agreeing to the belief. Second through fourth superintendency superintendents had a mean of 2.0 where two (2) represents agreement and the higher mean shows movement from degrees of agreement toward disagreement. Superintendents in their first superintendency value the importance of the use of diverse teaching strategies more than experienced superintendents value these strategies.

2. What are the common leadership characteristics of local district superintendents with Venture Capital schools in their districts?

This second research question addressed the initial section of the survey instrument (Appendix B). The means of the frequency responses to this section of the instrument are presented in Table 2. The purpose of this section was to allow the responding Venture Capital superintendents to provide their view of their leadership role in supporting the 14 renewal areas delineated in Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal (1993)(Appendix A). However, one must be cautious in the interpretation of self-reported data. On a
### Means of Frequencies of Responses to Leadership Role Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing attitudes</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual risk-taking</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen assessment</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective risk-taking</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocate resources</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate external resources</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared decision making</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty collegiality</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical self-assessment/reflection</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional quality</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties to the community</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth-staff</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum quality</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own professional growth</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Judgments were on a seven point scale.
(1 = extremely important, 7 = extremely unimportant).
seven point scale with one representing extremely important and
seven extremely unimportant, the range of leadership
characteristics starts with the lowest mean of 1.7 in developing
attitudes and extends to the highest mean of 2.4 in strengthen
assessment. Out of the 14 leadership indicators, three had means
of less than 2.0; eight had means of 2.1 or 2.2; two had means of
2.3; and one had a mean of 2.4.

The leadership characteristics had two significant differences
between urban and non-urban superintendents that were not
included in Table 2. The first leadership item involved developing
attitudes undergirding renewal. For urban superintendents (n = 5)
and non-urban superintendents (n = 90) the difference of means on
the seven point scale were 1.8 (SD = 1.5) for non-urban to 1.2 (SD =
0.4) for urban superintendents (P = .046). Urban superintendents
viewed their leadership role in developing attitudes undergirding
renewal as more important than did non-urban superintendent.

The second leadership item of significance involved professional
growth for staff. Urban superintendents (n = 5) had a mean of 1.2
(SD = 0.4) on the seven point scale and non-urban superintendents
(n = 90) had a mean of 2.1 (SD = 1.508)(P = 0.006). Urban
superintendents believed that there was a greater need for
professional growth for staff than did non-urban superintendents.

3. What kind of professional development has been
identified as needed by the local superintendents to
implement Venture Capital effectively?
The third research question addressed the professional development part of the leadership component to the survey instrument (Appendix A). In Table 3 the means are identified for the superintendents' self-identified professional development needs for the leadership needed to support educational renewal. The means range from 1.6 to 2.3 on a three point scale with 1 representing great need, 2 representing some need, and 3 representing no need. Five of the leadership items had mean values lower than 2.0, while five had values of 2.0, and four had values above 2.0. Strengthen assessment had a mean of 1.6, while individual risk-taking had a 2.3 mean.

In comparing superintendents with Masters Degrees to those with Doctorates significance of was found by using a 2-tail t-test in three areas of professional development for superintendent renewal leadership. Masters superintendents (n = 43) had means of 1.8 (SD = 0.5) for shared decision making, while superintendents with Doctorates (n = 40) had means of 2.1 (SD = 0.6)(P = .055). Masters Degree superintendents had a stronger belief in the need for their professional development in the use of shared decision making than did superintendents with Doctorates. Instructional quality for Masters superintendents (n = 43) had a mean of 1.7 (SD = 0.5). Superintendents with Doctorates (n = 40) had a mean of 2.0 (SD = 0.6)(P = .035). Ties to community for Masters superintendents (n = 42) had a mean of 1.8 (SD = .437) and Doctorate superintendents (n = 40) had a mean of 2.1 (SD = .597)(P = .066). Superintendents with Masters Degree believed more
Table 3

Means of Frequencies of Responses to Professional Development Needs for Renewal Leadership Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing Attitudes</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual risk-taking</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen assessment</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective risk-taking</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocate resources</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate external resources</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared decision making</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty collegiality</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical self-assessment/reflection</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional quality</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties to the community</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth-staff</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum quality</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own professional growth</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Judgments were made on a three point scale.
(1 = extremely important, 3 = extremely unimportant).
strongly in the importance of their professional development in the areas of ties to the community and instructional quality than did superintendents with Doctorates.

Professional development for superintendents to support ties to community also had significance in a comparison of those in their first superintendency to superintendents in their second through fourth superintendency. The mean for first superintendencies (n = 46) was 1.8 (SD = 0.5) and the mean for multiple superintendencies (n = 43) was 2.1 (SD = 0.5)(P = .006). These means were generated on the three point scale explained above. Superintendents in their first superintendency had stronger beliefs in the importance of their need for professional development in supporting ties to the community than did more experienced superintendents. Shared decision making is the second significant professional development leadership area of difference for superintendents in their initial superintendency verses those with multiple superintendencies. Those in their first superintendency (n = 46) had means of 1.8 (SD = 0.7) and more experienced superintendents (n = 44) had means of 2.1 (SD = 0.4)(P = .015). Those in their first superintendency believed they needed more professional development in supporting shared decision making than did experienced superintendents.

4. How did Venture Capital grants affect the way local superintendents perceive the state role in local school improvement?
The fourth research question is addressed in survey items B.7 - B.10 and C.1 - C.5 (Appendix B). Table 4, items 3 - 6, provides data to address items B.7 - B.10. The means for items 3 - 6 range from 2.1 to 2.4 on a five point scale with one (1) representing extremely important and five (5) extremely unimportant with 9 representing don't know/does not apply. Across all the respondents, appreciation for shared decision making had a 2.1 mean, learning community results in new principal roles had a mean of 2.2, and teacher role clarified and administrative roles clarified both had means of 2.4. Observations of learning communities placing principals in new roles by urban superintendents (n = 5) compared to non-urban superintendents (n= 89) had significance. The mean for urban superintendents was 2.0 (SD = 0.0) and the mean for non-urban superintendents was 2.2 (SD = 0.8)(P = .010).

In items C.1 - C.5 (Appendix B) the range of means, on the same five point scale explained above, across all the respondents was: 1.9 for climate was supportive; 2.1 for better dialogue; 2.3 for communication between; 2.5 for Board of Education support; and 2.8 for more money since. Significance was only identified for Board of Education support between superintendents in their first superintendency (n = 47) with a mean of 2.3 and those with experience in more than one superintendency (n = 45) with a mean of 2.9 (P = .001). In this instance those in their first superintendency believed that school renewal, Venture Capital, had
Table 4

Means of Frequencies of Responses to Perspectives of the State's Venture Capital Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent supports the application</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent gains politically</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher roles are clarified</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning community results in new principal roles</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation for shared decision making</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of models</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Judgments were made on a five point scale with a sixth category #9 of don't know/does not apply.

(1 = strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree).
more support from their Board of Education than did more experienced superintendents.

In the comments area of the survey instrument (Appendix B), E.1 - E.4, three superintendents addressed their desire for additional involvement in developing the Venture Capital process. Also, in the telephone follow-up calls to the survey, two of the non-respondent superintendents verbally refused to respond because of Venture Capital's lack of superintendent involvement.

5. To what extent did local superintendents believe the Venture Capital proposal process diverted attention from existing local school improvement activities?

The fifth research question was addressed by the first four items in the B section of the survey instrument (Appendix B). The four items in section B of the instrument are delineated in Table 5. The means for these four items ranged from 3.4 to 3.8 on a five point scale with 1 representing strongly agree, 5 representing strongly disagree, and with an item 9 standing for don't know/does not apply. Additionally, Appendix D holds tables which display further comparisons of urban/non-urban superintendents and between superintendents in their first superintendency and those with more than one superintendency.

Urban superintendents in divisions among administrators observed had a mean of 3.8, while non-urban superintendents had a mean of 4.8 (P = .003). In divisions among schools observed the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention diverted from renewal</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative divisions</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School divisions</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement within the community</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Judgments were made on a five point scale with a sixth category #9 of don't know/does not apply.

(1 = strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree).
urban superintendents had a mean of 3.8, while the non-urban superintendents had a mean of 4.8 (P = .003). Urban superintendents observed greater divisions between administrators and buildings than did non-urban superintendents.

First time superintendents in attention diverted from renewal had a mean of 3.6, while experienced superintendents had a mean of 3.1 (P = .024). Superintendents in at least their second district in divisions among schools observed had a mean of 3.5, while first district superintendents had a mean of 4.1 (P = .021). The less experienced superintendents believed that Venture Capital diverted the schools from other renewal efforts to a greater extent than did more experienced superintendents. However, experienced superintendents observed more divisions among schools than did less experienced superintendents.

