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ABSTRACT

Previous state policy efforts at school reform were limited by a rather simplistic view of what needed to be accomplished in order for significant school improvement to occur. The Ohio Venture Capital process is a unique school improvement initiative aimed at creating building-level capacity for sustained school improvement. The role of the secondary principal is significantly impacted as governance, organization, assessment, and professional development issues are addressed in systemic ways which positively impact teaching and learning.

Specifically, the focus of the investigation was to describe how secondary principals of first-round funded Venture Capital schools perceived: selected leadership roles and secondary principal's appraisal of their own professional development needs for each role; the effects of the buildings' involvement in the Venture Capital grant application process on organizational roles and relationships; and the nature and function of the Venture Capital grant application process.

The method used to collect data for this study was the survey instrument. There were 197 total elementary and secondary principals of first-round funded Venture Capital schools. Seventy-eight of the 197 were secondary principals. The entire population of 78 secondary principals were surveyed.

The 89-item questionnaire used to collect data was developed specifically for this study from information drawn from the Ohio Department of Education monograph, Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal, from the literature base, and from experts in the field.
Based upon the findings of this study, numerous implications can be identified. First, the context of continuous school improvement presumes a shift from the traditional values which have characterized schools. Second, a broader view of leadership needs to be embraced. Third, recognizing that the cultural and symbolic aspect of an organization often is instrumental in creating the environment which makes the expected changes possible - there needs to be a greater understanding of the role of culture in school improvement. Fourth, central office plays an incalculable role in nurturing and sustaining classroom and building-level school improvement by developing a greater system capacity to support and sustain school improvement work. Recognizing the importance of its role and modeling the values and skills which are embedded in the Venture Capital framework will be important. Fifth, principalship preparation will need to more effectively address the knowledge, competencies, and dispositions that future principals will need. Sixth, because of the highly politicized nature of school reform/school improvement, there are numerous policy implications.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Overview

The release of the report, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, on April 26, 1983, set off a wave of activity, nationwide, aimed at improving the nation's schools and establishing a national agenda for educational renewal. *A Nation at Risk* focused attention on the need to reexamine fundamental assumptions underlying education as well as the need to consider dramatic changes in the educational system.

Following *A Nation at Risk* (1983), Ohio joined the reform movement. Quick and simple solutions dominated the early reform agenda. In the Ohio Commission on Educational Excellence report, *Responsible Reform: Focusing on the Future* (1983), recommendations included raising minimum standards which required additional course work in mathematics for state high school graduation as well as developing competency-based educational programs and teacher competency tests. Additionally, colleges and universities were encouraged to increase admissions requirements. Other early reforms included increasing teacher pay while attempting to change tenure laws making it easier to remove poor teachers.

By the end of the 80s, state level interest in education continued to spread rapidly. In his "State of the State address (1989), Governor Richard Celeste devoted a great deal of attention to education in Ohio. The governor emphasized that Ohio was at a crossroads and educational excellence was the appropriate course of action. Education
was a vital force for a strong and competitive economy that could help to prevent future state budgets from becoming overwhelmed by the increasing costs of welfare and crime. 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. While many of the fiscal aspects of Celeste's plan did not take place, the calls for accountability and deregulation did receive legislative attention. Incentives for schools meeting high goals did not materialize; however, 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 July, 1993, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Ted Sanders, released the report, *Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal* (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 intended as an investment in professional development.
experiences pertaining to new models of teaching, learning, and schooling in an effort to break the old school mold.

**Background to Venture Capital**

In 1991, Dr. Ted Sanders, former Under Secretary of Education in the Bush administration, was appointed Ohio’s Superintendent of Public Instruction succeeding Franklin Walter. Sanders entered this key leadership position at a time when there was a great deal of interest and attention being focused on the need for educational improvement in Ohio’s schools.

An influential “gap analysis” study had been conducted by the Ohio Department of Education in cooperation with the Governor’s Education Management Council, legislative staff, as well as consultants from the National Alliance for Business and National Business Roundtable. *Removing the Barriers: Unleashing Ohio’s Learning Power*, the published summary of this study, identified a key gap between the current educational system and what the system needed to do to meet the national goals as being the need for Ohio’s schools to create organizational structures and cultures which supported innovation and continuous improvement. An accompanying recommendation called for a fundamental “restructuring of Ohio’s schools as a precondition to the realization of a high-performance system. 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. 11).

Subsequently, a series of state supported local renewal initiatives were created where innovation and experimentation by school districts in the “transformation and improvement of education in Ohio” was encouraged and expected.
The Venture Capital grant process was the result of the Ohio Department of Education's response to the gap analysis and to the increasingly articulated need for broad and substantive changes in conventional schooling. Venture Capital's charge to educators as described in Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal states that,

"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

Originating in the business sector, the concept of Venture Capital represented "retained corporate earnings or individual savings invested or available for investment in the ownership element of new or fresh enterprise" (State of Ohio Board of Education, 1994, p. 1). Since investors were literally experimenting with these funds, Venture Capital also became known as "risk capital."

The State Board's vision statement encourages "long term effort(s) for positive change that encourages experimentation and risk-taking" to ensure that "conditions are right for learning" (State of Ohio Board of Education, 1994, p. 1). To the extent that monies are invested in the new enterprise of "educational improvement," Venture Capital has the same significance for education as it does for the business community.

In Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal (1993), educational reform is described in terms of school improvement and restructuring. Throughout this document school improvement is identified as a needed effort to "change the fundamental structure of the educational system in order for all students to learn at higher levels."

The intent of Venture Capital is to "spark" experimentation, risk-taking, and entrepreneurial activity with outside funds for a limited period of time as schools build their capacity for continuous improvement. School districts are expected to recognize their responsibility in this area and will begin reallocating funds in order to sustain
school improvement efforts. After the five-year time period, schools are expected to have successfully begun the process of “institutionalizing their commitment to professional development” and “transforming the context in which school renewal is to be implemented. These schools, then, become “lighthouse” schools or exemplars for others. As employed in the monograph, school or educational renewal, improvement, change, and restructuring are used as interchangeable terms.

Venture Capital grants, then, are not intended to be short-term, temporary projects focusing on a particular aspect of change (e.g., curriculum, instruction, assessment, professional development) nor are educators being asked to merely adjust some component of conventional schooling. Rather, the five year commitment offers educators an opportunity to attempt new approaches and to institute fundamental change and coherence in organization, governance, assessment, professional development, and teaching and learning. Indicators of success, which are clear and measurable, become crucial to the ongoing evaluation of Venture Capital schools.

In summary, Venture Capital is a unique policy initiative which does not endorse a top down restructuring approach that emanates from the state through the district and finally is deposited at the building level. The school building is the initial site for the implementation of the Venture Capital project, although Venture Capital does not endorse only a bottom up approach that focuses upon the building staff to the exclusion of other local, state and national stakeholders. Rather, Venture Capital utilizes a combination of both approaches to the school renewal process. This combination design better ensures a more coherent approach to educational improvement.

Purpose of the Study

The Venture Capital process is a unique school improvement initiative aimed at creating building level capacity for sustained school improvement. This shift in
authority and responsibility significantly impacts the role of the secondary principal as governance structures and systems change.

The issue under investigation was to describe how secondary principals of first-round funded Venture Capital schools perceived: selected leadership roles and secondary principal’s appraisal of their own professional development needs for each role; the effects of the buildings’ involvement in the Venture Capital grant application process on organizational roles and relationships; and the nature and function of the Venture Capital grant application process.

**Research Questions**

The questions which guided this study are:

1. What are individual characteristics of secondary principals participating in the first-round funded grant application process in regard to: gender, age, race, academic degrees, years of full-time teaching experience, years of full-time administrative experience, years of administrative experience in current building, number of grant writing experiences where personally involved, and number of funded grants where personally involved?

2. How do principals perceive the importance of particular leadership roles that they potentially exercise in their building?

3. What types of professional development related to the perceived importance of particular leadership roles have been identified as being needed for first-round Venture Capital secondary principals?

4. What have been the building-level effects of the buildings’ involvement in the Venture Capital grant application process on organizational roles and relationships?
5. How do the principals of the first-round funded Venture Capital secondary schools view the nature, meaning and function of the Venture Capital grant application process?

These questions address the important issues underlying fundamental educational reform in Ohio through the Venture Capital process.

Research Methodology

There were 197 total elementary and secondary principals of first-round funded Venture Capital schools. Seventy-eight of the 197 were secondary principals. The entire population of 78 secondary principals were surveyed.

The 89-item questionnaire used to collect data was developed specifically for this study from information drawn from the Ohio Department of Education monograph, *Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal*, from the literature base, and from experts in the field.

An introductory prenotification cover letter was sent August 5, 1994, regarding the intent of the survey. A return date of August 26 was specified which was three weeks away. On August 12, 1994, the survey questionnaire booklet was mailed to each of the 78 first-round funded Venture Capital secondary principals. If, as of August 26, respondents' completed surveys were not received, respondents were telephoned. Calls were attempted until the status of the survey was determined (i.e., the survey was lost, never received, or was in the mail). Additional instruments were sent again as needed.

The telephone follow-up ended October 7.

All but 14 questionnaires were returned by October 17, 1994, the date set to close the questionnaire process and to start compiling the data from all of the returned surveys. The 64 responses represented an 82% response rate from the population of 78 Venture Capital secondary principals.
Significance of the Study

As a result of this study there will be a better understanding of how an innovative state policy initiative is perceived at the local level. This study also contributes to the knowledge base regarding the potential roles of secondary principals within the school improvement context. As well, insights will be gained regarding the evolving role and focus of administrative professional development as researchers and practitioners endeavor to create and sustain those "conditions" which will be vital to the ultimate success of school improvement.

Assumptions and Limitations

This study has two basic assumptions:

1. The respondents involved in this study responded seriously to the questionnaire.

2. The persons responding to the questionnaire were the persons to whom the questionnaires were sent.

For the purpose of this study the following limitations should be noted:

1. The mailed questionnaire method of data collection was used in this study which represents self-reporting of information and is subject to errors inherent in data based on self-report.

2. The results are also limited by all the conventional limits of survey research. These include: incomplete returns, the influence of item wording on responses, and measurement error. Also, there is the possibility that data collected early in the multi-round selection process can be subject to subsequent attitudinal change.

3. Generalizations of the methodological results are limited to the issues investigated, to the self-assessment questionnaire employed, and to the first-round funded Venture Capital secondary principals in Ohio.
While utilizing well-established procedures in survey research, generalizations of methodological results are somewhat limited as a result of creating an entirely original survey instrument as opposed to utilizing a well-established one.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions will be used in this study:

**Secondary Principal**—While not specifically referred to in state policy, a principal is often responsible for the oversight and/or implementation of a broad and diverse array of state policies. Traditionally, the principal has been seen as a middle manager whose job it is to supervise plant and personnel operations and to ensure compliance to established policies and standards. Paradoxically, within the context of school renewal, principals are being expected to employ new knowledge and skills as teacher “empowerment” and shared decision-making help to shape school improvement efforts.

**Venture Capital**—A competitive grant application process developed by the Ohio Department of Education to spark school renewal efforts and to encourage risk takers who want to create a new type of educational system.

**Learning Community**—Consists of a broad range of stakeholder groups who recognize their capacity both individually and collectively, to enhance school improvement. This community is characterized by people who are continually learning how to learn together.

**Systemic Reform**—Is a policy system characterized by its purposeful coordination of educational policy initiatives and a coherent system of curriculum controls at the state and national governmental level. This term is also used to refer to comprehensive change that is focused on many aspects of the system while others stress the notion of “policy integration, coordination, or coherence around a clear set of outcomes” (Smith and O’Day, 1991, p.2). An intent is to create more effective coherence between national and state policy actions and local practices.

**Restructuring**—School reform, school renewal, and school improvement may all be used interchangeably based upon the notion of restructuring. Restructuring is used in this study to apply to any effort to change the fundamental structure of the education system in order to create conditions in which teaching and learning are enhanced for all. This is a concept which is manifest within a particular school organization where changes to and alignment of the core technology (curriculum, instruction, and assessment), organization, governance, and professional development lead to more “enhanced” teaching and learning.

**Site-Based Management**—Is a decision-making model in which responsibility and authority regarding significant educational issues are delegated at the building site.
Overview of Dissertation

Chapter 2 describes the theoretical, philosophical and research background for studying the secondary principal's evolving leadership role within the local as well as state educational reform context. It provides an overview of the literature related to theories of leadership and the changing nature and role of the unique leadership position of the secondary principalship. Literature is also reviewed regarding state-initiated reform efforts with particular attention focused on the implementation of educational reform policies.

Chapter 3 describes the research methodology employed and includes a description of the procedures used in the study including: the selection of subjects, the survey research design; instrument development and review; data collection techniques; and data analysis.

Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study in terms of a variety of descriptive data and an analysis of the significant frequency distributions of responses.

Chapter 5 presents research summary, implications, and recommendations for further study.

A Significant Caveat

This study, with its focus on secondary principals of first-round funded Venture Capital schools, was designed as part of a larger, more policy oriented, joint research effort. Mark Stevens, a former superintendent, focused his dissertation study on the superintendents' perspective of the Venture Capital program, and Sharon Dawson, an elementary principal, focused on the perspective of elementary principals. Taken together, these dissertations were meant to be vehicles for informing and influencing the state policy making process during the first year of implementation. Unfortunately, due to a variety of setbacks, this study was delayed for several years.
Thus, the original intent has not been realized and this dissertation now serves as an important touchstone in the historical review of the Venture Capital program. As a study of first year venture schools, this dissertation provides a solid basis for initial administrative perceptions about the Venture Capital program.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter the theoretical, philosophical, and research frameworks for addressing the purpose of the study and for answering the research questions are presented. This is not a comprehensive review of all of the relevant literature in the fields of leadership theory, administrative behavior, school change, and the policy sciences. Instead, illustrative examples from the literature are presented to connect my understanding of the nexus of leadership, school change, policy, and research to the present study.

The chapter begins with a focus on the definitional aspects of leadership. An overview perspective is then offered which identifies the various schools of leadership which have emerged to the present time. The changing nature and role of the secondary principal is then explored.

Chapter 2 concludes with a discussion of the emerging prominence of state government in the school reform movement. Attention is given to identifying different phases of the reform movement as well as an assessment of policy mechanisms which have been used nationwide to further school reform initiatives. The nature and role of policy and policy analysis is then explored, followed by a review of the literature on the implementation of public policy, particularly those policies associated with the educational reform movement.
The secondary principal, then, encounters a complex dilemma as a key player in the school reform movement. By virtue of the nature of the position, the principal must often simultaneously address the issue of compliance as well as the issue of capacity building. A variety of forces are precipitating innovative responses to important policy concerns. As a result, organizations and individuals are having to consider non-traditional behaviors in the quest for "authentic" reform.

Leadership

It can be argued that most individuals are in agreement regarding the importance and even necessity for leadership. This is especially true in times of change, crisis, or uncertainty. Many questions remain, however, regarding leadership's desired form, direction, or effects within the field of education. The various levels in education (elementary, secondary, and higher; local, states, and national; professionals, laity, and clients) create confusion for practitioners and researchers as they attempt to expand the knowledge base regarding leadership and the role of leadership in education.

The importance of leadership is demonstrated by its place in social science research. According to Mitchell (1979) and DeMeuse (1986), leadership has been one of the frequent subjects of empirical research, concentrating on the antecedents of leaders' behavior and the factors that contribute to its effectiveness.

Defining Leadership

There are multiple definitions of leadership and as Pfeffer (1977) noted, many of them are ambiguous. As well, the distinction between leadership and other socially influenced processes is often unclear (Bavelas, 1960; Hollander & Julian, 1969). The
multidimensional nature of leadership with the various overlapping meanings have added to the confusion.

Bass reminds us that definitions can be used to serve a wide range of purposes. As well, he notes (1960) that the use of a definition in a particular study depends on the purposes of the study. Yukl (1998) provided affirmation of this view when he concluded that “leadership research should be designed to provide information relevant to the entire range of definitions, so that over time it will be possible to compare the utility of different conceptualizations and arrive at some consensus on the matter” (p. 5).

The handbook definition of leadership is Bass and Stogdill’s Handbook of Leadership (3rd Ed.) which maintains that leadership:

is an interaction between two or more members of a group that often involves a structuring or restructuring of the situation and the perceptions and expectations of the members. Leaders are agents of change - persons whose acts affect other people more than other people’s acts affect them. Leadership occurs when one group member modifies the motivation or competencies of others in the group.

Leadership Theories

While there are many classification systems and typologies, several major schools of thought seem to be more visible. Theories of leadership attempt to provide an explanation for those factors that are important in the “emergence” of leadership or in the nature and effects of leadership. Theories of leadership attempt to explain the factors involved either in the emergence of leadership or in the nature of leadership and its consequences (Bass, 1990, p. 37). The following is a survey of the most well-established theories of leadership. These theories of leadership include: Personal and Situational Theories, Humanistic Theories, Interaction and Social Learning Theories; Theories of Interactive Processes; Perceptual and Cognitive Theories; and emergent “hybrid” models.
Personal and Situational Theories

The Great-Man theory posits that history is shaped by the leadership of great men. Dowd (1936) maintained that “There is no such thing as leadership by the masses” as the superior few are the leaders and rulers. Wiggam (1931) noted that the application of survival of the fittest and intermarriage would aid in producing an elite governing class which was biologically different from the lower classes. A high birthrate among the better classes will help to insure an adequate supply of superior leaders.

Trait Theory

The Great-Man Theory contributes to trait theory in that if a given leader is endowed with superior qualities that distinguish him from the masses, these traits must be identifiable. Gouldner (1965), however, reported that reliable evidence does not exist which supports universal leadership traits. This theory is rather limiting, since leaders do not function in solitude but rather in an interactive manner with the important variable of “group” or follower.

Situational Theories

Situational theorists provide an opposite model to trait theorists by suggesting that leadership can be accounted for by the particular situation which will determine who will emerge as leader and what leadership qualities are needed for the situation. Thus, the leader is the product of the situation not the hereditary offspring of the previous leader (Stogdill, 1975).

Situationalists advanced the view that the emergence of a great leader was due to time, place, and circumstances. However, many theorists assert that situational factors are not sufficient to account for leadership. Rather, the interaction of situational and individual factors account for leadership.
The personal-situational theory (Bass, 1990) maintains that both the great man and situational theories are inadequate because they attempt to explain leadership as a confined set of forces. Rather, the interaction of individual and situational factors help to create leadership. Case (1933) held that there are three factors that come together to produce leadership: the personality traits of the leader; the nature of the group and its individual members; and the issue confronting the group. There must be a relevant connection in the relationship between the leader's traits and the characteristics of the group (Stogdill, 1948). The dynamics of the personal-situational theory are created by the interaction of the leader's goals and the needs and goals of the followers.

Common interpretations found within the psychoanalytic school view the leader "as father figure, as a source of love or fear, as the embodiment of the superego, and as the emotional outlet for followers' frustrations and destructive aggression" (Wolmon, 1971, p. 41).

Kets deVries (1980) and Hummel (1975) used psychoanalytic theory to show how the interaction of a leader's personality and the situation is dramatized during periods of turmoil or crisis. Charismatic leaders, according to Kets deVries (1980), arise in crisis "out of a sense of their own grandiosity and the group's sense of helpless dependency" (Kets deVries, 1980, as reported in Bass, 1990, p. 42). "Whether they serve well as leaders depends on whether they can transform their 'paranoid potential' and sense of omnipotence into reality testing" (G. T. Stewart 1974 as reported in Bass, 1990, p. 42). The charismatic leader as perceived by Max Weber possesses unique personality qualities which distinguish her/him from others. These individuals seem to have a clear sense of self, understand the "big picture", and function with great passion and intensity in their pursuit of the noble and extraordinary (Eisenstadt, 1968).
Humanistic Theories

The theories of such individuals as McGregor, Angyris, Likert, Blake, and Mouton, Maslow, and Hersey and Blanchard were grounded in American democratic principles and freedoms. The core focus concerned the development of the individual within an effective and cohesive organization. The premise is that by nature the individual is a motivated organism; whereas, by nature the organization is structured and controlled. The primary function of leadership, then, is to alter the organization to provide freedom by which individuals will be able to satisfy their needs and, at the same time, to contribute to the attainment of organizational goals (Bass, 1990).

Interaction and Social Learning Theories

The interaction and social learning theories provide an explanation of the leader-follower relationship as a consequence of a leader's interaction with followers and includes the circumstances involved. The emergence of leadership as manifest through interaction theories may be explained in terms of a leader's role and its attainment, reinforcement of change, paths to goals, and the effects of contingencies.

According to leader-role theory, there is an interaction of individual characteristics with the demands of the situation in such a way as to allow an individual or individuals to emerge as leaders. A group is considered organized to the extent that positions and roles are differentiated, with leadership representing one of the differentiated positions in a group. The individual occupying the leadership position is expected to play a different role from other members in the group. Leadership behavior will be determined by what is expected of them and how they perceive their roles. Both leader's and followers' expectations and perceptions of roles are influenced by formal organizational devices, informal communication, and one's own needs, values, and desires (Kahn & Quinn, 1970).
Theories of role of attainment attempt to provide an explanation regarding who emerges as a leader of a group and why this has occurred. Stogdill (1959) finds that group members interact and engage in mutual goal settings with the expectation that each will continue to act and interact according to past performances. The leadership potential is defined through mutual goal setting in which the individual initiates and maintains interactions.

In reinforced-change theory, as reported by Bass (1960), leadership is the ability to enable a group to achieve expected goals. In the process, the leader is able to change the motivation, understanding, or behavior of other group members. Leaders acquire and maintain their position as a result of their perceived ability to reinforce the behavior of group members through their successful deployment of rewards and punishments.

A prominent feature of Path-Goal theory includes the leader's reinforcement of change in the follower. Georgopoulos, Mahoney and Jones (1957) and M. G. Evans (1970a) suggested that those leaders who are identified as successful identify those rewards that are available to the follower. House (1971) observes that the leader also shows the follower the paths or behaviors which are necessary in order for rewards to be obtained. Thus, an important role for the leader is to clarify goals and paths to the goals for the followers.

Contingency theory, as studied by Fiedler (1967a), suggests that the effectiveness of leaders who tend to be either more task-oriented or relations-oriented is contingent upon situational demands. He maintains that effective placement of the individual within a situation for which she or he is best suited is crucial.
Theories of Interactive Processes

Numerous other theories and models have developed which identify leadership and leader-follower relationships as an interactive process.

The multiple-screen model, another model developed by Fiedler and Leister (1977), provides another interaction approach aimed at explaining the relationship between leader intelligence and group performance. Fiedler and Leister suggest that intelligent leaders foster effective groups if there is a good relationship between leader and boss. If the relationship is not a good one, then experienced leaders rather than intelligent ones are responsible for group success.

Exchange theory is based on the assumption that interaction among group members constitutes a form of exchange in which group members make contributions at a cost to themselves and receive benefits at a cost to group members. Interaction continues as a result of individuals finding social exchange mutually rewarding. Leadership implies an equitable exchange relationship between leader and followers.

Behavioral theory suggests that "leaders do not directly cause subordinates' behavior; they merely set the occasion or provide a discriminative stimulus for the evocation of it" (Bass, 1990, p. 49). All of the various behavioral theories emphasize reinforcement and making the use of rewards and punishments contingent on the particular desired behavior.

Perceptual and Cognitive Theories

Another major category of leadership theories is that of the Perceptual and Cognitive Theories. Among the specific theories to be discussed here are Attribution Theory, Open-System Analysis theory, and Rational-Deductive Approaches Theory.

Attribution theory provides that each group member, leader and followers, maintains his/her own theory of leadership. Attributions of leadership by followers are
biased by their individual social realities. Recognizing this, Calder (1977) maintains that leadership changes from an obtuse concept to a study of a social phenomenon of group members: "a study in how the term is used, when it is used, and assumptions about the development and nature of leadership" (Bass, 1990, p. 50).

The perspective of the Open-System Analysis Theory is based on the premise that a leader's followers must be sensitive to the larger environment and organization in which they are involved. As inputs are converted into outputs and there is more feedback impacting this dynamic system, there is a great potential for an increase in the rate and intensity of change as well as decision-making. At the higher levels of the organization, leadership involves strategic decision making in a "nearly unbounded environment" (Bass, p. 52).

In considering a Rational-Deductive Approach to leadership, Vroom and Yetton (1973) provided a prescription for a successful leadership style. Their argument was that "supervisors ought to be directive when they are confident that they know what needs to be done and when their subordinates do not have this knowledge" (Bass, 1990, p. 52). They suggest that in this situation the subordinates will accept a decision made by the supervisor. However, a supervisor should be participative if subordinates have more information than the supervisor, their commitment and acceptance are important, and they can be trusted to support organizational interests.

Classifying or categorizing theories of leadership can often be done only tentatively at best. Any number of leadership theories may be "at work" in any organization at a point in time. It may be that under certain conditions, it is more beneficial to make use of behavioral theories to understand the behavior of leaders. Under other circumstances, such as when leaders and followers must make decisions based upon their interpretation of a situation, perceptual and cognitive theories are more useful. It may be that components of a particular theory or the essential theory
itself may provide more useful insights for leaders addressing short-term conflict, while other theories may better address leadership issues involving long-term or chronic conflict or maladjustments. Thus, in considering leadership within the context of school improvement, we need to be open to the usefulness and applicability of any number of leadership theories and models.

Hybrid Models

Within the past two decades, the transformational leadership school has become a dominant paradigm for the observation and study of leadership within the “excellent schools” and “school reform” context.

Prior to the 1980’s, an area of focusing on leadership concentrated on the transactional exchange between the leader and followers. The leader clarified what needed to be done and the benefits to the self-interests of the followers for compliance. Starratt (1993) wrote that “transactional activity involves a bargaining, sometimes unspoken, over the individual interests and claims of people going their own separate ways, or, although engaged in collective endeavor, or people motivated primarily by self-interest” (p. 70). This exchange process can be viewed metaphorically as a form of leadership as bartering where the focus is on basic, largely extrinsic motives and needs. For example, merit pay would be awarded for increased performance. Critics maintain that transactional leadership is based on a limited view of human potential, an inadequate world view, and an antiquated view of organizational theory and practice (Sergiovanni and Moore, 1989). Furthermore, self-interest is glorified at the expense of more moral aspects of schooling. Burns conceived leaders to be either transformational or transactional but Bass (1985a, 1985b) modified the paradigm by proposing that transformational leadership augments the effects of transactional leadership on the efforts, effectiveness and satisfaction of followers. In the new
paradigm, the transformational leader moves the followers to transcend their own interests for the good of the group, organization, or society (Bass, 1985a, Burns, 1978). "Followers are asked to consider their long-term needs to develop themselves, rather than their needs of the moment; and to become more aware of what is really important" (p. viii). Essentially, followers are converted into leaders.

Transformational leaders develop in their followers an expectation of high performance rather than merely engage in the manipulation of rewards and punishments (Gilbert, 1985). Intrinsic motivation becomes an important goal. Brandford and Cohen (1984) see the leader as more than a successful technician. The transformational leader is a developer of people and a builder of teams. Zaleznik (1977) saw transformational leaders as being similar to charismatics, in that, they attract strong feelings of identification from their followers.

In describing the hybrid nature of transformational leadership, Tichy and DeVanna (1986) note that this type of leadership is not attributed solely to charisma. It is a behavioral process capable of being learned and managed. It's a leadership process that is systematic, consisting of purposeful and organized search for changes, systematic analysis, and the capacity to move resources from areas of lesser to greater productivity to bring about a strategic transformation (p. 13). The term transformational leadership refers to the "process of influencing major changes in the attitudes and assumptions of organization members and building commitment for the organization's mission or objectives" (Yukl, 1989, p. 204).

Initially, transformational leadership takes the form of leadership as building. The focus is on "arousing human potential, satisfying higher needs, and raising expectations of both leader and follower to motivate them both to higher levels of commitment and performance" (Sergiovanni and Moore, 1989, p. 215). Leadership as building responds to individual needs regarding esteem, competence, autonomy, and self-
actualization. Concepts normally associated with transformational leadership as building, for example, are empowerment and symbolic leadership.

Ultimately transformational leadership becomes moral when it raises the level of “human conduct and ethical aspiration” (p. 215) of both the leader and follower and transforms them both. As a result, transformational leadership takes the form of leadership as bonding.

The focus is on increasing awareness so that goals and purposes are elevated to the level of a shared covenant. Leaders and followers are bound through this covenant in a moral commitment. Leadership as bonding responds to such human needs as purpose and meaning. A more selfless engagement in service to teaching and learning begins replacing the selfish “turf” wars.

Burns reminds us that traditional (transactional) and emergent (transformational) leadership are not to be considered as mutually exclusive. Both types may be present at the same time and practiced by the same leader. Which view of leadership is emphasized has important implications for school improvement.

Another model which might arguably be considered within the hybrid model context is the competing values model. Robert E. Quinn (1988) developed the competing values model of management as a framework to describe the seemingly contradictory values embraced by organizations. These values give rise to conflicting roles that managers must assume in order to be successful.

While there are many models of management, often with contradictory assumptions regarding which aspects of management are most important, the competing values framework combines the four historically most dominant models of organization and management into a single conceptual framework. One of the strengths of this approach is that it shows the values underlying each organizational model and helps to clarify the complexities and competing demands that managers must face. Each model
provides various lenses for viewing managerial behavior and provides a framework for examining the dynamic nature of multiple managerial perspectives. Quinn recognizes that while effective managers need to use multiple frames, they may appear to act in paradoxical ways. "They engage the contradictions of organizational life by using paradoxical frames. Viewed from a single point in time, their behaviors may seem illogical and contradictory" (Quinn, 1988, p. 4). He goes on to link the "mastery of management" to the capacity to create excellence (p. 12). "Excellence is a paradoxical phenomenon that emerges under conditions of uncertainty and creative tension" (p. 12). Ultimately, according to Quinn, organizational effectiveness is directly linked to mastering the contradictions of organizational life.

The four models of organization which Quinn also develops as "information-processing orientations" (p. 38) are based upon powerful underlying assumptions regarding what constitutes "good management." Even more powerful may be their representation of four competing moralities for judging organizational life and for seeing the world. All four models exist in an interrelated fashion in every organization and managers are expected to reconcile effectively the various roles and balance the competing demands that are represented by each set of expectations. As well, each of the models emphasizes different prevailing values and criteria for effectiveness and, thus, each suggests different roles that managers must assume.

In the open systems model, a more recent model of organization, the underlying assumption is that individuals have a high need for growth, development, and stimulation. Thus, flexibility, adaptability, and change are emphasized. Key processes include creative problem solving, innovation, political adaptation, and the management of change. The leadership style is an inventive one where risk-taking plays a prominent role.
The manager is expected to be an adaptable innovator and broker whose "boundary spanning function" prompts growth and resource acquisition. The manager as innovator has numerous organizational implications. In this role, the manager is expected to facilitate adaptation and change. The innovator buffets uncertainty by monitoring external events and trends and conceptualizes and initiates innovative ideas utilizing induction and intuitive insights. The innovator aids in creating an organizational culture which is guided by "visioning" and a prevailing value system which seems to encourage and expect individuals' collective risk taking. While excessive emphasis on this role might lead to excessive fragmentation, ignoring this role might lead to overly conservative policies which are woefully out of alignment with emerging external trends.

In a system where political skill in working with the external environment is important, the broker role takes on added significance. Ensuring external legitimacy and securing external resources are important responsibilities of the broker. Positively impacting decision making within the organization is important as well. In this role, the manager is expected to be politically astute, influential, persuasive and thus, powerful. Overemphasis on this role may result in political expediency, at the expense of ethical considerations, totally dominating the decision making process, while ignoring this role might result in a lack of attention and resources being given to this component.

The individual's high need for achievement is the assumption that undergirds the rational goal model. Productivity and profit are key measures of organizational effectiveness, as virtually all decisions are driven by "bottom line" considerations. Goal clarification and rational analysis characterize this model. The leadership style is directive and goal or task oriented as the manager is compelled to function as a producer and director.
A producer is expected to get people to complete tasks and reach objectives by creating a climate that is achievement oriented. The strength of this role involves the ability to accomplish goals, realize profits, and initiate tasks. Focusing too much on this role, however, may lead to overwork and ultimately, low production. On the other hand, too little emphasis on this role may lead to low productivity. In the director role the manager provides direction, identifies priorities, and communicates organization’s vision. The main strengths of this role include the abilities to plan, prioritize, clarify, and provide structure. Taken to excess, this role can lead to overregulation and a lack of attention to employee needs and concerns. Too little emphasis on this role may result in company policies being unclear and indecisive.

In the internal process model, people are assumed to have a great need for security. This model of organization values continuity, stability, and predictability. It is thought that documentation results in accountability. Thus, strict adherence to rules and regulations is valued as power is exercised through information control (Quinn, 1992). The leadership style exercised in this model is cautious and conservative as managers work to guarantee "efficient workflow" (Quinn, 1992, p. 2) and fulfill their roles as monitor and coordinator.

As a monitor, a manager is responsible for knowing what is occurring, for monitoring progress through the development of measures and checkpoints, and for reviewing the process. The monitor collects information and is concerned with efficient systems maintenance. Taken to the extreme, this role may cause antiseptic managerial practice while underemphasis might lead to faculty decision making because of inadequate information. The coordinator brings a sense of order or unity to the organization and thus, helps maintains the structure. This role is an influential role for its ability to provide stability, continuity, and control. At one extreme, this role may
cause the status quo to be maintained even when it is time to change. Without attention to this role, the workplace could be chaotic and inefficient.

The human relations model holds the assumption that individuals have a strong need for affiliation. The values that are considered important in this model include consensus, morale, and interpersonal relationships. Conflict resolution, team building, and broad based participation are emphasized. The prevalent leadership style embraces concern and support as the manager attempts to exercise his/her power in relationship building through assuming the roles of facilitator and mentor.

The facilitator is expected to practice participatory decision making in order to build consensus and teamwork. This role is based on a process orientation. While this role may lead to excessive organizational meeting and planning time which serves as an obstacle to decision making, undervaluing this role may lead to group conflict, poor communication, and alienation. The mentor possesses a human resources frame of reference and is committed to the professional development of colleagues. Success in this role may lead to higher commitment and loyalty and greater productivity. Balancing individual and organizational interests will always be problematic as both are symbiotically linked and linchpins for substantive organizational success.

It seems that as we analyze the role of leadership within the school improvement context, an appropriate approach might be to consider the multiple perspectives that the various theories offer. Leadership's dynamic nature and potential power may best be captured by embracing a more eclectic approach to understanding the nature of this elusive concept.
Management vs. Leadership

An ongoing controversy surrounds the relationship and relative importance of management and leadership. No one has suggested that managing and leading are equivalent terms, but the degree of overlap is the point of contention. Some writers contend that the two are qualitatively different, even mutually exclusive. For example, Bennis and Naaaus (1985, p. 21) propose that “managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing.” Zaleznik (1977) proposed that managers are concerned about how things get done, and leaders are concerned with what the things mean to people. The essential distinction appears to be that leaders influence commitment, whereas managers merely carry out position responsibilities and exercise authority. Quinn, on the other hand, has taken a contrary view by seeing considerable overlap between management and leadership and recognized the possibility, even necessity, of being both an effective manager and leader.

During the last decade and a half, numerous studies have been conducted to determine what constitutes “good leadership” in organizations (Bennis & Nannus, 1985; Clifford & Cavanagh, 1985; Conger, 1989; Kotter, 1982, 1988, 1996; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Levinson & Rosenthal, 1984; Maccoby, 1981; Peters & Austin, 1985; Vaill, 1982).

It seems that the only characteristic of effective leadership that is universal in these studies is vision. “Effective leaders help to establish a vision, to set standards for performance, and to create a focus and direction for organizational efforts” (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. 411). One other characteristic that appears repeatedly (Clifford & Cavanagh, 1985; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Peters & Austin, 1985) is the ability to communicate effectively a vision through the use of symbols. An organization’s vision
can influence its future, but only if it shapes policy and behaviors within the organization.

An often overlooked yet arguably essential aspect of leadership is the notion of self-knowledge that is manifested in myriad leadership “acts.” Bennis writes that self-knowledge is an essential part of defining a leader’s integrity. “To become a leader you must become yourself, become the maker of your own life” (Bennis, 1989, p. 51). He observes that knowing thyself is “the most difficult task any of us faces. But until you truly know yourself, strengths and weaknesses, know what you want to do and why you want to do it, you cannot succeed in any but the most superficial sense of the word” (Bennis, 1989, p.40). Steven Covev., in The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People, describes personal leadership as an ongoing process of clarifying one’s vision and values, and aligning one’s life in congruence with eternal principles. To live a “principle-centered life” requires an individual to thoroughly examine one’s thoughts and feelings so that there is more clarity regarding the purpose of one’s life and an identification of what is really important.

Self knowledge, unique individual leadership characteristics, and situational variables help to create a dynamic, fluid, and complex environmental context for the evaluation of leadership within a change context.

Principalship

As we move closer to the twenty-first century, educational administrators, especially those in the public sector, occupy a role with “peculiarly contradictory” demands. They are expected, on one hand, to “work actively to transform, restructure, and redefine schools and the processes and persons therein” (Goldring & Rallis, 1993; Murphy, 1992, p. 34). On the other hand, the organizational positions which they
occupy have historically and traditionally been bastions of stability committed to resisting change (Bredeson, 1985; Sergiovanni, 1987, 1992). In addition, principals are being forced to clarify their roles, relationships, and responsibilities at a time when their schools and society are in a state of flux and turmoil (Murphy & Hallinger, 1992). “The role of the principal is an extremely malleable one, shaped by a diverse set of concerns and events” (Beck & Murphy, 1993, p. 197).

Evolution of Change Literature

In considering the evolution of the change literature during the past two decades, Fullan (1992) describes this evolution as beginning with a somewhat limited preoccupation with the implementation of single innovations. The evolution then continued with a relatively brief period of concern for how multiple innovations could be managed and currently has expanded into questions regarding how “the basic capacity to deal with change” (p. 113) can be developed. This current interest in capacity building acknowledges the continuous nature of the change process given the societal context for schooling. As well, it also reflects an appreciation of the rates of change now being expected of our educational system (e.g., Schlechty, 1990).

Fullan reminds us that the failure of educational change might be attributed as much to the fact that many innovations and reforms were never implemented in practice rather than the fact that political, economic, and societal factors were responsible for inhibiting change within educational systems (Fullan, 1991). Berman and McLaughlin (1979) write “the pressures for change seem to subside with the act of adoption followed by the appearance of implementation” (p. 1).

Hall and others have found that principals have the potential for having a great impact on the degree of implementation of particular innovations. Trider and Leithwood (1988), however, have found that principals often favor innovations related to their
background interests while withholding support for those unrelated innovations. Thus, generalizing from how a principal reacted to a given innovation is misleading, and focusing on the relative success of implementing single innovations does not bode well for long-term school improvement. The school improvement movement known as "restructuring" demands that we transition from viewing the principal's role in influencing the implementation of singular innovations to a role which is responsible for leading changes in the school as an organization (Fullan, 1991).

**Restructuring**

There is a complex web of interrelated factors responsible for providing the momentum for ongoing school improvement efforts with a particularly visible and pervasive strand focusing on the comprehensive redesign of the American educational system through "restructuring."

The impetus to restructure schools is created from an ongoing set of challenges facing our society as well as educational system. While today's schools are characterized by their uniformity, passivity, and order, large-scale changes in our world demand initiative, diversity, and innovativeness. Many reform reports have indicated that due to our increasingly information-based society, future workers, for their livelihood, will need to be able to frame problems, pose solutions, and adapt continuously to changing needs (Carnegie Forum, 1986; National Science Board, 1983; National Governors' Association, 1986; Schlechty, 1990).

Changing demographic and social conditions which include, in particular, increased poverty, ethnic diversity, and declining institutional and community support for young people require that schools embrace a much different, proactive relationship toward their communities. At the same time, educators are working in schools designed on scientific management principles whereby the mass production of "educational
products" with low-level skills is the frequent outcome (Darling-Hammond, 1990a; Oakes, 1985).

Conceptions of the principalship are being shaped through the ongoing debate concerning the meaning and role of restructuring as it relates to educational improvement. There is a fragile consensus behind the idea of restructured schools which says essentially that public schools, as they currently exist, are incapable of “meeting society’s expectations for the education of young people” (Elmore 1990). In addressing the issue of what constitutes an “effective or successful” education, Astuto, Clark, Read, McGee, and Fernandez (1994) contend that:

> what we have experienced so far are practices and policies rooted firmly in a set of dominant assumptions that reflect orthodox views and conservative interpretations of the knowledge bases and practices of organizational studies, schooling, and educational policy.