6. Did local superintendents find the Venture Capital application process valuable for local school improvement?

This sixth research question is partially addressed in the first two items of Table 4 and the items in Table 6. The means of the respondents to the first item in Table 4, superintendent supports the application, was 1.3 on the five point scale explained earlier for this table. For item two, superintendent gains politically, the mean for all respondents was 2.5.

In Table 6 the means of all respondents range from 1.7 to 2.3 with one mean of 1.7, three means of 1.9, and two means of 2.3. These means were taken from a five point scale with 1
Table 6

Means of Frequencies of Responses to Venture Capital Proposal Process Items Supporting School Renewal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five year time frame</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Department of Education waivers</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal funding amount per grant</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No required budget</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent's statement</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of change models</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Judgments were made on a five point scale with a sixth category, #9 designated as don't know/not applicable. (1 = strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree).
representing strongly agree, 5 representing strongly disagree, and a category 9 representing don't know/not applicable.

Appendix D adds to the information about question 6. There is significance in the comparison of means between urban and non-urban superintendents about supporting resubmission. Urban means were 1.0 with non-urban means at 1.3 (P = .053).

Additionally, superintendents in their first district have stronger beliefs about the support generated by Venture Capital than do superintendents with experience in multiple districts with board of education support since Venture Capital granted. First district superintendents had a mean of 2.3 and multiple district superintendents had a 2.9 mean on the five point scale explained earlier (P = .001).

In addition to the six research questions there was also a question about the efficacy of the application process itself. Table 6 delineates the responses to the six items in section D of the survey instrument (Appendix B). This section addresses some of the specific elements in the Venture Capital proposal process. The means on the five point scale used in the survey instrument across all the respondents range from 1.7 for value of model choice to a 2.3 for value of no budget page.

In a comparison of urban superintendents and non-urban superintendents (Appendix D) in value of ODE waivers the urban mean was 1.2 and the non-urban mean was 1.9 (P = .015). A second area of significance was with equal money per school. The
urban mean was 1.6 with the non-urban mean at 2.3 \((P = .042)\). In these instances the urban superintendents believed there was greater importance in waivers and in equal school funding than did non-urban superintendents.

Additional elements to the Venture Capital process were included in the comments sections of the survey instrument. Of the 33 comments made, 16 were positive in nature with 12 general positive comments. Three of these addressed the positive nature of building teamwork, and one addressed encouraging risk-taking. For the 17 negative comments: six addressed the rating system; five were general negative comments; three were that the process was too time consuming; one was that ODE gave out misinformation about the process; another one was negative about the Regional Professional Development Center; and the last one voiced a distrust of the process.

There were also comments to item E.4 on the survey instrument (Appendix B). These comments were in response to the question \textit{would you continue to support, if you could do over}. There were 93 responses, some made multiple responses \((n = 64)\). Of the responses 13 were negative and 80 were positive. The negatives ranged from five general negative comments, four of the selection process needing improvement, two of more schools needing money, one of too time consuming, and one negatively referred to the religious right. The 80 positive comments were distributed in this fashion: 28 that it helps other reform efforts;
16 that it helps improve staff; 14 that the money helps; 13 general positives; 6 that it promotes teamwork; one that it builds morale; one that it promotes on-site decision-making; and one that it promotes risk-taking.

Summary

The rate of response to this survey was 86%. 97 of the superintendents of the 113 districts, that received one or more Venture Capital grants in the processes first round, responded. A general description of first round Venture Capital recipient superintendents was that of a Caucasian male between the ages of 50 and 51 with a Masters Degree (three more superintendents had Masters than Doctorates). The superintendent taught for nearly seven years before entering school administration. The profile first round Venture Capital superintendent had twenty years of total administrative experience and was in the fourth year of his first superintendency in a non-urban city district.

While the majority of superintendents agreed to the four common beliefs held in Venture Capital, nearly 10% of the respondents disagreed with at least one of the common beliefs. Further, another 7.2% to 12.4% had no opinion. Between 17.6% and 22.6% of the responding superintendents had no opinion or disagreed with these four common beliefs which were at the heart of the Venture Capital process.
The kinds of characteristics that the Venture Capital process determined important for educational renewal (Appendix A) were also viewed as important by the responding superintendents. On a seven point Likert-like scale the range of responses by the responding superintendents ranged from 1.7 to 2.4 on the 14 items of the first section to the survey instrument (Appendix B). In the above range one (1) represented strongly agreed and seven (7) represented strongly disagreed.

Upon applying the superintendent's personal professional development needs against the 14 leadership items, the responding superintendents were neutral over-all to their needs. The responses on a three point scale (1 = extremely important, 3 = extremely unimportant) ranged from a mean of 1.7 to 2.3.

The perspectives of the Venture Capital superintendents to the State's role in local school improvement ranged from a mean of 1.3 to 2.4 on a five (5) point scale (1 = strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree, and 9 = don't know/does not apply). However, there is not tremendous support for five of the seven items used in these parts of the survey (Table 4).

The general neutrality of the superintendent's responses continued in the exploration of possible negative consequences of Venture Capital. Table 5 addressed the distribution of means across four negative Venture Capital consequences. While the superintendents disagreed with the items, meaning they did not believe that Venture Capital had negative consequences, their mean responses ranged from 3.4 to 3.8. The scale employed was the five
point scale employed before, with 1 = strongly agreed, 5 = strongly disagree, and 9 = don't know/does not apply.

A further explanation of the responses was selective ignorance of the superintendents. The superintendents may have chosen to avoid the issues raised in the Venture Capital process with the expectation that these problems would go away of their own accord. Also, since the superintendent was not required to be directly involved in the Venture Capital process he may have believed that it wasn't his responsibility to address these issues and therefore chose to ignore the issues and not address them in the survey. The potential to gain $125,000 per building would also impact the superintendent's responses, although the superintendents did not expect to gain much personal political capital from Venture Capital.

Generally, the responding Venture Capital superintendents agreed with the value of the items listed on tables 4 and 6. However, the responses were not strongly supportive. Except for their own support, which had a 1.3 mean, the rest of the superintendents responses ranged from 1.7 to 2.5 on the five point scale employed (1 = strongly agreed, 5 = strongly disagreed, and 9 = don't know/does not apply).

There were 126 comments that were made in the comment areas of the survey instrument (Appendix B). Of the comments, 96 were positive and 30 were negative. The most common positive response was that it helped other reform efforts. The most common negative response panned the rating system.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

The Venture Capital grant program in Ohio is part of a systemic effort to merge top-down general state-level expectations with bottom-up building-level implementation strategies. Through state incentive grants that specify the expectations to be met by applicant buildings, Ohio is attempting to bring about educational restructuring. The buildings, through a competitive process, address the state expectations in a building and learning community based process. Once there is a building buy-in to the state expectations, program development control moves to the site. The process expects that the building site will select the best implementation processes to meet the state's expectations, given the realities of the building's learning community.

As part of the systemic nature of Ohio's restructuring plan, all parts of the educational system need to be included in the restructuring process (Sarason, 1990). Ohio's Venture Capital program is one of the most structurally comprehensive restructuring plans in the United States (Rapp, 1995). In an interview with Warren Russell, current Director of Legislative Services for the Ohio School Board's Association and immediate former Director of Legislative Services for the Ohio Department of
Education, the researcher clarified that Dr. Sanders, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, was the primary architect of Ohio's restructuring system. According to Russell, Dr. Sanders envisioned Venture Capital as a way to develop human capital to support and initiate school restructuring across the state. As the person with the responsibility to carry the state's education budget through the executive and legislative process, Warren Russell was in a critical position to know Dr. Sander's vision. Russell elaborated that Venture Capital was a critical piece to Ohio's educational restructuring efforts.

Prior to implementing Venture Capital, Dr. Sanders, with the State Board of Education's approval, initially changed the role of the Ohio Department of Education from a basically regulatory agency into a capacity building organization. Then, as an extension to capacity building, eight regional professional development centers were established to support capacity building for restructuring at the regional level. These centers were expected to build cohesion among educational service deliverers to support restructuring efforts at the local district level through regional collaboration. With regional support and state-level capacity-building, Venture Capital was unveiled to support restructuring in the individual school buildings.
Purpose and Objectives

As part of the systemic nature of Ohio's educational restructuring plan, all parts of the educational system need to be brought into the process (Sarason, 1990). This study of Venture Capital superintendents was undertaken to look at the superintendency and the critical position local district superintendents' hold within the state's educational restructuring process.