Part of the appeal of “restructured schools” as a theme for education reform may be attributed, in part, to the fact that it lacks definitional characteristics which are widely understood or acknowledged. School restructuring has many of the characteristics of what political and organizational theorists call a “garbage can” (Cohen, March, & Olsen, 1972; Kingdon, 1984); in other words, the theme of restructured schools contains numerous notions regarding what is problematic about American education, as well as a host of solutions favored by various interest groups. If the theme of school restructuring is unspecified and fluid, it continues to provide cohesiveness for reformers. This “coincidence of interests” does not provide a guarantee that restructuring schools will be provided a well-articulated, coherent policy agenda, much less any changes in the nature and outcomes of schooling. However, if it becomes too well-defined, it may begin to divide rather than unite diverse political interests, thus providing even less chance for “significant” changes (Elmore, 1990).
Definitions of Restructuring

In providing a definitional framework for restructuring, Michael Kirst writes, "restructuring is a word that means everything and nothing simultaneously... It is in the eye of the beholder." Similarly, Goodlad has said, "We are rapidly moving toward the use of the word 'restructuring' whenever we talk about school reform at all. This is becoming another catchword when the truth of the matter is that hardly any schools are restructured" (Olsen 1988, p. 73).

One view of restructuring (Goldman, Dunlap, & Conley, 1993) would require changes to the core technology of a school (curriculum, instruction, assessment), to the occupational conditions of teaching (increased professionalism and accountability), to authority and decision-making structures, and to roles and relationships. Corbett's (1990) definition only includes requiring changes in the patterns of rules, roles, relationships, and results. Frank Newman, executive director of the Education Commission of the States, has offered one of the more expansive definitions: "restructuring applies to any effort to change the fundamental structure of the education system in order to create conditions in which all students can achieve at higher levels. The structure includes such elements as curriculum, teaching, testing, management, budget, schedules, roles and responsibilities, relationships, incentives and other practices, policies and procedures that define school and district working environments." The generally desired results include: "far greater student learning; vastly different roles and working conditions; major shifts in leadership, administration, and community relations; and new forms of education policy, politics and coalitions" (ECS, 1991, p. 2). Webster's (1993) provides a more succinct and generic definition of restructuring as effecting a fundamental change in, for example, an organization or system. While there appears to be a great deal of overlap throughout the literature regarding the essential characteristics of restructuring, a major problem
that emerges is not in the multiple meanings but in the various approaches (National Association of Secondary Principals, 1992).

Financial Implications

A number of financial issues are also responsible for creating a nebulous quality to school restructuring. The first involves determining the necessary level of resources required to transform dramatically the educational establishment. Two positions seem to dominate. One position maintains that there is the argument that sufficient funds are currently available and what is needed is less bureaucracy and more effort (Murphy, 1991). The other position maintains that there are insufficient resources available (Jordan & McKeown, 1990) and suggests that enhanced effort be joined with additional resources. Thus, it appears that efforts to reform dramatically schools throughout the country are being undermined by the unwillingness or inability of society to pay for needed changes, or as Kerchner (1988) has noted, "the cost of the existing educational reform movement is probably well in excess of the capacity of states to finance it" (p. 391).

Reinforcing this conclusion is the fact that very little attention has been given to the issue of the costs of educational reform measures. Ginsberg and Wimpelberg (1987) have concluded that "little, if any, attention is paid to the financial or procedural requirements for putting educational commission recommendations into practice" (p. 358). Even when there is clear specificity regarding expenditures, opportunity costs are usually absent. With incomplete or absent data concerning the real costs of educational reform, policymakers are ill informed, and the educational community is ill served.

Another financial issue that is conspicuous by its absence involves data to compare the cost-benefits of different reform measures (Levin, 1987). There are two primary reasons why this creates a dilemma. First, the amount of money that state
legislators have provided or are projected to provide in the future for reform initiatives is limited (Odden, 1990); thus, it is important for policymakers to possess the relevant information which will enable them to make appropriate decisions as a result of understanding the benefits of investing public funds in various reform strategies (Levin, 1984; 1988). Second, the welfare benefits and welfare costs that accompany forced collective consumption of government services (e.g., school-based decision making) should be considered (Oates, 1972).

A last funding concern involves the "pathetically small" amount of money states are spending to assess the impact of their reform initiatives (Kirst, 1987, p. 163) which is severely limiting our ability to learn from restructuring efforts and to make more informed decisions regarding the future school reform agenda. More money is needed to fund data collection activities designed to inform more effectively the policy process aimed at restructuring this country's schools (Southern Regional Educational Board, 1990).

Reconceptualizing the Role of Policy

Within the current restructuring movement, some analysts are involved in reconceptualizing the role of policy. Viewing reform as "steady work" grounded in the day-to-day experiences of school life is a major shift away from the idea that innovation is a sporadic event (Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988). As an expression of this new view, policy is less likely to buffer constraints than to enable effective practices to occur (McLaughlin, 1989). The role of policy is changed by the recognition that, for school restructuring to occur, a combination of factors must be existent simultaneously and in an ongoing manner: leadership, group mission, school-based goals, resources, climate for collaboration, and the promotion of professional growth opportunities for teachers. As Milbrey McLaughlin suggests, "We have learned that we can't mandate what matters
in creating effective practice; the challenge lies in understanding how policy can enable and facilitate" (1989, p. 23).

**Change Context for Principals**

During the past two decades, the vast majority of studies regarding school change and reform have identified the principal as a key player (Dwyer, Lee, Rowan, & Bossert, 1983; Firestone & Wilson, 1985; Fullan, 1985, 1991, 1992; Leithwood, 1992; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Smith & Andrews, 1989). Regardless of the particular research perspective chosen in individual studies, much of this research has been grounded in a traditional view premised on the positional power of the principal in a hierarchical school organization (Brady, 1984; Conway, 1984; Firestone & Wilson, 1985). In this view, the principalship has access to an organizational perspective as well as power and control mechanisms that are not available to others. In fact, it is this structural position that allows principals to become brokers of elements critical to the success of change efforts. While more recent research has recognized the complexity, paradox, and ambiguity inherent in the role of the principal in change efforts (Fullan, 1991; Louis & Miles, 1990), the more traditionally defined leadership and management perspective continues to dominant.

**Positional Perspective**

This positional perspective regarding the role of the principal contains limitations that may systematically exclude or marginalize other ways of understanding or conceptualizing the role of the principal, especially in a restructuring context. Emphasizing the managerial and rational decision-making aspects of the principal’s role within the school change context actually reinforces the underlying assumption that change efforts are based largely on top-down leadership initiatives (Thiessen, 1993). As well, this perspective tends to ignore the holistic, interactive, and reciprocal nature
of restructuring as it relates to the interconnectedness between the substance, process, and meanings of change for all the various participants. To date, much of the restructuring literature has focused on those behavioral and structural adaptations that are easily observable and "relatively bounded." (Murphy & Louis, 1994, p. 124). While this has been an understandable response to the initial imperative to address first-order changes in structure and process, this tends to isolate the role of the principal from the change process and cause an inference that change is unidirectional (Murphy & Louis 1994).

Centralization vs. Decentralization

Throughout our history periods of dissatisfaction with our educational system have refueled the centralization versus decentralization school governance controversy. While the rhetoric surrounding this controversy has promised a great deal, it appears that no matter how schools have been run, "basic patterns of instruction appear to have changed remarkably little over long periods of time" (Cuban, 1984; Cohen, 1990). Elmore also supports the notion that governance structures have very limited influence on issues regarding the accountability or effectiveness of school systems. He argues that governance debates are about "who should have access to and influence over decisions, not about what the content and practice of teaching and learning should be or how to change those things" (Elmore in Hannaway & Carnoy, 1993).

Within our current context, the increasing disenchantment with the bureaucratic infrastructure of schools is helping to fuel the latest episode in this historic debate. Increasing criticism of the prevailing model of bureaucracy has critics arguing that the governance, organization, and management of schools employing such a model paralyzes initiative, innovativeness and professional judgment (Bolin, 1989; Chubb & Moe, 1990; Conley, 1989; Frymier, 1987). Bureaucracies are also seen as being a counter prevailing force to the needs, interests, and desires of educators within a school and
"that it is impractical, and it does not fit the psychological and personal needs of the workforce" (Clark & Meloy, 1989, p. 293; Bolin, 1989; Frymier, 1987). Critics also claim that bureaucratic management is antithetical to the essential values and purposes of education, and they question "fundamental ideological issues pertaining to bureaucracy's meaning in a democratic society" (Campbell et al., 1987, p. 73; American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1988; Angus, 1988; Giroux, 1988; National Center for Effective Schools Research and Development, 1989).

Many state policy makers view the essence of restructuring as being the changing of authority and accountability mechanisms (National Governors' Association, 1991). Policy makers view restructuring as a process which allows educators more decision-making authority in exchange for more accountability regarding "significant" educational improvements and increased student achievement. One of the most common manifestations of restructuring involves altering governance arrangements so that more decisions are decentralized to the school site (sometimes called school based management) and more decision-making authority is being shared with teachers, and to a lesser extent parents (Murphy, 1991).

A clear lesson which has been learned from earlier research regarding school improvement is that the superintendent is the "lynchpin of sustaining reform movement" (Finn & Clements, 1989, p. 6). Even in districts that support decentralization, superintendents tend to act as gatekeepers for change both at the district and the school level. "Without their endorsement and support, their willingness to commit valuable tangible and intangible organizational resources, the seeds of restructuring are likely to fall on barren ground" (Murphy, 1991, p. 92). On the other hand, where there is transformational change occurring, there is invariably a superintendent who supports the notion (Carnoy & MacDonnell, 1990; Casner-Lotto, 1988; Lindquist & Murial, 1989).
Rationale for Decentralization

The classical rationale for devolution can be classified according to political and economic arguments. The political science position regarding decentralization maintains "the proposition that the closer government is to the people the more likely it is to be responsive to their demands and interests" (Campbell, n.d., p. 2). Expressions of this "grassroots" idea of responsiveness include issues of democracy, constituent influence and involvement, widespread ownership of public systems, and organizational accountability. Supporters of devolution maintain that decentralized bodies increase "knowledge about, access to, and participation in governance; enable organizational change to occur more easily; and inhibit the consolidation of power and influence either hierarchically or at localized site locations (Murphy, 1991, p.2). In the economic context, proponents of decentralization argue that devolution of authority is important in producing competition in "sheltered monopolies." Competition produces an experimental milieu where innovativeness is more likely to occur. Organizations develop more responsiveness to consumer demands and become more efficient and effective in their use of resources. (Bradford, et. al., 1969). Budgeting at the school site, an example used by proponents, increases the efficiency of resource allocation.

Role of Teachers

If we accept the tenet that understanding how teachers respond to change is central to the issue of improving schools, the question regarding the purpose of leadership within the current school improvement context is essential. "Educational change depends on what teachers do and think - it's as simple and complex as that" (Conley, 1993, p. 416; Sarason, 1990; Darling-Hammond, 1990).

Three perspectives on planned change and teachers' contribution to it have evolved over the years: the technical, the political, and the cultural (House, 1981;
Tichy, 1983). The technical perspective is based upon a rational approach to improving instructional practice and rests on the assumption that increased knowledge and technical assistance produces well-designed products that teachers willingly will use to improve instruction. The political perspective recognizes that this process is infrequently so linear and harmonious. It assumes that teachers, administrators, and other stakeholders frequently have divergent interests and that all parties use the power and influence at their disposal to shape new programs. The cultural perspective stresses the importance of shared norms, beliefs, and values among practitioners and the various symbolic meanings they attach to efforts toward change (House, 1981; Tichy, 1983). The component parts of cultures help individuals to create shared meanings. Common rituals, stories, beliefs, images, or symbols may have an important unifying function as diverse constituencies and goals find a common meaning through their culture. Cultures can assist individuals in better understanding their purpose within the organization (Morgan, 1986). The shift in focus among the perspectives is "from the innovation, to the innovation in context, to the context itself" (House, 1981, p. 28).

School Culture

The process of school restructuring cannot be thought of simply in terms of changes in organization or governance, or of a maze of disconnected projects and programs. Ultimately, it must address issues regarding the culture of the school (Conley, 1993).

A cultural perspective concerning organizations, although not new, has recently taken on considerable significance (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Schein, 1985; Tichy, 1983; Sizer, 1984). Increasingly, school reformers are recognizing that substantive, long-term school improvement will occur "school-by-school-by-school" (Sizer, 1984).
Deal (1987) offers an explanation regarding the importance of culture in understanding schools as stable environments:

Culture as a construct helps explain why classrooms and schools exhibit common and stable patterns across variable conditions. Internally, culture gives meaning to instructional activity and provides a symbolic bridge between action and results. It fuses individual identity with collective destiny. Externally, culture provides the symbolic facade that evokes faith and confidence among outsiders with a stake in education (Meyer & Rowan, 1983; Deal, 1987, p. 6).

Conley (1993) argues that educational leaders, such as principals, must understand the importance and power of culture as they attempt to address the various needs of other members of the organization that will surely arise within an evolving change context. An important aspect of the art of leadership involves managing the school culture - an imprecise process that does not lend itself to prescription. Managing the change process within a cultural context is influenced by the frame of reference the leader uses when analyzing the organization. Leaders often possess tendencies to apply one frame of reference through which they attempt to explain everything that occurs throughout the organization, and within which all solutions are offered. Bolman and Deal (1991) have suggested four frames of reference commonly utilized by leaders as they attempt to manage and lead organizations within a change context: structural, human resources, political, and symbolic frames. Their point is that for restructuring to occur, principals must understand that change must occur to some degree in each of these frames. Ultimately, a leader's job is to make conscious decisions that impact the culture of the school in a way that makes that culture more amenable to change and more effective in its delivery of educational services to students.

While it is important to attempt to address how fundamental reform measures are impacting the work environment of the principal, Murphy reminds us that "improvement strategies occupy only a small section of the educational landscape. Discovering how principals in these schools act tells us little about how the average
principal is behaving" (Murphy & Louis, 1994, p. 21). Also, given the fact that substantive school reform is a fairly recent phenomenon, we must be careful not to draw definitive conclusions from findings which may be based on the evolving role of the principalship early in the change process. Examining the principal's role during a later stage of the change process may produce yet another "picture" of that role.

The Changing Work Environment of the Principal

Influenced by a variety of forces identified earlier, it seems that principals are working increasingly in a "turbulent policy environment that has important consequences for the organizational life of the school" (Vandenberghe, 1992, pp. 24, 33; Goldring, 1992) as well as for the principalship itself. There are three reform strands which appear to be contributing to this turbulence. First, the educational system is becoming very complex. There has been an increase in educational expectations and the number of "players" has risen, "increasing the scale and complexity of school management tasks" (Bolam, et al., 1992, p. 24) and adding "exponentially to the complexities and ambiguities of principaling" (Smylie, et. al., 1993, p. 10).

As well, in a number of locations the scale and pace of change are overwhelming. Throughout the United States schools began to respond to a large number of reform proposals based upon teacher and school effectiveness research (Murphy, 1990a, 1990b) when they were inundated with an array of new reform initiatives based upon rediscovered notions of learning (Cohen, 1988) and reframed views of leadership, organization, and governance (Murphy, 1990a, 1991).

Lastly, as part of the change context, there has been an increase in "environmental uncertainty" (Goldring, 1992), which has caused more confusion and concern for principals (Pristine, 1991a, 1991b). McPherson and Crowson (1992)
highlight the fact that a great deal of this uncertainty stems from the disintegration of bureaucracies and the disappearance of their often predictable and stable routines. Uncertainty is also produced when the nature of reform initiatives are contradictory (Boyd, 1990; Murphy, 1990a; 1991). A somewhat common example includes centralized authorities advocating strong local control and governance while simultaneously mandating systemwide curriculum and assessment strategies (Goldring, 1992; Vandenberghe, 1992; Weindling, 1992): “At best, principals receive mixed signals on what state policy makers want for them (Education Commission of the States, 1990, p. 7).

Of great concern is the expanding workload for principals of restructured schools. “Data indicate that school reform has increased the principals’ work load as well as expanded the repertoire of skills they need to function effectively” (Bennett, Bryk, Easton, Kerbow, Luppescu, & Sebring, 1992, p. 24). At the same time, “significant changes are expected in patterns of behavior for principals” (Bredeson, 1991, p. 19). Studies illustrate that little is being deleted from the principal’s role as increasing expectations are being added (Bredeson, 1989; Ford, 1992). Within the context of this turbulent environment and “given the fact that the principal’s role grows increasingly unclear as the sophistication of the position and the demands of society continue to increase” (Alexander, 1992, p. 13), this increasingly overloaded role is often connected to role ambiguity (Prestine, 1991a, 1991b). Principals of restructured schools often experience increased stress due to the fact that the interplay of role overload and role ambiguity often cause the principalship to no longer be a “concrete role” (Alexander, 1992, p. 19) which causes principals to experience a loss of control and professional identity (Bredeson, 1991).
The Changing Nature of the Role

According to initial studies which focus on the principals' changing role in restructured schools, "principals have experienced more change under school reform than any other group (Bradley, 1992, p. 29). New legislation, externally generated expectations, and internal experimentation have led to the fundamental altering of roles in many cases. Among the numerous examples of these role changes are "leading from the center," enabling and supporting teacher success, managing reform, and extending the school community (Murphy & Louis, 1994).

In attempting to "lead from the center, the principal now becomes relocated from the apex of the pyramid to the center of the network of human relationships and functions as a change agent and resource" (Wilkinson quoted in Chapman, 1990, p. 227).

A key to this leadership shift involves principals struggling to redefine their leadership. For example, in a study conducted by Early, et. al. (1990) "approximately two thirds of the principals believed that they had become more consultative, more open and more democratic. They spoke of becoming increasingly aware of the need for more participative management and for staff ownership of change" (p. 9). Various studies have concluded that essential to this redefinition is the "recasting of power relationships" (Leithwood, Jantzi, Silins, & Dart, 1992, p. 30) and the redistribution of the "considerable power and authority that have resided in the bureaucratic position of the principalship" (Chapman, 1990, p. 227) - to teachers, parents, and occasionally students (Bredeson, 1991; Hallinger & Hausman, 1993).

As a result of a series of carefully constructed investigations, Leithwood (1992), Leithwood and Jantzi (1990), Leithwood, Jantzi, and Dart (1991), Leithwood et al. (1992), and Leithwood, Jantzi, and Fernandez (1994) identified the two tasks that form the basis for "redesigned" power relationships - "delegating authentic leadership
responsibilities" and developing "collaborative decision-making processes in the school" (Leithwood et al., 1992, p. 30). Prestine (1991a) reports that the biggest change involves "empowering" others and poses "the greatest difficulties and problems for principals" (Prestine, 1991b, p. 15). Often it is very difficult for the organization and the community to allow the principal to let go or give up some control. Existing norms, expectations, and reward structures are often solidified, while support for delegating control is often fragile (Prestine, 1991a). The Leithwood studies also reinforce the importance for the principal and teachers to have a trusting relationship which is necessary in making genuine delegation a possibility (Chapman, 1990). Smylie and Brownlee-Conyers (1992) note in their study of transformational change in Midwest schools that:

The findings of this study suggest that teachers' willingness to participate in school decision making is influenced primarily by their relationships with their principals.....Teachers appear substantially more willing to participate in all areas of decision making if they perceive their relationships with their principals as more open, collaborative, facilitative, and supportive. They are much less willing to participate in any area of decision making if they characterize their relationships with principals as closed, exclusionary, and controlling. (Smylie, 1992, p. 63)

There is strong evidence to suggest that principals in transformational change efforts can be successful only by learning to delegate authority (Prestine, 1991a; Bredeson, 1991). From the teachers' perspective the sharing of authority and decision making were essential before any other substantive restructuring could occur (Prestine, 1991a, pp. 11-12). Numerous attempts are being made through, for example site-based decision making, to create vehicles for altered authority and decision making patterns by establishing alternatives to traditional decision making structures and to merge the principal's role consistent with the evolving authority relationships that define these structures.
Principals have the capacity to give meaning, through their use of language and actions, to emerging shared decision making models through their willingness to help create "collaborative professional school cultures" (Leithwood, 1992, p. 9). An important change in the principals' role includes their willingness and "ability to work in collaborative, cooperative group decision making processes (Prestine, 1991a, p. 23); to orchestrate from the background; and to become a support element or facilitator, an equal participant in shared decision making, and one of many creative, caring, collaborative individuals in the school" (Christensen, 1992, p. 18).

Among the insights being provided through empirical studies focusing on the role of principals in restructuring schools is the admonishment for principals to assume a more supportive role, rather than a directive one (Shields & Newton, 1992, p. 15). Principals can reduce micro-management (Christensen, 1992); participate in team meetings not as chair but as a member; "encourage participation, acknowledge individual contributions and ensure effective implementation of committee decisions" (Chapman, 1990, p. 223); and "model the kinds of behaviors that lead to increased collaboration" (Conley, 1991, p. 42).

This role change has numerous professional development implications as principals will need to develop a plethora of new skills, especially group-problem solving and group facilitation skills (Hallinger & Hausman, 1993). Becoming more intentional regarding the ongoing training needs of principals will be an important issue (Murphy, 1992b).

As well, there is a lack of firmly established linkage between teacher empowerment/school-based decision making and student learning (Murphy, 1991; Murphy, Evertson, & Radnofsky, 1991; Taylor & Bogotch, 1992). Elmore suggests that a more or less random relationship exists as to changes in curriculum, teaching and student learning (Elmore, 1993). An important focus for the future will be to link the
process dimensions of "leading from the center" with knowledge and research regarding teaching and learning so that the evolving role of the principalship can be connected to actual increases in student learning (Murphy & Louis, 1994).

Enabling and supporting teacher success

The emerging empirical picture of principal leadership in restructured schools, although tentative, is not as much grounded on line authority as it is "based on mutual respect and equality of contribution and commitment" (Prestine, 1991a, p. 27). It reflects a "general style of management" (Bolam et al., 1992, p. 11) that is democratic, participative, and "consultative" (p. 19). "Group-centered leadership behaviors" (Bredeson, 1991, p. 19) are often primary. The role of "behind-the-scenes facilitator" (Louis & King, 1993, p. 234) is often "paramount."

Clift, et. al. (1992) and Goldman, et. al. (1991) cite five functions which principals involved in fundamental reform perform which enable and support teacher success: a) helping to create a shared vision; b) "cultivating a network of relationships" (Prestine, 1991b, p. 16); c) allocating resources consistent with the vision; d) disseminating information to staff; e) promoting teacher professional development. A key strand throughout these functions involve the efforts of principals to promote a more expanded notion of leadership (Clift, Johnson, Holland, & Veal, 1992; Goldman et al., 1991) and to "provide the scaffold for teachers to enhance their own understanding and professional awareness" (Prestine, 1991a, p. 25) as to their particular role change (Smith, 1993).

As with the effective schools improvement model (Murphy, Hallinger, & Mesa, 1985), helping to create a shared vision is a key ingredient for principals involved in facilitating significant change in their schools. A major difference in restructured schools is that the principal is not the primary or sole architect of the vision (Hallinger, 1992; Murphy, 1992a). As Goldman, et. al. (1991) noted, the essence of
the change lies in the fact that, while the principal remains a "valued participant," "vision is embodied by the process rather than by individuals" (p. 9). Principals in restructuring schools play a helpful role in assisting colleagues in understanding the importance of maintaining a broad perspective. These principals are known for their ability and willingness to become "the keeper and promoter of the vision" (Christensen, 1992, p. 21). "The importance of principals modeling and reinforcing vision-related behaviors" (Goldman, et al., 1991, p. 23) appears essential to the success of reform efforts (Leithwood, 1992).

Prestine (1991b, p. 16) states, "the role of the principal in cultivating a network of relationships... is of importance not only in developing collaborative, participatory decision making but in maintaining the restructuring effort as a whole." Restructuring principals are often skilled at creating what Goldman, et al., (1991) refers to as "synergistic groups": "they select and develop groups of people who can work effectively, and then empower them by giving them meaningful assignments." They champion staff participation and attempt to build internal support structures, such as joint planning arrangements, which reduces teacher isolation (Leithwood, 1992).

Another important function the principal provides within the restructuring context involves the providing of necessary resources (Hallinger & Hausman, 1993). In successfully restructuring projects, "the principalship is viewed as the primary role for obtaining and maintaining those conditions and factors which allow the change/restructuring process to proceed" (Prestine, 1991a, p. 14). While principals may be useful in securing additional resources, their primary importance lies in their ability to assist staff in successfully utilizing existing resources (Goldman, et al., 1991). These successful leaders allocate personal resources (for example, their own time) in ways that are supportive of the restructuring agenda of the school (Leithwood, et al., 1991).
A significant finding which emerges across these cited research studies is the connection between access to knowledge and successful teacher empowerment (Kirby & Colbert, 1992). A second finding offers that if this linkage is to occur principals "will have to serve as information and knowledge resources for their staffs" (Prestine, 1991a, p. 24). The studies consistently portray how "principals actively facilitate sound teacher decision making by helping teachers obtain the information they need now" (Goldman, et al., 1991, p. 13). This is not always an easy task for principals when needed information may involve knowledge and expertise regarding the restructuring process or knowledge about how all the pieces of reform become aligned and coherent (Prestine, 1991a).

A final way that principals were found to enable teacher success in restructuring schools was through support for the "development of new skills and abilities among teachers" (Hallinger & Hausman, 1993, p. 132). As a catalyst for school improvement, coherent, meaningful, and ongoing professional development experiences hold a great deal of promise. However, building political support for a more prominent role for professional development remains problematic.

Managing reform

As principals engage in role changes regarding their management of reform, they are reportedly devoting more time to the management aspects of their jobs (McPherson & Crowson, 1992; Bennett, et al., 1992). In some cases traditional responsibilities are being augmented (e.g. additional budgeting tasks), while in other cases principals are undertaking new tasks such as working with school-site decision making bodies. Too often, however, the increased responsibility to manage reform is addressed at the expense of less attention being given to the principals educational and instructional role as well as their own professional development needs (Bennett, et al., 1992).
Given the established linkage between principal instructional leadership and school performance (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Murphy, 1990c), more effort will need to be focused on learning how to utilize management functions in order to foster educational goals. Otherwise, the role redefinition previously described is a cause for concern for substantive, long-term school improvement.

**Extending the School Community**

There is a large body of evidence illustrating that the “boundary-spanning” function of the principal is enhanced when the importance of parental involvement is addressed in school restructuring endeavors (Earley & Baker, 1989: Goldring, 1992; Hallinger & Hausman, 1993). Reports from throughout the restructuring movement confirm that “the boundaries between schools and their external environments are becoming more permeable” (Goldring & Rallis, 1992, p. 3), and there is a “complicated blending of school and community” (McPherson & Crowson, 1992, p. 25) taking place.

As well, there is greater recognition of the need to expand public relation functions with external constituents. An entrepreneurial role of the principal is being enhanced as there is greater awareness regarding “the importance of client perceptions of schools” (Davies, Elliston, Thompson, & Vann, 1993, p. 2). As principals recognize that restructuring contributes to a more competitive educational environment, with market mechanism implications, more of the principals’ time is being devoted to “public relations and the promotion of the school’s image” (Earley, et. al., 1990, p. 8) and towards the marketing of the school and its programs to the community (Goldring, 1992; Hallinger & Hausman, 1993).

There seems to be a shortage of data emphasizing the “growing importance... of interagency collaboration” (ECS, 1990, p. vi) and the principal’s role in creating service delivery system networks. As well, there appears to be a gap between the
prescriptive literature and data indicating what is actually occurring in various reform efforts.

The Dilemmas of Role Change

A common theme throughout the literature involves the sense of being overwhelmed that principals are feeling as they engage in restructuring efforts. Bennett, et. al. (1992) reported that "principals feel overwhelmed by administrative demands. Almost three-quarters of the principals hired prior to reform strongly argue that administrative demands have increased since reform" (p. 25).

A common complaint dealing with the work environment has to do with the time dimension. Principals complain about the time-consuming nature of fundamental change, and the lack of time available to complete all the responsibilities that school restructuring requires. An accompanying concern is a lack of time needed for their own role adjustment and the "opportunity costs" associated with spending time on managing reform initiatives rather than on leadership responsibilities (Bredeson, 1991; Hess & Easton, 1991).

Other work conditions adding to the complexity of the principal's role includes a lack of trust and inadequate financial resources. While existing empirical evidence illustrates the importance of trust at the district and building levels in order to promote restructuring (Kirby & Colbert, 1992; Short & Greer, 1993; Smylie, 1992) and permit "principals to more easily relinquish control, delegate responsibilities, take risks, share frustrations and rethink their leadership roles without feeling threatened in terms of job security or their self-identity as principals" (Bredeson, 1991, p. 10), often there is a pervasive lack of trust throughout districts engaged in restructuring reforms (Christensen, 1992; Earley & Baker, 1989; Prestine, 1991a). Insufficient
resources continue to be responsible for hampering the attempts of principals to foster new roles within the school improvement context (Bennett, et. al., 1992).

From the principals' perspective the problem is reinforced through the belief that they "face multiple expectations which often seem at odds" (ECS, 1990, p. 10). They become frustrated by what they view as "conflicting policy directives" (Zeldin, 1990, p. 20) and inconsistent communication from the district office (Ford, 1991), particularly messages to emphasize a bottom-up management strategy while the "central office itself maintains a traditional top-down decision-making model" (Alexander, 1992, p. 21). Because of the role conflict generated by school reform, principals continue to experience a "high degree of anxiety and uncertainty about their evolving role in the change process" (Alexander, 1992, p. 14). They often see themselves "caught between district level and school level change" (Rowley, 1992, p. 27) or "as the middle person between all the players in the change process and who perhaps must deal with too many factors to bring about the necessary changes" (Alexander, 1992, p. 15), a situation often "inducing disenchantment and further fragmentation of the meaning and process of restructuring" (Rowley, 1992, p. 34).

Even principals who are supporters of fundamental reform may, in fact, be extremely limited in their ability to affect change because of their training, beliefs, and experiences. Exacerbating this dilemma is the fact that principals are being asked to reconceptualize their role often with inadequate resources (Conley, 1993). There are many examples of restructuring plans not "fostering the learning of the new attitudes and roles that are fundamental to the new style of decision-making and management" (Chapman, 1990, p. 240) required of principals in restructured schools. Therefore, principals readily acknowledge that they often do not possess the knowledge and skills necessary to fulfill their new responsibilities (Weindling, 1992) and agree that "there
has been inadequate in-service and training to prepare principals for the role they are expected to play" (Alexander, 1992, p. 18).

A final dilemma, accountability, is the ultimate concern for principals. The dilemma involves ultimate responsibility residing with the principal while others are empowered to make decisions (Hess & Easton, 1991). There is growing belief among principals of restructuring schools “that if parents and teachers are given the authority to make decisions, they must also be accountable for the results” (Hallinger, et. al., 1992, p. 347).

**Secondary Principals**

The vast majority of the literature addressing the principalship, whether theoretically, conceptually, or empirically, does not differentiate the elementary and secondary principal. In many ways the forces, realities, and context impacting them are strikingly similar. Differences are often a matter of degree, not of kind. Still, I will endeavor to highlight those factors which may impact the role of the secondary principal in somewhat distinguishable ways.

Most studies involving planned educational improvement have emphasized elementary schools. However, there appears to be clear consensus in the literature that successful approaches at the elementary school level may fail when duplication is attempted at the more complicated and turbulent environment of secondary schools, especially that of high schools (Neufeld, Farrar, & Miles, 1983). While there are images of excellence portrayed in commission and study reports of secondary schools, the process of implementation whereby schools “become improved” is less clear.

The environmental context that secondary principals create, particularly at the high school level, is frequently very different from that of elementary principals. A fundamental reality in high schools is the diversity, and often contradictory nature, of purposes and objectives. While an ultimate goal is to educate students, questions remain
as to "in what" and "for what" purpose. Even national commission reports disagree regarding what an "excellent" high school should look like. Is the emphasis placed on classical academic education, critical thinking skills, or "the basics"? At the elementary level, developing a consensus view of what students should achieve seems easier (Firestone, Herriott, & Wilson, 1987). There seems to be general agreement as to what constitutes the "basics" as well as the recognition that schools have a responsibility for emphasizing personal and social development. The role of extracurricular vocational education and preparation for the 21st century all contribute to the ongoing debate. Priorities may differ between and among parents, staff, and teachers as well as between the school, community, and state policymakers.

There are several structural features of high school organizations that are influential in reform efforts, including size, organizational complexity, student movement around the school, and ability grouping (Louis & Miles, 1990). For example, the larger the school the more difficult and expensive each intervention becomes. As well, the departmental structure encourages conflicts and competition over students and resources (Powell, Cohen, & Farrar, 1985). Ability grouping is problematic because it creates divisions over curricular and instructional issues. Social divisions also occur which makes consensus more difficult to achieve. Curriculum and social divisions take on greater importance given the findings suggesting that high schools are more "loosely coupled" than elementary schools and authority more decentralized (Louis & Miles, 1990).

In considering the work environment, high school teachers are more likely to view themselves as subject matter specialists and less likely to see themselves as having responsibility for the "whole child," a responsibility often seen as being reserved for guidance counselors and administrations. As a result of being attached to departments, they often exhibit greater loyalty to their immediate work group than to the school as a
whole (Hall & Guzman, 1984). This phenomenon has serious implications for school reform efforts. One study, focusing on the topic, found that school-wide planning which is an important component for a number of reform initiatives does not become easily established in secondary schools because it is viewed as "foreign" (Bermun & Gjelten, 1984).

Louis and Miles (1990) remind us that urban secondary problems differ from those in other settings, such as suburban or rural settings, more in terms of scope and intensity rather than type. The vast diversity of the student body and the local community become major sources of differences.

There is more potential for fragmentation in an urban school's program and structure. For example, the "environmental" diversity facing an urban secondary school is far greater than in a typical suburban or rural school. First, urban schools seem to be continuously responding to a large number of constituencies: courts, special interest groups, and combative unions. As well, there is the often turbulent broader environment of urban politics. If the urban environment is "chaotic", education is less a focal point than in rural areas where schools are often the center for the communities' social and cultural lives. Suburban area residents tend to be more attentive to "quality education" issues because of its potential impact on property values. In cities, where many parents are not property owners, property values are unrelated to the question of education. Consequently, schools may lack economic and social meaning to a large percentage of residents (Louis & Miles, 1990). It is then the pervasiveness of environmental diversity which leads to fragmentation and sense of fatalism.

Within the complex, bureaucratic, urban school district organization, environmental uncertainty persists as the urban superintendency seems to be a revolving door. While there are often wide variations in the quality and performance of schools within an urban district, there are strong pressures for school uniformity.
Policy makers at the state level also tend to treat all schools throughout a state in a similar fashion, ignoring the differing needs and problems at the school site or classroom (Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988). Research suggests that this insistence upon uniform treatment of diverse schools may be counterproductive (McLaughlin, 1987; Oakes, 1987).

Often top-down policy changes, either at the district or state level, become layered on previously mandated policy changes with the result being a series of failed or aborted efforts to improve. The principal, if he or she is to be effective, must be simultaneously a "supreme politician, negotiating special resources and exemptions from the rules, and an outlaw who is willing to spend time covering up unauthorized deviations from policy" (Louis & Miles, 1990, pp. 12-14).

**Elementary and Secondary Principals**

While there are a number of "contextual differences," there is evidence to support the notion that "effective principals" of both elementary and secondary schools possess similarities in terms of what they pay attention to, regardless of levels of schooling and sizes of schools. Leithwood (1990), for example, carried out a systematic review of research comparing characteristics of effective elementary and secondary schools. Twenty-three of the thirty-four characteristics he examined were common at both levels. Among the important differences identified were that secondary schools "pursued a more complex and broader range of goals; require principals to consider more factors in order to exercise influence; have less need for close parent involvement, but more need for working with business and social institutions in the community; and are more concerned with developing a sense of community and affiliation among staff and students" (p. 89).

Smith and Andrews (1989) found similar differences. Those high school principals who were identified as "strong" spent more time on improving educational
programming than did "average" high school principals. However, they spent less time on improvement than did middle/junior high and elementary principals. Strong high school principals also were found to spend more time than their counterparts in earlier grades on "building management, operations, and district relations." Elementary school principals have more of an opportunity to influence instruction directly through more collaboration with individual teachers and classroom observation. Fullan (1991) believes that if one considers the evidence as a whole, the differences between elementary and secondary principals are a "matter of degree, not of kind" (p. 162). The "up-close" descriptions of effective high school principals (Louis & Miles, 1990; Wilson & Corcoran, 1988) provide an illustration of an active leader "working continuously on program and instructional issues, collaborative and professional work cultures, resource acquisition, stable work environments, engagement of staff and students, and monitoring for results" (Fullan, 1991, p. 162).

Historically, as a group, secondary principals have paid less attention to these issues. Now that some secondary school principals are focusing on school improvement issues, it may be that they are exercising a broader perspective in addressing comprehensive organizational issues than are elementary school principals. In other words, rather than spending large amounts of time involved in classroom observations of individual teachers, secondary principals may be engaged in the long term institutional development of schools which involves the "shaping" of the instructional and work climate of the school as an organization (Fullan, 1991). Dwyer (1984), Hallinger, Bickman, and Davis (1989), Hallinger and Richardson (1988), among others, all found that principals exercised instructional leadership through shaping the organization, climate, and resources of the school rather than by intensive, direct involvement in instruction. Direct classroom observation has an important role to play; however, the point to be made is that it is not the primary vehicle for organization improvement.
Gender Differences

In considering the gender differences of individuals occupying the role of principal, while statistics show that the principalship is dominated by men, there are, for example, subpattern differences by elementary and secondary level. The percentage of women principals for most districts at the elementary level is in the 20% to 50% range while for secondary schools it is 5% to 20%, vastly underrepresenting their numbers in teaching (Marshall & Mitchell, 1989; Mertz, McNeely, & Venditti, 1989; Schneider, 1988). The continued increase in the percentage of women in administration is a continuing phenomenon, illustrating the expanding opportunity base for women in positions traditionally occupied by men. There appears to be more opportunities for women in larger school districts where there are more openings and where more women are appointed (Mertz, et.al., 1989).

There is evidence showing that, as a group, women are inclined to exhibit behaviors associated with effective leadership. For example, Smith and Andrews (1989, p. 30) found that female principals spent more time in educational program improvements than did male principals. Marshall and Mitchell (1989) have reported studies that illustrate that women are more focused on "curriculum issues, instructional leadership, teachers’ concerns, parent involvement, staff development, collaborative planning strategies, community building" (p. 48), and other key components of the restructuring process.

Shakeshaft (1987) states that there is solid evidence to suggest that women are more likely to possess characteristics and exhibit behaviors associated with effective leadership and effective school improvement. Of course, there are exceptions within and across gender. An important, salient implication which arises is that greater attention must be given to fostering characteristics associated with effective leaderships across gender and within the ranks of teachers as well as administrators.
Knowledge about the scope and nature of the effective principal’s role, within a restructuring context, is still emerging. There is no simple list of imperatives that can be used in developing a prescriptive model for the principal of the future. Continued research, training, and reflective practice are essential as leadership plays a vital role in creating significantly better schools.

In considering the various manifestations of change which affect the principal’s position, understanding the implications of state policy making is important to understand how the secondary principal must continually negotiate a course which paradoxically involves both compliance and capacity building.

**State Reform Initiatives**

Toward the end of 1983, The Education Commission of the States task force observed: “Hardly a month has passed without the release of a major report by a prestigious group of citizens concerned about the nature of American Education” (p. 1). The 1983 report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk*, put the theme that was common to most of these reports, most dramatically: “Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovations is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world” (p. 5). By mid 1984, the United States Department of Education observed that the reports issued in 1983 had “created a tidal wave of school reform which promises to renew American education with an extraordinary array of initiatives under discussion and underway” (p. 11). Although the report described these initiatives as diverse and comprehensive, it also described state leadership as “one of the hallmarks of this reform effort” that “also saw a quantum increase in the variety of public school activities involving leaders of the university, corporate, and foundation communities” (*A Nation at Risk*, p. 17).
Two Waves

In addressing reform initiatives, two metaphorical waves have been used to describe different phases of reaction to *A Nation at Risk*. While differentiating these waves has been useful for analytical purposes, many reform measures do not cluster neatly into two distinct phases (Green, 1987; Plank & Ginsberg, 1990; Murphy, 1991; Firestone, Fuhrman, & Kirst, 1990). As well, the underlying theories of these waves are working in parallel and sometimes at cross purposes throughout the country. These two streams of policy stem from radically different notions of how students learn and what is required for effective teaching (Darling-Hammond, 1988).