Because the superintendent is the Chief Executive Officer of the school district organization, the role the superintendent assumes within educational restructuring can be critical. The superintendent is in a position to directly support the building restructuring efforts as initiated through Venture Capital. The superintendent could also hinder or stop the building's restructuring efforts. Additionally, the superintendent could take a strictly neutral position in regard to restructuring in the district's buildings.

The political implications for the local district with Board of Education elections and school levies for financial support can impact the superintendent's position. Internal politics also impact the superintendent's role in restructuring. These internal politics include relationships across buildings, between principals and other administrators, and district relations with employee organizations.

This study was done to determine the role Venture Capital superintendents assumed in the educational restructuring efforts underway in their district. Because each superintendent had one or
more Venture capital schools within their district, Venture Capital served as the common factor in studying educational restructuring that impacted these 97 responding Venture Capital superintendents.

**Procedures**

In this study, the population of 113 Venture Capital grant receiving district superintendents was chosen to explore the superintendents' beliefs about Venture Capital and educational restructuring. These 113 superintendents each had one or more of their district's school buildings selected to receive Venture Capital. Of these 113 superintendents, 97, or 86%, responded to the researcher's census survey instrument. The 97 respondents responded to questions concerning specific items that related to their beliefs and experiences with Venture Capital and educational restructuring. The responding superintendents were specifically asked about: the efficacy of the Venture Capital process; the impact of the proposal process; and the effects of the Venture Capital process on the school community. Within the specific questions delineated above, the researcher was also seeking information about the Venture Capital superintendents' reaction to such an entrepreneurial approach to educational restructuring. Another area of interest was the Venture Capital superintendents' perception of the state's promoting professional development as an appropriate issue for state policy. Additionally, demographic data was compiled from the 97 responding superintendents.
Descriptive statistics were calculated to describe the population of superintendents and the beliefs they held in this study. Binomial distribution for significance was employed through the administration of 2-tailed T-tests. Employing this test proved important to finding significance.

**Summary of Findings**

The typical responding superintendent was a 50 year-old white male. Additionally, the typical Venture Capital superintendent worked in a non-urban city, had 20 years total administrative experience, was in the fourth year of his first superintendency, had a Masters degree (only 3 fewer with Doctorates than Masters Degrees), and taught nearly seven years.

In general the Venture Capital superintendents supported the Venture Capital process. When asked if they would support the process if they had it to do over, the majority of the responding superintendents said that they would. The majority of responding superintendents also supported professional development as a positive aspect to Venture Capital. However, there is a statistically significant difference in the degree of importance urban superintendents believe about the importance of professional development for staff and about the four common beliefs of the Venture Capital initiative, when compared to non-urban respondents. However, the caveat of the small numbers of Ohio urban superintendents must be noted.
For the importance of professional growth for staff the urban superintendent mean was 1.2 on the seven point scale employed (1 = extremely important, 7 = extremely unimportant), while the non-urban superintendent mean was 2.1. The urban superintendents also had statistically stronger agreement with the four common principals that were embodied in the Venture Capital process. For all students can learn the urban mean was 1.0 to the non-urban 1.9. The second belief, multiple types of intelligence, had an urban mean of 1.0 with a non-urban mean of 1.8. Learning communities foster growth, the third common belief had a non-urban mean of 1.9, while the urban mean was 1.0. Finally, the fourth common Venture Capital belief, diverse learning strategies, had a non-urban superintendent mean of 1.8, while the urban superintendent mean was 1.0.

Urban superintendents statistically believed more strongly in the need for the professional growth of staff to support renewal than did non-urban superintendents. Additionally, the urban superintendents statistically supported the four common beliefs of Venture Capital more strongly than did non-urban superintendents. Especially given the unanimity and strength of response of the urban superintendents to the four common beliefs in comparison to non-urban superintendents, this is an area to conduct additional research to see why there are such differences. Also, given the small number of urban superintendents in Ohio, additional steps would need to be employed to avoid validity and reliability problems and to better ensure the value of the research findings.
The responding superintendents agreed in general with the four common school improvement beliefs delineated by the Ohio Department of Education. However, ten percent of the responding superintendents do not agree with one of the school improvement beliefs. When extended across 197 buildings, that means nearly 20 buildings have superintendents in disagreement with a fundamental principle that supports their school restructuring effort. Further, there is a strong significance of difference between urban superintendents and non-urban superintendents concerning agreement with the four common school improvement beliefs. All the responding urban superintendents (five out of six eligible) believe in the four common state beliefs to the maximum value possible. Non-urban respondents made up all of the superintendents disagreeing with the four common beliefs as addressed earlier.

Of the four common beliefs another difference appeared between superintendents in their first superintendency and those in their second to fourth superintendency. First superintendency superintendents believed in a significantly stronger response that diverse learning strategies are important.

The Venture Capital superintendents also generally agreed with the value of the common leadership characteristics delineated in Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal (1993). On a seven point scale that was employed to add discretion to the superintendent's responses, the responses were found in agreement. The range of means to these leadership characteristics was from 1.7 to 2.4. On
the scale, 1 represented extremely important and 7 represented extremely unimportant. The 1.7 to 2.4 range was strongly in the important range. Again, there was some significance between the responses of urban and non-urban superintendents. Urban superintendents believed more strongly that their leadership role called for developing attitudes undergirding renewal. Urban superintendents also had a significant difference in the degree to which they more strongly supported professional growth for staff.

Venture Capital superintendents tended to believe that they personally had generally some need for professional development to effectively support Venture Capital. There were significant differences between Venture Capital superintendents with Master's Degrees and those with Doctorates. In the areas of shared decision making, instructional quality, and ties to the community the superintendents with Master's Degrees believed that they needed professional development more than did Venture Capital superintendents with Doctorates.

In the areas of ties to the community and shared decision making, there was significance between the responses of first time superintendents and those having had multiple experiences. In both instances the first time superintendents believed they had a greater need for personal professional development to effectively implement Venture Capital than did the multiple district superintendents.

The perceptions of Venture Capital superintendents concerning the state's role in local school improvement had
responses that tended to support the state's role. The range of means in this section was based on a five point scale with 1 representing strongly agree, 5 representing strongly disagree, and a #9 for don't know/does not apply. The range was from 1.9 to 2.5 across the items related to the state's role in local school improvement.

There was significance between first superintendency and multiple superintendency respondents. Venture Capital superintendents in their first superintendency agreed to a greater role for the state in local school improvement. This was significantly evident in the responses to questions about Board of Education support for local school improvement.

Urban superintendents also agreed to a significantly greater degree than did non-urban Venture Capital superintendents to the positive role of the state in local school improvement. This significance came in response to learning communities placing principals in new roles for local school improvement.

As a rule Venture Capital superintendents did not believe that Venture Capital diverted attention from local school improvement activities. The means across the items relating to Venture Capital diverting attention from local efforts ranged from 3.4 to 3.8 on a five point scale. The five point scale ranged from 5 representing strongly disagree to 1 representing strongly agree with #9 representing don't know/does not apply. However, the disagreement that Venture Capital diverted local renewal efforts was not a strong disagreement.
There were significant differences in responses between urban Venture Capital superintendents and non-urban superintendents. While both believed that Venture Capital did not divert attention from local renewal efforts, non-urban superintendents believed so much more strongly in the area of divisions arising among administrators. However, the differences were the opposite between urban and non-urban superintendents concerning divisions arising among schools. Urban Venture Capital superintendents believed much more strongly that there were not divisions between buildings because of Venture Capital.

With statistical significance, first time superintendents believed more strongly than did superintendents with multiple superintendencies that attention was not diverted from local renewal efforts.

In the area of Venture Capital supporting local school improvement the means of the related items ranged from 1.3 to 2.5. These means were based on a five point scale with 1 representing either strongly agree or extremely important and 5 representing strongly disagree or extremely unimportant with #9 representing don't know/does not apply.

In questioning the likelihood of Venture Capital superintendents supporting the process if they had it to do over again, urban superintendents had a 1.0 mean with no deviation. Non-urban superintendents, while supportive, were not as strong in their response.
First district superintendents significantly believe they have more Board of Education support for renewal since Venture Capital was granted than do Venture Capital superintendents with a background of multiple superintendencies.

The efficacy of the application process itself was also an area for study. The range of means for the items related to process efficacy was from 1.7 to 2.3 on the five point scale that has been used in much of the survey instrument. I represented strongly agree while 5 represented strongly disagree with #9 representing do not know/doesn't apply. The lowest valued item had to do with no required budget page.