**First Wave**

The first wave reform, which had been emerging at the state level for some time, Fullan describes as "intensification" of the current system (Fullan, 1991). These reform efforts, which were characterized by their particular dominance from 1982-1986, (Murphy, 1989) focused on restoring quality by improving the existing educational system. The philosophical foundation for repairing the existing system was highly mechanistic and consisted mainly of centralized controls and standards (Boyd, 1987; Sedlak et al., 1986). This model of policy making, exemplified through first wave reforms, assumes that changing the design specifications for schooling will change the nature of schooling that is delivered in classrooms. This model is based upon a behavioralist view of learning and assumes that the essential problem is a lack of focus, direction, and effort on the part of educators (Darling-Hammond, 1993).

A number of assumptions provide the underpinnings for the first wave. There is an assumed linkage between international and national economic competition and the condition of American schooling. An educated work force is seen as essential to increased economic productivity and this country's ability to adapt to continuously changing economic forces. Thus, economic competition demands that our entire workforce have
the requisite skills necessary to enable American business to compete successfully throughout the world (Kirst, 1988). The second key assumption underlying the state statutes of the first wave, was that while the educational system did not require fundamental change, the existing delivery system should be standardized to meet the economic challenge (Kirst, 1988). Standardization was seen as providing a mode of control that would better assure higher standards and, thus, a higher quality education. Advocates of standardization claim that it is only through tightened control and routinized classroom policies that a more effective educational system will be produced as measured by quantitative devices such as increases in graduation requirements and improved standardized test scores.

Utilizing a bureaucratic model of management to institute school improvement proposals led to the emphasis in the early reform efforts on such policy mechanisms as prescriptions, tightly controlled resource allocations, and performance measures which focused on repairing various aspects of the system (e.g. developing better textbooks) and increasing the quality of the education workforce by telling teachers how to work (e.g. specifying particular instructional models) (Coombs, 1987; Hawley, 1988; Underwood, 1990). Hargreaves (1992) links the intensification argument to the Marxist theory of the labor process which is characterized by the depersonalization of work. Increasingly teacher work is portrayed as becoming more routinized and deskilled. There is less opportunity to exercise the power and expertise of discretionary judgment with young people (Hargreaves, 1992).

**First Wave Critics**

Critics of wave one reform measures were concerned that too much attention was being devoted to the quick fix which ignored the broader interrelationships of schooling. As well, critics felt proponents of wave one reforms were using inappropriate policy
mechanisms, such as mandates, to improve schooling (Chubb, 1988; Cuban, 1984; Elmore, 1987; Purpel, 1989; Sedlak et. al., 1986; Sizer, 1984).

Detractors have claimed that teachers are being demoralized and deskill ed as a result of increasingly strict requirements imposed from above, and these mandates have hindered the learning environment by creating an atmosphere of distrust (Passow, 1984; Hawley, 1988). As well, standardization has often been seen as being unresponsive to the needs and interests of minorities and students at risk. To the extent that standardization inhibits the efforts of teachers to meet the diverse special needs of students, an argument can be made that standardization provides only the illusion of promoting equality and may, in actuality, be an obstacle to equity. Standardization may, in fact, promote one of the most sinister forms of inequality: equal treatment of unequals (Bacharach, 1988).

Second Wave

The second wave reformers which began to exert their influence in the mid 1980s argued that fundamental changes were needed in societal institutions in the ways educational institutions were organized and governed, in the roles adults performed in schools, and in the processes used to educate young people. A pervading belief that the existing system was beyond repair began to gain currency. Analysts began advocating a complete overhaul of the educational system - a comprehensive attempt to rebuild or restructure the fabric of American schooling (Murphy, 1991). Thus, only through creating second-order changes which would seek to alter the "fundamental ways in which organizations are put together, including new goals, structures and roles" (e.g. collaborative work cultures) would improved schooling occur (Cuban, p. 342).

The key concepts of this second wave are decentralization, professionalism and a bottom-up process with the school as the basic unit of change. Most second wave
reforms seek to place authority in the hands of school personnel (Smith & O'Day, 1991).

Neither the first or second wave reforms have significantly altered on a broad scale the inadequate models of teaching and learning which currently shape the content and instructional practices of American education (Smith & O'Day, 1991). Even though a great deal of money and effort have been expended in reform, the processes and content of instruction in most schools looks remarkably unchanged, containing little depth or coherence, emphasizing isolated facts and "basic skills" over opportunities to analyze and solve problems (Cohen, 1989, 1990a; Cuban, 1990). Even more importantly, the policy system does not provide support to teachers and other school-based reformers for significant improvements in teaching and learning (Clune 1991).

Policy coherence

Policy coherence has been notable by its absence throughout the myriad reform measures and, thus, the search for more coherent policy has become part of the policy discourse surrounding K-12 education. In the 1980s, leaders in California and a few other states were advocating challenging, common goals regarding student learning and the close coordination of various components of the policy infrastructure around student outcomes. Marshall Smith, a current Undersecretary for Education and former Dean of Stanford University's School of Education, conceptualized "systemic" reform which would pair ambitious, coordinated state policies with restructured governance (Smith & O'Day, 1991). Numerous players at all levels of government, as well as associations, foundations, and other independent organizations, advocate and support this change (for example, National Governors' Association, 1991; Business Roundtable, 1992; and the National Council on Educational Standards and Testing). Dozens of diverse states are involved, as well as national agencies such as the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Department of Education (Fuhrman, 1993).
As many as forty-five states are involved in increasing the coherence and alignment of the state education system to “support school-site efforts to improve classroom instruction and learning (Smith & O'Day, 1991). The goal of systemic school reform is that all students be taught and learn ambitious content knowledge and higher-order skills (Elmore, 1990b). Essential to the ultimate success of systemic reform is the development of a coherent system of instructional guidance where agreement is established regarding a core body of challenging and engaging knowledge, skills, and problem-solving capacities as goals for all students. All state policies guiding instruction (curriculum issues, professional development, and assessment) will be based on these goals, forming a consistent, supportive policy structure for school improvement. The purpose of a more coherent policy system is to support and sustain school-based change. Numerous political observers wonder how we can expect such a rational approach from a system which produces policies that have an incremental and a disorganizing effect (Lindblom, 1959; Wildavsky, 1974).

At its core, the problem of systemic reform fundamentally is a problem of teachers learning how to translate enhanced curricula and higher standards into teaching and learning for all their students (McLaughlin, 1993). Moving from uniformly high standards to widely diverse ways of helping children achieve them is the fundamental issue (O'Neil).

While there is growing support for it, systemic education reform is stymied by unclear and inconsistent definitions. Even if a clear definition is provided, often there is little understanding and even less agreement among policymakers, researchers, and practitioners about its relation to the daily practices in districts or schools. (McKersie, et. al., 1994, p. 48).

It might be that systemic reform's recent popularity is a reflection of its political appeal as a vehicle for unifying the diverse interests of those interested in
educational improvement. Systemic reform ideas take on currency as political power to the extent that they serve as a platform for reconciling diverse reform constituencies (Fuhrman, 1993; Fuhrman & Massell, 1992). Those ideas that exert the greatest influence are those that are able to balance competing political forces, finding ways to enlist current interests while serving as a vehicle for openness to new possibilities.

Systemic reform has many of the properties of so-called "public ideas" (Moore, 1988; Reich, 1988). It challenges "society to perceive and deal with a problem differently" (Moore, 1988) by altering the terms and language of the education reform debate.

**Increased state role in education**

In the past two decades the federal role in education has been sharply redefined and reduced, and, as a consequence, the state role has been greatly increased. Deepening budget deficits, the "new federalism" philosophy of conservative Republican administrations and a fracturing of the congressional policy process has sharply reduced federal allocations and influence (Finn, 1992).

Because of the perceived link between high quality schooling and economic growth and competitiveness, state governors and legislatures now are involved in educational policy-making in an unprecedented way. One notable consequence is that the already circumscribed policy-making authority of local school districts has been further reduced, as power and control has shifted to the state (Finn, 1992).

Legislative leadership or activism is partially a reflection of outside forces, including the withdrawal of the federal government from programmatic leadership as well as the active interest of business elites in educational issues. State legislative leadership also reflects the strengthened capacity of state legislatures as institutions. The increase in staff specializing in educational issues and the increased time devoted to educational issues has prepared legislatures to assume more leadership over a state
function that has been commanding a larger share of state budgets (Rosenthal & Fuhrman, 1981).

An argument has been made that these pressures were so strong that legislatures were in greater jeopardy by not enacting education reforms than they were by acting - even though this provided an unprecedented extension into matters of school performance (McDonnell & Fuhrman, 1985).

As we enter the mid-1990s, state legislatures appear to be more selective in exerting their influence than they were during the 1980. While this relatively low profile is not universal, a change is noticeable in some previously very active states. For example, the legislature in South Carolina has not initiated any major education reform measures since 1989. California and Georgia have produced a steady but relatively small stream of education bills in recent years. With the exception of Kentucky, omnibus education reform packages of the early eighties are not as much in evidence today.

The range and scope of legislative enactments is much smaller today, in part, because of the fiscal stress experienced by many states. Public resentment of state mandates without funding is causing legislatures to be cautious of making a great deal of new and directive policy (Fuhrman, et. al., 1994). As well, the cautious stance of legislatures may reflect a power vacuum as a result of prominent education advocates leaving office. A third explanation has to do with the current reform movement. A current emphasis is on standards and coordinating, for example, assessment and professional development policies which are linked to standards. Therefore, ongoing reform work lies within the existing authority of state agencies (Fuhrman, et. al., 1994).
Contributors to incoherent policymaking

The fragmented nature of our political system makes coordination and consensus difficult. Different governmental jurisdictions, each with its own system of checks and balances, operates according to its own rules and individual members are influenced by incentives related to institutional membership and maintenance rather than the entire system as a whole. Coordination activities with other policymakers do not occur naturally and may require facilitation through the creation of other institutions, thus increasing the structural complexity of government (Fuhrman, 1994).

Legislative policy-making in education has been fragmented if not sometimes contradictory. Teacher policy provides an example of ambiguous and contradictory policy. Many states simultaneously increased requirements for teacher education and certification and allowed for loopholes in order to ensure an adequate teacher supply (Darling-Hammond, & Barnett, 1988). In addition to the difficulty of creating coherent policy within a single policy area like teacher certification, it has been even more difficult to coordinate policies addressing different aspects of education policy. Numerous states mandated more credit hours in liberal arts for prospective teachers as well as developing new curriculum materials and frameworks and requirements for students. Few efforts have been made to explore the relationship between the additional credits taken by teachers and the actual content they would be expected to teach (Smith & O'Day, 1991). Similarly, some southern states developed new statewide teacher evaluation systems as content standards were being developed. These important activities often proceeded in a parallel fashion with a result being that the ability to teach the newly required content was not a component part of the competencies on which teachers were to be evaluated (McLaughlin, 1987).

Focus on elections - The emphasis placed on campaigning and elections is a second salient characteristic of our system that limits the possibility of rational
policymaking. Often concern for re-election takes preference over policy or institutional improvement goals. A "permanent campaign" mentality becomes established, in both the legislative and executive branches, as elected officials engage in full-time work and become career politicians (Salmore & Salmore, 1990; Rosenthal, 1989). As a result, politicians often seek ways to distinguish themselves from their colleagues, rather than work cooperatively towards a complex, multifaceted solution, in order that they are recognizable to their constituents.

Another consequence of the preeminence of elections is the inclination to avoid difficult, complex, or controversial issues. The tendency is to support policies that are simple, easily explained, and capable of being featured in a "sound bite." Policies with immediate, tangible results are simpler to explain and easier to "sell" than those with longer term, diverse, or ambiguous benefits (Fuhrman, 1994).

Policy Overload. Policy overload contributes to fragmented policymaking, in that, rather brief electoral cycles coupled with competition with the executive branch for policy center stage creates incentives for continuous new policymaking. New initiatives provide more visibility than either restraint or refinement of existing policy (Mayhew, 1974, & Fuhrman, 1993).

New policies often provide for new directions, rather than attempting to align or complement past policies, for a number of reasons. The legislature may lack the capacity to analyze the effectiveness of past policy, while new directions possesses political capital for its innovation and creativity. Those governors interested in educational policymaking will propose new policy directions for the same reasons causing the legislature to become involved in the political interplay leading to new proposals. Simply debating them gives them a certain viability. Finally, the inability of policy to affect directly some of the most pressing problems of educational practice and performance may unwittingly suggest that the problem is not inherent within a
particular policy but can be seen in the failure to identify yet another policy or set of policies which will actually produce the desired results.

The fast succession and volume of policy initiatives makes it difficult to sort out the effects of any one policy to guide future efforts. In some states where consistent data over time has been compiled, it is impossible to identify which improvement resulted from which particular policy or policies. With a "quick layering of policy initiatives, the system has no time to absorb them" or to reflect on their implications. As well, direct relationships linking particular policy initiatives with actual improvements cannot be established (Elmore & Fuhrman, 1994).

Specialization. Traditionally, specialization has been used as a strategy for managing complexity. Specialization increases the number of areas in which politicians can claim credit and impress voters. Consequently, legislative committees and subcommittees expand in number and develop narrower jurisdictions. Specialization also causes policy to be crafted by experts who have few incentives for considering more integrated approaches to policy problems.

Policy

Policies describe the actions which people are expected to take, and policy language is an "action" language, which focuses on human intentions and purposes, according to Kerr (1976). Policies are deliberately and purposely created in order to impact the lives of others. This discussion begins with an attempt to provide a definition of policy and considers the various types of policies and the primary policy instruments which are used as vehicles for policy implementation.

Policy Definition and Types

Various scholars have described the difficulty of defining the term 'policy' (Dunn, 1981; Mitchell, 1984; Prunty, 1984). Definitions include broad statements,
such as “the conduct of public affairs or the administration of government,” (Dunn, 1981, p. 7) or “what governments do and say” (Dubnick & Bardis, 1983, p. vii) as well as extremely detailed descriptions of conditions which must be existent before a policy can be said to exist (Kerr, 1976). The difficulty in defining policies can be attributed to their ambiguous and multifaceted nature.

The definition of policy, according to Mitchell, emerges from “its role in resolving the two fundamental human conditions of scarcity and conflict (Mitchell, 1984, p. 138). The fact that human society is not characterized by unlimited resources, the absence of conflict, and universally shared values necessitates that policy decisions are needed to control conflicts over scarce resources.

Lowi (1972) presented four types of public policies, all of which tend to be coercive towards individual and collective conduct. While regulatory policies impose restrictions or limitations on the actions of individuals and groups, distributive and redistributive policies allocate or reallocate resources among different individuals or groups, and constituent policies have to do with setting up constituencies through reapportionment, for example. Thus, the type of policy influences its definition (Prunty, 1984).

An important aspect of any policy is its role in the allocation of values. In the continuing search for "a more improved society" all policies, whether regulatory, distributive, redistributive, or constitutive, reflect such issues as power, control, authority, justice, equity, legitimacy, and values (Prunty, 1984). The ultimate outcome concerning who will gain and who will lose as a result of the promulgation of any of these policies is based on the values of the policy makers.

Within the educational establishment, for example, Bernstein (1971), has argued that curriculum policies reflect what constitutes knowledge, pedagogical policies reflect what constitutes a valid transmission of knowledge, and evaluation policies
reflect what constitutes a valid demonstration of what the student knows. These policies become expressions of the values of those in power to legitimate certain forms of knowledge, transmit knowledge, or demonstrate such knowledge over others. In essence, as summarized by Prunty (1984):

...Policy is the 'authoritarian allocation of values'...To ask what counts as knowledge and culture in the schools is also to query whose values have been validated. The authoritative allocation of values draws attention to the centrality of power and control in the concept of policy, and requires us to consider not only whose values are represented in policy, but also how these values have become institutionalized.... On the bottom line, policy is the legitimation of values. (p. 42) (emphasis in original)

There is a critical role for policy analysis when probing issues regarding whose values are reflected in a given policy and how these values become legitimated.

Policy Instruments

Focusing on the instruments common to different policies and on the conditions under which these instruments will most likely produce the intended results will aid in expanding the viability of implementation research (McDonnell & Elmore 1991). A conceptual framework focusing on policy instruments provides the potential for a larger, and theoretically richer policy implementation context (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987).

The following generic framework centers on the notion of alternative policy instruments or mechanisms that translate substantive policy goals (e.g. improved student learning) into concrete action (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). They are based upon different assumptions and have different consequences.

The policy instrument categories are constructed from existing theories regarding the effects of governmental action. Mandates, for example, are based upon theories of regulation, which deals with conditions under which the targets of regulation can be expected to comply, given diverse levels of enforcement, sanctions, as well as the costs and benefits of compliance. (Elmore & McDonnell, 1987).
(incentives) are linked to theories of public finance which pertain to governmental transfers. These theories address the conditions under which certain governmental agencies can be induced to perform specified actions as a result of being awarded conditional grants of funds from other governmental agencies (Gramlich, 1977; Ingram, 1977). Mandates and inducements are based on fairly well-specified theoretical issues; thus, an issue involves linking existing theory to various policy questions. The theoretical basis for capacity-building and system changing is less well-developed and depends, for purposes of distinguishing these categories of policy instruments, on observed patterns of policy making.

While capacity-building and inducement involve the conditional transfer of funds from one governmental unit to another, capacity building introduces the additional element of unpredictable future benefits. While, in a sense, capacity-building draws on theories of regulation and intergovernmental transfers, many questions remain regarding how this mechanism works in situations where outcomes are long-term and ambiguous (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987).

System changing involves the transfer of authority, rather than money, with the express purpose of altering the organizational structure by which policies are implemented. While it can be argued that system-changing instruments owe their theoretical basis to the critique of public bureaucracy growing out of political economy, that literature has dealt only indirectly with the problems of policy analysis (Moe, 1984; Tullock, 1985).

Mandates "are rules governing the action of individuals and agencies, and are intended to produce compliance" (McDonnell & Elmore 1987). They have been utilized as a legitimate tool to initiate government activity in areas not addressed by local units of government. The aim is to provide uniform service levels across an entire state.
The commonly voiced criticism of mandates involves the loss of local control. Local units of government have less flexibility to respond in diverse ways to particular local problems and issues. In the case of unfunded mandates, little attention is often given to the costs which are passed on to local jurisdictions. Often the policy implementation process is compromised as a result (University of Southern California Center for Research in Education, 1991).

Inducements "transfer money to individuals or agencies in return for certain actions" (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). For several years states have experimented with rewards to schools, as organizational units, rather than to individual teachers and administrators (National Governors' Association, 1986).

School performance incentives are based upon a number of potentially questionable assumptions. For example, school performance incentive plans assume schools can improve on identified performance outcomes and schools will respond in a positive fashion to such incentives. These plans also assume that the identified outcomes can be fairly measured and compared between schools and that increasing the measures will actually promote rather than inhibit student learning. Often, too little attention is given to the local political and cultural context (Richards & Shujaa, 1990).

There are several key policy implications regarding the emerging use of school performance incentives as policy instruments. Definitive conclusions regarding their efficacy cannot be reached at this time because of a lack of research in this area. An exception is South Carolina whose evaluation in this area suggests that teachers are generally supportive of incentive programs (Richards, 1994). A great deal more information is needed; however, regarding what are the attributes associated with teachers' support of incentive programs.

A consequence of linking financial incentives to identified outcome measures might result in a more focused use of organizational resources and effort in improving
outcomes. Thus, the issue may be less a matter of increasing organizational effectiveness as of decreasing the impact of bureaucratic impediments to organizational effectiveness (Richards, et. al., 1990; Minor, 1988).

**Nonmonetary incentives.** In the cases of Kentucky and California there is anecdotal evidence that nonmonetary incentives can stimulate improvements in school-level performance measures; however, the comparative efficacy of monetary vs. nonmonetary incentives has not yet been evaluated. (Richards & Shujaa, 1990).

In the case of South Carolina, for example, the school performance incentives are one of a number of diverse incentives and school improvement initiatives offered within a broad context of state policy reforms. Thus, it would be extremely difficult to distinguish gains which could be attributed to the school incentive program from the more general reform context in the state. Successful state initiated school incentive plans are heavily dependent on the interplay of technical, political, and economic conditions (Richards & Shujaa, 1990).

**Capacity Building** "is the transfer of money for the purpose of investment in material, intellectual, or human resources" (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). Capacity building instruments are based on the assumptions that without immediate investment future economic, intellectual, and human benefits will not be fully realized, and these long-term benefits are important in their own right as well as serving as vehicles for the fulfillment of other policy objectives. Capacity building is used to deal with fundamental failures in the performance of particular institutions. Issues of capacity become part of the political agenda when, for example, policymakers fear the United States is continuing to become less competitive in the areas of math and science.

The fact that the process of capacity-building is rather ambiguous with the results not always easily delineated poses major problems for policy makers who are guided by accountability expectations. While capacity-building has long-term,
intangible results, mandates and inducements have more immediate, tangible effects. Ironically, policymakers' willingness to invest in intangible, immeasurable, and long-term benefits may affect its future ability to respond to mandates and inducements (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987).

System-Changing “transfers official authority among individuals and agencies in order to alter the system by which public goods and services are delivered” (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). System changing instruments have their own set of assumptions which includes the belief that existing institutions are incapable of producing the desired effects of policymakers and altering the distribution of authority among institutions will significantly contribute to the creation of the desired policy effect. These instruments can be utilized to deal either with institutional unresponsiveness to new policy initiatives or with the failure of institutions to respond to environmental changes which impact their level of efficiency and productivity.

Granting authority to new institutions or redistributing authority to existing institutions may create a new set of conditions which necessitate an organizational response, but does not provide a panacea for policymakers. System broadening policies can fail for lack of capacity in the institutions to which authority has been transferred. They then have a tendency to devolve into incremental adjustments of existing institutions and into an organizational context more conducive to mandates and inducements (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987).

Recent policymaking applications

The legislative policymaking of recent years has relied heavily on mandates and incentives, to the exclusion of other policy instruments (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). Specifically, legislatures generally did very little to build long-term capacity in districts or at specific school sites, through intensive and focused staff development, for
example (Little, 1993). Most states enacted requirements and sometimes offered inducements (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). Most of the requirements established minimum levels with an equalization motive of bringing bottom districts to the middle (Bardach & Kaagan, 1982). High school graduation requirements set by state legislatures, for example, were exceeded by the majority of districts in most states before their enactment (Clune, 1989; Firestone et. al., 1990). Inducements were also not designed to ignite large-scale improvements in practice.

An argument could be made that inducements or incentives were used simply because funds were available only for activities in a subset of districts, not because it necessarily represented a better approach. In reality, inducements often appeared with numerous strings looking very much like mandates. For financially depressed districts that were searching for any funding source, a district's decision to participate in an incentive program often did not appear to be a choice (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987).

The literature does not support the proposition that over the past two decades mandates and incentives were sufficient for sustainable school improvement with measurable "enhanced" learning results for students.

There are numerous examples of "experiments" taking place throughout the country with significant student learning results occurring at school sites where educators, parents, and community members have designed their own school improvement approach based upon local needs and realities (David, 1989; Elmore, 1988, 1990; Firestone & Bader 1992). It would appear that state legislatures could best encourage, initiate, and sustain school improvement activities through fiscal support of professional development and sustained technical assistance focused on capacity building in the system (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986).
Problems in translating policy into practice

Policy often has less effect on actual practice than policymakers expect because education works through the interaction of policy, administration, and practice. While policy may establish conditions for effective administration and practice, it is the local context that creates solutions to problems that arise (Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988). Some recent reforms were especially weak in that they did not go far enough in encouraging appropriate conditions for translating policy into practice. One of the most often used policy instruments for reform throughout the country has been the use of mandates requiring students to accumulate more Carnegie units for graduation. This requirement has not been coupled with other mechanisms, such as creating challenging learner outcomes and assessment and high-quality technical assistance in order to encourage schools to create more challenging courses. (Clune & Patterson, 1989).

With a “product-oriented,” bottom-line culture, many are pressured to expect or demand changes or results which have been artificially determined. Implementing new policies often can require resource shifts, changes in facility usage, and altered roles and responsibilities which can require training and assistance. As well, there is great diversity among school districts in their willingness and capacity to respond to new state policy. Thus, the results will be varied as policy becomes converted into practice. There may be an even longer gap between changes in practice and results, particularly with respect to effects on student learning. Numerous policies only indirectly impact student learning because they focus on conditions of schooling which are not tightly linked to student achievement. For example, changing school conditions by utilizing site-based management will not directly affect student achievement (Malen, Ogawa, & Kranz, 1990; Wohlstetter, 1993). These changes may impact factors more closely associated with student achievement, such as teacher engagement, but the
relationship between policy changes and improved learning is complicated and unpredictable.

A longer term perspective is needed in the legislature. It will be important for legislators to resist the political forces that suggest that action is automatically better than inaction and that getting on record is a more preferred goal than wise, deliberate policymaking.

Context for Policy Implementation

Economic Climate

In order to better understand the evolution of the policy making process through to implementation, emerging economic factors and subsequent consequences need to be considered. In comparing 1980 to 1990, state support of education rose by 33 percent and local support increased 40 percent (Congressional Budget Office 1993). However, in 1990 the percentage increase in revenues per pupil dropped to its lowest point of the decade, .9 percent (Firestone, et.al., 1991). In many states, with spiraling health care costs, education budgets have been adversely affected. States like California and Florida are faced with a weakened economy and exploding school populations. Thus, while these states made gains over the decade in terms of real expenditures, these gains were eroded by population growth and the attendant school services required for an increasingly diverse school population. An important consequence of this emerging situation is a continued willingness to propose reforms without a concomitant plan for or resources for implementation. Georgia education bills, for example, have passed through the legislature without funding or with funding for only pilot projects. Florida's new major school reform initiative requires that school sites reallocate existing aid for planning and renewal, with no new money allocated for implementation. As a result, the knowledge base and capacity for ongoing school reform is not being built.
State Level Capacity

While the participants taking leading roles in school reform have shifted somewhat over the past decade, one factor that has remained relatively stable is the fairly low capacity for meaningful reform at various levels of governance and practice (Fuhrman, et. al., 1994). One expression of this fact has been the lack of concerted effort to assure sufficient capacity for reform at the state level. As a result, there are serious consequences for failing to enhance capacity at the state level, especially for the more complex, integrated policy approaches which are now being pursued. The first function that suffers is development. Currently, most states lack the capacity for meaningful research and development in areas where technical advances are required (Kaagan, 1988) - such as the need to develop more sophisticated assessment devices. Second, technical assistance suffers as well. Since there is not enough funding, neither the neediest nor the more capable districts are well served. Neither have states fully developed indicator systems that relate educational inputs, process, and outcomes (Kaagan & Coley, 1989). Thus, we continue to be hindered in our attempt to describe the educational system, to measure progress towards policy objectives, and to examine interrelationships between policy instruments and actual results. While numerous states collect vast amounts of data, few are successful at integrating it in a meaningful way. A fourth function which suffers as a result of inadequate state-level capacity is policy research and evaluation. There is a great deal to be learned regarding successful implementation strategies and how policy and school conditions support or hinder implementation.

Therefore, the lack of attention to key components of capacity building, development, assistance, indicator systems, and policy analysis, may suggest that states are focusing on the accountability function - a concern more central to policymakers. States appear to be directing more efforts toward accountability: continuing to monitor
for compliance, developing more elaborate reports of performance measures for the public, and implementing programs that attach rewards and sanctions to various levels of performance (OERI, 1988; Fuhrman, 1989). The General Accounting Office (1993) finds that "Districts implementing systemwide reform may need substantial support" in the way of technical assistance, professional development, and resources" (p. 5). In fact, districts judged successful in initial systemic reform efforts were receiving outside funding for reform that enabled them to hire consultants and conduct training.

State policymakers cannot significantly enhance local capacity without attending to the state's own capacity in education. State education departments have for years, however, been mistrusted by legislators (Rosenthal & Fuhrman, 1981). State agencies have been seen as self-interested bureaucracies (composed of less competent personnel), representing the "education establishment rather than site-level educators, students, parents, or the public." This distrust, coupled with the political benefit of placing scarce dollars in specific schools rather than state agencies, has led to a negative cycle of underfunding and failure to keep pace with reform demands. (Fuhrman, et. al., 1994).

A critical question remains as to whether state departments will have the time, resources, or capacity to upgrade their own knowledge, let alone be service providers to schools and districts. Failure to enhance capacity at the state level has serious consequences for the implementation and effects of education policy (Fuhrman, et. al., 1994).

Policy Implementation

The literature regarding the implementation of public policies is replete with examples of how policy created at one jurisdictional level is not always implemented as intended by the actors at the local level. While federal policy makers may have been indifferent to local context, the "street level bureaucrats" who are responsible for local
implementation, often without the necessary technical support and resources, understand how a given policy needs to be adapted to local conditions (Weatherly & Lipsky, 1977). As individual practitioners interpret, make sense of, and act on the policy, a “mutual adaptation” takes place in which policy goals and accompanying regulations are fit into the local context (Bardach, 1977; Berman & McLaughlin, 1977, 1978; Elmore & McLaughlin, 1983; McLaughlin, 1976; Pressman & Wildavsky, 1984).

As well, Elmore and McLaughlin's analysis of implementation literature suggested that the success of policies is dependent upon both local capability and local will to carry out the policies (Elmore, 1983; Elmore & McLaughlin, 1982, 1983; McLaughlin, 1987). Essentially, policymakers cannot “mandate what matters” (McLaughlin, 1987, p. 172). Beginning and sustaining a new program in a school is dependent upon a variety of local conditions (e.g. multiple authorities, local stability, and conflicting priorities) as well as the individual attitude and beliefs of those individuals responsible for changing themselves in order to implement the innovation (McLaughlin, 1987). Furthermore, the expectation of compliance with regulations regarding a particular policy does not insure that the program is successful in accomplishing its purpose. As McLaughlin (1987) states: “An army of auditors would be unable to force compliance with the spirit of the law - which is what matters in the long run” (p. 173).

**Top-down and bottom-up strategies for Educational Reform**

Numerous small scale and large scale studies of top-down strategies, utilizing either voluntary or mandatory methods, have shown that actual local implementation has failed the vast majority of time (Fullan, 1994). Sarason argues that billions have been spent on top-down reform with little to show for it.
The Rand Change Agent study, which involved the study of “voluntary” adoption by Berman and McLaughlin and associates (1978) found that even though adoption was voluntary, districts often became involved in change projects for opportunistic reasons rather than for more substantial reasons. Involvement in such projects was seen as a low cost way to cope with “political pressures” to do “something” or to appear up-to-date in the eyes of the community. “Whatever the particular motivation underlying adoption there was an absence of serious educational concerns (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978, p. 14).

As dissatisfaction with failed implementation efforts grew, states and districts turned increasingly to mandatory solutions. Corbett and Wilson’s (1990) study included the unintended consequences of such mandated actions. In this case, new state testing requirements in Maryland and Pennsylvania actually narrowed the curriculum (including the range of instructional strategies and the range of course offerings) and created adverse conditions for ongoing reform. Other unintended consequences included the diverting of energy and attention from more basic reforms involving issues of school structure and instructional practice. As well, teacher motivation, collegiality, and morale were adversely affected.

Political impatience and expediency are understandable as motivators but are ineffective strategies in the promotion of educational reform. Government cannot mandate needs to be addressed because this is highly dependent on and mediated by local motivation, skills, commitment, and culture. As Goodlad (1992) observes: “Top-down, politically driven education reform movements are addressed primarily to restructuring. They have little to say about educating” (p. 238).

“Top-down strategies are problematic because complex change processes cannot be controlled from the top” (Fullan, 1994, p. 190). Senge (1990) refers to it as the “illusion” of being in control. “The perception that someone ‘up there’ is in control is
based on an illusion - the illusion that anyone could master the dynamics and complexity of an organization from the top" (p. 290). Essentially, the forces of educational change are extremely multifaceted and, thus, are inherently unpredictable. In addressing change as nonlinear and complex, Fullan (1994) states:

How is change complex? Take any educational policy or problem and start listing all the forces that could figure in the solution and that would need to be influenced to make for productive change. Then, take the idea that unplanned factors are inevitable - government policy changes or gets constantly redefined, key leaders leave, important contact people are shifted to another role, new technology is invented, immigration increases, recession reduces available resources, a bitter conflict erupts, and so on. Finally, realize that every new variable that enters the equation - these unpredictable but inevitable noise factors - produces ten other ramifications, which in turn produce tens of other reactions and on and on (Fullan, 1993a).

The strategy of control, then, does not work for the simple fact that there is too much to control. Even if there is the existence of strong leadership and vision-driven change, the very nature of change produces unpredictability, complexity, ambiguity, and paradox. What becomes needed is a "new mindset" to manage situations involving constant flux (Fullan, 1993a; Beer, Eisenstat, & Spector 1990; Stacey, 1992).

**Decentralized governance**

Because of the poor success record of centralized reform mandates many believe only decentralized, locally driven reform can succeed. The most prominent form of decentralized governance currently is site-based management. Much of its support is theoretical, since there is ample evidence to indicate that restructuring reforms that devolved decision making to schools may have altered the governance structure while leaving the teaching and learning core untouched (Fullan, 1991; Taylor & Teddlie, 1992; Weiss, 1992). Site-based management may become an end in itself.

A participative, bottom-up approach to education reform may be too slow and to ill-defined to respond effectively to the short-term demands of key players. It
represents "top managers" with the dilemma of how they can incorporate their views and perspectives into new solutions. It also raises questions regarding the motivation and skills of employees to create ambitious solutions which will force them, the employees, to change their attitudes and behaviors. As well, a more participatory approach can be subverted by a host of local actors (Beer, Eisenstat, & Spector, 1990). Without external stimuli, schools, in particular, have not been known for their innovativeness.

The evidence is indicating that decentralized initiatives are not faring any better than centralized reforms. The issue of the relative roles and relationships of centralization (top-down) and decentralization (bottom-up) strategies tends to promote disconnectedness and illustrates the need for conceptual clarification and a more strategic consideration of their uses within the context of education reform.

There is another body of research which extends the discussion of appropriate or effective strategy even further. Research regarding effective and collaborative schools show that these schools do not operate or exist in isolation, but are actually part of a broader network in which external and internal influences interact in important ways. For example, collaborative schools are more likely to be involved in seeking outside ideas, more likely to be linked to district initiatives and priorities, as well as more likely to react to state-level policies proactively (Louis & Miles, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989). A study of forty-eight school districts in Illinois, by Baker, Curtis, and Benenson (1991), confirms that internal development and external development must occur together. Those districts which were classified as successful, as identified by their engagement in "systematic improvement" on a sustained basis, utilized external support from regional education service centers and several other sources of support.

External linkages are not necessarily connected to a hierarchical authority center, but effective systems include two-way communication with those in authority.
Problematically, the boundaries between external and internal systems, between top-down and bottom-up levels become blurred, unclear, and permeable in successful organizations. As well, the dispersion of authority complicates the process of "meaning making" as schools and districts attempt to improve successfully within a broader interactive context (Fullan, 1994).

Since both top-down and bottom-up strategies exist in successful schools, there will be ambiguity and tension regarding what is the appropriate strategy to employ (Fullan, 1994). For purposes of clarification (Fullan, 1994), he makes two generic distinctions regarding division of labor (between the center and local), and the sequences of strategies. Two jurisprudential dichotomies are provided: the school (local)/district (center) jurisdiction and the district (local)/state (center) jurisdiction. The notion of division of labor concerns the relative role of the center and the local entities. Generally, in "bilateral systems", the center's role is to "stimulate and respond to local action," help provide a "common" direction; collect and disseminate performance data; focus on selection, retention, and promotion issues; and provide the necessary resources for ongoing professional development. The local unit's role includes taking action, creating shared vision, establishing collaborative cultures, solving problems relative to desired direction, and essentially developing the habits and competencies needed to promote a learning organization.

In dealing with the sequence of strategies notion, the sequence of events and emphasis is problematic. In complex, interactive systems there can be no totally predictable, ideally sequenced set of procedures. Fullan (1993a) describes recent research showing that nonlinear change does work in "approximate patterns" that seems to point to particular strategies as likely to be more effective than others. "Even though it sounds heretical, reliance on visions and a strong shared culture creates severe limitations for addressing complex change" (Fullan, 1993)
The Beers et.al. (1990) study regarding "the critical path to corporate renewal: supports this by offering among its conclusions: that even top management supported change efforts that begin by creating corporate programs aimed at altering organizational culture are inherently flawed. As well, they note that instead of beginning organizational renewal by changing the organization structure and system, this should be the last component changed. These authors have found that often there are "pockets of change" throughout an organization that are reflected in new behaviors which may permeate an organization and eventually cause structures and processes to change. Professional development becomes an important vehicle for stimulating the growth of ideas and new behaviors through collegial interactions.

The Ford Foundation sponsored Comprehensive School Improvement Program, implemented in the 1960's, was designed to build the capacities of school systems to create their own change design or to adopt appropriate models focusing on the enhancement of curriculum and/or instruction.

A Foundation Goes to School was the final report on the improvement effort and highlighted a number of "lessons learned." The complexity of improving schools was underestimated. The political, social, and economic forces that constitute the "environmental context" of a particular school community must be considered. It became clear that the "ultimate innovator in schools was the teacher." A major result of the study was that "lasting and significant changes would not occur unless teachers were directly and actively involved in the planning and development of the desired changes." Further, "the importance of the individual school itself - rather than the school system - emerged as the proper focus for efforts to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Most of the reforms instituted since the release of this report have generally ignored the knowledge generated by the Comprehensive School Improvement Program."
The residue of educational reform

Tyack, Kirst, and Hansot, after having examined the "residue" of past reform efforts, conclude that the changes that persist are those that: 1) alter the structure of schooling; 2) create a new constituency or at least strengthen and expand an already existing constituency although the tendency for each successive state administration to launch a new program inhibits long-term constituency building; or 3) are easily monitored by outside parties. They offer examples from the past: Carnegie units, flexible scheduling, and team teaching.

The development of the Venture Capital initiative was based upon the "lessons learned" from prior successful reform initiatives as well as the admonitions offered in the school reform and school change literature. Much is known from both research and practice about creating an environment that fosters school improvement. The challenge Venture Capital offered was to use this knowledge to break down barriers to educational improvement. Venture Capital provided an invitation for school communities to examine their need, commitment, and capacity for school improvement. The "learning community" was given an opportunity to adopt or invent a school improvement model which would provide educators a framework for addressing improvements and an opportunity for collaborating for sustained change.

An expanded focus on professional development was seen as the critical key to school improvement. The acquisition of new knowledge, skills, and dispositions would contribute to the process of continuous and self-sustaining improvement. The Ohio Department of Education became committed to facilitating professional development required by the various school improvement models by becoming a partner with schools to build organizational capacity. As well, it was felt that school improvement would be nurtured through the establishment of formal collegial networks that would encourage the sharing of expertise and collaboration.
In order to create "learning communities" which are based on the assumption that all students can learn, school improvement was seen as achievable only through the fundamental restructuring of Ohio's schools. This meant that school improvement must focus on the development and interrelationships of all the major components of schooling simultaneously: governance, organization, assessment, professional development, and the enhancement of teaching and learning. Creating a supportive culture is crucial as well.

While the state and local schools and districts have entered into a unique partnership, the "real" work of school improvement is just beginning. There are no road maps or blueprints and even history does not offer a measure of comfort as it once did.

Many schools throughout the state have recognized the need to change dramatically the process and content of schooling. Building, nurturing and sustaining the commitment and capacity building elements of this school improvement strategy are more problematic.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

This chapter delineates the methodology which was used to investigate the questions in this study. A brief overview of the study is followed by an in-depth discussion of each of the following research procedures: a) selection of subjects; b) research design; c) instrumentation; d) survey review; e) data collection; f) data analysis procedures.

Overview

The Ohio Department of Education under the leadership of State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Ted Sanders, developed Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal (1993) to serve as a mechanism for initiating and supporting school renewal throughout Ohio's public education system. This initiative was created in response to an organizational study of the Ohio Department of Education by a Task Force on Education created by Governor George Voinovich. A key task force recommendation involved the creation of an agenda for state initiated and supported innovation and experimentation throughout the various school districts in Ohio.