Statistically, urban superintendents were significantly more supportive of the value of ODE waivers and for equal money per school building than were non-urban Venture Capital superintendents. But throughout this section, the superintendents responded positively.

Conclusions

Based upon the findings of this population of Venture Capital superintendents, the following conclusions can be drawn:

Throughout their responses to the census survey instrument the Venture Capital superintendents supported the process. The superintendents agreed with the leadership roles, delineated by the Ohio Department of Education, required to support Venture capital in the superintendent's district. Venture Capital superintendents
perceived some limited professional development needs for
themselves related to effectively implementing Venture Capital.
The Venture Capital superintendents strongly supported their
commitment to the four common beliefs of Venture Capital. This
population of Venture Capital superintendents support the state's
role in local school improvement through Venture Capital. These
superintendents also believed that Venture Capital was valuable for
local school improvement. Then these Venture Capital
superintendents did not believe that Venture Capital diverted
attention form local school improvement activities.

However, within some of the different categories that
comprise this population of Venture Capital superintendents there
were some statistically significant differences. Most of the
differences were between urban and non-urban superintendents.
In most cases the urban superintendents responded more strongly
in support of Venture Capital's premises than did non-urban
superintendents (Note the small numbers of urban
superintendents). The greatest statistical significance was with the
four common beliefs of Venture Capital.

Another difference between categories of Venture Capital
superintendents was with first district superintendents and multiple
district experience superintendents. The superintendents in their
first superintendencies believed they needed more professional
development to support Venture Capital in their district.
Additionally, these first district superintendents more strongly
supported the premises of Venture Capital.
Discussion

This study sought to determine how the Venture Capital superintendents perceived their role within the Venture Capital process. Because Venture Capital is a significant part of Ohio's educational restructuring effort, understanding how the important structural and political position of the district superintendency actually fits into the process is important. This understanding is especially important if we consider the work of Senge (1990) in organizational restructuring. Senge (1990) emphasizes the importance of understanding the interconnectedness of all the parts of the organization. Schlechty (1987, 1990) and Sarason (1990) strongly support Senge's organizational work in their works that focus on educational organizations.

As addressed in the first chapter of this study, there are two other studies underway that are exploring the roles of the elementary and secondary principals in Venture Capital. These studies mirror this study of the Venture Capital superintendent. All three studies focus on the first round of Venture Capital and explore the same time frame. Further, the census survey instruments were developed together to allow for comparisons across the populations of superintendents, secondary principals, and elementary principals. Originally, comparisons were to be included in each study's fifth chapter; however, the three studies have not been completed together. The comparisons between the superintendent's responses
and those of the elementary principals and those of the secondary
principals will follow upon the completion of the other two studies.

What will be especially informative is comparing the
superintendents' perceptions of their own roles to the perceptions of
the principals about the superintendents' roles. In a complimentary
fashion, the comparison of the Venture Capital principals'
perceptions as to their roles and the Venture Capital
superintendents' perceptions about the principals' roles will offer
insight. These comparisons about the agreement or disagreement of
role perceptions within the organization and across the Venture
Capital process will provide significant insight into the educational
organizations' structural leadership positions.

Additional studies that focus on Venture Capital teachers and
Venture Capital learning communities can add to the information
and understandings initiated in the three first round Venture
Capital leadership studies.

This researcher would be especially interested in comparing
the perceptions and understandings of Venture Capital principals,
teachers, and learning community members to the results of this
study in a number of areas. Among the most significant areas of the
Venture Capital superintendent study, comparisons about the
significance of the superintendents' leadership roles would be
enlightening. The superintendents tended to see themselves having
an important leadership role in the district across 14 leadership
characteristics identified from the Venture Capital process as
important for supporting educational renewal (Appendix A). However, the formal structure of the Venture Capital application procedure only required a written endorsement from the superintendent to be included in the building application and did not seek an explanation about the type of distract leadership and support that would have been provided Venture Capital. Determining if the circumventing of central office had an affect on the degree of involvement of the superintendent could provide useful information for altering a Venture Capital-type process to cause the process to be a more completely systemic process. While by-passing the central office removed some potential barriers to Venture Capital's implementation, other long-term barriers were possibly created by initially cutting the central office out of this process.

In a like fashion the local school board was circumvented. No specific endorsement of the Venture Capital process or of a building's specific application was required. In fact it was possible to provide the required endorsement from the board for Venture Capital through the use of providing a copy of the board's resolution of support of *America 2000* (1991) or *Ohio 2000* (1991). Supporting either of these programs would not specifically mean the board was supporting a Venture Capital application. Again, some potential board of education generated barriers may have been circumvented initially; however, greater long-term barriers were possibly created by leaving the local board of education out of any substantive part of the Venture Capital process.
Another area of interest would be a comparison of professional development leadership needs for Venture Capital superintendents. According to their responses, Venture Capital superintendents did not believe that they had significant need for their own professional development in the areas of leadership identified as important by the Venture Capital process (Appendix A). Additionally, Venture Capital superintendents with Doctorates believed they less need for Venture Capital related leadership professional development than did superintendents with Master's Degrees. Venture Capital superintendents who were in their second through fourth superintendency also believed they had less need for Venture Capital related professional development than did first district superintendents.

What is most troubling about these findings is that the literature strongly addresses the rapidly changing nature of the expectations for schools. For example, the uniqueness of Venture Capital's systemic process calls for some leadership skills that are not the skills that superintendents have traditionally employed in the more common top-down processes of the first wave educational reforms. If the Venture Capital superintendents are correct in their personal assessments about their leadership skills, their principals are in a position to verify those perceptions. However, these Venture Capital principals are also in positions to cast doubt on the superintendents' self-perceptions. Further, the areas that the principals note as weaknesses can be those used to provide support for superintendents. In like fashion, the Venture Capital
superintendents can shed light on the professional development needs of the Venture Capital principals. Additional studies including Venture Capital teachers and learning community members can also shed further light on this issue.

In light of the Venture Capital superintendents' perceptions, there are some useful findings that can be of assistance to organizations that provide professional development to current superintendents. This information can also be helpful to the Universities and Colleges in Ohio that prepare the majority of Ohio's educational administrators.

If the self-perceptions of the Venture Capital superintendents and principals proves to be supported by the information gathered in the three Venture Capital studies' leadership sections, further research could then be done to determine what needs these leaders do require. Also, studies would be in order to determine if non-Venture Capital leaders do have different professional development requirements.

However, if the comparisons determine there is dissonance between varied perceptions of leadership professional development needs, the professional development providers for superintendents and principals will have some significant information to utilize. Due to the changing organizational nature of educational organizations in Ohio and across the nation, professional development for educational leadership has trailed research findings. These studies of the Ohio Venture Capital process provide a vehicle to review current and formative professional development
leadership requirements in an emerging systematically interconnected educational system undergoing change from a unique top-down and bottom-up process.

If there are additional studies into the teacher and learning community components of Venture Capital, additional information from different perceptions will add to the knowledge about professional development leadership needs for superintendents and principals. Further, this study was conceived as the initial work into the Venture Capital educational restructuring process in Ohio. Upon initiating the study, the uniqueness of the Ohio program became evident. The purpose of this study was and remains a starting point for an analysis of systemic educational renewal in Ohio.

**Implications**

The Ohio Venture Capital process has been developed as a significant part to Ohio's systemic educational change process. As noted earlier, some national observers view Venture Capital as one of the nation's most comprehensive structural systemic renewal efforts in the United States. Because of the systemic nature of the Venture Capital process and the support systems the Dr. Ted Sanders, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, was able to put into place, Ohio's renewal program is far-reaching. The changes to support systemic restructuring come from the top of the organizational hierarchy at they Ohio Department of Education and
flow to the teaching and learning expectations that occur within the individual classroom. The support for Venture Capital, at this juncture, includes the educational leadership within the Ohio Legislature and in the Governor's Office.

However, as within any politically dynamic system where funding issues are part of ongoing political negotiations, the future of Venture Capital rests within a political environment. In Ohio and the nation adequacy of public school funding is a politically sensitive issue. In a number of states judges have been responding to lawsuits that have questioned the state's meeting state constitutional requirements as to funding public schools equitably. Ohio is currently facing a lower court decision that held that the current funding system does not meet the state constitution's required "thorough and efficient" education system provision. That lower state court decision has been appealed to the Ohio Supreme Court by the Ohio Attorney General. The Ohio State Board of Education voted not to be party to the appeal.