The specific strategy for the transformation of schooling throughout Ohio became known as Venture Capital. The purpose of Venture Capital was to provide a means to "spark" school renewal efforts and to "encourage risk-takers" who were intent on creating "high performance teaching and learning." The focus for change was the individual school where educators would become committed to fostering "sustained
change" through the alignment of governance, organization, assessment, professional development, teaching, and learning.

Although the state's initial commitment of support was for five years, Venture Capital was funded the first two years by the Ohio Legislature through the biennial budget process, which is the limit of their funding authority. By the end of the five-year period the expectation is that schools will have institutionalized their commitment to professional development and school improvement, and districts will have reordered their priorities in order to enable sustained school improvement to occur.

The inauguration of Venture Capital occurred in the summer of 1993 with the statewide presentation of Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal. The Ohio Department of Education, Ohio's Governor, George Voinovich, and the Ohio Legislature all formed a supportive "posture" as Venture Capital was introduced. Another prominent group which lent its support to this initiative was the Ohio business community, through the Governor's Education Management (GEM) Council. Through a number of initiatives at the state level, including Ohio 2000 and BEST, the government and business communities are working together for the "renewal" of Ohio's schools.

Within the context of educational reform, particularly at the state level, this study aimed at examining the perspective of secondary school principals in terms of selected individual characteristics, the perceived importance of particular leadership roles that these principals potentially play in their buildings, and the extent to which they have additional professional development needs for each leadership role. As well, selected building-level effects of the buildings' involvement in the Venture Capital grant application process were analyzed as was the secondary principals' view regarding the efficacy of the Venture Capital grant application process.

Three researchers collaborated in this endeavor which was aimed at examining the perspectives of the elementary and secondary principal as well as the superintendent.
in terms of the effectiveness of the Venture Capital process and its impact at the building and district level. The three researchers shared ideas and research and with the guidance and support of Dr. Brad Mitchell, Principal Investigator, created an instrument which could be utilized by all three researchers.

The results of this study focusing on secondary principals was intended to expand the understanding regarding the role of the secondary principal in the application process involving the state reform initiative, Venture Capital. Increasing the understanding of perceived roles and responsibilities within an educational organization can aid in the ultimate success of Venture Capital as well as other school improvement efforts as schools and service providers continue to analyze those attributes of effective leadership that are linked with successful school improvement initiatives. Within the change context the secondary principal occupies an important position within a school organizational setting.

Both first-round funded Venture Capital elementary and secondary principals received the same survey and were part of the same data collection procedure. Secondary principals of first-round funded Venture Capital schools were identified through the Educational Management Information System (EMIS), the Ohio Department of Education's data reporting system.

Selection of Subjects

There were 197 total elementary and secondary principals of first-round funded Venture Capital schools. Seventy-eight of the 197 were Ohio secondary principals. The source of information for these 78 secondary principals was the Ohio Department of Education's Division of School Improvement. In addition to the names of the 78 Venture Capital secondary principal recipients, the Ohio Department of Education's 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), which the researcher adhered to, employed multiple mailings to ensure a high survey response rate from these secondary principals.

Upon reviewing Rossi, Wright, and Anderson's Handbook of Survey Research (1983) and Dillman's Mail and Telephone Surveys (1978), the researcher determined that surveying the entire population (78) of first-round funded Venture Capital secondary principals through a mail survey would provide the most valuable information for this study. Thus, a census survey was employed. Additionally, the researcher had consulted with other researchers including Dr. William Loadman, who had often utilized successfully the Dillman Total Design Method when responses from large samples or whole populations were sought.

Research Design

Descriptive research was employed in this study. According to Gay (1987), descriptive research "answers" questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study, and determines and reports the way things are (p. 189). Typical descriptive studies are concerned with the assessment of attitudes, opinions, demographic information, conditions, and procedures. Descriptive data are typically collected through the use of a questionnaire, an interview, or observation (Gay, 1987). In this study, descriptive data were collected from mailed questionnaires to first-round funded Venture Capital secondary principals regarding their views concerning: 1) certain individual characteristics; 2) the perceived importance of selected leadership roles and professional development needs each respondent has for each role; 3) the building-level effects of the buildings' involvement in the Venture Capital grant application process on communication processes, roles and relationships, and general understandings at the
building level; 4) and the perceived efficacy of the Venture Capital grant application process.

Instrumentation

The 89-item questionnaire (Appendix B) used to collect data was developed specifically for this study from information drawn from The Ohio Department of Education monograph, Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal (which focused on the Venture Capital initiative), from the literature base, and from experts in the field. The Total Design Method guidelines advocated by Dillman (1978) were followed.

Introduction and Cover Page

An introductory prenotification cover letter (Appendix D) was sent August 5, 1994, regarding the intent of the survey. The text addressed the three elements which must be communicated to the respondents in order to maximize survey response: the cost of participating in the study, rewards for doing so, and trust that the rewards will be forthcoming (Dillman, 1978). The cover letter (Appendix D) made it clear that the only investment expected of the respondent was the time necessary for the completion of the questionnaire. A return date of August 26 was specified, which was two weeks away, and the respondent was encouraged to select a convenient time in which to reply.

To address the reward or benefit element for respondents, the introductory cover letter offered an opportunity to participate in a study of initially funded schools, which would elicit important feedback for a unique state-sponsored school-improvement initiative. While such an intangible reward may not matter to some people, there are those respondents who want to, in some way, attempt to impact the policy-making system.
The third factor, that of establishing trust, began with the professional appearance and The Ohio State University relationship which was communicated in the cover letter, the questionnaire, and throughout the entire process. Additionally, the code number was not hidden in an attempt to imply anonymity, but was prominently displayed. Also, the fact that the code number was to be used only to identify returns was clearly explained. This was followed by a promise that all information collected would remain confidential.

Dillman (1978) recommends designing the cover of the questionnaire booklet to include only the following: study title, a graphic illustration, any needed directions, and the name and address of the study sponsor. The title, Venture Capital Grant Proposal Study, was chosen. The Polimetric Laboratory for Political and Social Research, which is located on the campus of The Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio, utilized their existing logo which included two overlapping squares to illustrate this relationship. Succinct and clear directions were provided on the cover page as well. The combination of the above factors resulted in a cover designed to increase the probability that respondents would turn the page for more information regarding the survey.

Instrument Content and Format

The 89-item questionnaire (Appendix B) was prepared to facilitate responses and was divided into eight subsets of questions that addressed the following issues related to first-round funded Venture Capital secondary principals: perceived importance of particular leadership roles that they potentially exercised in their building; extent to which they perceived they needed additional professional development related to the identified leadership roles; agreement with fundamental school renewal principles; view of the effects of the Venture Capital grant proposal process on communication processes,
roles and relationships, and general understandings at the building level (two time periods involved): 1) from the time when secondary principals first learned about the Venture Capital grant until October 29, 1993, when the application was submitted; 2) from the time the application was submitted (October 29, 1993) until the time the grant money was awarded in March 1994; view of the efficacy of the policy components of the Venture Capital grant application process; and individual background information.

The first subset of thirteen (13) items concerned specific leadership roles which are being linked to successful school renewal efforts, and the importance of the secondary principal's leadership role in regard to the "expression" of these qualities. These attributes are well represented in the school restructuring and change literature and were also embedded in the Venture Capital monograph, Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal, (Ohio Department of Education, 1993). Examples of particular roles which a principal may exercise include developing attitudes and values that undergird school renewal, promoting different governance and decision-making processes, influencing curricular and instructional issues, and advocating for professional development.

The second subset involving the same thirteen (13) leadership attributes focused on the individual secondary principal's perceived professional development needs related to each of the leadership roles. These questions were included to provide information concerning those leadership areas where additional, more intentional, professional development attention might be given. There is widespread attention given to the linkage between professional development and meaningful school renewal in the literature as well as in the Venture Capital monograph.

The third subset consists of four (4) items which form the belief statements undergirding the Venture Capital initiative as well as education throughout Ohio. These items are found in national and state policy goal statements, state curriculums and instructional subject area models, professional association writings, as well as
throughout the school improvement literature. They include belief statements as to whether all students can learn, learners possess multiple types of intelligences, participation in a learning community fosters social, civic, emotional and intellectual growth, and whether diverse instructional strategies and environments enhance learning.

The fourth subset consists of twelve (12) factors that seek the secondary principal's responses regarding the impact of involvement in the Venture Capital process on communication processes, roles and relationships, and general understandings at the building level. This subset included the application process timeline: from the time Venture Capital was first heard of until the application was submitted.

The five (5) items of subset five also sought further information regarding the impact of being involved in the Venture Capital grant application process from the time the grant was submitted until grant money was awarded. As with subset four (4), the focus is on the impact of being involved in this process on communication processes, roles and relationships, and general understandings at the building level. Examples of survey items relative to subsets 4 and 5 include questions as to whether divisions arose between teachers and schools. As well, there was interest in determining if roles were clarified, if faculty leaders emerged, and if the superintendent was supportive of the process. Questions were also developed in order to better determine general understandings as to the learning community concept and the shared decision-making process.

In considering policy efficacy, the nine (9) items in subset six are asking respondents to comment on the "value" of different aspects of the policy process. These questions were based on policy guidelines found in the Venture Capital monograph.
The eleven (11) items that comprised subset seven (7) were also concerned with policy efficacy questions but allowed the secondary principals to respond to an agreement continuum. Again, each question was based on a policy guideline found in the Venture Capital monograph and was indigenous to this particular broad-based school improvement initiative. Examples of survey items for subsets 6 and 7 included questions related to the importance of the Ohio Department of Education's role in the Venture Capital grant application process, the element of flexibility (through the use of waivers, open-ended budget guidelines, and choice of models), and the clarity and timeliness of the process.

Factors related to biographical and demographic information provided a basis for the eighteen (18) items comprising subset eight (8). Data in this section included: 1) years of full-time teaching experience; 2) years of full-time administrative experience; 3) years as principal in current building; 4) highest degree attained; 5) gender; 6) ethnicity; 7) year born; 8) number of grant writing experiences; 9) number of funded grant writing experiences; 10) amount received through grant writing experiences; 11) student average daily membership; 12) percentage of students who receive free and reduced lunches; 13) ethnic composition of student body; 14) number of full-time certificated teachers; 15) size of community students are from; 16) building level. This information was requested in order to compile descriptive information to develop a profile of Venture Capital secondary principals.

In subsets one through seven, Likert-type standard scales were used (McLver & Carmines, 1981). Given the nature of the leadership roles, subset one provided for the greatest degree of specificity. The nature of the questions led to concern about redundancy or homogeneity of response. Because the researcher felt there was variation, a seven-point scale was utilized with the opposing anchors consisting of “extremely important” and ranging to “extremely unimportant.” Because of the less
threatening nature of subset two, a three-point scale ranging from "great need" to "some need" to "none" was used to identify professional development needs. Subsets three through five and seven had five-point scales ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Subset six utilized a standard five-point scale ranging from "extremely valuable" to "not valuable." Subsets three through seven included another response, #9, that included the response "don't know or not applicable." In responding to these scales, the responding secondary principal was to circle the appropriate response.

For the seventh subset, a different format was used for some terms. The first five items employed a five-point scale which ranged from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Six items were based upon a dichotomous attribute and two yes-no sub-items provided space for elaboration. The last subset, concerning eight personal and demographical profile questions, provided spaces for responses to ten of the questions and allowed for a yes-no response for the other eight questions.

Finally, the final page of the questionnaire presented an open-ended question and space for optional responses. The question merely asked if the respondents would care to offer any additional comments regarding the Venture Capital Grant Proposal Process. All components of the questionnaire were developed utilizing the Total Design Method (Dillman, 1978). Additionally, recommendations of the Polimetrics Lab staff, Dr. Mitchell, and Dr. Loadman, were incorporated into the survey's design to ensure a high response rate.

**Validity**

Content validity concerns item sampling adequacy, the extent to which a specific set of items reflects a content domain (De Vellis, 1991). It was established in the following manner. Selected leadership roles came from the transformational leadership literature, a strand of thought which is a dominant force in the school improvement
literature. As well, Quinn's competing values model of managing/leading identifies four concomitant models or spheres of organizational life: open systems, rational goal, internal process, human relation models. Quinn asserts that the successful leader will attempt to manage and lead in all four spheres. Other components of the instrument were based on the literature or on specific policy guidelines that The Ohio Department of Education utilized in order to promote long-term, systemic reform through the employment of top-down and bottom-up strategies. Specific policy guidelines can be found in the Venture Capital monograph.

Building-level administrators, Ohio Department of Education personnel, Central Ohio Regional Professional Development Center staff, and The Ohio State University personnel, both polymetrics consultants and Ohio State faculty continued to make suggestions for the instrument's improvement. In considering content, these individuals were asked to judge the content as to whether the instrument measured what it purported to measure, and whether the items were clearly worded. Format issues concerned such issues as the clarity of the printing, size of type, appropriateness of language, clarity of directions, and suggestions for the addition or elimination of items (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1990).

Survey Review

The survey was reviewed by two high-school principals, three middle-school principals, an Ohio Department of Education staff member and the co-director of the Central Ohio Regional Professional Development Center.

Revisions were made according to the concerns expressed by these individuals. Specific changes made included: reducing the length of the questionnaire, combining items which were repetitious, clarifying language, and reducing the length of numerous items. A review by experts indicated that the instrument was content valid.
Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was conducted on the leadership role subscale, Items V1-V13, and the professional development needs subscale, which included Items V14-V26.

Table 3.1 illustrates the factor loading matrix for the perceived importance of leadership traits subscale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1 - Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Factor Loading Matrix for Perceived Importance of Leadership Traits Subscale.

A principal-components analysis was conducted to identify the number of dimensions or factors which were underlying the leadership subscale (V1-V13).

On the leadership subscale (V1-V13), a factor analysis revealed that all 13 measures were highly correlated, constituted one underlying concept or dimension, and were equally good measures of leadership. Eleven of the thirteen items correlated at the 0.80 level or above. The highest correlations included "influencing instructional quality" (V9) and "encouraging personal and collective risk-taking" (V2), with correlations of 0.89 and 0.88 respectively. Interestingly, a great deal of research indicates that we need to encourage much more innovation through the valuing of risk-
taking in order for more emphasis to be placed on student learning rather than adult teaching. The transforming of roles and relationships in instructional practices is arguably an essential leverage area in school reform.

The two exceptions included Item V4 which dealt with "reallocating existing internal resources," which had a 0.72 correlation. The lowest correlation, 0.50, resided in Item V5 which dealt with "generating external resources." Possibly this one item had a lower correlation because this might be an area more beyond the control of the building administrator in the exercise of leadership. Still, all items of the leadership subscale (V1-V13) were tapping the same factor.

Table 3.2 illustrates the factor loading matrix for the perceived professional development needs subscale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V14</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V18</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V19</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V21</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V22</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V23</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V24</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V25</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V26</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Factor Loading Matrix for Perceived Professional Development Needs Subscale.

A Principal-components analysis was conducted to identify the number of dimensions or factors which were underlying the leadership traits professional development subscale (V14-V26). Unlike the measures related to leadership (V1-
V13), these measures related to perceived professional development needs relative to potential leadership roles (V14-V26) are found to have more item to item differentiation and load on three factors rather than one. Thus, one cannot discuss professional development as a unitary concept.

In the professional development needs subscale containing Items V14-V26, eight of the thirteen items correlated at the 0.63 level or above on the professional development needs factor. The highest correlations involved Item V15 "encouraging personal and collective risk-taking" which resulted in a 0.74 correlation and Item V25, "encouraging professional growth activities for my staff", and Item V22 "influencing instructional quality" each resulted in a 0.72 correlation.

While the factor analysis identified the presence of a second and third factor, there appeared to be no commonality, and thus no substantive relation involving the thirteen survey items (V14-V26) to factors two and three.

While not as strong or as consistent as the leadership subscale, the professional development needs subscale (V14-V26) was, for the most part, tapping the same factor.

Reliability

Internal consistency reliability for the survey was estimated by computing Cronbach alpha coefficients for each subscale and for the entire instrument.

While the entire survey had 89 items, the Cronbach alpha was conducted on 72 items. The demographic information section, consisting of 18 items, was not included, nor were two open-ended questions from subset eight involving policy efficacy.

Tables 3.3 - 3.9 illustrate Cronbach's alpha reliability and item correlations for the survey's subscales.

Table 3.3 illustrates the Cronbach alpha and item correlations for the leadership roles subscale.
Table 3.3: Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha Reliability and Item Correlations for the Leadership Roles Subscale

The overall reliability of the leadership role subscale was 0.96 (Table 3.3). Question 9 regarding “influencing instructional quality” had the highest correlation with the total (0.86); Question 5 regarding “generating external responses” had the lowest correlation with the total (0.46). Question 5 contributed least to the overall reliability. The overall reliability would have increased only slightly with this item deleted (0.96) (Table 3.3).

Table 3.4 illustrates the Cronbach alpha and item correlations for the perceived professional development subscale.
Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha

For RAW variables: 0.889256
For STANDARDIZED variables: 0.889401

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deleted Variable</th>
<th>Correlation with Total</th>
<th>Correlation with Alpha</th>
<th>Correlation with Total</th>
<th>Correlation with Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>0.706108</td>
<td>0.875069</td>
<td>0.707092</td>
<td>0.874924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>0.731454</td>
<td>0.873826</td>
<td>0.731086</td>
<td>0.873700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>0.353303</td>
<td>0.890824</td>
<td>0.358402</td>
<td>0.891975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>0.425041</td>
<td>0.888724</td>
<td>0.419056</td>
<td>0.889106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>0.392128</td>
<td>0.390448</td>
<td>0.387933</td>
<td>0.890583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>0.420905</td>
<td>0.889058</td>
<td>0.418094</td>
<td>0.889152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>0.545199</td>
<td>0.883041</td>
<td>0.539987</td>
<td>0.883265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>0.669942</td>
<td>0.876564</td>
<td>0.671183</td>
<td>0.876743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>0.693423</td>
<td>0.876260</td>
<td>0.704153</td>
<td>0.875073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>0.583586</td>
<td>0.881051</td>
<td>0.594310</td>
<td>0.880588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>0.636954</td>
<td>0.878182</td>
<td>0.631679</td>
<td>0.878727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>0.707237</td>
<td>0.874148</td>
<td>0.702526</td>
<td>0.875156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>0.708619</td>
<td>0.874623</td>
<td>0.708025</td>
<td>0.874876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha Reliability and Item Correlations for the Perceived Professional Development Needs Subscale

The overall reliability of the perceived professional development needs subscale was 0.89 (Table 3.4). Correlations with the total ranged from a low of 0.35 for Question 16 regarding “strengthening school assessment activities” to a high of 0.73 for Question 15 regarding “encouraging personal and collective risk-taking.” The overall reliability would have been increased only slightly with Question 16 deleted (0.89) (Table 3.4).

Table 3.5 illustrates the Cronbach alpha and item correlations for the school improvement belief statements subscale.
Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha

For RAW variables: 0.887100
For STANDARDIZED variables: 0.888220

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deleted Variable</th>
<th>Correlation with Total</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Correlation with Total</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>0.740464</td>
<td>0.860610</td>
<td>0.742384</td>
<td>0.860967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>0.741070</td>
<td>0.859314</td>
<td>0.739550</td>
<td>0.862033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>0.784532</td>
<td>0.844568</td>
<td>0.783462</td>
<td>0.845341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>0.750963</td>
<td>0.855603</td>
<td>0.753840</td>
<td>0.856643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5: Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha Reliability and Item Correlations for the School Improvement Belief Statements Subscale

The overall reliability of the belief statements subscale was 0.89 (Table 3.5). Correlations with the total ranged from a low of 0.74 for Question 27 regarding “all students can learn” to a high of 0.78 for Question 29 regarding “participation in a learning community fosters social, civic, emotional and intellectual growth.” Each of the four items contributed to the overall reliability.

Table 3.6 illustrates the Cronbach alpha and item correlations for the building-level policy impact subscale.
Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha

For RAW variables: 0.627460
For STANDARDIZED variables: 0.662465

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deleted Variable</th>
<th>Correlation with Total</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Correlation with Total</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>0.191027</td>
<td>0.627926</td>
<td>0.178407</td>
<td>0.662819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32</td>
<td>0.148889</td>
<td>0.638526</td>
<td>0.118221</td>
<td>0.672389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>0.037608</td>
<td>0.654397</td>
<td>0.035860</td>
<td>0.695953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>0.212663</td>
<td>0.620316</td>
<td>0.162855</td>
<td>0.665344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>0.091607</td>
<td>0.635812</td>
<td>0.100557</td>
<td>0.675159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>0.428218</td>
<td>0.587381</td>
<td>0.474723</td>
<td>0.612569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>0.438014</td>
<td>0.573839</td>
<td>0.462379</td>
<td>0.614769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38</td>
<td>0.369641</td>
<td>0.594882</td>
<td>0.395435</td>
<td>0.626537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>0.498478</td>
<td>0.565784</td>
<td>0.558866</td>
<td>0.597314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>0.252702</td>
<td>0.610867</td>
<td>0.313294</td>
<td>0.640601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41</td>
<td>0.366240</td>
<td>0.588966</td>
<td>0.415526</td>
<td>0.623035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42</td>
<td>0.485211</td>
<td>0.570001</td>
<td>0.543160</td>
<td>0.600196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This subscale covers the timeframe from the time when the respondent first learned about The Venture Capital Process until October 29, 1993, when the application was submitted.

Table 3.6: Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha Reliability and Item Correlations for the Building-Level Policy Impact Subscale

The overall reliability of this building-level policy impact subscale was 0.63 (Table 3.6). The item correlations with the total ranged from a low of 0.04 for Question 33 regarding “divisions arose among schools in our district” to a high of 0.50 for Question 39 regarding “the administrative roles were clarified.”

Three items (Questions 32, 33, and 35) did not contribute to the overall alpha of 0.63. Alpha would be slightly higher if Question 32 regarding “divisions arose among teachers in our building” had been deleted. Question 33 regarding “divisions arose among schools in our district” had the lowest correlation with the total (0.04) and, if
deleted, the alpha would have been 0.65. As well with Question 35 deleted regarding “our superintendent was supportive of the process” the alpha would have been 0.64.

Table 3.7 illustrates the Cronbach alpha and item correlations for the building-level impact subscale.

Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deleted Variable</th>
<th>Correlation with Total</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Correlation with Total</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q43</td>
<td>0.442315</td>
<td>0.822267</td>
<td>0.466838</td>
<td>0.829580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44</td>
<td>0.638430</td>
<td>0.801227</td>
<td>0.669038</td>
<td>0.807269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45</td>
<td>0.706088</td>
<td>0.796823</td>
<td>0.728254</td>
<td>0.800456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46</td>
<td>0.534790</td>
<td>0.812436</td>
<td>0.568466</td>
<td>0.818549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47</td>
<td>0.490210</td>
<td>0.817157</td>
<td>0.499484</td>
<td>0.826076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48</td>
<td>0.645229</td>
<td>0.800510</td>
<td>0.621225</td>
<td>0.812677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49</td>
<td>0.397970</td>
<td>0.828948</td>
<td>0.377852</td>
<td>0.838942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q50</td>
<td>0.540344</td>
<td>0.814026</td>
<td>0.523878</td>
<td>0.823434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51</td>
<td>0.506285</td>
<td>0.816267</td>
<td>0.483641</td>
<td>0.827781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This subscale covers the timeframe from the time The Venture Capital Grant proposal was submitted and before the grant money was awarded in March of 1994.

Table 3.7: Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha Reliability and Item Correlations for the Building-Level Policy Impact Subscale

Each item of the building-level policy impact subscale contributed to the overall reliability of 0.83 (Table 3.7). The item correlations with the total ranged from a low of 0.40 for Question 49 regarding “our board of education was more supportive of school renewal activities” to a high of 0.71 for Question 45 regarding “the school climate was more supportive of continuous school renewal.”

Table 3.8 illustrates the Cronbach alpha and item correlations for the policy efficacy subscale.
Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha

For RAW variables: 0.638387
For STANDARDIZED variables: 0.655885

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deleted Variable</th>
<th>Correlation with Total</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Correlation with Total</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q52</td>
<td>0.199464</td>
<td>0.639277</td>
<td>0.201184</td>
<td>0.657487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q53</td>
<td>0.036189</td>
<td>0.653028</td>
<td>0.050866</td>
<td>0.688595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q54</td>
<td>0.630506</td>
<td>0.525286</td>
<td>0.614760</td>
<td>0.560877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q55</td>
<td>0.596095</td>
<td>0.536619</td>
<td>0.601017</td>
<td>0.564361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q56</td>
<td>0.464428</td>
<td>0.585861</td>
<td>0.497272</td>
<td>0.590039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q57</td>
<td>0.301666</td>
<td>0.615352</td>
<td>0.339785</td>
<td>0.526963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q58</td>
<td>0.340146</td>
<td>0.607984</td>
<td>0.325949</td>
<td>0.530092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q59</td>
<td>0.139405</td>
<td>0.681371</td>
<td>0.118889</td>
<td>0.574769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q60</td>
<td>0.299609</td>
<td>0.619881</td>
<td>0.306898</td>
<td>0.534370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This subscale covers the timeframe from the time when the respondent first learned about The Venture Capital initiative through March 1994 when monies were awarded.

Table 3.8  
Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha Reliability and Item Correlations for the Policy Efficacy Subscale

Two questions on this subscale did not contribute to the overall alpha of 0.64 (Table 3.8). Alpha would be slightly higher (0.65) if Question 53 had been deleted. This item relating to the value of “involving school building teams in the interview process” also had the lowest correlation with the total (0.04). Alpha would also be higher (0.68) if Question 59 relating to the value of “having a relatively short timeline for writing the proposal” had been deleted.

Table 3.9 illustrates the Cronbach alpha and item correlations for the policy efficacy subscale.
Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha

For RAW variables: 0.300910
For STANDARDIZED variables: 0.364949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deleted Variable</th>
<th>Correlation with Total Alpha</th>
<th>Correlation with Total Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q61</td>
<td>0.181955</td>
<td>0.232626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q62</td>
<td>-0.044325</td>
<td>0.403646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q63</td>
<td>0.530782</td>
<td>-0.092965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q64</td>
<td>0.378816</td>
<td>0.084222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q65</td>
<td>-0.097077</td>
<td>0.489266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q66</td>
<td>0.058654</td>
<td>0.303842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This subscale is different than the subscale in Table 3.8, in that respondents were asked their level of agreement with survey questions on this subscale. (The subscale in Table 3.8 focused on the value of particular policy features.)

Table 3.9 Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha Reliability and Item Correlations for the Policy Efficacy Subscale

The overall reliability of this subscale was 0.30. Only Question 66, which dealt with the appropriateness of the page-limit requirements, approximates 0.30. None of the other questions contribute to the overall alpha of 0.30. Questions 63 and 64, by their deletion, would have caused alpha to be -0.09 and 0.08 respectively. Question 65 regarding "we chose a model we believed would be likely to be funded", if deleted, would have alpha at 0.49.

Nunnally (1978) has suggested that the generally accepted standard for reliability estimates is above 0.70. Using this criterion, three subscales failed to demonstrate acceptable levels of internal consistency. The subscale having to do with the building-level effects of involvement in the Venture Capital Grant proposal process (referencing the time period from when respondents first heard about the Venture Capital grant until October 29, 1993, when the application was submitted), Table 3.6 -
Questions 31-42, whose twelve items were identified as B1-B12, had a reliability coefficient of 0.63. Table 3.7 - Questions 43-51, which constitutes survey subscale C, was also a policy impact subscale (referencing the time period from when the Venture Capital grant proposal was submitted, October 29, 1993, to the time the grant money was awarded in March 1994), whose nine items were identified as C1-C9. The reliability coefficient on this subscale was 0.83. When combining the B and C subscale for purposes of reliability analysis, the result was a reliability coefficient of 0.78.

The policy efficacy subscales, D and E, had lower Cronbach alpha scores as well. The nine items comprising the D scale (Table 3.8 - Questions 52-60), which dealt with the time period covering the entire Venture Capital grant proposal process to the time of actual funding in March 1994, had a Cronbach alpha score of 0.64. This subscale asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they valued different aspects of the process.

The eleven-item E scale (Table 3.9 - Questions 61-66), while similar, asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement/disagreement with various policy statements related to the Venture Capital grant application process. The reliability coefficient related to this subscale was 0.30. When combining the D and E subscales for purposes of reliability analysis, the result was a reliability coefficient of 0.59.

Using the 0.70 criterion, the three subscales just described failed to demonstrate acceptable levels of internal consistency. This implies that these subscales are not sufficiently homogeneous; in that, the items do not satisfactorily measure the same construct. The researcher was, however, constrained as he developed survey items related to subscales B and C related to building-level policy impact and subscales D and E which focused on policy efficacy implications.

In order to collect data that was based on the characteristic features of the systemic Venture Capital school improvement framework that underlay this entire process, the researcher felt compelled to utilize language found and policy features
highlighted in the Ohio Department of Education Monograph on School Renewal (1993). Thus, there was not substantial flexibility to create survey items which would, in fact, result in higher alpha scores. The alphas presented here are the highest generated after ongoing, repeated revisions in the development of the survey instrument.

The computed coefficient of 0.91 indicated the composite score possessed adequate internal consistency and was within an acceptable range (Nunnally, 1978) for use in statistical analysis.

Data Collection

Materials for review were submitted to the Behavioral and Social Sciences Human Subjects Review Committee (HSRC). The category for “Expedited Review,” research where the behavior of the subjects is not manipulated and which does not involve stress to subjects, was appropriate for this study. At the March 14, 1994, meeting the HSRC approved the research protocol.

The investigator utilized two sources of data collection. The major source of information used in this study was a questionnaire mailed to each secondary school principal (grades 7-12) whose school was awarded a Venture Capital grant during the first round of the award process. The first round schools submitted their applications during the fall 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 secondary school principals in the middle of August, 1994. The intent was to get the survey to these principals after most had returned from vacation but before job demands of the coming school year limited their time.
The utilization of a mail survey "allows the researcher to have access to samples that might be hard to reach in person or by telephone... and it permits the respondents to take sufficient time to give thoughtful answers to the questions asked" (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1990, p. 335). An attempt was made to overcome the disadvantages of the mail survey (i.e., no opportunity to clarify instructions or items and the ease with which some respondents may disregard requests for assistance) by making all components of the questionnaire as clear as possible and by implementing the Total Design Method of mail surveys (Dillman, 1978) to maximize the response rate.

The Total Design Method (TDM) developed by Dillman (1978) 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's intentions are carried out in complete detail. In order to implement more effectively Dillman's recommendations for maximizing response rates and with Dr. Brad Mitchell's encouragement, the services of the Polimetrics Laboratory of Political and Social Research at The Ohio State University were employed.

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, 1978) that were utilized by the researcher in this study.

Following the Total Design Method for constructing the questionnaire (Dillman, 1978), 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 x 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 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.

On August 5, 1994, the Venture Capital secondary principals throughout the state of Ohio were mailed a prenotification letter from the study’s Principal Investigator, Dr. Brad Mitchell (Appendix D). This letter was prepared on The Ohio State University, Department of Education Policy and Leadership stationary and began by offering congratulations to building principals for the building's receipt of an Ohio Venture Capital grant. The letter also addressed the importance of the principal’s response to the survey and introduced the survey packet which the building principal would receive the following week. As a conclusion, the letter provided an assurance of confidentiality and the opportunity to contact Dr. Mitchell if the principal had any questions. These letters and their envelopes were individually addressed to each secondary principal. The letters also included Dr. Mitchell’s signature.

On the following August 12, 1994, the survey questionnaire booklet (Appendix B) was mailed to each of the 78 first-round funded Venture Capital secondary principals. Accompanying 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 D), which covered the exact same items as included in Dr. Mitchell's letter.

This data collection effort was based upon a short "turnaround time." There was a desire to have the survey responses returned either before the school year began or during the first few weeks of school. Prolonging this process might have resulted in a lower response rate due to school business issues diverting attention away from the completion of the survey. As well, more accurate responses based upon a clearer memory was another consideration in choosing a shorter date collection timeline. If, as of August 26, respondents' completed surveys were not received, respondents were telephoned. Calls were attempted until the status of the survey was determined (i.e., the survey was lost, never received, or was in the mail). Additional instruments were sent again as needed. The Polimetrics Laboratory assumed responsibility for speaking with or leaving multiple messages for every respondent. The telephone follow-up ended October 7. The second mailing elicited seven (7) additional responses and four (4) more were returned after telephone contact was made with the respondent. These late respondents' mean scores were compared with earlier respondents for each survey item, and differences no greater than 0.4 emerged on a scale from 1-7 typically. Three questionnaires were not returned because the respondent had moved and was no longer in the position as principal of the first-round funded Venture Capital school, and in two cases the secondary principal had retired. Several promised to respond in the follow-up telephone calls, but did not follow through in returning the completed survey instrument.

Each of the non-respondents were contacted directly by a graduate researcher associated with the Polimetrics Lab, who had undergone the training involving the telephone interviewing process. A uniform interview question format was used, and this individual was selected for her excellent communication skills.
Of the 64 responses analyzed, there were occasions where the respondents did not respond to every question listed in the survey instrument. An example included three respondents who failed to complete the entire subset of questions related to each respondent's appraisal of their own professional development needs regarding their potential leadership roles at the building site. After reviewing the literature regarding missing data (Reubin and Little, 1976; McIver and Carmines, 1981; Anderson, Basilevsky, and Hum, 1983; Foreman, 1991) and discussing this issue with the Polimetrics Laboratory staff, the researcher determined that the rest of the missing data was random in nature and that the data analysis would not be improved by any further manipulation of existing data. Data analysis would not be improved by attempting to generate responses to missing items based upon inferences from completed responses. Also, the removal of all 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.

All but 14 questionnaires were returned by October 17, the date set to close the questionnaire process and to start compiling the data from all of the returned surveys. The 64 responses represented an 82% response rate from the population of 78 Venture Capital secondary principals.

Interviews

An additional source of information was provided through personal interviews. The researcher met with Ron Rapp, a national educational policy analyst for the Education Commission of the States (ECS) in Denver, Colorado, on July 28, 1994. As well, there have been ongoing telephone contacts with Mr. Rapp since that time. Of particular interest was the national perspective that the Education Commission provided regarding the efficacy of state educational restructuring initiatives throughout the
United States. ECS is particularly interested in the Venture Capital initiative because of its "systemic nature" and its systems changing and capacity building policy mechanism.

A second series of telephone interviews was held with Dr. Joseph Murphy, Professor of Education at Vanderbilt University, and Dr. Patricia Wesley, Senior Research Associate at the Coalition of Essential Schools, Brown University. Both of these researchers provided confirming evidence that conceptions of leadership within the context of school restructuring need to be eclectic and not tied to any one particular school of leadership.

As well, they both noted that the literature tends to address the generic "principal" rather than distinguishing between elementary and secondary principals. This is natural they asserted because the values, knowledge, and skills necessary for effective leadership in restructuring schools is the same regardless of administrative level.

A third series of interviews was held with individuals who had particular knowledge concerning the intent of the Venture Capital initiative. These individuals included: State Senator Cooper Snyder, Chairman of the Senate Education Committee; Susan Streitenberger, Assistant Director of the Ohio Department of Education's Division of School Improvement; Russell Warren, former legislative liaison for the Ohio Department of Education; and Paul Palog, policy analyst, with Governor George Voinovich's staff.

Summary notes reflected numerous "shared perspectives" concerning the "potential" importance of the policy mechanism known as Venture Capital. The development of the Venture Capital initiative was based upon "lessons learned" from prior successful reform initiatives as well as the admonitions offered in the school reform and school-change literature. Much is known from both research and practice about creating an environment that fosters school improvement. The challenge Venture
Capital offered was to use this knowledge to break down barriers to educational improvement. Venture Capital provided an invitation for school communities to examine their need, commitment, and capacity for school improvement. An opportunity was created to adopt or invent a school improvement model which would provide educators a framework for addressing improvements and for collaborating for sustained change.

Open Ended Survey Questions

A polimetrics staff member read all responses to each open-ended question of the returned surveys, recording key phrases and looking for patterns of similar responses. A content analysis determined whether the comments were positive or negative. Comments were also able to be coded to respond to questionnaire items. No new categories emerged. A polimetrics staff member trained and experienced in coding open-ended responses was utilized. This individual understood language subtleties and subject matter nuances.

Open-ended question responses were associated with survey items E10A, E11b, and item number 18 at the end of the demographic section. Regarding the open-ended follow-up question asking "How was the Regional Professional Development Center used?" (item E10A), no responses were provided. In reference to open-ended question E11b, regarding "Why do you think the venture capital framework favored one level of schooling - elementary, middle, high- over another?", out of the 64 respondents there were 22 missing scores. The responses of respondents were not entirely clear. Sixty percent of the responses indicated that a particular level of schooling was favored either for the money or because it was good for staff. Relative to the questions being asked, the responses are confusing and difficult to interpret. The general comments question (at the end of the demographic section), which was reserved as the last question of the survey, had 47 non-respondents and only 17 respondents. Thus, not many respondents
had additional comments to make. Of those who did respond, 11 individuals (69% of the cumulative percent of respondents) indicated they were positive about the dollar amount being invested or were generally positive about the process. The remainder of respondents indicated some degree of negativity: either toward the Ohio Department of Education's role and function in the grant application process, poor communication generally, or general negativity.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to present and analyze the data on the respondents and their responses. Overall, frequency counts, mean responses and standard deviation scores were examined to determine secondary principal's perceptions as to the importance of potential leadership roles; their appraisal of their own professional development needs for each role; the effects of the buildings' involvement in the Venture Capital grant application process on organizational processes, roles and relationships; and the nature and function of the Venture Capital grant application process.

A number of analyses were conducted throughout the various phases of the dissertation process. Factor analysis was performed on the leadership roles and professional development needs associated with each leadership role subscales. Cronbach alpha coefficients were computed for each subscale and for the entire instrument. Content analysis was utilized for the open-ended questions in the survey. To determine the representation of the sample, chi-square goodness of fit tests were calculated for gender, age, and race variables. The data set was located in files on the mainframe computer at The Ohio State University. All subsequent statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS-X (SPSS Inc., 1990).
Descriptive statistics and content analysis were used to address the questions in this study. The results of these analyses will be presented in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER 4
PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The problem under investigation was to describe how secondary principals (grades 7-12) of first-round funded Venture Capital schools perceived: the importance of particular leadership roles that they potentially exercise in their building and their need for professional development for each role; the effects of the buildings' involvement in the Venture Capital grant application process on organizational processes, roles and relationships; and the nature, meaning and function of the Venture Capital grant application process.

The data presented in this chapter was collected by using an 89-item questionnaire (see Appendix B). A census survey was conducted involving all secondary school principals (grades 7-12) of first-round funded Venture Capital schools throughout Ohio.

This chapter presents the results of the analysis of the data obtained from 64 of the 78 secondary principals of first-round funded Venture Capital Schools in Ohio. A description of particular school characteristics from those responding schools is first offered. This is followed by a presentation of findings organized around the five research questions in the study.

School Characteristics

The individual school characteristics of first-round funded Venture Capital schools which are described include: the student average daily membership (as of
October 1993), the percentage of each school's student body who were on free or reduced lunches, the ethnic/racial composition of each school, the number of full-time equivalent teachers employed at the time of the Venture Capital grant application process for first-round funded schools, and an identification of the living areas where students of first-round funded schools resided.

Table 4.1 illustrates data relative to student average daily membership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Average Daily Membership</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94 - 500</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 - 1000</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 - 2000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 - 2000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 - 2500</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Student Average Daily Membership (as of October, 1993) at Schools of First-Round Funded Secondary Principals Responding to the Survey in August of 1994 Regarding the Venture Capital Grant Application Process

Fifty-one individuals responded to this item, and there were 13 missing cases. A possible explanation for the nonresponses of 13 individuals may be attributed to the fact that someone other than the secondary principal compiled the October 1993 student average daily membership number, and the principal had only an approximate number in mind. In their quest to complete the survey as expeditiously as possible and not knowing how survey data might be used, these nonrespondents may have chosen to simply leave this item blank.
The responses regarding the student average daily membership as of October 1993 ranged from 94 to 2022. The mean school building membership was 679.98.