Should the Ohio Supreme Court uphold the lower state court's decision, the entire structure of public school funding could change as the Ohio Department of Education, the Governor, and the Ohio Legislature will be required to develop a funding structure that will meet the courts' expectations. The lower Ohio court ruling stipulated that the Ohio Department of Education was to start addressing an equalizing of funding for state public schools.

In the state budget currently being developed, the Governor has proposed reducing the amount of state funds that go to the
wealthiest districts in Ohio and shifting those funds to the poorest districts in the state. Further, the requested budget of the State Board of Education has been reduced by the Governor. The State Board of Education budget submitted to the Governor requested 400 new, additional Venture Capital grants, on top of those already being funded on the five-year time-line. However, the Governor's budget reduced the number of new, additional Venture Capital grants to 200. This reduction was a function of competing budgetary pressures.

The implication of the reduction is that Venture Capital an the educational restructuring process is really not seen at the heart of the educational process. Rather, the political focus is on maintaining the current system as much as possible. While restructuring is important in a conceptual way, the current system carries with it known political realities. Because politicians are much more focused on current problems, like school funding issues, Venture Capital could be eliminated before the promised five year time frame and $125,000 have been provided. Should this occur, the ultimate result of the process would be negative. The learning community around each school would feel betrayed, through yet another example of promises broken by politicians and bureaucrats, ignorant of schools.

In many ways, school districts are like politicians in that, like politicians, districts in Ohio must continually go before their community's voters for operating funds. Within the Ohio school funding structure, most school districts must put funding issues on the ballot every three to five years to offset the inflationary
pressures that they face. Ohio’s system for funding schools does not allow for enough local tax base funding growth to cover inflationary costs, so school districts must periodically go to their voters.

As superintendents are the focal point in projecting and securing the needed revenues to operate the school system, any opportunity that brings with it significant funding must be given a full hearing. Venture Capital did bring substantial discretionary funds to buildings in each receiving district. Accordingly, superintendents would have been hard pressed to reject the process. The funding dilemma they faced would pressure superintendents to give grudging support to the process even if serious doubts existed, because the fiscal incentives were stronger that their doubts. The lukewarm support of the superintendents to the survey could well have indicated a fiscal response to get the money over a belief in the process. Further, should the superintendent actively inhibit the district’s buildings from seeking the Venture Capital funds, the superintendent would have faced a political problem of not even attempting to bring additional state dollars to the district. That would not be a positive political position for the superintendent.

Because of the funding requirements placed on the local districts, these districts often react like politicians in focusing on the immediate problems instead of those in the future. As one of the Venture Capital superintendents, who refused to complete the survey instrument, used as a reason - he was too busy with a school district levy campaign to to complete the questionnaire.
While Venture Capital has potential to significantly alter schooling in Ohio, parts of the system beyond the control of the Ohio Department of Education may provide insurmountable obstacles to this systemic processes' fruition. Indeed, in such a case a true systemic process does not really exist; because, a truly systemic process would include all facets of the learning community. Those facets include the funding mechanisms at the state and local levels. Perhaps those parts can be brought into the system; however, the prospects for such close involvement are pragmatic.

In such a scenario the role of the district C.E.O. becomes even more significant. If state-level funding will not be maintained, the necessary support will need to be a local district effort. Rarely do buildings have the capacity to raise the sustaining funds for projects of the scope of Venture Capital. However, if the basic premises that make up Venture Capital are adopted by the local district leader, they can be continued through the local district's mission.

The United States has always had individual buildings that have been exceptional; however, we have not had a significant number of exceptional districts. If Venture Capital is to have any lasting success it will be in creating a culture for school renewal that transcends buildings and encompasses local districts. In such a situation, the role of the district superintendent takes on added significance. Additional information about local district superintendents' role in school renewal is important. Additional support and involvement for these superintendents at the state, regional and local levels is extremely important. With the focus of
Venture Capital on individual buildings, the local district superintendent and local district boards of education can easily be left out of the school renewal loop. Potentially, this gap could be the greatest shortcoming in Ohio's systemic restructuring program.

Upon reviewing the summary results of this study of Ohio superintendents within the Ohio systemic renewal initiative, Venture Capital a few observations are needed. The intent of Venture Capital is to help schools make state policy maker's changes. Such expectations exist whether or not Venture Capital is provided.

The responses of the local district superintendents were guardedly supportive. There was little unequivocal support. Perhaps this because the process focused on the building and not the district. But, while the process did not specifically demand a lot of superintendent involvement, it also did not specifically exclude a large superintendent involvement either. What this really brings into question is how superintendents envision school renewal with an already full work agenda. Perhaps the finding that superindents did not expect to gain much political capital from Venture Capital (Table 4 and Appendix D) is a more valid reason for their reticence about the process.

Providing renewal models for the schools to follow did get support (Table 4 and Appendix D). A variety of explanations could allow for this finding. Finding the reasons for the value of models provision could support development of assistance to better meet the building and district educational renewal efficacy requirements.
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Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal

Funding from the state legislature has made venture capital grants available to support school improvement. The use of venture capital is an essential strategy for high performance teaching and learning. It is used to "spark" school renewal efforts and to encourage risk-takers who want to create a new kind of educational system. The state's commitment of support is five years. After that time, schools are to have institutionalized their commitment to professional development and school renewal—to transform the context (culture) in which it is to be implemented so that it can survive and flourish.

The use of venture capital to support school improvement must be woven as deeply as possible into the fabric of the organization. Venture capital grants are not designed to be short-term, temporary efforts or projects focused on a particular dimension of change (e.g., curriculum development, professional development, assessment). Educators are not asked merely to adjust the structures of conventional schooling, but over their five-year commitment attempt fresh approaches and active explorations of fundamental change in teaching and learning, assessment, governance, organization, and professional development.

Much is known from both research and practice about creating an environment that fosters school improvement. The challenge is to use this knowledge to break down barriers to progress, and do so as a community of educators with the single-minded goal of making schools better places for teachers to teach and students to learn.

This monograph is intended to initiate a dialogue about school improvement efforts which have the greatest potential for enhancing the ability of educators to improve student learning. The monograph defines school improvement, provides examples of school improvement models, and outlines the selection criteria. Schools are encouraged to use this monograph to work with their learning community to examine their commitment, capacity, and need for school improvement. The most significant contribution of this monograph is the invitation it offers: the opportunity for the learning community to adopt existing school improvement models or the challenge to invent something that might be better. It offers guidance for educators in reflecting about what they do, in developing improvements, and in collaborating for sustained change.
Connecting Renewal Efforts

High Performance Teaching and Learning

Using venture capital grants to create a high performance system of teaching and learning in Ohio's schools calls for a statewide, coordinated support structure that will build the capacity of the learning community. A "learning community" can be defined as people in the community who recognize the capacity of each member of the community to enhance school improvement; it is the sum of their capacities that represents the power of the group. Members of the learning community include students, parents, educators, school board members, higher education personnel, legislators, senior citizens, and other representatives from the community such as social services, government, child and youth services, law enforcement, business and industry, churches, medical services, and the media.

The school improvement models provide a framework for helping schools understand how high performance teaching and learning can be achieved. Attributes of high performance teaching and learning include teacher facilitation of both group process and student construction of knowledge, teachers creating a positive learning environment, and teachers encouraging students to develop the intrinsic motivation to learn. High performance learning is characterized by student capacity to formulate and solve problems, think critically and creatively, value learning, and possess confidence in their own learning.

Training and Professional Development Infrastructure

A professional development infrastructure is a key component of Ohio's educational system. This infrastructure can be defined as a long-term process intended to provide opportunities for growth and learning within the organizational framework. Professional development based on high performance teaching and learning will provide the kind of guidance learning communities need to support school improvement and renewal. Resources currently supporting a professional development infrastructure in Ohio include Regional Teacher Training Centers (RTTCs), Special Education Regional Resource Centers (SERRCs), vocational training centers, Project Discovery, services provided through instructional television agencies, and professional organizations.

An expanded focus on professional development is the critical key to school improvement. The implementation of a school improvement model cannot succeed unless training in the model's basic ideas, skills, and methods occurs at all organizational levels. The use of new skills by educators will build a process of continuous and self-sustaining improvement. The Ohio Department of Education is committed to facilitate professional development required by the various school improvement models by becoming a partner with schools to build organizational capacity. Collective and collaborative efforts are required to
provide an educational system in which all students can learn and succeed. The improvement of schools will be nurtured through the establishment of formal collegial networks that encourage the sharing of expertise and collaboration.

School Community Collaboration

School community collaboration should identify, integrate, and focus all available educational opportunities and resources to support learning. Ohio's community support services presently include Ohio 2000, the Ohio Family & Children First Initiative, Project Pass, community education grants, and business advisory councils. The support of respective local boards of education should also be enlisted in school improvement efforts. This suggests that local school boards seeking change must not only be committed to change, but must be involved in making change happen.
Integrating Resources

Several resources from other state and federal programs are available to help schools develop the capacity for school improvement efforts. These include Chapter 1, Chapter 2, Early Childhood Education, Special Education, Vocational Education, Community Education, and Ohio 2000. As you read these brief descriptions, consider the extent to which you are utilizing these resources within a school improvement framework. You may also wish to consider or explore how the listed resources in which you are not involved can contribute to school improvement efforts.

Chapter 1

School districts may use Chapter 1 funds for projects to provide supplemental services to meet the educational needs of educationally deprived children at the preschool, elementary, and secondary levels. The following Chapter 1 programs support Ohio's commitment to school renewal:

- Schoolwide projects
- School Program Improvement

Chapter 2

The Chapter 2 program provides funds for the planning, development, operation and expansion of seven targeted assistance programs:

- Students at-risk
- Educational materials for instructional use
- School-wide improvement including the Effective Schools Program
- Training and professional development
- Training programs for illiteracy identification
- Student excellence and achievement
- Innovative projects to enhance the educational program and climate of the school

Early Childhood Education

Early Childhood Education provides programs and services to all preschool-age and early primary-age children (at-risk, disabled, gifted, typically developing) through interagency collaboration and coordination. Activities that can support Ohio's commitment to school renewal include:

- Ohio Family & Children First Initiative
Special Education

Several initiatives currently being implemented through the Division of Special Education target building-level change through the development of shared responsibility for all students, the meaningful involvement of parent and community members, and the creation of high-performing teams that support, rather than sort, all students at the building level. Activities include

- Alternative service delivery models
- Alternative assessment/problem-solving pilot projects
- Ohio Classroom Management Pilot Project
- Staff development for Experimental Model Teams
- Parent mentor projects
- Jacob Javits Gifted Student Education Project

Vocational and Career Education

Programs that support and complement school renewal include

- Career Development
- Occupationally specific programs
- Work and Family Life Programs
- Tech Prep

Community Education

Community education is a process in which all segments of a community are involved in setting educational goals; working in collaborative partnerships to obtain resources and deliver educational services; and planning, implementing, evaluating, and adjusting educational programs on an ongoing basis. Programs that support school renewal include

- Planning Grants
- Demonstration Grants
- Community Education Technical Assistance Network (CETAN)

Ohio 2000

The Ohio 2000 process is a grass roots effort that encourages citizens in each community—through a consensus-building process—to conduct a gap analysis. This analysis allows communities to examine where they are, project future educational needs, create and implement a plan for meeting the needs, and then regularly report progress. Ohio's benchmarks for the National Education Goals constitute minimum standards against which school communities can measure progress.
School improvement refers to efforts that focus on long-term, positive change in schools. Such efforts may involve enhancing instructional strategies, sharing leadership, designing curriculum, or some combination of all of these. School improvement applies to efforts to change the fundamental structure of the educational system to create conditions in which all can achieve at higher levels. The structure includes such elements as curriculum, teaching, management, roles and responsibilities, relationships, incentives, and other practices that define school and district working environments. Essential to school improvement is the recognition that schools must educate all students. The term “all students” is defined as students from a broad range of backgrounds and circumstances including disadvantaged students; students with diverse racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds; students with disabilities; students with limited English proficiency; and academically talented students.

School improvement can only be achieved if there is a willingness to fundamentally restructure Ohio's education system. School improvement must focus on the development and interrelationships of all the main components of the system simultaneously — teaching and learning, assessment, governance, organization, and professional development. It must also focus on the culture of the system.

The State Board of Education mission statement begins with a commitment to the belief that all students will learn if the conditions are right. Creating a high performance system of education requires a transformation of the nature of schooling to meet the needs of learning communities. New systems and structures must be developed to ensure that learning communities have the flexibility and support to redesign teaching and learning, assessment, governance, organization, and professional development.

This flexibility must be guided by a common belief system that

1. All students can learn
2. Learners possess multiple intelligences
3. Participation in a learning community fosters social, civic, emotional, and intellectual growth
4. Diverse instructional strategies and environments enhance learning

School improvement usually involves site-based management and enhanced roles for teachers in instruction and decision making. Site-based management places the authority and responsibility for decisions regarding budgets, teaching and learning, personnel, and/or school policies in the hands of individual school staffs, as opposed to central office administrators. Collaborative decision making involves teachers, parents, students, and community members in decisions traditionally made by district and/or building administrators alone.
School improvement requires that teachers play an important role in the change process. The continuous and long-term involvement of teachers in planning and implementing change becomes a powerful impetus for capacity building among professionals. Those who plan and carry out improvements will not only address the challenges of transforming entrenched traditions, cultures, and beliefs, but will themselves experience professional transformation.

The quality of school improvement is surely mirrored in “outcomes.” Focusing attention on results, however, is premature and even counterproductive without a prior and overarching focus on the processes that bring forth desired results. The school must be developed as an integrated set of relationships with the ability to change and focus those relationships in the direction of improvement.

Schools should consider Total Quality as a systemic change strategy. Total Quality is a long-term commitment to a way of perceiving, thinking, and acting. It is a philosophy and a set of tools and techniques to improve an organization's effectiveness and efficiency. Essentially, it is meeting and exceeding expectations through a systematic process focused on continuous improvement.

As new systems and structures are developed, the board of education of a school district may submit an application to the Ohio Department of Education for an exemption from specific statutory provisions and/or rules to implement a proposed innovative education program. This exemption is allowed through the State Board of Education's waiver authority. An innovative education program is defined as one in which teaching and learning, assessment, governance, organization, and professional development differ from commonly accepted practice in the district. Districts are encouraged to take advantage of this waiver authority as school improvement plans are conceived and implemented.
Nominating A School

School districts are asked to nominate schools within the district where there exists

1. A structure or a desire for involving staff and community in collaborative planning for school improvement

2. An expressed need and desire to provide coordinated services

3. An administrator who is a risk-taker and is willing to share decision making for school improvement with a cross-functional collaborative team

4. A willingness to identify desired student outcomes and use data as a basis for planning school improvement

5. A "problem solving" rather than an "opportunistic" approach to school improvement

6. An understanding that change, to be productive, requires new skills, capacity, commitment, motivation, beliefs, and insight

7. A staff capable of individual and collective inquiry and continuous improvement and renewal

8. The school's commitment to serve as a resource to other schools within and outside of the district in related school improvement efforts

Following a district's nomination, applicants will be asked to document in writing the nature of

1. A schoolwide improvement effort that will be integrated into the school structure as evidenced by the consensus of 80% of the school faculty

2. The active and authentic collaboration of community resources

3. The restructuring of the school to maximize staff and student learning

4. The review and alteration of those policies and practices which do not contribute to the success of students

5. An expanded role for teachers in planning and implementing change

6. Leveraging of existing dollars and identification of new monies for support of the schoolwide improvement effort
Basis of Competition

Schools will be competing for venture capital funds on the basis of their commitment to renewal, capacity for renewal, and need for renewal. There are a variety of ways to conceptualize the renewal of Ohio's schools. One such conceptualization uses five fundamental processes as a basis: teaching and learning, assessment, governance, organization, and professional development. These five processes, coupled with the parameters of commitment, capacity, and need, provide a conceptual framework for helping learning communities grapple with entry points and goals for beginning or continuing school improvement efforts.

Broadly defined, commitment is a statement of belief for the learning community. School improvement leading to school renewal places great demands on the system including the staff and community. It is important that realistic judgments be made as to the level of support (commitment) to the community's fundamental beliefs. Everyone must be dedicated to continuous improvement, personally and collectively. Commitment relies not only on intentions but actions. It means that educators are willing to foster change in systems in which entrenched conditions resist such efforts.

School improvement requires change. Building internal capacity for initiating and sustaining continuous change is a significant challenge. Enabling factors such as human and fiscal resources indicate the capacity within the community to move forward with renewal. It is important that the learning community think about the capacity to begin renewal efforts as well as ways to sustain such efforts by examining the needs and resources of the community.
Criteria for Evaluating Applications

Schools will be compared on the basis of written descriptions of their commitment, capacity, and need. A number of factors should be considered in the initial planning for school improvement. To inform the best thinking and planning, applications need to reflect the factors listed below. These factors are essential to continuous school improvement.

1. Evidence of community readiness and willingness to develop and implement new school improvement ideas and to anticipate change and reshape thinking and behavior.