Table 4.2 identifies the percentage of each first-round funded school buildings' student body who were on free or reduced lunch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Student Body on Free or Reduced Lunch</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 and above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Percentages and Frequencies of Free or Reduced Lunches at Schools of First-Round Funded Secondary Principals Responding to the Survey in August 1994 Regarding the Venture Capital Grant Application Process

Fifty-eight individuals responded to this item, and there were six missing cases. There were fewer nonresponses to this question either because principals knew the percentage of the student body on free or reduced lunch or because they felt freer to approximate the percentage as compared with the preceding question asking for student average daily membership as of October 1993. The student average daily membership number for October is what the state of Ohio uses as its basis for allocating state aid.
The responses regarding the percentage of the student body that received free or reduced lunches ranged from 1% to 80%. The mean percentage was 24.81 as the percentage of the student body on free or reduced lunch.

In item 15 of the demographic information section of the survey, secondary principals were asked to "fill in" a response to the question "What percentages of the following groups constitute your student body, at the time you received funding?" Individual tables, C.1-C.6, showing the percentages of African-American, Asian, Caucasian, Hispanic, Native-American, and "other students" that characterize these schools can be found in Appendix C.

The responses regarding the percentage of the student body that consisted of the various ethnic/racial groups are summarized as follows: the responses regarding the percentage of the student body that consisted of African-American students ranged from 0% to 97%. Ten respondents indicated that they had 0% of African-American students while one respondent indicated that 93% of their student body consisted of African-American students. The mean percentage of African-American students in a student body was 14.24. In terms of percentiles, the 50th. percentile regarding the cumulative percentage of frequencies fell between the 4-5 percentage value (see Table C.1, Appendix C).

The responses regarding the percentage of the schools’ student body that was Asian-American ranged from 0-99%. Thirty-two respondents, or 55.2% of those responding, indicated that they had no Asian-American students while one indicated that 99% of the students were Asian-American. The mean percentage of Asian-American students in a student body was 3.07. The 50th. percentile regarding the cumulative percentage of frequencies corresponded to a 0% value (see Table C.2, Appendix C).

The responses regarding the percentage of the schools’ student body that was Caucasian ranged from 0 to 100%. Two respondents indicated that they had no Caucasian
students, and two indicated that 100% of their student body was Caucasian. The mean percentage of Caucasian students in a student body was 78.53, while the 50th percentile regarding the cumulative percentage of frequencies corresponded to the 90% value (see Table C.3, Appendix C).

The responses regarding the percentage of schools' student body that was Hispanic ranged from 0 to 42%. Forty-three respondents indicated that they had no Hispanic students, and one indicated that 42% of their student body was Hispanic. The mean percentage of Hispanic students in a student body was 1.67, while the 50th percentile regarding the cumulative percentage of frequencies corresponded to the 0% value (see Table C.4, Appendix C).

The responses regarding the percentage of schools' student body that were Native-American ranged from 0-7%. Fifty-five respondents indicated that they had no Native-American students, and one indicated that 7% of their student body was Native-American. The mean percentage of Native American students in a student body was 0.16, while the 50th percentile regarding the cumulative percentage of frequencies corresponded to the 0% value (see Table C.5, Appendix C).

The responses regarding the percentage of their study body that might be classified as "Other" ranged from 0-10%. Forty-eight respondents indicated that they had no students who might be classified as other, and one indicated that 10% of their student body was other. The mean percentage of "Other" students in a student body was 0.40, while the 50th percentile regarding the cumulative percentage of frequencies corresponded to the 0% value (see Table C.6, Appendix C).

Thus, the student body of Venture Capital secondary schools was overwhelmingly Caucasian in the composition of its student body with Hispanic, native-American, and "other students" almost non-existent. The African-American student presence was more apparent.
Table 4.3 identifies the frequencies of full-time equivalent certified teachers in the buildings of first-round funded venture capital secondary schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of FTE Teachers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 - 80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 - 90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 - 100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Frequencies of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE), Certified Teachers in the Buildings of First-Round Funded Secondary Principals Responding to the Survey in August 1994 Regarding the Venture Capital Grant Application Process

The responses regarding the number of full-time equivalent, certified teachers in the building ranged from 12-148. The mean percentage was 49.72, while the 50th percentile regarding the cumulative percentage of frequencies corresponded to 45 full-time equivalent teachers.

Thus, it appears that the “typical” first-round funded Venture Capital secondary school had approximately 700 students with a fairly sizable disadvantaged population as witnessed by the average percentage of students, 25%, on free or reduced lunches. As
well, there were approximately 50 teachers in each of the first-round funded Venture Capital secondary schools, and the student body was predominantly Caucasian.

The following table, Table 4.4, addresses the "living areas" where students attending the Venture Capital schools resided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes / No</th>
<th>Percentages Yes / No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On a farm</td>
<td>22 / 38</td>
<td>36.7 / 63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural, but not on a farm</td>
<td>25 / 35</td>
<td>41.7 / 58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a small city or town (under 50,000 people)</td>
<td>32 / 28</td>
<td>53.3 / 46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a medium-sized city (50,000-500,000)</td>
<td>8 / 52</td>
<td>13.3 / 86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a large city (100,000-500,000)</td>
<td>7 / 53</td>
<td>11.7 / 88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a suburb of a large city</td>
<td>14 / 46</td>
<td>23.3 / 76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a very large city (over 500,000)</td>
<td>3 / 57</td>
<td>5.0 / 95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a suburb of a very large city</td>
<td>4 / 56</td>
<td>6.7 / 93.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Frequencies of Yes/No Responses and Corresponding Percentages Related to Geographic Areas Where Students of First-Round Funded Venture Capital Secondary Schools Lived

Sixty secondary principals chose to answer this question and there were four nonresponses. Principals were asked to identify where the children in their building lived and to check all the categories that applied.

It appears from the data presented in Table 4.4 which identifies geographic area where the children of first-round funded secondary school students lived, that rural and small-town locations were well represented. Very large cities (over 500,000), large cities (100,000 to 500,000), and suburbs of very large cities did not have nearly the
percentage of students attending a first-round funded secondary school as the more rural areas and especially the small city and town (under 50,000) locations. The suburban locations of large cities (100,000 to 500,000) did fare better than their urban counterparts.

Research Questions

The rest of Chapter 4 is devoted to the answering of the research questions.

*Question 1*: What are the individual characteristics of secondary principals participating in the first-round funded grant application process with regard to the following characteristics: gender, age, race, academic degrees, years of full-time teaching experience, years of full-time administrative experience, years of administrative experience in current building, number of grant-writing experiences where personally involved, and number of funded grants where personally involved?

Table 4.5 presents the demographic data collected from the secondary principals responding to the Venture Capital Grant Proposal Study survey. The categories presented in this table were created to more fully provide a complete picture of the principals in this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n²</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Degrees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., Educational Specialist)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Teaching Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 6 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond 25 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Administrative Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 6 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond 25 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** n=64

²Frequencies may not sum to 64 because of non-response to the item.

**Table 4.5:** Demographic Characteristics of First-Round Funded Secondary Principals Responding to the Survey in August of 1994 Regarding the Venture Capital Grant Proposal Process

(table continues)
The following are summary characteristics of the responding secondary principals from the demographic information section of the survey.

Regarding the gender question, seventy-four percent of the secondary principals responding were male; 26% were female. Three respondents chose not to respond to this item. Information on the age of the principals was collected as a “fill-in” question; the range of responses was from 34 to 58 years; the mean age was 46. The modal age of this group of principals was 40-49 (72%). Seven percent of the secondary principals who responded to the Venture Capital Grant Proposal Study survey were 30-39, and 21% were 50-59.
As to race, ninety-two percent of the secondary principals responding to the survey were Caucasian, 5% were African-American, fewer than 2% were Hispanic, and fewer than 2% responded to the “other” category of the item.

In response to the highest degree attained question, while only 5% of respondents had earned a doctorate, a predominant number, 86%, of secondary principals had earned their Master’s Degree. Ten percent of respondents had earned another terminal degree such as the Educational Specialist Degree. Every respondent, then had a “higher degree attained” beyond a bachelor’s degree.

The secondary principal respondents were not evenly categorized within the years of full-time teaching experience category. Thirty-eight percent of the principals had taught six to ten years (this was the modal group), 22% had experienced fewer than six years of teaching experience, while 15% had taught 11-15 years. Ten percent had taught 16-20 years, 8% experienced 21-25 years of classroom experience, and 7% had beyond 25 years of teaching experience. If the perception is that building administrators often teach for a short period of time, if at all, before moving into an administrative position - this statistic is instructive. It indicates that approximately 80% of the responding secondary principals had at least 6 years of teaching experience. Prior teaching experience, it might be assumed, could better help principals to understand the frustrations and complexities that impact the translation of school improvement processes and practices into reality.

There was a somewhat more even distribution pertaining to the years of full-time administrative experience question. Twenty-seven percent of secondary principals had 6-10 years of administrative experience, followed by 24% who indicated they had 16-20 years of such experience. Twenty-one percent indicated they had 11-15 years of administrative experience, followed by 15% who had “under six years” of experience, with 13% identifying their years of administrative experience as being in
the 21-25 years category. Approximately 85% of respondents had at least 6 years of full-time administrative experience, with approximately 60% having more than 10 years of full-time administrative experience. For those who might argue that administrators become more adamant guardians of the status quo as they get older and accumulate more administrative experience, this may be a somewhat surprising statistic. This is especially so, when considering the potentially disruptive and widespread implications of Venture Capital as a systemic improvement initiative.

As to the question asking them to identify how many years they have been principal in their current building, most of the secondary principals had been working in their current building for fewer than six years (56%). Thirty-one percent had held their current position 6-10 years, 12% responded to the 11-15 years category, and 2% had been in their current building for between 21-25 years. Possibly a school culture that supported or was receptive to a potentially more intentional school improvement process had been taking shape and the building principal was “nurtured” through the process. Or possibly, the building principal understood the personal, professional, and educational implications of being a participant in pioneering work and furthered the notion among building faculty.

Information regarding the approximate number of grant-writing experiences that principals were personally involved in was collected as a “fill-in” question. Most principals (39%) indicated that they experienced 0-2 grant-writing experiences, while 33% indicated that they had been personally involved in 3-5 experiences. Twelve percent indicated a personal involvement in 6-8 grant-writing experiences, 8% were involved in 9-13, and 8% were personally involved in more than 13. Given the number of years of experience that these survey respondents had accumulated, it appears that engaging in grant writing experiences was not a frequent exercise.
Information regarding the approximate number of funded grant-writing experiences that principals were personally involved in was collected as a "fill-in" question as well. Forty-nine percent of respondents indicated that they had experienced 0-2 funded grant-writing experiences, while 37% indicated they had been personally involved in 3-5 experiences. Seven percent indicated a personal involvement in 6-8 funded grant-writing experiences, and 7% were involved in more than 8 funded grant-writing experiences. The low number of funded grants is reflective of the low number of grant writing experiences.

For those secondary school principals who comprised the sixty-four (64) respondents: 63% (40) were high school principals, 31% (20) identified themselves as middle/junior high principals, and 6% (4) identified themselves as principals of combined 7-12 buildings.

Representativeness

The Ohio Department of Education's Education Management Information System provided personal data for secondary principals practicing in the state of Ohio during 1994, the time this survey was conducted. Relevant to this study was data involving gender, age, and race. Principals were categorized as elementary of secondary, and junior high/middle school was subsumed under the secondary category.

To determine the representativeness of the sample, chi-square goodness of fit tests were calculated for the gender, age, and race variables. The results can be found in tables 4.6-4.12.
Gender

Table 4.6 illustrates a chi-square test of goodness of fit for the first-round funded secondary school principal sample to the first-round funded secondary school principal population by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>50.63</td>
<td>10.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 (1, N=61) = 3.54, P< .05$

Table 4.6: A Chi-Square Test of Goodness of Fit for the First-Round Funded Secondary School Principal Sample to the First-Round Funded Secondary School Principal Population by Gender

The calculated Chi-Square value was 3.54. With one degree of freedom at the .05 level of significance, the tabled Chi-Square value was 3.84. At an alpha of .05, the sample represented the population of first-round funded Venture Capital principals on gender.

Table 4.7 illustrates a chi-square test of goodness of fit for the first-round funded secondary school principal population to the secondary school principals in the state of Ohio by gender.

The calculated Chi-Square value was 2.77. With one degree of freedom at the .05 level of significance, the tabled Chi-Square value was 3.84. At an alpha of .05, the population represented the State on gender.

Table 4.8 illustrates a chi-square test of goodness of fit for the first-round funded secondary school principal sample to the secondary school principals in the state of Ohio by gender.

Table 4.8: A Chi-Square Test of Goodness of Fit for the First-Round Funded Secondary School Principal Sample to the Secondary School Principals in the State of Ohio by Gender.

The calculated Chi-Square value was 14.46. With one degree of freedom at the .05 level of significance, the tabled Chi-Square value was 3.84. At an alpha of .05, the
secondary principal sample in this study did not represent the secondary principals in the State on gender. This sample was clearly over-represented by female principals.

**Age**

Table 4.9 illustrates a chi-square test of goodness of fit for the first-round funded secondary school principal sample to the first-round funded secondary school principal population by age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>23.18</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 (6, N=61) = 10.93, P< .05\]

**Table 4.9:** A Chi-Square Test of Goodness of Fit for the First-Round Funded Secondary School Principal Sample to the First-Round Funded Secondary School Principal Population by Age.

The calculated Chi-Square value was 10.93. With six degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance, the tabled Chi-Square value was 12.59. At an alpha of .05, the sample represented the population of first-round funded Venture Capital principals by age.

Table 4.10 illustrates a chi-square test of goodness of fit for the first-round funded secondary school principal population to the secondary school principals in the state of Ohio by age.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>18.48</td>
<td>27.72</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 (6, N=77) = 11.82, P< .05 \]

**Table 4.10:** A Chi-Square Test of Goodness of Fit for the First-Round Funded Secondary School Principal Venture Capital Population to the Secondary School Principals in the State of Ohio by Age.

The calculated Chi-Square value was 11.82. With six degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance, the tabled Chi-Square value was 12.59. At an alpha of .05, the population represented the State on age.

Table 4.11 illustrates a chi-square test of goodness of fit for the first-round funded secondary school principal sample to the secondary school principals in the state of Ohio by age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>25.96</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 (6, N=61 = 9.87, P< .05 \]

**Table 4.11:** A Chi-Square Test of Goodness of Fit for the First-Round Funded Secondary School Principal Sample to the Secondary School Principals in the State of Ohio by Age.
The calculated Chi-Square value was 9.87. With six degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance, the tabled Chi-Square value was 12.59. At an alpha of .05, the sample represented the State on age.

Race

Table 4.12 illustrates a chi-square test of goodness of fit for the first-round funded secondary school principal sample to the secondary school principals in the state of Ohio by race.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>56.96</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 (2, N=64 = 0.665, P< .05 \]


The calculated Chi-Square value was 0.67. With two degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance, the tabled Chi-Square value was 5.99. At an alpha of .05, the principal sample in this study represented the secondary principals in the State on race.

Question 2: How do principals perceive the importance of particular leadership roles that they potentially exercise in their building?

The second research question addressed the initial section of the survey instrument (Appendix B). Table 4.13 presents the overall descriptive data for the 63 respondents to this subscale. One individual chose not to answer any questions in this
13-item subscale. This subscale dealt with how principals perceived the importance of particular leadership roles that they potentially exercise in their building. The Ohio Department of Education's monograph, *Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal* (1993), described the Venture Capital initiative and process and highlighted these roles as necessary within the school renewal context. The literature provided confirming evidence that some combination of these leadership roles are found in schools that are successfully engaged in school renewal/restructuring work.

Table 4.13 provides the means and standard deviations of the thirteen leadership role indicators.
### Table 4.13: Means, Standard Deviations, and Sample Sizes Relating to the Perceived Importance of Particular Leadership Role Indicators by Secondary School Principals of First-Round Funded Venture Capital Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Leadership Roles</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1. Developing attitudes and beliefs</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2. Encouraging risk taking</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3. Strengthen assessment</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4. Reallocate internal resources</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5. Generate external resources</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6. Shared decision making</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7. Faculty collegiality</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8. Critical self-assessment/reflection</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9. Instructional quality</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10. Curriculum quality</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11. Strengthen ties to the community</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12. Professional growth - staff</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13. Professional growth - self</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** A seven-point scale was utilized where the only anchor identification was at the end points: 1 indicated extremely important and 7 indicated extremely unimportant.

\( \hat{M} = 1.99 \) and \( \hat{SD} = 1.04 \).

Utilizing a seven-point scale with "one" representing extremely important and "seven" representing extremely unimportant, the range of leadership characteristics extends from the lowest numerical mean of 1.68 in "developing attitudes, beliefs and values that undergird school renewal" to the highest mean of 2.37 in "reallocating..."
existing internal resources." Out of the 13 leadership indicators, seven had means of less than 2.0; three had means of 2.00-2.20; and three had means over 2.20. The total mean scale score of 1.99 indicated that the principals perceived the leadership role indicators as being important.

Nor does the standard deviation show much variability since the 13-item subscale range of standard deviations was 1.10-1.57. The item with the greatest variance with a standard deviation of 1.57 was item V7 ("promoting faculty collegiality within the building"). Item V5 ("generating external resources") had the least variance (SD 1.10).

Item V1 ("developing attitudes, beliefs and values that undergird school renewal") had the lowest mean ratings (1.68), which is close to the 1.0 anchor of "extremely important." Item V9 ("influencing instructional quality") also had the second lowest mean score of 1.71; however, Item V10 ("influencing curriculum quality") had a mean score of 1.98. The mean difference is interesting with these two items, given the symbiotic nature of curriculum development and the resultant instructional strategies that potentially are necessary for effective curricular implementation. It can be argued, however, that the mean difference between V9 and V10 is not significant.

Item V6 ("shared decision-making") and Item V2 ("encouraging risk taking") were held to be close to "extremely important" as they had scores of 1.76 and 1.83 respectively. Somewhat surprising were items V4 ("reallocating internal resources") and V5 ("generating external resources") with mean ratings of 2.37 and 2.22 respectively. While still strongly in the "important" part of the scale, the fact that these are not rated as favorably as other items might have implications for a building principal's willingness to sustain ongoing school-improvement work.
Item V3 ("strengthen assessment") is not viewed as important as most other leadership roles, with a mean rating of 2.32 (only item V4 "reallocate internal resources" had a lower mean rating 2.37). An argument could be made that by creating better assessment measures and assessment results, it would be more possible for educators to reallocate existing funds and access additional monies in support of school improvement work.

In considering those leadership role items that connect to the issue of professional development or individual growth, Item V8 identified the importance of "promoting critical self-assessment and reflection" and had a mean score of 2.03. Item V13 ("engaging in my own professional growth activities") had a mean rating of 2.10. These two roles were seen as a little less important than "encouraging professional growth activities for my staff" (1.89).

In order to identify any patterns regarding these 13 leadership role indicators, an arbitrary distinction was drawn between indicators that were below the 2.00 mean and were seen as approaching extremely important and those that were above it. Seven indicators were below 2.00 and six indicators were above the 2.00 level.

Those leadership role indicators below the 2.00 mean are areas where principals, it can be argued, see themselves as having more control. "Developing attitudes and beliefs" (V1) and "encouraging risk taking" are school culture issues. "Creating a shared decision-making process" (V6) is a school governance issue. "Influencing instructional and curriculum quality" (V9 and V10) relates directly to classroom efficacy. "Strengthening ties to the community" (V11) is a perennial issue that principals try to improve. Finally, "encouraging professional growth activities for my staff" (V12) is often the way principals can build support and understanding for the other leadership role indicator areas.
Those leadership role indicators that exceeded the 2.00 mean (and were farther from the “extremely important” anchor) might be seen as being farther removed from a secondary principals more immediate and direct control. With this set of indicators there might be more players, decision makers, or circumstances which impact the effective “exercise” of these leadership roles. For example, in making decisions regarding “reallocating internal resources” and “generating external resources” a principal’s role may be constricted because of others’ involvement. Central office personnel may have a vested interest and may establish parameters for decision making.

“Strengthening school assessment activities” is often an area of responsibility where principals defer to their faculties for leadership in this area. Promoting critical self-assessment, reflection, and engaging in one’s own professional development activities can sometimes be seen as luxuries as the daily demand and rigor of school life diverts the attention and energy of the secondary principal from these leadership roles.

An apt question to pose is in regard to the rather uniform responses which favored the “important” to “extremely important” segment of the scale. Did the responding principals respond openly and honestly to this subscale, or did they attempt to be “political” or generous not knowing how the results were going to be used and how it might impact them and their building?

**Question 3:** What types of professional development related to the perceived importance of particular leadership roles have been identified as being needed by secondary principals?

The third research question addressed the professional development aspect of the leadership roles component of the survey (Appendix B). In Table 4.14 the means and standard deviations are identified for the secondary principals’ perceived self-identified professional development needs for the leadership roles identified in Table 4.13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development Needs Related to Roles</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD(^a)</th>
<th>n(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V14. Developing attitudes and beliefs</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15. Encouraging risk taking</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16. Strengthen assessment</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17. Reallocate internal resources</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V18. Generate external resources</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V19. Shared decision making</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20. Faculty collegiality</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V21. Critical self-assessment/reflection</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V22. Instructional quality</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V23. Curriculum quality</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V24. Strengthen ties to the community</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V25. Professional growth - staff</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V26. Professional growth - self</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A three-point scale was utilized where each anchor point had the following identification: 1=greatly needed, 2=some need, and 3=not needed at all.

\(^a\)The overall score for the subscale is: M = 1.92 and SD = 0.43.


The means on the thirteen items ranged from 1.54 to 2.20 on a three-point scale, with "one" representing great need, "two" representing some need, and "three" representing no need. Eight of the leadership items had mean values lower than 2.00, while five had values above 2.0. The 13-item subscale range of standard deviations is
0.56 to 0.77. The item with the greatest variance with a standard deviation of 0.77 was item V25 ("engaging staff in professional growth activities"). Item V16 ("strengthening school assessment activities") had the least variance (SD 0.56).

Item V16 ("strengthening school assessment activities") had the lowest mean rating of 1.54, which is at the midpoint between "greatly needed" (1) and "some need" (2). Items V18 ("generating external resources") and V22 ("influencing instructional quality") had mean scores of 1.73 and 1.70 respectively. The mean score of the closely associated item V23 ("influencing curriculum quality") was close with a 1.79 mean rating. The following items are grouped within 0.20 mean of each other: V21 ("promoting critical self-assessment and reflection") and V24 ("strengthening ties to the community") had mean scores of 1.90 and 1.86; V14 ("developing attitudes, beliefs, and values that undergird school renewal"), V19 ("creating a shared decision-making process"), and V25 ("encouraging professional growth activities for my staff") had mean scores of 1.94, 2.03, and 1.95 respectively; Item V15 ("encouraging personal and collective risk taking") had a mean score of 2.10 and V26 ("engaging in my own professional growth activities") had a mean score of 2.13. While not "extremely" dispersed from the other means, Item V17 ("reallocating existing internal resources") and Item V20 ("promoting faculty collegiality within the building") had the highest means scores with 2.18 and 2.20 respectively.

There is some level of support for "professional development experiences" for secondary principals for all of these potential leadership roles. This suggests some significant implications for administrative training programs and other related professional development experiences for secondary administrators. Traditionally, building administrators have not received much preparation for their roles as change leaders (Fullan, 1993).
Traditional educational administration programs have often been known for their abstract theorizing, lack of problem and skill focus, absence of mechanisms for application and follow through, and a heavy reliance on the managerial role of the school administrator (Murphy, J. and Hallinger, 1987).

Increasingly, there is a shared assumption that a fundamental reconceptualization of administrative training is necessary. Today, schools, professional associations, and principal academies must educate leaders who must manage and lead sophisticated, persistent, and continuous improvement processes. Bennis and Nanus (1985) refers to such leaders as those involved in perpetual learning. The emerging pantheon of knowledge and skills needed include those relating to instructional and assessment processes and issues, and those related to developing and nurturing organizational norms and culture capable of supporting a learning community.

In comparing the findings in Tables 4.13 and 4.14, it is interesting to note that the four leadership roles that were seen as being the most important in Table 4.13, as evidenced by the mean scores, were those that could be linked to “school culture.” Secondary principals indicated that it was particularly important for them to exercise leadership roles which helped to develop beliefs and values which undergirded school renewal, encouraged risk taking, and created shared decision-making processes. Interestingly, they also indicated that influencing instructional quality was particularly important.

When considering the secondary principals’ perceived professional development needs (in Table 4.14) for leadership role indicators (Table 4.13), the four lowest mean items were related to strengthening assessment, influencing instruction, influencing curriculum quality, and generating external resources. The four lowest mean items more closely approximated anchor point 1 which represented “greatly needed” professional development experiences.
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Of particular note is the strengthening assessment activities survey item (V16). Using mean averages, eleven other leadership roles in Table 4.13 were viewed as being more important than assessment by responding principals. However, of all 13 items, "strengthening assessment activities" was seen as the area of greatest professional development need.

Possibly this can be attributed to the respondent's realization gained through their involvement in the Venture Capital grant application process that the identification of indicators of success and an ability to document measured progress towards the fulfillment of these assessment goals was a clear expectation of the Venture Capital initiative. A perception could have been that further funding would be based upon documented success in this area. As well, for those principals committed to the four beliefs upon which Venture Capital was based a deeper understanding and a more strategic promotion of assessment practices could become a vehicle for a fuller realization of those belief statements.

Influencing curriculum and instructional quality were also seen as a "higher need" professional development area than virtually all other leadership role areas. This probably should not be surprising given the fact that the promotion of a more enriching and effective teaching and learning environment is the ultimate focus of the Venture Capital initiative. Arguably, curriculum, instruction, and assessment provide substance and definition to this learning context.

Lastly, generating external resources was seen as the third highest professional development need area. Gaining the knowledge and skills which would enable building principals to sustain school improvement work after the disappearance of Venture Capital funding would be an important motivation for gaining more skill and expertise in this area.
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Question 4: What have been the building-level effects of the buildings' involvement in the Venture Capital grant application process on communication processes, roles and relationships, and general understandings at the building level?

To answer this research question, a B and C subscale were developed to deal with different phases of the grant-application process. Subscale B, which contained 12 items, referred to the application process -- from the time the secondary principal first learned about the Venture Capital Grant until October 29, 1993, when the application was submitted. Subscale C, which contained 9 items, referred to the application process, from the time the application was submitted -- by October 29, 1993, until the time the money was awarded in March of 1994.

Subscale B - Building-level impact

In Table 4.15 the means and standard deviations are identified for the building-level effects of involvement in the Venture Capital Grant Application Process by Secondary Principals of first-round funded Venture Capital schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>1 (Cases)</th>
<th>2 (Cases)</th>
<th>3 (Cases)</th>
<th>4 (Cases)</th>
<th>5 (Cases)</th>
<th>Total Cases</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SDa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention diverted from other reform work</td>
<td>4 (6.8)</td>
<td>8 (13.6)</td>
<td>11 (18.6)</td>
<td>18 (30.5)</td>
<td>18 (30.5)</td>
<td>59 (100)</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty divisions</td>
<td>4 (6.8)</td>
<td>13 (22.0)</td>
<td>8 (13.6)</td>
<td>17 (28.8)</td>
<td>17 (28.8)</td>
<td>59 (100)</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B3.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School divisions</td>
<td>2 (3.6)</td>
<td>8 (14.3)</td>
<td>12 (21.4)</td>
<td>18 (32.1)</td>
<td>16 (28.6)</td>
<td>56 (100)</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B4.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreements within community</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
<td>10 (17.2)</td>
<td>14 (24.1)</td>
<td>15 (25.9)</td>
<td>18 (31.1)</td>
<td>58 (100)</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B5.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent was supportive</td>
<td>39 (66.1)</td>
<td>16 (27.1)</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
<td>59 (100)</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B6.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty leaders emerged</td>
<td>30 (51.7)</td>
<td>23 (39.7)</td>
<td>3 (5.2)</td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>58 (100)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B7.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater principal role emerges</td>
<td>19 (33.3)</td>
<td>19 (33.3)</td>
<td>14 (24.6)</td>
<td>3 (5.3)</td>
<td>2 (3.5)</td>
<td>57 (100)</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B8.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher roles clarified</td>
<td>6 (10.1)</td>
<td>25 (42.4)</td>
<td>24 (40.7)</td>
<td>4 (6.8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>59 (100)</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B9.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative roles clarified</td>
<td>9 (15.2)</td>
<td>23 (39.0)</td>
<td>21 (35.6)</td>
<td>4 (6.8)</td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
<td>59 (100)</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B10.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning community concept clarified</td>
<td>8 (13.6)</td>
<td>26 (44.1)</td>
<td>20 (33.9)</td>
<td>4 (6.8)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
<td>59 (100)</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B11.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning community concept caused new principal role</td>
<td>10 (17.2)</td>
<td>25 (43.1)</td>
<td>13 (22.4)</td>
<td>7 (12.1)</td>
<td>3 (5.2)</td>
<td>58 (100)</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B12.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation for shared decision making</td>
<td>26 (44.0)</td>
<td>22 (37.3)</td>
<td>7 (11.9)</td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
<td>59 (100)</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note 1:** These items referred to the application process, from the time the secondary principal first learned about The Venture Capital Grant until October 29, 1993, when the application was submitted.

**Note 2:** A five-point scale was utilized where the anchor points were identified as follows: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=disagree, and 5=strongly disagree. A9 was included in the scale for those who chose don't know/not applicable.

*The overall score for this subscale is: M = 2.60 and SD = 0.48.*

Table 4.15: Frequencies, Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations Relating to the Building-Level Effects of Involvement in the Venture Capital Grant Application Process by Secondary Principals of First-Round Funded Venture Capital Schools
The means ranged from 1.47-3.68 on a five-point scale with "one" representing "strongly agree", "two" representing "agree", "three" representing "neither agree nor disagree", "four" representing "disagree", and "five" representing "strongly disagree". A "nine" was included in the scale for those who chose "don't know/not applicable".

Three of the items had mean values under 2.00, while five had mean values of between 2.00-2.50. Four had mean values which exceeded 3.00. The 12-item subscale range of standard deviations is 0.84-1.30. The items with the greatest variance were Items B1 (SD 1.24) ("attention diverted from other reform work") and B2 (SD 1.30) ("divisions arose among teachers in our building"). Item B6, ("faculty leaders emerged") had the least variance (SD 0.75). Item B8 ("teachers' roles were clarified") had a standard deviation value of 0.77.

Items B1-B4 were those items which were related in some way to the communication processes operating at the building level. All four of the means of these items fell within the 3.50-4.00 range which were closer to anchor point 4 ("disagree") than anchor point 3 ("neither agree nor disagree").

The percentage of responses indicating a 4 ("disagree") or 5 ("strongly disagree") ranged from 57% for Item B4 to 61% for Item B1. The high percentages of respondents registering disagreement or neutrality on these items could be attributed to the fact that very few people knew that a particular building was going to apply for a Venture Capital grant. Some schools and districts have established a norm of professionalism. Thus, in a given case a schools' commitment to this process might have caused few disagreements because of the supportive culture for innovation which already existed. Twenty-two percent of respondents indicated that they "agreed" (2) that "divisions arose among teachers in our building." Seventeen percent indicated that they "agreed" (2) that "disagreements in the community over school renewal were pointed
out." The percentages of those respondents who rated the items a 3 ("neither agree nor disagree") ranged from 13.6% regarding Item B2 ("divisions arose among faculty") to 24.1% regarding Item B4 ("disagreements in the community over school renewal arose").

Items B5-B9 were those items related to roles and relationships which were in some way impacted by the buildings' involvement in the Venture Capital grant-application process. The mean scores for these five items ranged from a 1.47 for Item B5 which stated "our superintendent was supportive of the process" to 2.44 for Items B8 ("the teacher roles were clarified") and B9 ("the administrative roles were clarified"). All five items had mean scores which ranged between the midpoint of anchor point 1 ("strongly agree"), anchor point 2 ("agree") and anchor point 3 ("neither agree nor disagree").

The percentage of responses which were favorable in nature, either by having a score of 1 ("strongly agree") or 2 ("agree"), ranged from a high of 93.20% for Item B5 ("our superintendent was supportive of the process") to a score of 52.50% for Item ("teacher roles were clarified"). Fully 67% of respondents "strongly agreed" that their "superintendent was supportive of the process." Clearly superintendent support was a key element in the Venture Capital grant application process. Ninety-one percent were in some level of agreement that "faculty leaders emerged" (B6), followed by 66.60% who indicated that "a greater principal role emerges" and 54.20% who agreed that "administrative roles were clarified." As well, principals tended to operate on their belief (Table 4.13) of the importance of shared decision making by fostering a climate where faculty leaders emerged. The emergence of faculty leaders and a greater principal role in the planning process provide a cadre of key people for the subsequent implementation of a school improvement process. A rather high number of respondents, 40.70%, expressed that they "neither agree nor disagree" with Item B8 ("teacher
roles were clarified"). At the same time, 35.60% indicated the same position for Item B9 ("administrative roles were clarified").

Items B10-B12 represented those survey items related to the issue of **general understandings** which include the definitional and conceptual considerations of the school-improvement context. The mean scores for these three items ranged from a 1.85 for Item B12 ("a better appreciation for the shared decision-making process was developed") to a 2.45 for Item B11 ("the learning community concept placed me in new leadership roles"). These items ranged between the midpoints of anchor point 1 ("strongly agree") and 2 ("agree"), and 2 ("agree") and 3 ("neither agree nor disagree").

Eighty-one percent of respondents expressed some level of agreement that "a better appreciation for the shared decision-making process was developed." Creating shared decision-making processes (Table 4.13) was seen by secondary principals as one of their more important leadership roles. However, translating an "appreciation for the shared decision-making process" into something more substantive is problematic. Promoting shared decision-making and, by implication, expanding leadership opportunities impacts established roles and relationships, responsibility, authority, and, ultimately, control issues. At the same time 60.30% expressed some level of agreement that "the learning community concept placed me in new leadership roles" (B11). What the learning community represented to each respondent is difficult to detect. If the principal viewed his new leadership roles positively, there is a greater chance for a more collaborative school improvement model to emerge. Fifty-eight percent felt that "the learning community concept was clarified among staff people in my building" (B10). Still, on this B10 item, 33.9% indicated a response of 3 ("neither agree nor disagree"). It is somewhat surprising that such a high percentage of principals indicated that the learning community concept was clarified. There was
little clarification of the meaning and implications of a learning community in the monograph and other Ohio Department of Education documents. As well, most applicants had to focus their time and energy on adhering to the timeline and completing the requirements of the Venture Capital application process.

In Table 4.16 the means and standard deviations are identified for the building-level effects of involvement in the Venture Capital Grant Application Process by Secondary Principals of first-round funded Venture Capital Schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total Cases Percentages</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SDa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1. Board of Education was supportive</td>
<td>11 (18.3)</td>
<td>21 (35.0)</td>
<td>22 (36.7)</td>
<td>5 (8.3)</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
<td>60 (100)</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. More collegial climate in building</td>
<td>17 (28.3)</td>
<td>28 (46.7)</td>
<td>10 (16.7)</td>
<td>3 (5.0)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>60 (100)</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. More supportive school climate</td>
<td>21 (35.0)</td>
<td>30 (50.0)</td>
<td>6 (10.0)</td>
<td>3 (5.0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>60 (100)</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4. Better dialogue among staff</td>
<td>20 (33.3)</td>
<td>26 (43.4)</td>
<td>11 (18.3)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
<td>60 (100)</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5. Better dialogue between school and community</td>
<td>8 (13.3)</td>
<td>22 (36.7)</td>
<td>26 (43.4)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>60 (100)</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6. Better relationship between staff and CDE</td>
<td>5 (8.8)</td>
<td>24 (42.1)</td>
<td>19 (33.3)</td>
<td>8 (14.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.8)</td>
<td>57 (100)</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7. Better relationship between staff and RPDO</td>
<td>13 (22.8)</td>
<td>20 (35.1)</td>
<td>15 (26.3)</td>
<td>8 (14.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.8)</td>
<td>57 (100)</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8. More district money has been leveraged</td>
<td>5 (8.5)</td>
<td>10 (16.9)</td>
<td>12 (20.4)</td>
<td>18 (30.5)</td>
<td>14 (23.7)</td>
<td>59 (100)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9. Better communication between superintendent and principal</td>
<td>8 (13.3)</td>
<td>22 (36.7)</td>
<td>18 (30.0)</td>
<td>8 (13.3)</td>
<td>4 (6.7)</td>
<td>60 (100)</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** These items referred to the application process, from the time the application was submitted—by October 29, 1993—to the time the money was awarded in March of 1994.

**Note:** A five-point scale was utilized where the anchor points were identified as follows: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=disagree, and 5=strongly disagree. A 9 was added to the scale for those who chose don't know/not applicable.

*The overall mean score for this subscale is: M = 2.42 and SD = 0.62.*

**Table 4.16:** Frequencies, Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations Relating to the Building-Level Effects of Involvement in the Venture Capital Grant Application Process by Secondary Principals of First-Round Funded Venture Capital Schools
Subscale C- Building-level impact

The means ranged from 1.85 to 3.44 on a five-point scale, with “one” representing “strongly agree”, “two” representing “agree”, “three” representing “neither agree nor disagree”, “four” representing “disagree”, and “five” representing “strongly disagree”. A “nine” was included in the scale for those who chose “don’t know/not applicable”.

Two of the items had a mean value under 2.00, while four had mean values between 2.00 to 2.50. Three had mean values which exceeded 2.50. The 9-item subscale range of standard deviations is 0.80 to 1.26. The item with the greatest variance with a standard deviation of 1.26 was Item C8 (“we have been able to use Venture Capital grant money as leverage to obtain other district monies for school renewal”). Item C3 (“the school climate was more supportive of continuous school renewal”) had the least variance (SD 0.80=).

Items C2-4 were those items which were related in some way to the communication processes operating at the building level. The range of these mean scores was 1.85 to 2.08. They approximated the anchor point of “agree” (2). Item C3, “more supportive school climate,” had the lowest mean score of 1.85, and also had the largest percentage of responses which were in the categories of “agree” (50.00) or “strongly agree” (35.00), for a total percentage of agreeable responses of 85.00 percent. One wonders if the principal perceived widespread support or generalized from the support they witnessed from those with whom they were working most closely. Seventy-five percent of the responses also identified considerable agreement for item C2 (“considerable more collegial climate in building”) -- while 16.70 percent provided a neutral 3 (neither agree nor disagree). Again, was there the perception of widespread collegial climate or was it generalized? On item C4 “better dialogue among staff,” 76.70 indicated some form of agreement that there was better dialogue among staff.
Responses for C2-C4 provided strong indications of agreement for processes operating at the building level. It could be argued that principals were acting on those leadership attributes which they considered important (Table 4.13): developing attitudes and beliefs for school improvement, encouraging risk taking, and promoting shared decision-making. The "better dialogue" and more collegial support could be attributed to principals exercising these leadership traits. The existence of a more supportive collegial school culture at this phase of the 5 year Venture Capital cycle provides an important opportunity for building leaders to nurture and sustain these manifestations of a school improvement culture.

Favorable initial impressions of building-level relationships by the principal, may mask the need to be intentional in understanding the need for change, creating capacity, and developing shared understandings. Principals will need to continue to work at building increasing support for school improvement. It cannot be assumed that all staff understand the need for change and share common beliefs and vision. Nor can it be assumed that individuals understand "systemic improvement."

The items that most clearly related to changes in roles and relationships that involved the building and entities outside the building were items C1 and C5-C9. With one exception, these items had between 50 and 58% of the respondents who indicated some level of agreement. This pertained to those items which indicated that: the board of education was supportive, there was better dialogue between school and community, there was a better relationship between staff and ODE, there was a better relationship between staff and RPDC, and there was better communication between superintendent and principal. The one item which was notable for the large number of principals who expressed some level of disagreement (54.20%) stated "more district money has been leveraged." Add the number of neutral responses (code 3) and there is roughly 75% of the responding secondary principals who saw no evidence that the district was
attempting to access additional money for the building’s school improvement work. Having districts realize the need to reprioritize and build the capacity for sustaining school improvement efforts after the disappearance of Venture Capital funding will be an ongoing issue during the Venture Capital process.

What is readily apparent with these items related to the buildings’ relationships with outside entities, is the significant percentage of respondents who provided a neutral score of 3 (neither agree nor disagree). Between 26-36% of respondents indicated such a score. The changes that took place at the building level that were observable to staff tended to have fewer respondents who utilized the “3” category.