2. School improvement strategies collaboratively designed by the community and integrated into the school's structure demonstrating that all children can learn.

3. Planned changes that are systematic and wide-ranging.

4. Evidence that community agencies and groups are thoughtfully and purposively involved.

5. School improvement strategies that focus on learning.

6. Evidence that teachers are given expanded roles in planning and implementing change.

7. Policies and practices that contribute to the success of all students.

8. School improvement plans that leverage existing dollars and resources and identify new monies and resources for the support of improvement efforts.

The application process for funding will involve two parts: (1) a preapplication outlining the purpose, concepts, activities, and budget; and (2) an interview that will be initiated upon positive evaluation of the preapplication. The intent is to follow a "best in class" model to ensure statewide representation across urban, rural, and suburban schools.
Competition and Award Process

There are several dimensions that will be considered in defining what is meant by a “best in class” model. Applicants will be selected from the entire continuum of schools in Ohio. This selection will enhance the development of a network of “school improvement sites” that can support one another. In addition to representation across rural, urban, and suburban schools, the following will also be considered:

1. Demonstrated building and/or district performance levels
2. Degree of current involvement with school improvement efforts
3. Population size
4. Geographic locations (representative of state)
5. Differing school situations
Evaluation Design

Each school is charged with evaluating the success of its renewal efforts. It is essential to systematically identify, analyze, and document the events that aid or hinder progress toward school improvement efforts. Evaluation is viewed as an ongoing practice of identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the school improvement process. It provides continual input into developmental activities and planning for the future and assesses a school's outcomes and contributions to school renewal. The success of school improvement efforts will be determined by the accumulation and analysis of data. School improvement will be judged by the same evaluation process that is advocated for use in schools (e.g., identifying the desired outcomes, determining descriptors which reflect the achievement of outcomes, and collecting appropriate information to determine the level of accomplishment). Schools will need to identify their early accomplishments as well as what they plan to accomplish after the five-year period.

Benchmarking is a basis of establishing performance goals through the search for best practices that will lead to high performance teaching and learning. It is suggested that schools utilize benchmarking strategies to identify sources of sound practices to help educators build their own data base. At several intervals, benchmarking will offer guidance for educators in reflecting about what they do, in developing improvements, and in collaborating for sustained change. Potential advantages of benchmarking include

1. Breaking away from old paradigms to create new approaches to improvement
2. Acknowledging that good or better ideas exist
3. Integrating a systemic approach to improvement
4. Encouraging the search for knowledge, for new ideas, and for new learning

At the state level, one way of determining the success of adopting or inventing a school improvement model will be through reports to the Ohio Department of Education. Each school will periodically provide a description of its school improvement procedures as well as data which describe the improvement made toward achieving desired outcomes.

As schools move into implementation and successful adoption, the following expectations will be reviewed. These are indicative of the early stages of planning for change and must be revisited each year to determine continuous improvement.

1. School process standards that students, educators, and parents see as both appropriate and possible must create a vision of what education can be.
2. Students will be held accountable for their performance; that is, the knowledge, skills, and applications that they have had an opportunity to learn. Student accountability measures require knowing where students start
(baseline measures) as well as the progress they make. This requires longitudinal data gathered from multidimensional assessments.

3. Professional development will correlate with school improvement efforts.

4. School performance standards will lead to a system of school input and process indicators. The indicators will give priority to describing the enacted curriculum, the pedagogical practices, and the curriculum embedded resources gathered by self-report (e.g., interviews, daily instructional logs, and questionnaires).

5. A commitment to continuous improvement, recognizing that the existing reforms do not embody all the answers. Communities must build systems that continuously monitor themselves and have the capacity to change when necessary.

6. Members of the school community will be involved on an ongoing basis in planning, initiating, managing, and facilitating the collaborative process of school improvement.

7. Strategies, policies, and practices will be developed to reach stated outcomes.
## Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Spring 1993</td>
<td>• School districts nominate schools (by June 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Summer 1993</td>
<td>• Schools use school improvement monograph to engage in discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Schools study models and conduct self-appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Schools decide to adopt or invent school improvement model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ohio Department of Education offers regional meetings for applicants; applications available at regional meetings (August 23 through September 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1993</td>
<td>• Schools submit applications (September 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ohio Department of Education conducts interviews (October)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ohio Department of Education selects schools (November 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Selected schools plan for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Year 1993-1994</td>
<td>• Ohio Department of Education facilitates training of school teams in various models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Schools implement models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ohio Department of Education coordinates extended services for school improvement site network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ongoing assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Venture Capital Grant Proposal Study
The following are questions asking your opinions and attitudes about the Venture Capital Grant Proposal Process. Please indicate your response either by circling the appropriate number or by filling in the blank provided. Again, thank you very much for your assistance.
In the first column, please indicate the importance of your leadership role in your district. Circle the number of the most appropriate response along the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Extremely Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second column, please indicate the extent to which you believe you need additional professional development. Circle the number of the most appropriate response along the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greatly Needed</th>
<th>Some Need</th>
<th>Not Needed at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| EI | EU | \begin{tabular}{l}
Developing attitudes, beliefs and values that undergird school renewal. \\
Encouraging personal risk taking. \\
Encouraging collective risk taking. \\
Reallocating existing internal resources. \\
Generating external resources. \\
Creating a shared decision-making process. \\
Promoting faculty collegiality within the district. \\
Promoting critical self-assessment and reflection. \\
Influencing instructional quality. \\
Strengthening ties to the community. \\
Encouraging professional growth activities for my staff. \\
Influencing curriculum quality. \\
Attending to my own professional growth activities.
\end{tabular} | Great Some None |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the extent to which you as a superintendent involved in the Venture Capital Grant Proposal process, agree/disagree that the process strengthened your commitment to the following statements, as of the month in which the grant money was awarded, by circling the appropriate number:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>don't know/not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A1. All students can learn.  
A2. Learners possess multiple types of intelligences.  
A3. Participation in a learning community fosters social, civic, emotional and intellectual growth.  
Please focus now on the period of time during the application process, from the time you first learned about the Venture Capital Grant until October 29, 1993 when the applications were submitted. Please indicate your level of agreement/disagreement with the following statements by circling the appropriate number:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>don't know/not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Attention was diverted from other important renewal efforts.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Divisions arose among administrators involved in the Venture Capital Grant Process.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Divisions arose among the schools in our district which were involved in the Venture Capital Grant Process.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Disagreements arose within the community about school renewal.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>I was supportive of the application process.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>I found this renewal process to be politically beneficial.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>The teachers' roles were clarified by the process.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>The administrative roles were clarified by the process.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>The learning community concept placed principals in new leadership roles.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>A better appreciation for the shared decision-making process was developed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now, in thinking about various aspects of your job since the Venture Capital Grant Proposal was submitted and before the grant money was awarded in March of 1994, please indicate your level of agreement/disagreement using the same scale where

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>neither agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>don't know/ not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C1. Our Board of Education was more supportive of school renewal activities.  
C2. The climate in those schools involved in the Venture Capital process was more supportive of continuous school renewal.  
C3. There was better dialogue between the schools involved in the Venture Capital Process and their communities.  
C4. We have provided other district monies for additional support to those buildings involved in the Venture Capital Process.  
C5. Communication on school renewal was better between the principals involved in the Venture Capital Process and myself.
Now, thinking about the entire Venture Capital Grant Proposal Process, from when you first heard about it, through October when the application was submitted, up to the time in March of 1994 when the money was awarded, please indicate the extent to which you do or do not value the following aspects of the process by circling the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely valuable</th>
<th>Quite valuable</th>
<th>Fairly valuable</th>
<th>Not very valuable</th>
<th>Not valuable</th>
<th>Don't know/not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D1. Utilizing a five year school improvement timeline
D2. Allowing buildings to seek Ohio Department of Education waivers
D3. Awarding every Venture Capital building an equal amount of $25,000
D4. Having no specific required budget guidelines (without a budget page)
D5. Having a statement from the superintendent concerning the district's commitment to school renewal
D6. Having the ability to choose an existing model or to develop a model for school renewal.

Still thinking about the entire Venture Capital Grant Proposal Process, please indicate your level of agreement/disagreement with the following statements relating to the Venture Capital Grant application process, by marking the appropriate response along the same scale used earlier.

E1. Should your level of involvement with the Venture Capital Process have:
   1. ____ been increased
   2. ____ been decreased
   3. ____ stayed the same
   Go to question E4.

E2. Should the level of involvement of your School Board with the Venture Capital Process have:
   1. ____ been increased
   2. ____ been decreased
   3. ____ stayed the same
   Go to question E4.
E3. If your level of involvement and/or the level of involvement of your School Board were to change, what kind of involvement would you have expected?