There tended to be, it seems, an unwillingness or an inability on the part of respondents to assess changes in attitudes or behaviors of those representing governing boards or organizations outside of the building. The number of “qualified” responses could be an indication that it was too soon to document substantive changes in relationships outside the building.

In order to assist building personnel in creating and sustaining their school improvement work, it will be important to align the building initiative with the support and resources of those entities that can help to develop the capacity for successful school improvement.

**Question 5:** How do the principals of first-round funded Venture Capital schools view the efficacy of the Venture Capital grant application process?

To answer this research question a D and E subscale were developed. While both subscales are aimed at receiving feedback on different policy items relating to the entire Venture Capital grant proposal process, from that time when the principal first heard about Venture Capital to the time in March 1994 when the money was awarded, there are different scale descriptors for subscale D and E. Subscale D utilizes a five-point scale with 1 = “extremely valuable”; 2 = “quite valuable”; 3 = “fairly valuable”; 4 = “not
very valuable”; and 5 = “not valuable”. A “9” was included for those who chose “don’t know/not applicable”. With subscale E the scale continuum offered anchor points identifying “degree of agreement”. One represented “strongly agree”; two represented “agree”; three represented “neither agree nor disagree”; four represented “disagree”; and five represented “strongly disagree”.

There will be an additional reporting of data for Items E6 and E7 which utilize a 3-point scale (1=Very appropriate, 2=somewhat appropriate, and 3=not appropriate), as well as for E8, E9, and E11 which offer a “yes/no” response. Item E11a provides a follow-up to E11 by asking the respondent to identify which level of schooling the Venture Capital philosophy favored elementary/middle/high? Item E10 provides a five-point “helpful” scale related to the role of the Regional Professional Development Center (1=extremely helpful, 2=quite helpful, 3=fairly helpful, 4=not very helpful, and 5= not helpful at all).

In Table 4.17 the means and standard deviations are identified for survey items which reflected the secondary principals’ viewpoint regarding the policy efficacy of the Venture Capital grant application process focusing on the time period from when the principal first heard about Venture Capital through October 1993 when the application was submitted up to the time in March 1994 when the money was awarded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total Cases</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SDa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1. Three grant application evaluators</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. Building teams in interview process</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3. Ohio Department of Education monograph on school renewal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4. Self-appraisal checklist in monograph</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5. Five-year timeline</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6. ODE waivers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7. Equal funding per grant</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8. Short timeline</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9. Open-ended budget guidelines</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These items were based upon the time period beginning from when secondary principals first heard about Venture Capital, through October when the application was submitted, up to the time in March of 1994 when the money was awarded.

Note: A five-point scale was utilized where the anchor points were identified as follows: 1=extremely valuable, 2=quite valuable, 3=fairly valuable, 4=not very valuable, and 5=not valuable. A 9 was included in the scale for those who chose don't know/not applicable.

*The overall score for this subscale is: M = 2.06 and SD = 0.47.*

Table 4.17: Frequencies, Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations Relating to the Value of the Venture Capital Grant Proposal Process Items Supporting School Renewal as Seen by Secondary Principals of First-Round Funded Venture Capital Schools

**Subscale D-Policy Efficacy**

The mean scores ranged from 1.32 to 3.21. Five of the items had mean values under 2.00 (between 1 "extremely valuable" and 2 "quite valuable") while two had
mean values of between 2.00 to 2.50 (the midpoint area of 2 “quite valuable” and 3
“fairly valuable”). Two had mean scores which exceeded 2.50 (which approximated the
midpoint of the scale anchors 2 and 3). “Having open-ended budget guidelines” (D9),
without a prescribed budget page, had the mean score of 1.32 which most closely
approximated the scale value 1 “extremely valuable”. The highest mean score of 3.21
was associated with Item D8 which asked for a response related to the value of “having a
relatively short timeline for writing the proposal”. This 3.21 score most closely
approximated the scale value 3 “fairly valuable”.

The 9-item subscale range of standard deviations is 0.57 to 1.32. The items
with the greatest variance with a standard deviations of 1.26 and 1.32 respectively were
Items D7 “awarding every Venture Capital building an equal amount of $25,000.00”
and D8 “having a relatively short timeline for writing the proposal”. Items D2
“involving school building teams in the interview process” and D9 “having open-ended
budget guidelines” had the least variance (SD 0.59 and 0.57).

Two policy decisions which “stand out” as to the high degree of support offered
by principals as to their “valuableness” pertain to items D2 “involving school building
teams in the interview process” and D9 “having open-ended budget guidelines”, in
particular. Item D2 had 36 respondents (59.10%) who rated this policy mechanism as
“extremely valuable” (1), while 24 responding principals (39.30%) indicated that
this was “quite valuable” (2). Only one respondent rated this item other than a “1” o r
“2” and that respondent rated it as “not very valuable” (4). Recognizing the value and
importance of creating and sustaining building-level teams signals the need for
significant changes in attitudes, behaviors, and necessary professional development
experiences regarding the changing nature of roles/relationships and concepts of
leadership necessary for a school improvement context. Forty-three respondents
(72.90%) indicated that having “open-ended budget guidelines “was extremely
valuable" (1), while 13 (22.00%) noted that it was "quite valuable" (2). Three (5.10%) indicated that this policy feature was "fairly valuable" (3). In contrast to often rigid budgetary guidelines, this policy feature offered building decision-makers the flexibility to leverage money in context specific high impact area.

"Allowing buildings to seek waivers" (Item D6) was thought to be "extremely valuable" (1) by 33 (55.00%) of the respondents, while 20 (33.30%) thought it was "quite valuable" (2) as a policy mechanism. Likewise, Item D7 which provided the "awarding of every Venture Capital building an equal amount of $25,000.00" was seen as being "extremely valuable" by 55.00% of principals, and 18.30% saw this policy as "quite valuable." However, 16.70% (10) of the respondents saw this item as either "not very valuable" (4) or "not valuable" (5). Critics felt that school size should determine award amount rather than an equal amount for all schools. "Utilizing a five-year school improvement timeline" (Item D5) was viewed as being either "extremely valuable" or "quite valuable" by 49 (81.60%) respondents. While often buffeted by forces that demand short-term solutions to complex problems, possibly this legitimation of a more long-term approach to school improvement planning will influence the dialogue and decision-making related to school improvement.

"Having the Ohio Department of Education's monograph 'Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal'" (Item D3) and being provided the "self-appraisal school improvement checklist in the monograph to frame building issues" (Item D4) received favorable ratings--however, less so than the previously described items. For both Items D3 and D4, each had 30.50% (18) and 32.00% (19) of their respondents who claimed that these policy features were "fairly valuable". Again, one wonders if these principals were less than forthright in some of their responses in wanting to be "politically correct" and not wishing to be adversely affected in some future aspect of the Venture Capital process.
The one item, D8 “having a relatively short timeline for writing the proposal”, had the most even distribution across all anchor points: 10.30% rated this item as “extremely valuable”; 24.10% rated it as “quite valuable”; 22.50% rated it as “fairly valuable”; 20.70% saw it as “not very valuable”; and 22.40% indicated it as “not valuable”. On one hand it could be argued that this policy feature provides a means of “weeding out” those schools who are not truly committed to this process. However, school building personnel often have so many different immediate demands and expectations upon them and their use of their time that it is difficult to create “space” for high quality, long-term thinking and planning and successfully pursuing grant opportunities when there is a short timeline.

**Subscale E-Policy Efficacy**

Subscale E is similar to subscale D with the only exception being the scale descriptors. Subscale E consists of a five-point scale with 1 = “strongly agree”; 2 = “agree”; 3 = “neither agree nor disagree”; 4 = “disagree”; and 5 = “strongly disagree”.

In Table 4.18 the means and standard deviations are identified for the five items focusing on the same time framework as Table 4.17.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total Cases</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SDa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1. Choice of change models was important</td>
<td>35 (56.4)</td>
<td>20 (32.3)</td>
<td>5 (8.1)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
<td>62 (100)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2. Technical assistance from ODE was not helpful</td>
<td>3 (5.1)</td>
<td>9 (15.3)</td>
<td>23 (39.3)</td>
<td>15 (25.3)</td>
<td>9 (15.3)</td>
<td>59 (100)</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3. Steps in grant application process were clearly identified</td>
<td>12 (19.4)</td>
<td>30 (58.0)</td>
<td>8 (12.9)</td>
<td>11 (17.7)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
<td>62 (100)</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4. Purpose of grant was clear</td>
<td>15 (24.2)</td>
<td>36 (58.0)</td>
<td>19 (9.7)</td>
<td>4 (6.5)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
<td>62 (100)</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5. We chose a fundable model</td>
<td>8 (13.1)</td>
<td>8 (13.1)</td>
<td>17 (27.8)</td>
<td>14 (23.0)</td>
<td>14 (23.0)</td>
<td>61 (100)</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** These items were based upon the time period beginning from when secondary principals first heard about Venture Capital, through October when the application was submitted, up to the time in March of 1994 when the money was awarded.

**Note:** A five-point scale was utilized where the anchor points were identified as follows: 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree. A 9 was included in the scale for those who chose don't know/not applicable.

*The overall score for this subscale is: M = 2.09 and SD = 40.*

**Table 4.18:** Frequencies, Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations Relating to the Efficacy of Various Venture Capital Grant Proposal Process Items Supporting School Renewal as Seen by Secondary Principals of First-Round Funded Venture Capital Schools

The means ranged from 1.60 to 3.30. Item E1 "an important option for our building staff was to choose an existing model or to develop our own model for school renewal" had a mean score of 1.60 and approximated the midpoint between anchor point 1 (strongly agree) and anchor point 2 (agree). A 3.31 mean score applied to Item E2 "the technical assistance provided by the Ohio Department of Education was not helpful" and a 3.30 mean score applied to Item E5 "we chose a model we believed would be likely
to be funded”. Both of these approximated the midpoint between anchor point 3 (neither agree nor disagree) and anchor point 4 (disagree). The five-item subscale range of standard deviations is 0.84 to 1.32. The item with the greatest variance with a standard deviation of 1.32 was Item E5 “we chose a model we believed would be likely to be funded”. Items E1 “the choice of change models was important” and E4 “the purpose of the grant application process was clear” both had the least variance with standard deviations of 0.84 and 0.87 respectively.

Of the five subscale items, E1 (which asked respondents to identify their degree of agreement with the "importance of having a choice of change models" received the highest percentage of support: 35 (56.40%) of principals “strongly agreed” (1) and 20 (32.30%) agreed. What was somewhat surprising was the degree of agreement that principals indicated for Items E3 “steps in the grant application process were clearly identified” and E4 “the purpose of the grant was clear”. For item E3, 12 (19.40%) of respondents indicated that they “strongly agreed” (1) with this item and 30 (48.40%) respondents indicated that they “agreed” (2). For Item E4, 15 (24.20%) indicated that they “strongly agreed” (1) with this item and 36 (58.00%) respondents indicated that they “agreed” (2). Given the unique systemic nature of the Venture Capital school improvement initiative and its somewhat “uneven” introduction to the public school world, I am somewhat surprised that these percentages are as high as they are.

As the Ohio Department of Education shifts from being primarily a regulatory agency to more of a service provider, Item E2 has important implications. This item states “the technical assistance provided by the Ohio Department of Education was not helpful”. While 24 (40.60%) displayed some degree of disagreement with this, 23 (39.00%) stated that they “neither agree nor disagree” (3), and 12 (20.40%) indicated some degree of agreement. Continuing to find ways to “build bridges” of
support and capacity building across organizational jurisdictions will continue to provide a challenge.

Interestingly, 28 (46.00%) of principals indicated that they either "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" that "we chose a model we believed would be likely to be funded" (E5). Twenty-eight percent responded to the midpoint 3 category "neither agree nor disagree". Twenty-six percent indicated some degree of agreement with the item. When inquiries were made to Ohio Department of Education officials at public forums and workshops where the Venture Capital initiative was being introduced, there were no common responses as the "politically correct" models to support. Since some ODE consultants commented that adopting an existing model might be easier, an inference could be made that adopting an existing model would be more preferred than creating one's own. Also, some of the school improvement models that were described in the monograph and were identified as "suggested" existing models, appeared to be sanctioned by the Ohio Department of Education (e.g. Coalition of Essential Schools and North Central). ODE consultants served as state coordinators or as liaisons to particular school improvement programs. Even so, approximately one-half of the respondents disagreed that they chose a fundable model. This suggests that these schools analyzed their particular situation and chose to adopt or create a model that would serve their unique needs and circumstances.

The following constitutes a summary of this research's major findings relative to the contextual elements of school characteristics and student geographic living areas as well as the research questions.

Summary of Findings

As to school characteristics of first-round funded Venture Capital secondary schools, it appears that the "typical" school had approximately 700 students with a
fairly sizable disadvantaged population as witnessed by the average percentage of students (25%) on free and reduced lunches. As well, there were approximately 50 teachers in each school, and the student body was predominantly Caucasian.

As well, it appears that in considering the geographic areas where the children of first-round funded secondary school students lived, rural and small-town locations were well represented. Very large cities (over 500,000), large cities (100,000-500,000), and suburbs of very large cities did not have nearly the percentage of students attending a first-round funded secondary school as the more rural areas and especially the small city and town (under 50,000) locations.

**Question 1 - (Principal characteristics)**

It appears that the "typical" first-round funded Venture Capital secondary school principal was a 46 year-old white male who had earned a master's degree and was serving in a high school principalship. He had 11 years of full-time teaching experience, 13 years of full-time administrative experience, and had been principal of his current building six years. As well, he had been involved in five grant writing experiences and had four grants funded.

**Question 1 - (Leadership traits)**

There was overall agreement regarding the importance of the selected leadership traits. While an argument could be made that the traditional role of a secondary school principal was largely a managerial one, principal responses reflected a more expanded notion of leadership. School culture and organizational development roles were seen as important as were processes that would foster different governance arrangements.

Exercising leadership in curriculum and instructional issues reflected the essence of Venture Capital as the focus of the entire building initiative needed to center
on teaching and learning. Attendance to this focus, was the recognition of the importance of ongoing, intentional, professional development that was aligned to teaching and learning priorities that was modeled by the building administrator. 

Continuing to identify effective ways of accessing resources and creating ties with the greater community was illustrative of respondents recognizing their need to communicate and align building emphases with outside support and resources. Their agreement that these leadership traits were important was further evidence that they understood or recognized systemic implications. This finding also suggests important implications for the study of leadership within educational settings.

**Question 3 - (Professional development)**

In considering their professional development needs for each of the leadership traits, responding principals expressed their need for at least some level of professional development for each of the leadership traits. The instructional leadership role, which links curriculum, instruction, and assessment, was seen as being the area with the greatest need. Building greater understanding among principals of effective assessment practices, for example, can help focus attention on a continuous school improvement process.

Creating and sustaining relevant, challenging, and meaningful professional development experiences for building administrations will be a major challenge. In building the capacity for developing some fundamentally different models of professional development, many of the same constraints that affect teachers will occur with administrators: restrictive formats, time, and money.

Besides building powerful professional development experiences that will help to sustain building level school improvement work, the viability of these experiences that
help to foster collegial support for administrations will impact administrator retention rates.

**Question 4 - (Building-level impact)**

Secondary principals expressed stronger agreement for those survey items that were more apparent within the building, such as: more collegial climate or better dialogue among staff. It was clear that in many cases faculty leaders emerged and the principals saw their role expanding.

Superintendent support was seen as being critical, but respondents often had a more difficult time ascertaining whether or not relationships with outside entities had benefited. There was a significant number of neutral responses regarding whether the board was supportive or there was better dialogue between school and community.

What this illustrates might be the need for building principals to be able to declare a specific position as to relationships rather than take a neutral position of neither agree or disagree. The importance of involving the various stakeholders in the school improvement process is a key underlying assumption. Being able to identify whether or not there is a “better relationship” with a particular group might be an important indicator of progress or success.

**Question 5 - (Policy efficacy)**

There was general agreement that many of the specific policy features associated with the Venture Capital grant application process were valuable. Those policy features which had the strongest level of agreement were those that the building had more control over, such as: having open-ended budget guidelines and being able to choose a change model. Utilizing a five-year timeline was also seen as being valuable -- a recognition that school improvement is a long-term proposition. Policy features which allowed the
process to be more "fluid" were also seen positively. Involving building teams in the interview process and allowing buildings to seek ODE waivers received strong support.

Those features which the Ohio Department of Education had more control over, e.g., short timeline and the "helpfulness" of technical assistance received low marks. Transforming the orientation of ODE from that of a regulatory entity to that of a service provider is easier said than done. Confronting the tradition and history of a bureaucratic organization and creating the reward structures and the accountability processes which will aid this change are complicated. If the Ohio Department of Education is to be an important player in the future, the attitudes and behaviors of its representatives need to be congruent with its espoused role and function.

Chapter 5 will provide summary information, significant implications, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 5 will include an historic addition, summary information regarding the research questions, some surprising findings about leadership, various implications that emerged as a result of this study, and recommendations for further research.

Historic Addition

This study, with its focus on secondary principals of first-round funded Venture Capital schools, was designed as part of a larger, more policy oriented, joint research effort. Mark Stevens, a former superintendent, focused his dissertation study on the superintendents' perspective of the Venture Capital program, and Sharon Dawson, an elementary principal, focused on the perspective of elementary principals. Taken together, these dissertations were meant to be vehicles for informing and influencing the state policy making process during the first year of implementation. Unfortunately, due to a variety of setbacks, this study was delayed for several years.

Thus, the original intent has not been realized and this dissertation now serves as an important touchstone in the historical review of the Venture Capital program. As a study of first year venture schools, this dissertation provides a solid basis for initial administrative perceptions about the Venture Capital program.
Summary Information

Summary Information (General School Characteristics)

As to school characteristics of first-round funded Venture Capital secondary schools, it appears that the "typical" school had approximately 700 students with a fairly sizable disadvantaged population as witnessed by the average percentage of students (25%) on free and reduced lunches. As well, there were approximately 50 teachers in each school, and the student body was predominantly Caucasian.

As well, it appears that in considering the geographic areas where the children of first-round funded secondary school students lived, that rural and small-town locations were well represented. Very large cities (with over 500,000 residents, large cities with 100,000-500,000 residents), and suburbs of very large cities did not have nearly the percentage of students attending a first-round secondary school as the more rural areas and especially the small city and town (with under 50,000) locations.

Summary Information (Research Questions)

Summary information pertaining to research Question Number 1 dealing with principal characteristics as follows. It appears that the "typical" first-round funded Venture Capital secondary school principal was a 46 year-old white male who had earned a master's degree and was serving in a high school principalship. He had 11 years of full-time teaching experience, 13 years of full-time administrative experience, and had been principal of his current building six years. As well, he had been involved in five grant write experiences and had four grants funded.

The principals included in this survey were representative of the general population of secondary principals throughout the state on race and age variables. As to the gender variable, the sample represented the population of first-round funded
Venture Capital principals and the population represented the state on gender. However, the principal sample in this study did not represent the secondary principals in the state on gender. This sample was over-represented by female principals.

As to Question Number 2, there was an overall agreement regarding the importance of the selected leadership roles. While an argument could be made that the traditional role of a secondary school principal is largely a managerial one, principal responses reflected a more expanded notion of leadership. School culture and organizational development roles were seen as important as were processes that would foster different governance arrangements.

Exercising leadership in curriculum and instructional issues reflected the essence of Venture Capital, as the focus of the entire building initiative needed to center on teaching and learning. Attending to this focus, was the recognition of the importance of ongoing, intentional, professional development that was aligned to teaching and learning priorities that was modeled by the building administrator.

Continuing to identify effective ways of accessing resources and creating ties with the greater community was illustrative of respondents recognizing their need to communicate and align building emphases with outside support and resources. Their agreement that these leadership traits were important was further evidence that they understood or recognized systemic implications. This finding also suggests important implications for the study and development of leadership within educational settings.

Summary information for Question Number 3 dealt with the perceived need for professional development associated with each of the potential leadership roles. In considering their professional development needs for each of the leadership traits, responding principals expressed their need for at least some level of professional development for each of the leadership traits. The instructional leadership role, which links curriculum, instruction, and assessment, was seen as being the area with the
greatest need. Building greater understanding among principals of effective assessment practices, for example, can help to focus attention on a results-oriented continuous school improvement process.

Creating and sustaining relevant, challenging, and meaningful professional development experiences for building administrators will be a major challenge. In building the capacity for developing some fundamentally different models of professional development, many of the same constraints that affect teachers will occur with administrators: restrictive formats, time and money.

Question Number 4 summary information deals with the building-level impact of being involved in the Venture Capital grant application process.

Secondary principals expressed stronger agreement for those survey items that were apparent within the building, such as: more collegial climate or better dialogue among staff. It was clear that in many cases faculty leaders emerged and the principals saw their role expanding.

Superintendent support was seen as being critical, but respondents often had a more difficult time ascertaining whether or not relationships with outside entities had benefited. There was a significant number of neutral responses regarding whether the board was supportive or whether there was better dialogue between school and community.

What this illustrates might be the need for building principals to be able to declare a specific position as to relationships rather than take a neutral position of neither agree nor disagree. The importance of involving the various stakeholders in the school improvement process is a key underlying assumption. Being able to identify whether or not there is a "better relationship" with a particular group might be an important indicator of progress or success.
Question 5 summary results deal with overall efficacy of the Venture Capital initiative. There was general agreement that many of the specific policy features associated with the Venture Capital grant application process were valuable. Those policy features which had the strongest level of agreement were those that the building had more control over, such as: having open-ended budget guidelines and being able to choose a change model. Utilizing a five-year timeline was also seen as being valuable—a recognition that school improvement is a long-term proposition. Policy features which allowed the process to be more “fluid” were also seen positively. Involving building teams in the interview process and allowing buildings to seek ODE waivers received strong support.

Those features which the Ohio Department of Education had more control over, e.g., short timeline and the “helpfulness” of technical assistance received low marks. Transforming the orientation of ODE from that of a regulatory entity to that of a service provider is problematic. Confronting the tradition and history of a large, bureaucratic organization and creating the reward structures and accountability processes which will aid this change are complicated. If the Ohio Department of Education is to be an important player in the future, the attitudes and behaviors of its representatives need to be congruent with its espoused role and function.

Some Surprising Findings About Leadership

1. In considering the leadership role subscale (V1-V13), V13 "Professional growth - self" was not perceived by secondary principals as being as important as V12 "Professional growth - staff." As well, item V8 "Critical self-assessment/reflection had a mean score of 2.03, which while viewed as important, was seen as less important than seven other leadership role indicators.
The literature in the field of leadership behavior (Senge, 1990; Covey, 1991; Kouzes and Posner, 1993), is replete with examples of organizational success being tied to leaders who visibly and consistently demonstrate a life which exemplifies self-learning. From this vantage point, if organizational leaders do not model this essential organizational behavior then organizational effectiveness can be compromised.

An underlying assumption throughout such leadership literature is that leaders are made, not burn. It is assumed we learn best when we are committed to taking charge of our own learning. Taking charge of our own learning is part of taking charge of our lives and is essential for becoming an integrated person and for realizing one's leadership potential.

Covey, Bennis, Senge et. al., concur that the process of reinventing yourself as a leader brings with it an internal focus. Reflection becomes an important way to learn about the choices and decisions we have made or need to make based on our experiences. Reflection adds richness and depth to the problem-solving and decision-making processes. Through developing self-knowledge one becomes aware of one's inner voice, learns how to learn, shifts one's paradigm of leadership to include viewing setbacks, shortcomings, and failures as opportunities for growth.

Principals arguably need to model the discipline of "personal mastery" which allows for approaching one's life as a creative endeavor, living life from more of a creative as opposed to reactive perspective. According to Senge (1990) this includes fostering a climate in which the principles of personal mastery are practices in daily life. This means building an organization with non-traditional values: where it's safe for people to create visions, where inquiry and commitment to the truth are the norm, and where challenging the status quo is expected. The current study "mildly" suggests that first year Venture Capital secondary principals do not greatly value Senge notion of personal mastery.
2. Throughout this study it has been assumed that managerial functions which serve to offer an orderly, efficient, and safe environment for teaching and learning are essential. Quinn's internal process and rational goal models are subsumed under the managerial role and the leadership roles of strengthening assessment and impacting instructional and curriculum quality constitute the "core technology" and represent characteristics of the rational goal model. Quinn's model provides a useful framework for analyzing the nature, role, and function of good leadership qualities within an organizational setting.

In considering the thirteen leadership role indicators (V1-V13) dealing with research question two, many of these indicators represent transformational leadership characteristics and seem representative of the human relations and open system models.

Those leadership role indicators which seem linked to the human relations model are developing attitudes and beliefs, shared decision making, faculty collegiality, critical self-assessment/reflection, and furthering professional development for staff and self.

Those leadership role indicators which seem to be linked to the open systems model are: encouraging risk taking, reallocating internal resources, generating external resources, and strengthening ties to the community.

Those leadership roles which were viewed as important by responding secondary principals represented the human relations and the rational goal models. Leadership role indicators seen as less important included ones which are examples of the open system model.

Differing assumptions regarding managerial leadership will cause a contradictory and paradoxical organizational environment to emerge. For example, in decision-making issues the rational goal will be characterized as logical and decisive. The human relations' model will include more participation and support. Regarding leadership style, the rational goal model include a more directive, goal oriented style.
while the human relations emphasizes a more concerned, supportive style. Effectiveness values include those of productivity and accomplishment for the rational goal model and the value of human resource for the human relations model.

It is interesting that the state policy planners for Venture Capital were more interested in rationally changing the core technology of teaching and learning while secondary principals seemed more interested in the human relations aspects of the reform initiative.

3. Coherence - The research shows that policy coherence has been notable by its absence throughout the myriad reform measures and, thus, the search for more coherent policy has become part of the policy discourse surrounding K-12 education (Fuhrman, 1994).

The conceptualization used for the Venture Capital process involved five components of schooling: assessment, governance, organization, professional development, and teaching and learning. These five components, coupled with the parameters of need, commitment, and capacity, provided a conceptual framework for helping "learning communities" deal with entry points and goals for beginning or continuing school improvement efforts. This framework included an expectation for schools to more intentionally connect with a variety of stakeholder groups for the purpose of enhancing learning, reallocating existing monies and expanding funding opportunities in order to increase capacity building.

While there were references to "systemic reform" throughout the grant application process and the implication that schools and districts were going to have to be more intentional and provide more coherence, this was not addressed directly. Common definitions and meanings did not prevail.

Policy coherence is difficult and problematic in any context. Within the state and federal context, aligning national standards, curricular and instructional standards - -
with assessment features, to licensure, training, and accountability measures is
difficult, time consuming, and subject to the manifestation of a "loosely coupled"
(Weick, 1978) organization. Contributors to an incoherent policymaking political
environment include the fragmented nature of our political system which makes
coordination and consensus difficult. As well, with an almost permanent campaign
mentality, many elected officials try to distinguish themselves from their colleagues,
rather than work cooperatively towards a complex, multifaceted solution, in order that
they are recognizable to their constituents. Thus, there is a tendency to support policies
that are simple, easily explained, and capable of being featured in a "sound bite." Also,
the competition between different branches of government leads to fragmented
policymaking which leads to policy overload and discontinuity.

While this external policy environment certainly impacts a local school system,
the individual system has its own features which make coherence, intentionality, and
capacity building problematic. If a local school wants to embrace a framework, like the
Venture Capital initiative, which promotes ongoing, continuous improvement it must
find a way to make the component parts (assessment, organization, governance,
professional development, and teaching and learning) and their interrelationships
understood. School personnel must become strategic in addressing the need,
commitment, and capacity building necessary to enable this to be a viable and successful
endeavor. Linking the system becomes key as individual schools and the district office
need to explore "system improvement" as a logical extension of the Venture Capital
initiative if genuine capacity building and sustained school improvement will ever take
place.
Implications

There were important implications emanating from this study associated with value system changes, leadership, school culture, central office relationships, professional development, and policy implications.

Value System Changes

Many of the questions included in the study in the sections dealing with leadership and the building level effects which included changes in roles and relationships, presume a shift in the prevailing values which have characterized schools.

In contrast to the core values that have traditionally been perpetuated, it seems that a much different value system is going to have to shape attitudes and behaviors. (Patterson, 1993) argues that tomorrow’s organization will need to be based upon a different value structure where there will need to be greater “openness” to broader participation, diversity in perspectives, the important role of conflict in leading to stronger solutions to complex problems, nurturing a reflective environment (Schoen, 1985), and encouraging people to acknowledge mistakes and learn from them. Schools can create powerful modeling opportunities by creating a continuous learning environment for teachers as well as students.

Causing shifts in attitude will often be difficult. Leadership has consistently been characterized by the central values of power and control. Organizations have been organized and evaluated on the premise that leaders are responsible for directing and controlling the organization. The “organizational chart” identifying the pyramid of the hierarchical structure illustrates this notion.

Important in the emergence of a different value structure is the understanding and support of key stakeholder groups — especially the superintendent and board of education. While a superintendent or particular board members may embrace a “non-
traditional" value system, there still must be concern regarding the perception of giving up management rights and the concern for the legacy of leadership prerogatives a school board leaves its successors.

Venture Capital was predicated on a value system that is not generally associated with a more traditional view of schooling. Legitimizing values that are unique to an ongoing school improvement context presumes an understanding of the need for adopting new values, a vision of how this translates into action, and a commitment to action.

Leadership

While the focus of this study was on the perceptions of secondary principals, it seems clear that few (if any) can take on the responsibility and burden of restructuring alone. In an attempt to bring about large-scale change, it would be unusual for any single person in an organization to have all the facts and the ability to conceptualize all the problems that must be faced. This approach would lessen the possibility of achieving success on behalf of students because it calls for dragging teachers along rather than accepting them as partners. Thus, it would be easy for teachers to become part of the problem rather than part of the solution.

There are those who argue that leadership and management, which some equate with administration, are fundamentally different concepts. A source of the disagreement appears to be that managers emphasize order, stability and efficiency, while leaders stress adaptation to change and getting people to agree on what needs to be changed and facilitating a process towards that end (Hoy, 1996).

While it is recognized that managing and leading are not the same act, the degree of overlap is disputed. I am assuming that management is an important function that must be performed successfully in schools. Within the school improvement context, however, I am focusing my remarks on the role of the leader. When asking principals to
indicate the level of importance they attach to various leadership roles (V1-V13), it was assumed that the educational leader would promote the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

What becomes readily apparent is the complex nature of the art and craft of leadership in schools. Mastering certain skills, finding the right situation, exhibiting a particular style of behavior, and coalescing these factors into a contingency approach or making a decision to become a transformational leader are necessary but not sufficient. The issue seems to be one of deciding how leadership can be a technical and instrumental activity as well as a symbolic and cultural one (Hoy, 1996). Utilizing various conceptualizations and applications of leadership potentially enhances the leadership capacity in schools.

It appears, however, that the potential power of the transformational leadership model, which represents a symbolic and cultural conceptualization of leadership, may be compromised by practitioners lack of understanding and professional preparedness. In some quarters this model suffers from a legitimacy crisis where it is seen as promoting that which is "soft," tangential, and hard to quantify. For some, this compromises the rigor and standardization expected and promoted by some stakeholder groups. However, this new "genre of theory" is evoking high levels of interest among scholars and practitioners. (Carey, 1992; House and Howell, 1992; Howell and Avolio, 1993). Leithwood (1994) conducted a four-year study of schools making numerous structural changes and concluded that "reasonably robust support" exists for the assertion that transformational forms of leadership are of significant value in restructuring schools. Specifically, Leithwood noted that transformational leadership in schools directly affects such outcomes as teacher perceptions of student goal achievement and student grades.
Indirectly, it affects these outcomes by influencing teacher commitment to change and organizational learning.

Yukl (1994) also concludes that “transformational, charismatic, visionary, or inspirational leadership seem to be making important contributions to the explanation of leadership processes and outcomes.” This approach recognizes the symbolic component of leadership, the importance of shared decision-making, and the recognition that leadership processes are embedded within the culture of the organization - shaping and being shaped by the organization.

A highly respected report which, in part, represents a nexus of leadership thinking is Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution (1996). This was a report of the National Association of Secondary School Principals in partnership with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching on the high school for the 21st century. A great deal of attention was paid to those ideas and actions which constitute more of a transformational style of leadership. All of the leadership roles which secondary principals responded to indicating their degree of importance were discussed at length in this report. As well, each role was seen as being important as an emerging broader view of leadership becomes apparent.

Recognizing the capacity-building potential of the transformational model of leadership (or at least, a more expanded notion of leadership) within the school improvement context, there are important implications for the education of future school leaders. Griffins, Stout, and Forsyth (1988) propose that administrator education programs would include the following strands for educating leaders: study theoretical models, learn the technical core of school administration, develop problem-solving skills through applications, practice leadership under supervised conditions, and demonstrate competence through “authentic assessment” measures. It can be argued that a blending of these strands, if widely promulgated, may help to lessen the criticism
from practitioners who see administrative training programs as too theory based, abstract, and sterile. However, in considering how to advance school improvement within a more symbolic or cultural context, there are different kinds of knowledge, dispositions, and performances that are needed.

One of the efforts to redefine the roles, and by implication education, of formal school leaders has been conducted by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium which operates under the aegis of the Council of Chief State School Officers. This initiative began in 1994 continues to exert national influence with generous grant support, the membership of 24 states, and the affiliation of numerous professional associations including the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, and the University Council for Educational Administration. The design strategy relied heavily on the research on the linkages between educational leadership and productive schools as evidenced by student learning outcomes as well as significant societal trends that hold implications for emerging views of leadership.

ISLLC standards reflect the centrality of student learning and the changing role of the school leader. Each standard identifies the knowledge the administrator needs to understand, the dispositions the administrator should have (as to what the administrator believes in, values, and is committed to) and certain performances in which the administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities that produce process and product results. The standards are evidence of an openness to an emerging value system that entertains a more expansive notion of leadership. The standards approach may provide the best vehicle to allow diverse stakeholders, including policymakers, to drive improvement efforts along a variety of fronts -- licensure, program approval and candidate assessment.

Embedded in the Venture Capital initiative is a different view of leadership: a view that might be characterized as embracing a willingness, if not urgent need, to view
an organization from a leadership perspective that promotes a fluid, inclusionary, integrative, and results-oriented organization enterprise.

School Culture

Often schools are program or event oriented—pursuing short-term goals or artificially short time lines. One wonders if the collaboration that occurred in schools during the Venture Capital grant application process was part of an ongoing collaborative dialogue aimed at issues related to school improvement or was an event-initiated, contrived exercise.

If a Venture Capital school adopted the metaphor of school as learning community where all members, including adults, were constantly learning and expanding themselves -- then, a norm of professional community and collegiality arguably should prevail. This would necessitate new organizational arrangements and collaborative relationships.

Altering the culture of the school to reflect this "new direction" will include the ways that teachers go about their work and the content, manner, and quality of their interaction with each other. Garmston (1991) says that school culture is a conscious pattern of values, actions, and artifacts that a new kind of staff development would lead educators to reflect on. Sergiovanni (1992) maintains that collegiality is a key element in culture building and must be seen as a form of "professional virtue" -- something that is more powerful and causes deeper connections to be made than simple congeniality. Venture Capital schools need to create a sense of community and of shared commitment that reduces teacher isolation and enhances teacher and organizational efficacy. Promoting a culture of collegiality can help foster a climate of receptivity and openness where adults view themselves as interdependent team members and not solely as independent practitioners.
There is a great deal of evidence to support the fact that exemplary teachers often flourish because of a principal who has the authority to open doors for others with less power so they can make good things happen. These principals as enablers encourage risk taking and serve as buffers during difficult times. In essence, they use their positions to fend off intrusions that otherwise prevent educational creativity from blossoming.

Levine and Lezotte (1990) cite many writings in the literature that show that "maverick" principals who "bend rules" on behalf of their faculty and challenge or disregard central office or external sources of pressures or directives contribute to making their schools effective. "Buffering actions of the unusually effective principal tend to focus on protecting teachers from external forces that threaten to reduce their commitment and limit their effectiveness," they say.

While a number of the leadership traits which responding principals indicated they valued involve a facilitative component, it is faulty to assume that it will be relatively easy for a principal to become more "facilitative." Some responding principals in this study feel they already have too little influence over a seemingly unwieldy enterprise, and to give others the small amount of power that remains within their control is illogical (Barth, 1993).

As the literature attests, the cultural and symbolic aspect of an organization often is instrumental in creating the environment which makes the expected changes possible. Within the "system" much is to be learned about the systemic property of culture as beliefs, commitments, meanings, values, lore, and traditions are woven into the changing fabric of the school system.

Central Office Relationship

In addition to a principal being agreeable to new arrangements for sharing power, the principal needs some assurance from the central office that efforts in this
direction are supported and even applauded. Often, central office administrators perceive their main responsibility to be to insure the smooth and orderly operation of the schools. Principals are expected to adhere to the norm of orderliness and deviation from this norm may be seen as a threat. Too much decision-making at the school level may be feared as a potential source of chaos. In some districts, trying to build broad-based support for change within central office may be difficult where the established bureaucrats are comfortable with the established organization and its chain of command.

Producing change in a school building when central office has little or no commitment to the goals is extremely difficult. While innovation may be introduced at the school without external support, the school cannot sustain innovation without the continuing support of the school district and other agencies (Fullan and Miles, 1992). In its national survey on the progress of school reform, conducted on behalf of the Business-Education Policy Forum, the Education Commission of the States found that the efforts of innovative principals were often being thwarted by district policies (Education Commission of the States, 1991). It is unrealistic to expect schools to make major changes in an environment where the district office does not alter expectations and yield some control. The notion of accountability has to be reconsidered, and the system has to see such change as systemic and fundamental -- not just a matter of tinkering.

As well, there must be a commitment to continuity. Superintendents who are supportive of innovation in their schools must be supported by those who can shield them from criticism. The school board and teachers union, for example, need to provide visible support for the superintendent's courage -- otherwise a superintendent's tenure may be jeopardized. Also, central office needs to display a commitment to continuity in both the principalship and the faculty at a school that is attempting to change. The entire enterprise can be jeopardized if key people are reassigned.
Central office plays an incalculable role in nurturing and sustaining classroom and building-level school improvement by developing a greater system capacity to support school improvement work. Recognizing the importance of its role and modeling the skills and behaviors which are embedded in the Venture Capital framework will be important.

Professional Development

Even those principals who are dedicated and committed to change and all of its ramifications, need ongoing support for their work. The paradox is that sharing responsibilities often means more work than ever for principals. While teachers get released time to think and plan, there are usually no similar concessions for principals. Playing a more facilitative role is one for which few principals are prepared, although they are increasingly expected to perform it.

Sarason (1982) goes so far as to say that "not by previous experience, formal training, or the process of selection is the principal prepared for the requirements of leadership and the inevitable conflicts and problems that beset a leader." (p. 161).

In considering how to professionally nourish building principals, numerous models are in existence. National centers, such as the Principal's Center at Harvard University's Graduate School of Education, helps principals work more effectively as members of school teams and creates a network of support that sustains principals during difficult times. An underlying premise is that principals who come to the center to share a culture of reflection, learning, and cooperation outside their schools want to see a similar culture flourish within their schools (Barth, 1990).

State and local associations and academies need to continue to offer support which fight the isolation of principals. Continuing to develop the knowledge, dispositions, and performances which are necessary to creating successful schools is primary.
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The challenge appears to be to create new leadership models that accommodate others associated with schools without stripping the principal of the authority to function effectively. As principals continue to be beset by pressures and complications that make their jobs extremely difficult, principals need to become linked to professional development experiences that provide them with the knowledge and skills that are imperative within the continuous improvement school context. As important, it can be argued, is the principals' need to have experiences which help them to develop and maintain a sense of professional community which feeds their spirit. It is important that we continue to be mindful of their unique role within the school improvement context, the complicated professional lives they live, and the need for them to be emotionally and intellectually invested in the essential issues facing their schools as we seek ways to better insure the administrative continuity of those principals who have provided evidence of their commitment to school improvement.

Policy Implications

As policy rethinking occurs, it is important that efforts to restructure secondary schools become more closely joined to efforts to restructure both teacher and administrator education. Training programs must prepare teachers and administrators in "cutting edge" conceptions and practices of teaching and learning. Principals identified curriculum, instruction, and assessment as three areas where they had considerable professional development needs; however, these areas frequently are not addressed in meaningful ways in administrative professional development opportunities. As well, the promotion of professional development opportunities open to both administrators and teachers need to be promoted. There are many advantages to having both role groups involved in common experiences.
A related challenge relates to the fragmented nature of the reform movement. Possibly due in part to lack of capacity for more integrative action and inherent conservatism, both government and private funders have a tendency to seek change at the margins rather than at the core of established practice. A plethora of projects and demonstrations are created which result in "overstuffed" agendas and curricular discontinuities. Policymakers need to consider that fragmented and disjointed initiatives may ultimately reduce the likelihood that any of their efforts will become institutionalized. Establishing some coherence and intentionality of direction and effort is a critical challenge for policy makers and organizational leaders. Timar (1989) writes:

"Creating a policy climate capable of fostering an integrated and organizationally coherent response to restructuring requires more than making such marginal changes as adding new programs or reshuffling organizational responsibilities. Such tinkering may actually have a negative effect on schools by embroiling them in organizational conflicts that further fragment operations and diffuse energy. An integrated response to restructuring is not likely to occur without a basic definition of the roles and responsibilities of just about every party connected with schools: teachers, administrators, professional organizations, policymakers, parents, students, and colleges and universities.

The school reform design models offered by the Ohio Department of Education, such as the Coalition of Essential Schools or Success for All, were intended to affect all aspects of school operations, including curriculum and instruction, school organization and governance, professional development, assessment and use of resources -- all focused on teaching and learning. The purview of these reform models was meant to be comprehensive in nature.

In looking to the future of school improvement work, both state and local policymakers need to seek the best evidence possible in order to provide schools advice about the effectiveness of various design options. Slavin and Fashula (1998) suggest focusing on student performance data and replicability, but also stress the importance of seeking answers to questions regarding the availability of technical support and training.
and program costs. The U. S. Department of Education's guideline for the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program suggests that four types of evidence be used in selecting designs: the theoretical or research foundation of the program; evaluation-based evidence of effective implementation; and, evidence of replicability (U. S. Department of Education, 1998).

Unfortunately, according to the Consortium for Policy Research in Education, most of the currently popular designs lack much of this type of evidence. Often they have been advanced by supporters because the model is associated with a well-known educator or theorist, has worked well in pilot sites, is based upon a plausible theory of school reform, or possesses a combination of these factors.

In considering the role of the state in supporting comprehensive school reform, a number of responsibilities are apparent. While future policy initiatives, sources of funding and accountability measures related to school improvement work in Ohio are unclear, it seems that an important role the state assumes is one related to how school design reform plays a role in their overall strategy as expressed by its standards and how their own policies can support it. The Ohio Department of Education should also play a continuing role in assessing design success and related factors over time. Evaluation and research is a key component of accountability with respect to the external design model "provider" and the "host" school as it becomes instructive to differentiate roles in producing successful results.

The Venture Capital assessment team from Synergetic Development Inc. noted after visiting Venture Capital schools that a "marked feature" in most Venture Capital schools was the distance between the school-based initiatives and the central office administration and school board. While most officials were seen as supportive, they were generally not involved and rather distant. By design or default (Stevens, 1995), that distance deprives the initiatives of the leadership needed to sustain continuous, on-
going improvement. It might also foreshadow a lack of essential support for the eventual institutionalization of needed new programs and the de-institutionalization of ineffective ones.

In considering the role of the district in stimulating and sustaining successful approaches to comprehensive school reform, there are new assumptions as well as new roles which must be played. It might be argued that the school district needs to develop a greater capacity to encourage, support, and sustain continuous improvement in the quality of education provided students in each school in the district. If so, it proceeds from the assumption that one of the greatest obstacles to long-term, comprehensive improvement in the schools is the fact that too few school districts have the capacity to support and sustain classroom and building-level change. It might further be assumed that even with enthusiastic and widespread support for change at the building and classroom levels, the status quo will be maintained without strong support at the district level and from the community at large.

Realizing that changing a district environment to become supportive of capacity building at the system level will take time, without the commitment to change and the changes that necessitates throughout the system, the ability of schools to implement designs is severely limited.

One of the most prevalent messages of contemporary organizational literature is that the long-term success or survival of any organization depends on its ability to function as a "learning organization" (Senge, 1990; Fullan, 1993). Leaders are advised that the most successful organizations of the future will be organizations "where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together" (Senge, 1990, p. 3).
Of particular importance to schools, researchers have concluded is that "the key to student growth is educator growth" (Joyce and Showers, 1995) and contend that the development of a learning community in which teachers and administrators continually generate and expand their knowledge and skills is essential to sustained school improvement (Fullan, 1993).

The Ohio Department of Education made some rather cursory references to the learning community in the monograph Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal (ODE, 1993). Many educators do not understand the powerful systemic implications of the school as learning organization metaphor. The traditional structure, processes, and culture of schools presents the antithesis of a learning organization. And, if the Ohio Department of Education is going to transform itself from a regulatory agency to a service providing organization, it will need to engage in an organizational improvement process comparable to schools and districts. It will need to embrace, in word and deed, the notion of learning community. New roles will require new skills, knowledge, and attitudes.

Framing issues and posing questions around this metaphor may help some individuals to understand the meaning of systemic change. The key to systemic reform, according to Schlechty is "the development of the capacity of school districts to support and sustain reform efforts at the building level and to ensure that those who occupy top-level positions in the system have the inclinations and skills to use this capacity to the fullest" (Schlechty, 1997, p. 204).

Educational is a highly politicized arena with multiple stakeholders possessing and advancing varied interests, perspectives, and priorities. It is very easy to become program or event-oriented as these can become easy substitutes for addressing the essential issues and questions which often are systemic in nature.
A key challenge for school people will be to try to build coherence and intentionality into school systems while simultaneously dealing with the contradictions, paradoxes, and complexities that characterize the policy environment. Attempting to relate all school improvement work to the issue of how student learning is "enhanced or improved" and providing viable means of measuring it are essential issues.

In conclusion, there is an uncertain future for Venture Capital grants in Ohio. It appears that there will be a reduction in the number of building grants and more resources for district-wide grants. Newly developed Network for Systemic Improvement grants are starting to be awarded to school districts. While the DeRolph case has complicated virtually all school funding issues, including the fate of Venture Capital, it appears that there is increasing support for district-wide grants. Creating and sustaining capacity-building for on-going school improvement will continue to be critical.

Recommendations for Further Research

The following are recommendations for future research:

1. Research that would help to determine which ODE sanctioned reform models were most successful.

Additional research of Ohio Department of Education sanctioned reform models - such as, Accelerated Schools, Classroom of the Future, Coalition of Essential Schools, Effective Schools Process, North Central School Improvement, Ohio Community Learning Experience, Outcome-Based Education, School Develop Program, and Success for All - could produce useful results.

Further research could help to determine if:

a. some models were more systemic, while others focused on one component of schooling (e.g., instruction).
b. particular models were more successful at particular levels or in particular types or sizes of schools.

c. some models require a great deal of external support as opposed to other models where implementation can be successful with internal people.

2. Replication of this study with later rounds of funded secondary Venture Capital schools.

It would be interesting to use essentially the same subscales pertaining to perceived importance of leadership roles, perceived professional development needs associated with each leadership role, building-level effects, and policy efficacy in order to determine if later round funded secondary principals had different perceptions regarding the grant application process and to analyze possible cause-effect relationships.

3. Research using those schools who had experienced principalship turnover during the implementation of Venture Capital in order to assess possible effects.

Since leadership continuity has been such an important issue to successful implementation of a change initiative, this research would provide potentially valuable insights into the myriad effects of such a departure on roles and relationships, decision-making, advocacy, and capacity-building.

4. A comparative study examining particular features of first-round funded schools with those schools who were denied funding in the first round but who were successfully funded in later rounds.
Using the same variables in my current study, a future study could focus on determining what effect the act of being involved in the grant application process over the course of several funding cycles had on the schools' improvement in beginning the initiative. A primary question might address the issue of whether by pursuing the initiative for some time, did schools develop a greater capacity for successful implementation.
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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 grassroots 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.
Defining School Improvement

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

**Late Spring 1993**
- School districts nominate schools (by June 30)

**Late Summer 1993**
- Schools use school improvement monograph to engage in discussion
- Schools study models and conduct self-appraisal
- Schools decide to adopt or invent school improvement model
- Ohio Department of Education offers regional meetings for applicants; applications available at regional meetings (August 23 through September 3)

**Fall 1993**
- Schools submit applications (September 24)
- Ohio Department of Education conducts interviews (October)
- Ohio Department of Education selects schools (November 1)
- Selected schools plan for implementation

**School Year 1993-1994**
- Ohio Department of Education facilitates training of school teams in various models
- Schools implement models
- Ohio Department of Education coordinates extended services for school improvement site network
- Ongoing assessment
Describing the Models

There are no recipes for restructuring a school to meet the needs of the learning community. A learning community must think creatively to invent its own approach to effecting real change. To simply adopt an existing school improvement model may result in traveling down a path to an unwanted destination. Whether a school decides to adopt an existing model or invent its own, the intent is to encourage innovation and to capitalize on diversity. Schools are also encouraged to develop their own school improvement model in collaboration with an institution of higher education.

The models which follow provide examples of ways that learning communities can transform the teaching and learning process. Each model is described according to its implementation, teaching content and practices, participant roles, assessment, and funding. The models included were selected because of their scope — they involve many schools in Ohio and across the country — and are thus recognizable examples for improving the education system. They are not, by far, the only worthwhile efforts underway. Likewise, this information is not meant to be a definitive guide but rather intended to highlight some school improvement strategies. It is important to point out that schools within each model can vary greatly. All, however, invite schools to tailor their approaches to local needs, conditions, and resources. Please refer to Appendix A for a comprehensive profile of each model and a chart examining how the various models address different aspects of renewing an education system. The charts outlining the national initiatives have been reproduced with permission from the Education Commission of the States' publication, State Education Leader, Fall, 1992.

How is the model implemented?

In order to launch a new accelerated school, the National Center at Stanford will provide an eight-day training workshop for prospective trainers. There are two types of information shared at the workshop: (1) the accelerated elementary and middle school philosophy, process, and proven effective practices; and (2) how a trainer can assist school sites to transform themselves into places where teachers, parents, students, support staff, administrators, the local community, and district staff work collaboratively to achieve a shared vision. Each school choosing to participate in the Accelerated School program is expected to have a trainer participate at the National Center.

What is taught? How is it taught?

Training consists of participating in activities that focus on the Accelerated Schools philosophy, process, and practices and the specific application of these. School-based practitioners from Accelerated Schools will assist prospective trainers in constructing initial implementation plans based on their experiences.

Accelerated Schools
with other Accelerated Schools. The training will embody accelerated learning principles and will be extremely active and hands-on in nature.

What new role(s) do teachers, administrators play?

Teachers, administrators, and parents identify and define educational challenges, look for alternative solutions, and implement and evaluate those solutions. Administrators—both in the school and in the central office—will play different roles from those in more conventional school districts. In an Accelerated School, the principal must move from the role of compliance officer to that of leader whose first priority is to be involved in the educational process. An Accelerated School principal is responsible for coordinating and facilitating the activities of the school community's decision making as well as for obtaining logistical support in the form of information, professional development, assessment, implementation, and instructional resources. School districts must play a greater service role for individual schools than they normally do if schools are to fulfill their vision. Instead of serving as regulators of schools to ensure compliance of school activities with some centralized plan, administrators in central offices must provide support services to help Accelerated Schools achieve their visions.

How is program effectiveness measured?

Student performance on standardized tests, portfolios of student work, student and staff attendance, parental participation, and retentions in student transfers assist in measuring program effectiveness.

Is the model operating in Ohio?

Weisenborn Intermediate School
Huber Heights City Schools

How much does the model cost?

First year costs include
1. Travel to training session and end-of-year retreat, plus room and board.
2. Freeing up time for planning, preparation, and weekly visits of the trainer.
3. Travel expenses and consulting fees for at least three certified mentor visits during the first year.

What training is required?

Please refer to how the model is implemented (see above).
How is the model implemented?

The Classroom of the Future’s tenets provide a foundation for transforming our system of education. In order to develop an educational system that prepares students to live and work in the twenty-first century schools must involve communities, parents, students, teachers, and administrators in the very early planning stages of their work.

What is taught? How is it taught?

In the Classroom of the Future, teams of teachers work with multi-age groups of students incorporating the belief that students learn in different ways and at different rates. Technology is used to teach students about the nature of evidence and the process of reasoning. This provides them with an understanding of the way knowledge is constructed and represented.

What new roles do teachers and administrators play?

Teachers in the Classroom of the Future understand that learning to teach is a lifelong process that encompasses peer collaboration, curriculum development, and student interaction. Administrators support the work of the teaching teams by sharing decision making and responsibility.

How is program effectiveness measured?

The participating institutions in the Classroom of the Future initiative have produced several interim reports and responded to other requests for self-appraisal. An independent evaluation of the Classroom of the Future will soon be completed.

Is the model operating in Ohio? Where?

Eight school districts (representing urban, rural, suburban, and vocational schools) and four institutions of higher education have been funded to implement the Classroom of the Future’s tenets.

How much does the model cost?

The initial costs of implementing multiple innovations are high. Funds provided to Classroom of the Future participants were presented as conversion capital—funds necessary to institutionalize changes and reallocate resources.

What training is required?

Professional development is critical to shaping the schools of the future. The school structure must provide regular, substantive opportunities for teachers to interact.
How is the model implemented?

Most schools adopting the Essential Schools process agree it is necessary to initiate planning at least twelve months before the first day of classes. The first step of the process is arriving at a vision of the school's purpose. At New Hampshire’s Thayer High School, principal Dennis Littky interviewed every teacher and student in the school, asking them what was important to them regarding their classes—what they liked and what they disliked. He found that the most common response from both teachers and students was that they all disliked study halls. So, study halls were abolished. This minor change started a chain reaction. Eliminating study halls led to longer class periods. Longer class periods in turn affected teaching styles.

The Coalition of Essential Schools, developed as a high school-university partnership, is designed to strengthen the learning of students by reforming school priorities and simplifying school structures. For schools that choose to adapt the Coalition’s Nine Common Principles, support is available at national, state, and local levels and include:

1. The Coalition staff, located at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island, and Coalition member schools, from California to Maine, offer summer institutes covering such topics as integrated curriculum, managing crisis in school reform, building effective school teams, and leadership in urban schools.

2. The Coalition publishes a quarterly newsletter, "Horace," and also produces research papers and ethnographic studies. Two books, Horace’s Compromise and Horace's School, both by the Coalition's founder, Theodore R. Sizer, a professor at Brown University, describe the Coalition's Nine Common Principles in detail.

3. The Ohio Department of Education is coordinating the first Ohio TREK, a year-long course of study in school change which begins with a week-long summer training session for school teams.

4. There are two Coalition-member schools in Ohio and a growing number of planning and exploring schools. Staff from schools throughout Ohio have visited these sites in order to see the Coalition's principles in action.

What is taught? How is it taught?

Each Essential School applies nine common principles in order to develop its own unique plan. These are:

1. The school should focus on helping students learn to use their minds well. Schools should not attempt to be "comprehensive" if such a claim is made at the expense of the school’s central intellectual purpose.

2. The school's goals should be simple: that each student master a limited number of essential skills and areas of knowledge. Curricular decisions
should be based on thorough student mastery and achievement rather than by an effort merely to cover (subject) content areas.

3. The school's goals should apply to all students, while the means to these goals should vary depending on the students. School practice should be customized to meet the needs of every group or class of students.

4. Teaching and learning should be personalized to the maximum extent possible. Decisions about courses of study, the use of time, and the choice of teaching materials and specific pedagogies must be placed in the hands of the principal and staff.

5. The governing practical metaphor of the school should be student-as-worker. A prominent pedagogy will be coaching, to encourage students to learn and to seek out knowledge.

6. Students should be awarded a diploma for graduation upon successful demonstration of mastery—an "exhibition." There is no strict age grading and no system of "credits earned" by time spent in class. The emphasis is on the student's demonstration of learning.

7. The tone of the school should stress the value of unanxious expectation ("I won't threaten you but I expect much of you"), of trust (until abused), and of decency (the values of fairness, generosity, and tolerance).

8. The principal and teachers should perceive themselves as generalists first and specialists second.

9. Administrative/budget targets: eighty or fewer pupils per teacher, substantial time for collective planning by teachers, competitive salaries for staff, and an ultimate per-pupil-cost not exceeding those at traditional schools by more than ten percent.

What new roles do teachers and administrators play?

The principal and teachers in an Essential School perceive themselves as generalists first (teachers and scholars in general education) and specialists second (experts in one particular discipline). Each member of the school staff performs multiple roles (teacher, counselor, manager) and shares a sense of commitment to the whole school.

How is program effectiveness measured?

In 1991, the Coalition began a nine-year longitudinal study following Essential School students through high school and five years beyond.

Individual schools are encouraged to document progress. This has often meant developing "uncommon" measures of accountability suited to Essential School practices. For example, one of the Coalition principles encourages teachers to plan their classes backwards by identifying some demonstrable way students can
Coallion of Essential Schools ( continued)

Effective Schools Process

exhibit mastery at the course's end. Students are asked to link concepts across disciplines, think on their feet, and speak and write persuasively about things that matter to them. This provides another focus for assessment that incorporates exhibitions and portfolios which demonstrate student progress over time.

Is the model operating in Ohio? Where?

There are two Coalition member schools in Ohio—Cincinnati Woodward High School, Cincinnati City Schools; and Reynoldsburg High School, Reynoldsburg City Schools.

There are three planning schools (schools that have made a commitment to the Nine Common Principles and are working toward Coalition membership)—Elida High School, Elida Local Schools; Independence High School, Columbus City Schools; and Madeira Junior and Senior High School, Madeira City Schools. There are an additional 35 to 40 schools in the exploring stage (schools that have begun to consider the Nine Common Principles as the focus for renewal).

How much does the model cost?

The costs associated with the initial stages of restructuring are highly variable. Schools are collaborating through the eight Regional Teacher Training Centers and other agencies to lower these costs. An Essential School budget should be no more than ten percent above comparable traditional schools.

What training is required?

The Coalition staff, located at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island, and Coalition member schools, from California to Maine, offer summer institutes covering such topics as integrated curriculum, managing crisis in school reform, building effective school teams, and leadership in urban schools.

How is the model implemented?

The Ohio Building Leadership Model provides direction on how to implement the Effective Schools Process. This model includes formation of a principal led team, developing and conducting a needs assessment, sharing the needs assessment with the total staff, and developing and implementing an action plan with ongoing assessment and evaluation.

What new role(s) do teachers, administrators play?

Effective Schools have principals who are, in fact, the leaders of the instructional system (teachers, parents, and others interested in student learning). They are encouraged to be creative, bold, supportive, and truly the "risk takers"
dedicated to the mission of the school. They are active and involved with all parts of the educational community. In a truly Effective School, the leadership doesn't necessarily start or stop with the principal. Teachers who are strong instructional leaders must be empowered to be the driving force behind the Effective School endeavors.

**Effective Schools Process (continued)**

**How is program effectiveness measured?**

Increased student achievement in school skills is the mark of excellence of an instructionally effective school. Establishing school excellence may require a great deal of time and effort.

There are some short-term indicators of success associated with increased student academic achievement that need to be monitored every six months (and annually) while building a plan leading to excellence. These short-term indicators of success include:

1. Increased assistance of volunteers
2. Decreased discipline referrals and charges
3. Increased student/staff attendance
4. Decreased student dropout rate
5. Increased parent/community involvement (e.g. meetings, telephone calls, parent conference days and contact with parents of students who are absent or who are not succeeding)
6. Increased effective homework policies/practices
7. Increased student achievement on assessments indicators (e.g. subject grades, standardized tests, competency tests, proficiency tests, authentic assessments, etc.).

The school-based plan leading to excellence must also be designed to achieve the six long-term national education goals whenever feasible.

**Is the model operating in Ohio? Where?**

Since 1981, the Effective Schools Process has been used in Ohio elementary, middle/junior high, high, and joint vocational school buildings. The Effective Schools Model is operating in more than 1,200 urban, suburban, and rural buildings in Ohio. For specific locations, contact the Effective Schools Section, Division of Equal Educational Opportunities, Ohio Department of Education.

**How much does the model cost?**

The cost of the Effective Schools Process is difficult to determine. Budgeting is determined relative to the level of intensity in developing and implementing the process. Initial start-up costs are the most costly part of the process.
What training is required?

Training in team building and in the collegial decision-making process is needed. Additional training is needed in all aspects of site-based management. An Effective Schools Process informational meeting and annual meeting are provided by the Ohio Department of Education to assist school buildings in developing, implementing, and continuing their Effective Schools Process endeavors. Additionally, the Ohio Academy for School Improvement Strategies (OASIS) Summer Institutes are available to administrators and their instructional leadership teams to develop an action plan for school improvement/restructuring.

How is the model implemented?

Each school establishes an internal school improvement team to provide overall coordination and direction for implementing the school improvement plan. The team is the decision-making mechanism for the school. Although the North Central Association (NCA) provides the structure and process for school improvement, all of the substantive decisions are made at the school building site by the people affected by the decisions. Thus, the decisions relative to goals, interventions, assessments, documentation, and professional development provide the internal school improvement team with significant leadership responsibilities. The NCA suggests that improvement goals be developed to support student learning in the following areas:

- Communications
- Caring for self and others
- Problem solving and critical thinking
- Making, growing, and fixing things
- Making decisions using quantity, shape, location, and pattern
- Technology's impact on society and its basis in science
- Global implications of social studies

To support the work of the school, the NCA model provides for an external review of the school's improvement process. An external resource team is established to visit the school to provide feedback and new ideas relative to the school's improvement plan. The team is expected to comment on all phases of the improvement process including the goals, interventions, assessments, documentation, and professional development. The team can offer school personnel many ideas to help implement the school improvement plan.

What new role(s) do teachers, administrators play?

The NCA model promotes shared leadership for the overall improvement process in the school. All members of the faculty are expected to participate in the improvement process and work collaboratively in designing and implement-
ing the instructional program to enhance learning. In addition, faculty members must be willing to share their talents in addressing such needs as professional development.

How is program effectiveness measured?

The school is expected to develop a student profile that describes current levels of student growth relative to the established learning goals. The profile provides baseline information for the school to use in measuring student learning.

The school is encouraged to establish both context bound and noncontext bound evaluation measures. Four levels of assessment are suggested at the school site to measure student learning. Curriculum embedded and portfolio/artifact assessment represent context bound measures that are recommended. On demand tasks and transition indicators are suggested as noncontext bound measures.

Documentation of the success of the plan requires the school to compare current data with baseline data and to provide other representative evidence from the assessment measures to demonstrate that the improvement goals have been achieved.

Is the model operating in Ohio? Where?

The NCA school improvement model is appropriate for elementary, middle, secondary, and vocational schools. Approximately 100 schools will begin the process during the 1993-94 school year. Another 40 schools have started a process to gain accreditation based on student outcomes. The identification of schools involved in the NCA improvement model can be obtained from the Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Development, North Central Association Section, Ohio Department of Education.

How much does the model cost?

The cost to implement the NCA school improvement model varies among schools. The degree of change that is promoted through the school plan has a direct impact on both human and fiscal resources.

What training is required?

The NCA provides specific workshops for principals, internal school improvement team members, and external resource team chairpersons. These workshops are held at regional sites throughout Ohio and are conducted by NCA staff. The NCA has developed support materials (handbooks, videotapes, training booklets, and self-study instruments) that are available to schools. An assessment hotline has been established at the regional level and can be accessed by any member school seeking additional help.
The NCA annual meeting in Chicago provides many opportunities for school personnel to interact with practitioners throughout the region who are engaging in evaluation activities designed to enhance student learning.

**Ohio Community Learning Experience**

**How is the model implemented?**

The model calls for community-wide implementation of a total redesign of the educational system, based on five axioms. The model requires new definitions of the most important schooling processes, including teaching and learning, assessment, governance, organization, and professional development.

**What is taught? How is it taught?**

All academic disciplines are taught across all traditional grade levels. Learners take responsibility for their learning in this constructivist model of schooling. Teachers facilitate learning rather than transmitting information. Transdisciplinary instruction characterizes the learning environment.

**What new role(s) do teachers, administrators play?**

Teachers assist learners with performance. They have extensive instructional decision-making authority and responsibility. Administrators have less responsibility for instructional leadership but a far greater role in educational leadership. All professionals become involved in the pursuit of excellence.

**How is program effectiveness measured?**

This model strives to help learners achieve world-class standards. In addition to the traditional measures of academic achievement, student performance is observed in authentic settings. Learners are expected to not only achieve high levels of literacy in each of the academic disciplines, but also to reflect the habits of mind unique to each of them.

**Is the model operating in Ohio? Where?**

Fourteen learning communities have demonstrated the need, commitment, and capacity necessary to engage in this level of transformation. They are Akron, Barberton, Cincinnati, Dayton, East Muskingum, Elmwood, Ironton, Mansfield, Mayfield, Mentor, Middletown, Reynoldsburg, South Euclid-Lyndhurst, and Swanton.

**How much does the model cost?**

Only existing personnel are used; therefore, only training costs are involved.
What training is required?

A comprehensive program of professional development is necessary to implement this model. The most important professional development, however, is in collaborative problem solving and educational redesign within the learning community.

Dr. William Spady is Director of the High Success Network on Outcome-Based Education (HSN), which he founded in 1986 after serving three years as director of the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. The HSN is a rapidly growing school reform and restructuring effort committed to fundamentally restructuring the paradigm and power of educational systems in North America and abroad.

How is the model implemented?

Outcome-Based Education (OBE) is a process rather than a program for increasing a school's or district's capacity to achieve its goals. The end results are higher achievement for students on outcomes of real significance and a focus on continuous improvement.

Outcomes-Based Education is founded on three basic premises:

1. All students can learn and succeed.
2. Success breeds success.
3. Schools control the conditions of success.

Four key principles guide the design, delivery, documentation, and decision making of schools:

1. Ensure clarity of focus on outcomes of significance.
2. Design down from ultimate outcomes.
3. Emphasize high expectations for all to succeed.
4. Provide expanded opportunity and support for learning success.

What is taught? How is it taught?

OBE strives to equip all students with the knowledge, skills, and competence needed to successfully meet challenges and opportunities they will face in life. Whether students learn something well is more important than how much time it takes them to learn.

Exit outcomes are developed from analyses of future trends and conditions. This precedes curriculum design, development, and delivery. OBE responds to differences in student needs and learning rates, while at the same time helping students accomplish high level outcomes of significance. Decisions, results, and programs are not defined by or limited to specific time blocks and calendar dates. There is a much greater emphasis on collaborative models of student learning (e.g., cross-grouping and cooperative learning), especially across disciplines.
Outcome-Based Education (continued)

What role(s) do teachers, administrators play?
Staff members work as collaborative teams to design and deliver challenging, time-flexible learning experiences. Teachers are more focused on the learning capabilities and individual needs of their students and put far less emphasis on covering a given amount of curriculum in a given time block.

Schools are mission driven with a focus on specific learner (exit) outcomes. Strategic design teams analyze future conditions. There is an implied shared governance/leadership.

How is program effectiveness measured?
There is far less reliance on norm-referenced standardized tests as indicators of either student or teacher accomplishment because outcomes of genuine significance cannot be assessed authentically with such limited devices. Districts custom design criterion-based assessment measures that directly operationalize the outcomes they define as most significant. Students develop portfolios as they move through the system. Rubrics are a significant part of the assessment process.

Is the model operating in Ohio? Where?
The High Success Network (HSN) conducted major OBE conferences in Cincinnati, Columbus, and Covington, Kentucky this past year. Many Ohio districts attended. Dublin City School district is working in depth with HSN and have helped form a Franklin County Consortium of districts interested in implementing OBE. Two northern Ohio districts have joined the Michigan-Ohio Consortium on OBE, with over 40 Detroit-area districts heavily involved.

How much does the model cost?
Costs vary depending on how many days and how many trainers are requested, but schools should anticipate at least 10 days of training support during the first year with qualified, experienced OBE trainers. The minimum cost for a thorough introduction of this type would be approximately $12,000, but can run higher if multiple trainers and types of help are requested. The intent of the Franklin County Consortium (which includes districts outside Franklin County as well) is to provide leadership in the area of school reform and restructuring efforts.

What training is required?
Training of personnel is needed for rethinking of the design, delivery, documentation, and decision-making systems to implement school changes, and for the design and implementation of outcomes of significance, interdisciplinary curriculum, restructured delivery systems, and authentic assessments. The adminis-
ative team must be trained through ongoing staff development about leadership including Total Quality Management, which is an integral part of OBE implementation.

**How is the model implemented?**

The model restructures the organization and administration of schools by bringing parents, teachers, and the principal into collaborative decision making roles through the School Governance Team. Parents work with the Mental Health Team to determine the best strategy for meeting the mental health needs of children. Strategies to foster active and meaningful parent/guardian involvement in the schools are developed by teachers, parents, and the principal.

The school district must develop a collaborative partnership with a university to coordinate change in schools with the way teachers are prepared.

**What is taught? How is it taught?**

This program focuses on the processes rather than the content of the educational system.

The School Development Program (SDP) works to improve students' academic performance by addressing the underlying social and psychological issues that interfere with learning.

**What new role(s) do teachers, administrators play?**

The overarching component of this program is the bringing together of parents, teachers, administrators, and mental health professionals into a relationship of shared responsibility for the development of the child.

**How is program effectiveness measured?**

Program effectiveness has been assessed using diverse strategies and methods.

1. **Academic Effects**

   School level aggregated data analysis provides evidence of significant SDP effects on achievement. Analyses in Michigan (1986), Prince George's County (Maryland, 1987) and New Haven (1984) showed gains in reading, language, and mathematics.

   Additionally, James Comer, the program developer and other researchers have conducted several experimental control group studies involving randomly selected students in carefully matched schools. Significant differences in academic achievement between the two student groups have been reported.
School Development Program (continued)

2. Behavior and School Adjustment Effects

Measures of attendance, suspensions, classroom behavior, group participation, and attitude toward authority were used to assess students' adjustment to school. Aggregated data analysis in Michigan schools and experimental control studies by Comer and others showed clearly positive results.

3. Self-Concept

A 1990 study by Haynes and Comer and a 1988 study by Haynes, Comer, and Hamilton-Lee indicated that SDP students showed significantly greater positive changes in self-concept when compared to non-SDP students.

4. Classroom and School Climate

A 1989 quasi-experimental study involving 288 students and a 1974 study involving 155 parents and 147 teachers both showed significantly more positive assessments of school climate than non-SDP schools.

Is the model operating in Ohio? Where?

The program is currently in operation at the following elementary schools in Cleveland City Schools:

- Brooklawn
- East Clark
- Mt. Auburn
- Warner

How much does the model cost?

Since only existing personnel are used, the only costs involved are training costs.

What training is required?

A leadership team is sent to Yale University. They in turn train their colleagues at school sites.

How is the model implemented?

In grades 1-3, specially trained certified teachers work one-to-one with students who are failing to keep up with their classmates in reading. Daily 20-minute tutorial instruction is closely coordinated with regular classroom instruction.

During reading periods, students are regrouped across age lines so that each reading class contains students at one reading level. The reading program in grades K-1 emphasizes language and comprehension skills, sound blending, and students reading to one another. In grades 2-5, students use novels or basal, but not workbooks. This program emphasizes cooperative learning activities built around partner reading, identification of characters, settings, problems,
and problem solutions in narratives and story summarization, writing, and
direct instruction in reading comprehension skills. Beginning in the second year
of implementation, cooperative learning programs in writing/language arts are
introduced in grades K-5.

Success for All (SFA) preschool and kindergarten programs emphasize language
development, readiness, and self-concept. Preschools and kindergartens use the-
matic units, Peabody Language Development Kits, and a program called Story
Telling and Retelling (STaR).

What new roles do teachers, administrators play?

A family support team works in each school to help support parents in ensuring
the success of their children. The team focuses on parent education, parent
involvement, attendance, and student behavior. This team is composed of exist-
ing or additional staff such as parent liaisons, social workers, counselors, and
assistant principals.

A program facilitator—typically an experienced teacher with a background in
reading, early childhood, or Chapter I—is the catalyst to SFA’s effectiveness.
This person works with teachers to help them implement the reading program,
manage the assessments, assist the family support team, improve communica-
tion, and help the staff as a whole make certain that every child is making ade-
quate progress.

How is program effectiveness measured?

The Advisory Committee (program facilitator, teacher representatives, and oth-
ers) meet weekly to review program progress. Researchers have conducted a
series of assessments that indicate significant improvement in the test scores of
students, especially those whose pre-tests placed them in the lowest quarter of
students their age. Retentions and special education placements have been sig-
nificantly reduced.

Is the model operating in Ohio?

Not at this time.
Success for All (continued)

How much does the model cost?

Non-personnel costs at school sites:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Implementation</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Release time for training</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials, Books</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training and monitoring costs to Johns Hopkins University (based on 9 buildings entering the program in Year 1):

- Trainers: $126,000
- Development Fee: $67,500
- Travel: $45,000
- TOTAL: $238,500

Total schools: 9

For more detailed information on year two and beyond, request a copy of the handout "Disseminating Success for All in Ohio."

What training is required?

The philosophy of training behind SFA is that while initial training is important, real change in teachers' practices takes place in the classroom, not the workshop. Initial training for staff new to SFA is ordinarily provided in August for three days. Around mid-year, training in writing/language arts is introduced for grade one-three teachers and beginning reading training is provided for kindergarten teachers. Ongoing training sessions are held on classroom management, cooperative learning, and other topics. Ongoing training is also provided to refine and extend topics presented earlier.
Planning for School Improvement

Building a School Profile

The implementation of school improvement models will be founded on site-based management and will include provisions for sustained professional development for all educators and education support personnel. Understanding how well a school is performing is one of the first tasks in a discussion about school improvement models. This understanding will drive decisions on whether to adopt or invent a school improvement model.

In initiating discussions about school improvement, it is important to develop a profile of your school, district, or learning community to determine how to move forward with school improvement. Examine the current status in your school's vision for teaching and learning, assessment, governance, organization, and professional development activities. Ask, what needs to be changed?

Gaining a clear picture of the school, what it looks like in terms of students and student performance, faculty and staff, professional development, and the context of the school within the community, means that data must be collected and analyzed to accurately depict the profile of the school or learning community. Data collection involves generating and analyzing information that has been systematically observed, recorded, organized, or defined in such a way that the data can be processed and inferences made to substantiate decisions regarding adoption or invention of school improvement efforts. Effective school improvement is data driven. All decisions regarding the management and development of school improvement should be based on the careful review and analysis of relevant data.

There is a great variety of information regarding student, community, and instructional characteristics that can be gathered to develop your profile. Student characteristics may include attendance, retention, and dropout rates; failure patterns; gender issues; standardized test scores; numbers of students in special programs; and any follow-up information about former students. Community characteristics may include socioeconomic status, geographical locations, and community attitudes toward learning. Instructional characteristics may include teacher attendance rates, curriculum and school organization issues, the instructional strategies used by teachers, and the school's methods of assessing student progress.

By assessing capacity for school improvement, local educators will be able to determine whether members of the learning community are ready to proceed with school improvement, or whether there is a need to do preliminary work. Such work could include awareness building of the need for an expanded view of school improvement, discussion among school staff concerning perceived developmental needs and goals, or reviewing various school improvement mod-
els. It is important to develop a consensus on capacity, commitment, and need before launching a serious school improvement effort.

School improvement efforts must be carefully planned, well-managed, and ultimately incorporated into a school system's ongoing structure and processes. School improvement models should be tailored to local needs, conditions, and resources. All stakeholders in the learning community must be included in discussions and formal planning sessions from the beginning in order to achieve desired outcomes. Initiating a broad-based dialogue in the learning community is a first step to getting started. A rationale for adopting or inventing a school improvement model can only be built after considerable reflection about teaching and learning has taken place and a consensus is built on the vision that will undergird the school's mission. What is done or not done prior to funding often determines the success of school innovation and reform. The following self-appraisal inventory is provided to raise a series of questions, to stimulate thinking, and to provide a foundation for the creation of successful school improvement efforts.
Success for All
(continued)

How much does the model cost?

Non-personnel costs at school sites:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Personnel Costs at School Sites</th>
<th>Year of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release time for training</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials, Books</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training and monitoring costs to Johns Hopkins University (based on 9 buildings entering the program in Year 1):

- Trainers: $126,000
- Development Fee: $67,500
- Travel: $45,000
- TOTAL: $238,500

Total schools: 9

For more detailed information on year two and beyond, request a copy of the handout "Disseminating Success for All in Ohio."

What training is required?

The philosophy of training behind SFA is that while initial training is important, real change in teachers' practices takes place in the classroom, not the workshop. Initial training for staff new to SFA is ordinarily provided in August for three days. Around mid-year, training in writing/language arts is introduced for grade one-three teachers and beginning reading training is provided for kindergarten teachers. Ongoing training sessions are held on classroom management, cooperative learning, and other topics. Ongoing training is also provided to refine and extend topics presented earlier.
Success for All  
(continued)

How much does the model cost?

Non-personnel costs at school sites:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Release time for training</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
</tr>
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</table>

Training and monitoring costs to Johns Hopkins University (based on 9 buildings entering the program in Year 1):

- Trainers $126,000
- Development Fee $67,500
- Travel $45,000
- TOTAL $238,500

Total schools 9

For more detailed information on year two and beyond, request a copy of the handout "Disseminating Success for All in Ohio."

What training is required?

The philosophy of training behind SFA is that while initial training is important, real change in teachers' practices takes place in the classroom, not the workshop. Initial training for staff new to SFA is ordinarily provided in August for three days. Around mid-year, training in writing/language arts is introduced for grade one-three teachers and beginning reading training is provided for kindergarten teachers. Ongoing training sessions are held on classroom management, cooperative learning, and other topics. Ongoing training is also provided to refine and extend topics presented earlier.
School Improvement Self-Appraisal

Defining the needs of an organization can be accomplished by recognizing the gap between what is and what could be—the difference between actual and optimal. The following self-appraisal instrument examines the fundamental processes of schooling—teaching and learning; assessment; governance and organization; and professional development. This review provides the opportunity to examine the school's commitment, capacity, and need relative to school improvement. The following self-appraisal instrument should be completed individually as well as collectively with representatives from the learning community. It can help determine a course of action regarding school improvement efforts and strategies.

Directions:

Please respond to the belief statements for each of the four categories: teaching and learning, assessment, governance, and organization, and professional development. Two statements are asked for each attribute:

A. The extent to which your school presently reflects these attributes.
B. The importance that you attach to these attributes.

Use this scale to rate questions A and B for each item. Circle your responses.

1  2  3  4  5

Not At All  Very Little  Somewhat  A Good Deal  A Great Deal

TEACHING AND LEARNING are characterized by

1. Cooperative learning structures.  A. 1  2  3  4  5
   B. 1  2  3  4  5

2. Themes and interdisciplinary units.  A. 1  2  3  4  5
   B. 1  2  3  4  5

3. Explicit performance standards at regular intervals.  A. 1  2  3  4  5
   B. 1  2  3  4  5

4. The use of technology and electronic communications to enhance instruction.  A. 1  2  3  4  5
   B. 1  2  3  4  5

5. Improvement of classroom instruction and learning.  A. 1  2  3  4  5
   B. 1  2  3  4  5

6. Challenging but flexible instructional options  A. 1  2  3  4  5
   B. 1  2  3  4  5
ASSESSMENT is characterized by

1. Use of multiple techniques, including written, oral, and demonstration formats
   A. 1 2 3 4 5
   B. 1 2 3 4 5

2. High expectations for all students.
   A. 1 2 3 4 5
   B. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Attention to cognitive learning and personal and social development.
   A. 1 2 3 4 5
   B. 1 2 3 4 5

4. Promotion based on performance, using outcomes with agreed-upon standards.
   A. 1 2 3 4 5
   B. 1 2 3 4 5

5. Opportunities for learners to make public demonstrations of mastery.
   A. 1 2 3 4 5
   B. 1 2 3 4 5

GOVERNANCE AND ORGANIZATION are characterized by

1. Site-based management and shared decision making.
   A. 1 2 3 4 5
   B. 1 2 3 4 5

2. Active participation by the learning community.
   A. 1 2 3 4 5
   B. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Formal collaboration with a variety of social service agencies.
   A. 1 2 3 4 5
   B. 1 2 3 4 5

4. A school culture that encompasses the values, beliefs, norms, and habits of continuous improvement.
   A. 1 2 3 4 5
   B. 1 2 3 4 5

5. An infrastructure that supports school improvement.
   A. 1 2 3 4 5
   B. 1 2 3 4 5

6. New and expanded roles and relationships for the learning community.
   A. 1 2 3 4 5
   B. 1 2 3 4 5

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT is characterized by

1. Collegiality and collaboration.
   A. 1 2 3 4 5
   B. 1 2 3 4 5

2. Incorporation of multiple knowledge bases.
   A. 1 2 3 4 5
   B. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Individual accountability for personal and professional renewal and reflection.
   A. 1 2 3 4 5
   B. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Including the learning community as an integral component to school improvement.  
   A. 1 2 3 4 5  
   B. 1 2 3 4 5  

5. Programs sequentially structured and supported over time, leading to improvements in student achievement.  
   A. 1 2 3 4 5  
   B. 1 2 3 4 5  

6. Purposeful activities undertaken as a structured effort to enhance professional capacity.  
   A. 1 2 3 4 5  
   B. 1 2 3 4 5  

Once you have completed this self-appraisal inventory, examine your score for each item based on the two statements:  
   A. The extent to which your school presently reflects these attributes.  
   B. The importance that you attach to these attributes.  