E4. If you had it to do over, would you continue to support the Venture Capital application process?

1. ___ yes  
2. ___ no

Why or why not?


Personal Information

Please answer as of October, 1993.

1. How many years have you been the superintendent in your current district?  

2. Is this your first, second, third, etc. superintendency?  

3. Please indicate the number of years that you have been a superintendent in each of the following categories:
   
   1. ___ Local  
   2. ___ City  
   3. ___ Exempted Village  
   4. ___ County  
   5. ___ JVS  
   6. ___ other

4. How many years of full-time administrative experience do you have?  

5. How many years of full-time teaching experience do you have?  

6. Highest degree attained?
   
   1. ___ Bachelors  
   2. ___ Masters  
   3. ___ Doctorate  
   4. ___ Other
7. Gender
   1. ____ Female  2. ____ Male

8. Ethnicity/Race
   1. ____ African American  4. ____ Hispanic
   2. ____ Asian American  5. ____ Native American
   3. ____ Caucasian  6. ____ Other

9. In what year were you born? ____

10. Would you like a copy of the results?
    1. ____ yes  2. ____ no

Comments:

Please feel free to use the space below to add any additional comments regarding the Venture Capital Grant Proposal Process:
APPENDIX C
Support Letters
July 29, 1994

Clyde Lepley
Louisville City Schools
418 East Main
Louisville, Ohio 44641-1400

Dear Clyde Lepley:

Congratulations on your district's receipt of Ohio's Venture Capital Grant! As a superintendent in one of the few school districts in the entire state of Ohio to have won this award, your feedback and opinions concerning the grant process are invaluable.

In the next week, you will receive a packet from the Polimetrics Laboratory for Political and Social Research at The Ohio State University. Polimetrics is gathering information about your opinion concerning the Venture Capital Grant Proposal Process. A letter of support from Dr. Jim Hyre, Superintendent of the Hamilton County Office of Education, will be included in this packet. We are examining various components of the process and need to have your input. It is extremely important that you personally respond because knowledge about the opinions of the superintendents in these winning schools will help us have a better understanding of the role of the superintendent in the Venture Capital Grant Proposal Process.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The results of this study will be used in research publications but the results will be aggregated and no individual respondent will be identified. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Dr. Brad L. Mitchell
Associate Professor, Education Policy and Leadership
August 1, 1994

Dear Superintendent:

I would appreciate your completing the enclosed Venture Capital questionnaire. The Hamilton County Office of Education hosts a Regional Professional Development Center that has been extremely involved in the Ohio Department of Education Venture Capital process. Our PDC Director, and some other educators, are interested in your experiences and beliefs about Venture Capital.

Please take a few minutes to share your perspective, as a superintendent, about Venture Capital.

Sincerely,

James G. Hyre, Ed.D.
County Superintendent

JGH:ir

enclosure
May 31, 1994

name  
address  
city, zip  

Dear name,

Congratulations again on your district’s receipt of Ohio’s Venture Capital Grant. Because yours is one of the few school districts in the entire state of Ohio to have received this grant, your opinions and attitudes towards the Venture Capital Grant Proposal process are extremely important.

We are asking the superintendents in the districts with schools which have received the Venture Capital Grant to give feedback about the process. It is extremely important that you personally respond because knowledge about the opinions of the superintendents in these winning districts will help us have a better understanding of the role of superintendents in the Venture Capital Grant Proposal Process.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so that we may check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Best regards,

Dr. Kathleen Carr  
Associate Director
Table 7

Number of Superintendencies (1st/2nd-4th) Held By Years and By District administrative experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as City superintendent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Held</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>2-tail probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.7872</td>
<td>2.948</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>63.98</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd - 4th</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.2326</td>
<td>5.362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as Exempted Village superintendent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Held</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>2-tail probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.1957</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>-2.04</td>
<td>48.41</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd - 4th</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.0455</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full time administrative experience</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Held</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>2-tail probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18.5000</td>
<td>5.190</td>
<td>-2.74</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd - 4th</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.3556</td>
<td>4.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Superintendencies Held By Teaching Experience and Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full time teaching experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd - 4th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Degree** |
| Number Held | n | Cases | M   | SD  | t value | df  | 2-tail probability |
| 1st          | 49 | 49    | 2.3673* | 0.528 | -3.61    | 86.51 | .001               |
| 2nd - 4th    | 46 | 45    | 2.8000* | 0.625 |          |       |                    |

**Note:** * 2 is value for masters, 3 is value for doctorate.
Table 9

Superintendent Degree by Type of District:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Ex. Vill.</th>
<th>J.V.S.</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>%-age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%-age</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>12.40247</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.05357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Missing observations: 2.
Table 10

Urban/non-urban Superintendents Agreement with Common Beliefs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief</th>
<th>Number Held</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All students can learn</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.8778</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple types of intelligence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.8315</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning communities foster growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.8667</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diverse learning strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.7556</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Urban/Non Urban Superintendencies By Divisions Observed and New Roles:

#### Divisions among administrators observed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Type</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7640</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>-4.41</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non urban</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.8000</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Divisions among schools observed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Type</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8000</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>-4.41</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non urban</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.7753</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Learning communities places principal in new roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Type</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>88.00 .010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non urban</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.2360</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 12

**Number of Superintendencies Held By Those Who Believe Attention Diverted, Schools Divided, and B.O.E. Support**

#### Attention diverted from renewal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Held</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.6042</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>86.38 .024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd - 4th</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.0889</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Divisions among schools observed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Held</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.0833</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>83.77 .021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd - 4th</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.5455</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Board of Education support since Venture Capital granted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Held</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.2766</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>87.88 .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd - 4th</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.8667</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Urban/Non Urban Superintendencies By Support for resubmission and Teaching Experience

### Would support resubmission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non urban</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.2935</td>
<td>1.434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Superintendent's teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non urban</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6.7978</td>
<td>3.978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

Urban/Non Urban Superintendencies By Value of Waivers, Value of Equal Money, and Level of Involvement

### Value of waivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non urban</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.9438</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Value of equal money per building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non urban</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.2989</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level of involvement should change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non urban</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.5165</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

**Frequency of Responses by Superintendents Agreeing with Common Beliefs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Belief 1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Belief 2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Belief 3&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Belief 4&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number not responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Judgments were made on a five point scale with a sixth category, #9, designated as don’t know/not applicable. (1 = strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree).

<sup>a</sup>Belief 1 = All students can learn.

<sup>b</sup>Belief 2 = Multiple intelligences.

<sup>c</sup>Belief 3 = Learning community fosters growth.

<sup>d</sup>Belief 4 = Diverse learning strategies.
### Table 16

**Frequencies of Responses to Leadership Role Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing attitudes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual risk-taking</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen assessment</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective risk-taking</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocate resources</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate external resources</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared decision making</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty collegiality</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical self-assessment /reflection</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional quality</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties to the community</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth -staff</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum quality</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own professional growth</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Judgments were on a seven point scale.

(1 = extremely important, 7 = extremely unimportant, and 8 = non-response with N = 97).
Frequencies of Responses to Professional Development Needs for Renewal Leadership Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing Attitudes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual risk-taking</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen assessment</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective risk-taking</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocate resources</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate external resources</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared decision making</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty collegiality</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical self-assessment/reflection</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional quality</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties to the community</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth-staff</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum quality</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own professional growth</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Judgments were made on a three point scale.
(1 = extremely important, 3 = extremely unimportant, and 8 = non-response with N = 97).
Table 18

**Frequencies of Responses to Perspectives of the State's Venture**

**Capital Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent supports application</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent gains politically</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher roles are clarified</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning community results in new principal roles</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation for shared decision making</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of models</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Judgments were made on a five point scale with a sixth category #9 of don't know/does not apply.

(1 = strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree, and 8 = non-response with N = 97).
Table 19

Frequencies of Responses to Effects of Participation on School Renewal During the Venture Capital Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention diverted from renewal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative divisions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School divisions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement within community</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Judgments were made on a five point scale with a sixth category #9 of don't know/does not apply.

(1 = strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree, and 8 = non-response with N = 97).
### Frequencies of Responses to Venture Capital Proposal

**Process Items Supporting School Renewal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five year time frame</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. D. E. waivers</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal funding per grant</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No required budget</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent's statement</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of change models</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Judgments were made on a five point scale with a sixth category, #9 designated as don't know/not applicable. (1 = strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree, and 8 = non-response with N = 97).
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