What types of patterns emerge? How do your scores compare with your colleagues and other members of the learning community? To what extent are your (low or high) scores based on your school’s commitment, capacity, and need regarding school improvement? What types of follow-up action steps or strategies are needed?
Concluding Thoughts

You are personally invited to become a partner in creating schools for Ohio's future. The year ahead will be one of unprecedented opportunity for everyone who has a stake in education to become personally involved. It will be a year to work to create a vision of what school improvement will look like. Schools can change dramatically and even the best schools can become better. The key to improvement is active participation and collaboration. School renewal can only become reality when the learning community takes responsibility for making change happen. Your role is to develop a strategy in which the best ideas and approaches work together, based on the needs of the school. The result will be a school culture in which learning is valued, individual contributors are recognized, community members feel empowered, leadership is shared, communication is facilitated, and student achievement is high. With the help of this monograph, we invite you to look at your role in education in a new way. Even more importantly, we hope this will inspire you to create a vision for school improvement and to work to change schools.
Assistance

The following individuals within the School Improvement Unit of the Ohio Department of Education are available to respond to questions involving specific school improvement models and processes. Please call (614) 466-2761 for assistance.

- Speed Dillon (Vocational Education)
- Mark Ealy (School Development Program)
- Jeanine Ellis (School Improvement Process)
- Alice Gibson (Federal Assistance)
- Jim Jilek (Effective Schools)
- Sherry Kapes (Outcome-Based Education)
- Margaret Kasten (Classroom of the Future)
- Ben Levin (Total Quality)
- Roberta Mohan (Outcome-Based Education)
- Sherry Mullett (Community Education)
- Mary Ellen Murray (Success for All)
- Linda Nusbaum (Ohio 2000)
- Karen Sanders (Early Childhood Education)
- Frank Schiraldi (Ohio Community Learning Experience)
- Susan Streitenberger (School Improvement Process)
- Gregg Stubbs (Accelerated Schools)
- Deb Télfer (Special Education)
- Gene Wenger (North Central School Improvement)
- Jon Williams (Coalition of Essential Schools)
School Improvement Models

**Accelerated Schools**

*Since the mid-1980s, more than 300 elementary schools across the country have initiated the Accelerated Schools model, a comprehensive approach to school change designed by Henry M. Levin and colleagues at Stanford University. The Accelerated Schools project is both a way of thinking about academic acceleration for all students and a concrete process for achieving it. The philosophy centers around creating the kind of schools we would want our own children to attend.*

Accelerated Schools targets students who are educationally at-risk because they begin school with learning gaps in areas valued by schools and mainstream economic and social institutions. Instead of slowing down instruction for lower-ability students, Accelerated Schools speed up instruction to help these pupils catch up with their peers. Accelerated Schools display the following characteristics: high expectations on the part of teachers, parents, and students; deadlines by which students are expected to meet particular educational requirements; stimulating and relevant instructional programs; and involvement of the teachers, parents, and the community in the design and implementation of programs. The Accelerated approach also creates a strong sense of self-worth and educational accomplishments for students.

The Accelerated Schools model has three guiding principles:

1. **Unity of purpose**: Passion and commitments, not formal mission statements, create the strong school structure where students are valued.
2. **Empowerment coupled with responsibility**: Decisions are made at the school site regarding resources, personnel, curriculum, and assessment.
3. **Building on strengths (of teaching and learning)**: Students' performance is assessed not only on standardized tests and formal assessments but other measures.

In addition, a fundamental set of values underlying these principles is necessary to establish integrated curricular, instructional, and organizational changes. The entire curriculum should be enriched and emphasize language development in all subjects. Instructional practices should promote active learning experiences through the use of cross-age tutoring and cooperative learning. The organization of an Accelerated School should be characterized by broad participation in decision making by administrators, teachers, and parents.
### Accelerated Schools

**Special Focus:** At-risk, elementary, language-based approach for all subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal (What are the goals of the effort)?</th>
<th>To enable at-risk students to benefit from mainstream education. To close test-score and grade-level promotion gaps and continue progress in middle school.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision (What beliefs guide this system)?</td>
<td>The Accelerated program can eliminate achievement gaps, and empower students to learn at full capacities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TEACHING AND LEARNING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards and Student Outcomes</th>
<th>Focused on closing the gap in academic capability and grade-level promotion between at-risk and more advantaged students by the end of sixth grade.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Connects academic material and students' daily lives. Emphasizes analysis, synthesis, problem solving, and applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/Classroom Organization</td>
<td>Mixed-ability groupings; active learning; peer tutoring; cooperative learning; student projects requiring independence, self-reliance, and self-confidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assessment</td>
<td>Standardized tests, portfolios, student/staff attendance, parental participation, reductions in student transfers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SYSTEM COMPONENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher Education</th>
<th>Includes study of governance, school budget, and policy to improve teaching and learning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>School-site decisions on matters such as resource allocation, instructional strategies, curricula, materials, and personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>The principal guides progress and coordinates programs. Faculty share accountability and decision-making responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and Responsibilities</td>
<td>Address significant changes in resource allocation within schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Has system accountability and support component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Accountability</td>
<td>Parents are involved in work groups; school steering committee shapes vision and sets priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Parent Involvement</td>
<td>Each school develops own form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Agency Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The mission of the Classroom of the Future is to develop an educational system that prepares students to live and work in the twenty-first century. It also helps students develop a commitment and capacity for lifelong learning. The initiative involves designing curricula, instruction, organization, and structure that are appropriate and adaptable for the delivery of education in the future and for implementing the design at model demonstration sites.

This project has four broad goals:

1. Forecasting the future of American society.
2. Identifying education's role in that future.
3. Designing curricula, instruction, organization, and structure that are appropriate and necessary to deliver that education in the future.
4. Implementing such education at model demonstration sites.

There are seven key components of Classroom of the Future:

1. Enabling teaching teams—teams of people, including teachers, tutors, counselors, nurses, psychologists, and others in the school who have positive input to what the youngster is all about—to create a learning community.
2. Offering formal and informal staff development.
3. Meeting the students' unique needs through individualized instruction and moving students forward as concepts are mastered.
4. Focusing curriculum on integrated communications, knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for living and constructive citizenship; seeing the connection between the school curriculum and issues facing society; and preparing students for work and lifelong learning.
5. Establishing learning as the constant and time as the variable.
6. Promoting learning through technology.
7. Looking at continuous progress through intelligent planning, and involving community members in the planning effort.
Classroom of the Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal (What are the goals of the effort)?</th>
<th>The mission of the Classroom of the Future is to develop an educational system that prepares students to live and work in the twenty-first century with a commitment and capacity for lifelong learning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision (What beliefs guide this system)?</td>
<td>The knowledge that we learn in different ways and at different rates serves as the foundation of teaching practices and is reflected in all educational decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHING AND LEARNING:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards and Student Outcomes</td>
<td>Schools develop own standards and student outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Curriculum focuses on integrated communications, knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for living and constructive citizenship; connecting the curriculum to societal issues; preparing students for work and lifelong learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/Classroom Organization</td>
<td>Individualized instruction places students in learning situations according to their readiness and interest levels. Teachers work in teams. Technology is used as a tool in the teaching process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assessment</td>
<td>A variety of assessments address diverse learning and communication styles of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYSTEM COMPONENTS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>There are four institutions involved in the Classroom of the Future initiative so a model exists for collaboration of higher education with the Ohio Department of Education and schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Lifelong learning influences professional development as well as peer collaboration, curriculum development, teachers as facilitators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>Learning communities with decisions made by teams of teachers, administrators, parents, and other support staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and Responsibilities</td>
<td>Administrators, teachers, parents, students, and communities have a responsibility to shape the schools of the future as productive and satisfying places in which to work and to prepare for life in the twenty-first century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Allocations for professional development may add to initial cost. Reallocation of resources can provide funds for technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Accountability</td>
<td>Shared accountability; looking at continuous progress through intelligent planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Parent Involvement</td>
<td>Community and parent groups are involved in the work of the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Agency Collaboration</td>
<td>Ohio Department of Education, universities and school districts are involved. It is likely that ITVs, media centers, businesses and RTCs are also involved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Coalition of Essential Schools was established in 1984 by Theodore R. Sizer, a professor at Brown University. It was designed as a high school-university partnership to strengthen the learning of students by reforming school priorities and simplifying its structures. Each Essential School applies a core of nine common principles in order to develop its own unique plan. These nine common principles are:

1. The school should focus on helping adolescents learn to use their minds well. Schools should not attempt to be “comprehensive” if such a claim is made at the expense of the school’s central intellectual purpose.

2. The school’s goals should be simple: that each student master a limited number of essential skills and areas of knowledge. Curricular decisions should be based on thorough student mastery and achievement rather than by an effort merely to cover (subject) content areas.

3. The school’s goals should apply to all students, while the means to these goals should vary depending on the students. School practice should be customized to meet the needs of every group or class of adolescents.

4. Teaching and learning should be personalized to the maximum feasible extent. Decisions about courses of study, the use of time, and the choice of teaching materials and specific pedagogies must be placed in the hands of the principal and staff.

5. The governing practical metaphor of the school should be student-as-worker. A prominent pedagogy will be coaching, to provoke students to learn and thus to teach themselves.

6. Students should be awarded a diploma upon successful final demonstration of mastery for graduation—an “exhibition.” There is no strict age grading and no system of “credits earned” by “time spent” in class. The emphasis is on the student’s demonstration that he or she can do important things.

7. The tone of the school should stress the values of unassuming expectation (“I won’t threaten you but I expect much of you”), of trust (until abused), and of decency (the values of fairness, generosity, and tolerance).

8. The principal and teachers should perceive themselves as generalists first and specialists second.

9. Administrative/budget targets: eighty or fewer pupils per teacher, substantial time for collective planning by teachers, competitive salaries for staff, and an ultimate per-pupil-cost not to exceed that of traditional schools by more than ten percent.
Coalition of Essential Schools (Sizer)

| Goal (What are the goals of the effort)? | To redesign American schools for better learning. |
| Vision (What beliefs guide this system)? | Work is guided by "Common Principles" which schools adapt their own settings. Focus on helping adolescents learn to use their minds as well. |

**TEACHING AND LEARNING:**

| Standards and Student Outcomes | School establishes graduation goals that apply to all students. Focuses on essential skills and knowledge, with the aim of mastery and achievement rather than broad coverage. |
| Curriculum | Derived from school and its goals. Decisions about coursework and materials rest with faculty. Integration of disciplines encouraged. |
| Instruction/Classroom Organization | Emphasis on personalization of teaching and learning. 1:80 teacher-student load recommended. Student-as-worker, teacher as coach, is prominent form of instruction. |
| Student Assessment | Performance-based assessments are central to academic program. "Exhibition" recommended for graduation, rather than Carnegie units or time spent in school. |

**SYSTEM COMPONENTS:**

| Professional Development | Regional and statewide resources are available for institutes on leadership, team building, etc. |
| Organizational Structure | Schools are encouraged to simplify structure and to include substantial time for collective planning for teachers. |
| Roles and Responsibilities | Faculty members set goals and design curriculum. Teachers have multiple obligations. Shared leadership and site-based management. |
| Finance | After restructuring, school must operate at no more than 10% above budget of comparable "traditional" school. |
| System Accountability | Schools are encouraged to document progress. Developing "uncommon" measures of accountability suited to Essential Schools practices. |
| Community/Parent Involvement | Encourages schools to treat parents as essential collaborators in redesigning school programs. |
| Cross-Agency Collaboration | Collaborates with educational Commission of the States in RE: Learning, with School Development Program, Project Zero, and Education Development in ATLAS Communities Project. |
The Effective Schools Process (ESP) is a comprehensive, collegial site-based management process to improve student's academic achievement. Effective Schools affects all students regardless of abilities, cuts across all curriculum areas, and examines all areas that affect academic achievement. Everyone is involved: administrators, teachers, support staff, parents, students, and business and community leaders.

The ESP is built upon four assumptions: all children can learn, increased academic achievement is the mark of effectiveness, leadership must be building based, and school improvement plans must be tailored to the needs of the students, teachers, and administrators.

There are seven factors of Effective Schools:

1. **A sense of mission.** Each school makes a conscious decision to become an effective school. A collegial decision and commitment is made to assure minimum mastery of basic school skills for all pupils.

2. **Strong building leadership.** The principals are, in fact, the instructional leaders of the staff. They are creative, bold, supportive, and dedicated to the mission of the school. They are active and involved with all parts of the education community.

3. **High expectations for all students and staff.** Effective Schools expect teachers to teach and pupils to learn. Standards are high but realistic. No student is allowed to attain less than minimum mastery of the basic skills of the assigned level.

4. **Frequent monitoring of student progress.** Teachers and principals are constantly aware of and monitor student progress in relation to the instructional objectives.

5. **A positive learning climate.** The climate is warm and responsive, emphasizes cognitive development, is innovative, and provides a student support system.

6. **Sufficient opportunity for learning.** Effective Schools emphasize more time on task to increase learning. Implications exist for improved use of time, more individualized instruction, and sufficient curricular content.

7. **Parent/community involvement.** Effective Schools have broad support from parents and the larger education community.

The Ohio Building Leadership Model provides the direction of how to implement the ESP. This model includes formation of the principal led team, developing and conducting a needs assessment, sharing the needs assessment with the total staff, developing and implementing the action plan, and providing ongoing assessment and evaluation.
### Effective Schools Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal (What are the goals of the effort)?</th>
<th>To improve student outcomes by implementing seven Correlates of Effective Schools (clear mission, instructional leadership, safe environment, high expectations, opportunity to learn, monitoring of outcomes, parental involvement).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision (What beliefs guide this system)?</td>
<td>Effectiveness can be measured through various student outcomes that demonstrate achievement across gender and race.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHING AND LEARNING:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards and Student Outcomes</td>
<td>Begins with a clear picture of what students need to know, do, and be like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Curriculum based on standards chosen. Task analysis is conducted to ensure all students achieve at all levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/Classroom Organization</td>
<td>Task analyses, research, and best practice are used to facilitate instruction, (e.g., cooperative learning).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assessment</td>
<td>Existing methods used; recommends locally-developed, criterion-referenced, nationally validated assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYSTEM COMPONENTS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Training focused on seven Correlates of Effective Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>School viewed as most strategic unit for planned improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and Responsibilities</td>
<td>Parents, teachers, administrators, students, and community members implement program support by district, state, national policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Designed to work within existing structure at no additional cost other than professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Accountability</td>
<td>(See Roles and Responsibilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Parent Involvement</td>
<td>Parent/community involvement is one of the seven Correlates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Agency Collaboration</td>
<td>Each school develops own form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The North Central Association (NCA) School Improvement model provides a framework to help people at the local school identify their highest-priority needs for student performance gains; build an improvement plan to raise student performance, implement the plan; and document student success.

Based on the belief that all students can learn, the NCA model promotes a continuous improvement process that focuses on enhanced learning for all students. Basic characteristics of the model include:

1. The school identifies significant learner outcomes that form the basis for the school improvement plan. These outcomes are supported by data and represent complex behaviors.

2. Once learner outcomes are identified, data are further analyzed and assembled to provide a student profile relative to each identified outcome. The profile documents that learner outcomes are significant and describes current levels of student growth relative to each outcome.

3. After current levels of student growth are understood, challenging and realistic levels of student learning are determined.

4. The faculty develops a preliminary improvement plan representing the school's design for achieving desired student growth goals.

5. The school assembles a team of peers from outside the school to function as a resource to the school. The team is responsible for:
   - analyzing the student profile
   - validating that the learner outcomes are significant and appropriate for the school to address
   - identifying resources that are needed or can be directed to achieve the student outcomes
   - critiquing the preliminary improvement plan and offering suggestions for enhancement

6. The school finalizes the improvement plan and begins implementation.

7. The school documents student growth throughout the implementation of the plan.
North Central School Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal (What are the goals of the effort?)</th>
<th>To provide a framework to help school improvement teams identify and implement a plan to provide &quot;quality with equity&quot; programs that result in the success of each student.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision (What beliefs guide this system)?</td>
<td>All students can learn effectively and all teachers have or can acquire the skills necessary to teach all students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEACHING AND LEARNING:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards and Student Outcomes</th>
<th>Student outcomes are supported by a variety of data and represent complex behaviors. Ideally there would be five target areas, three cognitive outcomes, and two affective outcomes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Curricular changes are addressed through the school improvement plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/Classroom Organization</td>
<td>Teaching environment is established through strategies and interventions identified in the school improvement plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assessment</td>
<td>Based on student outcomes, the assessment provides continued feedback to the plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SYSTEM COMPONENTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher Education</th>
<th>A resource specialist guides the team and school through each phase of school improvement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>The school dedicates three to four professional development days for planning and additional time as needed during and after implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>A School Improvement Team composed of teachers, administrators, resource specialists, a student and parent work as a planning and implementation team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and Responsibilities</td>
<td>All substantive decisions made at the local level with guidance of school improvement team and input from external review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>The resource specialist, professional development, and the requirements of the plan may require financing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Accountability</td>
<td>This model promotes a continuous improvement process that focuses on enhanced learning for all students. The Outcomes Accreditation Visitation Team has both a reporting and a monitoring function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Parent Involvement</td>
<td>The mission statement guides the team in making decisions and is written by a committee composed of faculty, parents, students, and community representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Agency Collaboration</td>
<td>Local agencies provide support and resources as the plan is implemented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Ohio Community Learning Experience (OGLE) was created by the Ohio Department of Education in cooperation with Battelle Memorial Institute, as Ohio's plan for implementing New American Schools. Preliminary design work is occurring in fourteen school sites in Ohio.

The OGLE design has four processes and four essential elements which constantly interact with each other:

**Processes**                                  **Essential Elements**
Teaching and Learning                          Students
Assessment                                      Teachers
Organizational Functions                       Content
Governance                                      Context

These processes and elements have been redefined into a new system—the New American School. New relationships between and among these elements and processes will produce a fundamental shift in the schooling roles of students, teachers, and the wider community. These relationships will also blur distinctions between teachers and students, and between schools and communities. The result will be a learning experience that has as its primary purpose the mastery of learning tasks through the integration of schooling with the human and material resources available from the larger community.

The OGLE model has the following learning outcomes:

1. Each learner will demonstrate the ability to recognize, assimilate, and communicate the essential conceptual knowledge, processes, and structures of English, mathematics, science, history, geography, and other academic disciplines.

2. Each learner will demonstrate the ability to apply academic literacy to encounters and interactions within the larger society.

3. Each learner will demonstrate, at increasingly higher levels of rigor and sophistication, the literacy, problem solving, and application proficiencies necessary to continue learning successfully.

4. Each learner will demonstrate the depth of understanding in each academic discipline (English, mathematics, science, history, geography, and others) necessary to pursue personal goals (e.g., vocational, educational, social, creative, etc.).

5. Each learner will demonstrate understanding of affective, or aesthetic experiences and of how they promote a complete and well-integrated life.
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# Ohio Community Learning Experience

| Goal (What are the goals of the effort?) | New relationships between teachers, students, and the community will result in a learning experience that has as its primary purpose mastery of learning tasks through the integration of schooling with the human and material resources available in the larger community. |
| Vision (What beliefs guide this system?) | Based on 5 axioms: All students can learn; every learner possesses multiple forms of intelligence; participation in a learning community fosters intellectual, emotional and social growth; diverse instructional strategies and environments increase learning; and learning is a lifelong endeavor. |
| **TEACHING AND LEARNING:** | |
| Standards and Student Outcomes | World class standards identified by learned societies, academic and professional associations, national and international standards with benchmarks set for grades 4, 8 and 12. Five outcomes based on academic content, literacy, problem solving, application proficiencies, and aesthetic experiences. |
| Curriculum | Rigorous academic-based curriculum designed to provide contexts for learning. |
| Instruction/Classroom Organization | Collaborative learning, community based. Uses four elements (teachers, students, content, and context) and five processes (teaching/learning, assessment, organization, governance, and professional development), providing ranges of learning processes. |
| Student Assessment | Multiple assessment strategies including open-ended questions, problems and tasks, projects, portfolios of products, writings, demonstrations (including computer demonstrations), presentations, discussions, debates, investigations, models, and simulations. |

## SYSTEM COMPONENTS:

| Higher Education | An active part of the learning community. |
| Professional Development | An integral part of the lifelong learning modeling. |
| Organizational Structure | A consortium of business, government, and the educational community serves as a management council. |
| Roles and Responsibilities | All members of the learning community have shared responsibilities focused on students as workers and teachers as facilitators and catalysts. |
| Finance | Existing finances will be realigned. Initial costs can include funding for the management council which includes clerical services, time-release payments of substitutes, assessment instruments; curriculum materials; establishment of the learning community; and capital expenditures. |
| System Accountability | School-community shared ownership of and accountability for educational achievement. |
| Community/Parent Involvement | Parents and community are an integral part of the learning community. |
| Cross-Agency Collaboration | All members of the learning community are involved. |
Outcome-Based Education (Spady)

Transformational Outcome-Based Education (OBE) is designed to equip all students with the knowledge, competence, and orientations needed for them to successfully meet the challenges and opportunities they will face in their career and family lives after graduating. The OBE model was developed by Dr. William Spady, Director of the High Success Program on Outcome-Based Education.

OBE applies four key operating principles to the design, delivery, documentation, and decision-making work of schooling:

1. **Clarity of focus on outcomes of significance.** Culminating demonstrations (outcomes) become the starting point, focal point, and ultimate goal of curriculum design and instruction.

2. **Expanded opportunity and support for learning success.** Time should be used as a flexible resource rather than a predefined absolute in both the instructional design and delivery to better match differences in student learning rates. Students should have more than one chance to receive needed instruction and demonstrate success.

3. **High expectations for all to succeed.** Outcomes should represent a high level of challenge for students and all students should be expected to accomplish them eventually at high performance levels.

4. **Design down from ultimate outcomes.** Curriculum and instructional design should carefully proceed backward from culminating demonstrations (outcomes) on which everything ultimately focuses and rests.

Schools employing the OBE model will operate along these dimensions:

1. Decisions, results, and programs will no longer be defined by and limited to specific time blocks and calendar dates.

2. Grading will focus on what students can eventually learn to do well rather than on how well they do the first time they encounter something.

3. There will be a greater emphasis on collaborative models of student learning and the "success for all" principles of OBE.

4. Traditional curriculum structures will be modified to respond to differences in student needs and learning rates.

5. Teachers will focus more on the learning capabilities of their students rather than on covering the materials in a given time block.

6. Curriculum tracking will disappear and all instruction will focus on higher level learning and competencies for all students.

7. There will be far less reliance on norm-referenced standardized tests as indicators of either student or teacher accomplishment.
### Outcome-Based Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal (What are the goals of the effort)?</th>
<th>To have all students exit the system with the capabilities they will need to successfully face the challenges of our Information Age world.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision (What beliefs guide this system)?</td>
<td>The fundamental character and structure of our educational system must be transformed to enable all students to learn successfully the things that will assist them most in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHING AND LEARNING:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards and Student Outcomes</td>
<td>Locally derived and established standards for challenging, high-level outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>High level challenge for all students who pursue life-relevant issues in integrated, cross-disciplinary frameworks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/Classroom Organization</td>
<td>Highly active and challenging learning environments with flexible grouping, team-based endeavors by students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assessment</td>
<td>Authentic performances on complex tasks and projects. Portfolios of most advanced work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYSTEM COMPONENTS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Must negotiate changes in traditional college admission practices which ignore authentic outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Develop classroom leadership and technical skills that allow for complex, challenging learning environments and demonstrations by students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>Total systems integration to assist students on a continuum of self-directed improvement. Restructure rigid grouping and scheduling practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and Responsibilities</td>
<td>All staff take responsibility for program design, implementation, and continuous improvement. Collaboration is essential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Support needed for major staff development for program redesign and restructuring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Accountability</td>
<td>Schools document progress. School develops measures of accountability suited to outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Parent Involvement</td>
<td>Heavy involvement in setting direction, establishing outcomes and beliefs, and in ongoing support of student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Agency Collaboration</td>
<td>Totally integrated learning approach encourages local sites to develop many community connections/partnerships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The School Development Program (SDP) was developed in 1986 by renowned child psychiatrist Dr. James Comer as a collaborative effort between the Yale University Child Study Center and the New Haven School District. The SDP, or Comer process brings together parents, teachers, and mental health workers to create a positive social climate in schools that serve poor and minority children. Comer schools improve students' academic performance by addressing the underlying social and psychological issues that interfere with learning. Adults in children's lives—at home, school, and in the community—are asked to join together to support and nurture every child's total development so each can reach his or her full potential.

The SDP is a nine component systemic change model consisting of three mechanisms, three operations, and three guidelines. For aning positive parent-school relationships is an essential ingredient of the Comer model. It calls for three fundamental mechanisms:

1. A governance and management team representing parents, teachers, administrators, and support staff.
2. A mental or support staff team to address individual behavior problems and to consider how school practices can be changed to prevent problems.
3. A parent program to increase parental involvement.

The governance and management team carries out three critical operations: (1) the development of a Comprehensive School Plan with specific goals in the social climate and academic areas; (2) staff development activities based on building level goals in these areas and (3) periodic assessment which allows the staff to adjust the program to meet identified needs and opportunities.

Several important guidelines and agreements are needed. Participants on the governance and management team must not "rubber stamp" the leader. On the other hand, the leader cannot use the group as a "rubber stamp." While the principal usually provides leadership to the governance and management group, decisions are made by consensus to avoid "winner-loser" feelings and behavior. A "no-faults," problem-solving approach is used by all of the working groups in the school, and eventually these attitudes permeate the thinking of most individuals.

The SDP is not a quick fix or an easy solution. The Governance and Management Team plays a vital role in giving the school a sense of direction, providing communication, and allowing everyone to experience a sense of ownership in the outcome of the program. When carried out by motivated and competent people, the Comer model can produce improved academic and social achievement of students and an improved school operation.
# School Development Program

Special Focus: At-risk, urban, elementary, middle grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal (What are the goals of the effort)?</th>
<th>To bridge the gap that occurs when the attitudes, values, and behaviors children develop at home differ from those at school.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision (What beliefs guide this system)?</td>
<td>Learning/behavior problems are conflicts of class, race, income, and culture between children’s home and school environment—not the fault of children themselves. No fault, consensus, collaboration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TEACHING AND LEARNING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards and Student Outcomes</th>
<th>School designs comprehensive plan to address climate, curriculum, assessment, and professional development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Supports physical, moral, social, psychological, speech, language, cognitive, and intellectual growth of all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/Classroom Organization</td>
<td>Creates school environment in which faculty and parents engage in collaborative work to support children’s total development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assessment</td>
<td>Advocates and supports use of innovative and authentic assessments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SYSTEM COMPONENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher Education</th>
<th>Quality standards for district, university partnerships. Requires participation for teacher training improvements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Regular inservice workshops, university/district conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>Collaborative decision making, site-based management, involvement of parents and mental health team professionals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and Responsibilities</td>
<td>Parents, administrators, faculty, and mental health professionals are responsible for administering program. It is the responsibility of the system to improve student achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Only existing personnel are used, therefore only training costs are involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Accountability</td>
<td>Shared accountability involving parents, schools, communities, central administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Parent Involvement</td>
<td>Parents and broader community are key collaborators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Agency Collaboration</td>
<td>Mental health team advises teachers, works to identify and prevent behavior problems and to connect schools with community resources. Coordinated effort by mental health professionals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Success for All (Slavin)

Many at-risk children are often allowed to fall behind until they are labeled in some way—learning disabled, economically disadvantaged, or emotionally disturbed. They are then provided with remedial instruction that rarely succeeds in raising them to the level of their classmates. Success for All believes that school failure, especially reading failure, can be prevented with virtually all students, regardless of background.

Success for All is a schoolwide program for students in grades pre-K to five which reorganizes school and community resources to ensure that virtually every student will make it through the third grade at or near grade level in reading and other basic skills, and then go beyond this performance level in the later grades. The goal of Success for All is to prevent academic deficits from appearing in the first place, recognize and intensively intervene when any deficits do appear, and provide at-risk students with a rich and full curriculum to enable them to build on their firm foundation in basic skills.

Developed and initiated in 1986 by Robert Slavin, co-director, and the staff of the Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Success for All has the following basic elements:

1. **Tutors.** In grades 1-3, specially trained certified teachers work one-to-one with students who are struggling to keep up with their classmates in reading. Daily 20-minute tutoring classes are closely connected with classroom instruction.

2. **School-wide curriculum.** During reading periods, students are regrouped across age lines so that each reading class contains students at all one reading level. The program emphasizes cooperative learning activities, a combination of phonetic teaching and whole language, and a wide variety of modalities to teach reading success.

3. **Preschool and kindergarten.** The programs emphasize language development, readiness, and self-concept.

4. **Eight-Week Assessments.** Students in grades K-3 are assessed every eight weeks to determine whether they are making adequate progress in reading. This information is used to suggest alternative teaching strategies in the regular classroom.

5. **Family Support Team.** A family support team in each school works with parents and community members on issues of parent involvement, attendance, behavior problems, and health and social needs.

6. **Facilitator.** A program facilitator works with teachers to help them implement the reading program, manage the assessments, assist the family support team, improve communication, and help the staff as a whole make certain that every child is making adequate progress.
## Success for All Schools

**Special Focus: Elementary, emphasizes language arts.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal (What are the goals of the effort)?</th>
<th>To ensure that virtually every student will reach the third grade on time with adequate basic skills and build on this basis throughout the elementary grades.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision (What beliefs guide this system)?</td>
<td>Prevention, early intervention, improved classroom methods, individual attention can be used to address problems students have inside and outside classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHING AND LEARNING:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards and Student Outcomes</td>
<td>Every child enters first grade with preparation needed to succeed and complete the early grades with success in reading and other basic skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Focuses on oral language, thematic units, story telling, comprehension, and shared reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/Classroom Organization</td>
<td>90-minute reading periods, cross-grade regrouping for reading, cooperative learning, one-to-one tutoring, half-day preschool, full-day kindergarten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assessment</td>
<td>Student progress reviewed every eight weeks; revised academic plan developed based on current progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYSTEM COMPONENTS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Developed in collaboration with higher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Focus on cooperative learning, one-on-one tutoring, family support teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>Designed to operate in current structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and Responsibilities</td>
<td>Family Support Team (parent liaisons, social workers, counselors, asst. principal) focuses on parent education, parent involvement, attendance and school behavior. Facilitator works with teachers to implement the reading program, manages the assessments, and to assist the Family Support Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>May require additional elementary school staff, such as tutors, facilitator, family support coordinator, attendance aides. Combination of Chapter 1, special education, and state funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Accountability</td>
<td>School system would have the support program given additional staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Parent Involvement</td>
<td>Involves parental, other support staff such as social worker, counselor, program facilitator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Agency Collaboration</td>
<td>Collaboration encouraged through the Family Support Team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Venture Capital Grant Proposal Study
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 school building. 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 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second column, please indicate the extent to which you need additional professional development. Indicate your response by circling the appropriate number along the following continuum:

<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>

- Developing attitudes, beliefs and values that undergird school renewal.
- Encouraging personal and collective risk taking.
- Strengthening school assessment activities.
- Reallocating existing internal resources.
- Generating external resources.
- Creating a shared decision-making process.
- Promoting faculty collegiality within the building.
- Promoting critical self assessment and reflection.
- Influencing instructional quality.
- Influencing curriculum quality.
- Strengthening ties to the community.
- Encouraging professional growth activities for my staff.
- Engaging in my own professional growth activities.
Please indicate the extent to which most of your building staff agrees/disagrees that the Venture Capital Grant Proposal Process strengthened their 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>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students can learn.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners possess multiple types of intelligences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in a learning community fosters social, civic, emotional and intellectual growth.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse instructional strategies and environments enhance learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 application was 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</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Attention was diverted from other important reform efforts.</td>
<td>SA 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>SD 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Divisions arose among teachers in our building.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Divisions arose among schools in our district.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Disagreements in the community over school renewal were pointed out.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Our superintendent was supportive of the process.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Faculty leaders emerged.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Faculty perceived a greater role for me as a member of the school improvement team.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>The teachers' roles were clarified.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>The administrative roles were clarified.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>The learning community concept was clarified among staff people in my building.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>The learning community concept placed me in new leadership roles.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>A better appreciation for the shared decision-making process was developed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 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>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 = Don't know/Not applicable

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1.</td>
<td>Our Board of Education was more supportive of school renewal activities.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK/NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.</td>
<td>There was a more collegial climate in my school building.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3.</td>
<td>The school climate was more supportive of continuous school renewal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.</td>
<td>There was better dialogue among the building staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5.</td>
<td>There was better dialogue between the school and the community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6.</td>
<td>The working relationship between the building staff and the Ohio Department of Education was more supportive of continuous school renewal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7.</td>
<td>The working relationship between the building staff and the Regional Professional Development Center was more supportive of continuous school renewal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8.</td>
<td>We have been able to use Venture Capital Grant money as leverage to obtain other district monies for school renewal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9.</td>
<td>Feedback on school renewal was better between the superintendent and myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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></th>
<th>extremely valuable</th>
<th>quite valuable</th>
<th>fairly valuable</th>
<th>not very valuable</th>
<th>not valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Don't know/Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D1. Using three readers to evaluate each grant application
   1 2 3 4 5 9

D2. Involving school building teams in the interview process
   1 2 3 4 5 9

D3. Having the Ohio Department of Education's monograph "Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal"
   1 2 3 4 5 9

D4. Providing the "self-appraisal" school improvement checklist in the monograph to frame building issues.
   1 2 3 4 5 9

D5. Utilizing a five year school improvement timeline
   1 2 3 4 5 9

D6. Allowing buildings to seek waivers
   1 2 3 4 5 9

D7. Awarding every Venture Capital building an equal amount of $25,000
   1 2 3 4 5 9

D8. Having a relatively short timeline for writing the proposal
   1 2 3 4 5 9

D9. Having open-ended budget guidelines (without a budget page)
   1 2 3 4 5 9
Still thinking about the entire Venture Capital Grant Proposal Process, please indicate your level of agreement/disagreement with each of the following statements relating to the Venture Capital Grant application process, by circling the appropriate response along the same scale used earlier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Don't know/Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E1. An important option for our building staff was to choose an existing model or to develop our own model for school renewal.

E2. The technical assistance provided by the Ohio Department of Education was not helpful.

E3. The steps of the grant application were clearly identified.

E4. The purpose of the Grant application process was clear.

E5. We chose a model we believed would be likely to be funded.

E6. How appropriate/inappropriate do you think the requirement of page limits was for each section of the grant?

1. very appropriate  2. somewhat appropriate  3. not appropriate

E7. How timely do you think the process of notification was for receipt of the grant?

1. very timely  2. somewhat timely  3. not timely
E8. Were you aware that there was a Regional Professional Development Center that was available to provide technical assistance in the Grant application process?

1. yes  2. no
If no, please skip to question E11.

E9. Did you use the Regional Professional Development Center?

1. yes  2. no
If no, please skip to question E11.

E10. How helpful/not helpful was the Regional Professional Development Center in its assistance?

1. extremely helpful  2. quite helpful  3. fairly helpful  4. not very helpful  5. not helpful at all

E10a. How was the Center used? .................................................................

E11. Did the Venture Capital philosophy as defined by the Ohio Department of Education favor one level of schooling (e.g., elementary, middle, high) over another?

1. yes  2. no

E11a. If yes, which level of schooling did it favor?

1. elementary  2. middle  3. high

E11b. Why do you think this happened? .................................................................
Demographic Information
Please answer as applicable to your school building as of October, 1993.

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

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

3. How many years have you been the principal in your current building? _____

4. Highest degree attained?
   1.____ Bachelors  2.____ Masters  3.____ Doctorate  4.____other

5. Gender
   1.____ Female  2.____ Male

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

7. In what year were you born? _____

8. Approximate number of grant writing experiences you, personally, have had: _____

9. Approximate number of funded grant writing experiences you, personally, have had: _____

10. Total dollar amount received from all funded personal grant writing experiences: $______
11. If you had it to do over, would you apply for Venture Capital?

1. _____ yes 2. _____ no

Why or why not? .....................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

12. Please circle the response that best characterizes the Venture Capital Grant Proposal Process.

1. _____ I wrote the grant by myself.
2. _____ I wrote the grant with the help of a committee.
3. _____ A committee wrote the grant with my input.
4. _____ Another individual within the building wrote the grant.
5. _____ Other. Please specify who the key players in the grant writing process were and
what their relationship is to your building ..............................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

13. Student Average Daily Membership in your building as of October, 1993: _____

14. What percentage of your student body receives free or reduced lunches: _____

15. Please indicate what percentages of the following groups constitute your student body, at the time
you received funding:

1. _____ African American
2. _____ Asian American
3. _____ Caucasian
4. _____ Hispanic
5. _____ Native American
6. _____ Other
100% 

16. Number of full-time equivalent, certified teachers in your building: _____
17. Where do the children in your building live? Check all that apply.

1. _____ On a farm
2. _____ Rural, but not on a farm
3. _____ In a small city or town (under 50,000 people)
4. _____ In a medium-sized city (50,000 - 100,000)
5. _____ In a large city (100,000 - 500,000)
6. _____ In a suburb of a large city
7. _____ In a very large city (over 500,000)
8. _____ In a suburb of a very large city

18. Building level, check any that apply.

1. _____ Elementary
2. _____ Middle
3. _____ Jr. High
4. _____ High School

Comments:

Please feel free to use the space below to add any additional comments regarding the Venture Capital Grant Proposal Process:
APPENDIX C

Tables
Respondents were asked to indicate what percentages of the following groups constituted their student body at the time that first-round funded Venture Capital schools received funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>African American Percentage of Student Body</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C.1: Percentages and Frequencies of African American Students Who Were Members of the Schools' Student Body at the Time of Funding for the First-Round Funded Secondary Venture Capital Schools

The responses regarding the percentage of the student body that consisted of African-American students ranged from 0% to 97%. Ten respondents indicated that they had 0% of African-American students. The mean percentage was 14.24. In terms of percentiles, the 50th percentile fell between the 4-5 percentage values.
Table C.2: Percentages and Frequencies of Asian Students Who Were Members of the Schools’ Student Body at the Time of Funding for the First-Round Funded Secondary Venture Capital Schools

The responses regarding the percentage of the schools’ student body that was Asian-American ranged from 0% to 99%. Thirty-two respondents, or 55.2% of those responding, indicated that they had no Asian-American students. The mean percentage was 3.07. The 50th percentile corresponded to a 0% value.
Table C.3: Percentages and Frequencies of Caucasian Students Who Were Members of the Schools' Student Body at the Time of Funding for the First-Round Funded Secondary Venture Capital Schools

The responses regarding the percentage of the schools' student body that was Caucasian ranged from 0 to 100%. Two respondents indicated that they had no Caucasian students, and two indicated that 100% of their student body was Caucasian. The mean percentage was 78.53, while the 50th percentile corresponded to the 90 percentage value.
The responses regarding the percentage of schools' student body that was Hispanic ranged from 0 to 42%. Forty-three respondents indicated that they had no Hispanic students, and one indicated that 42% of their student body was Hispanic. The mean percentage was 1.67, while the 50th percentile corresponded to the zero percentage value.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native American Percentage of Student Body</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C.5: Percentages and Frequencies of Native American Students Who Were Members of the Schools' Student Body at the Time of Funding for the First-Round Funded Secondary Venture Capital Schools

The responses regarding the percentage of schools' student body that were Native-American ranged from 0-7 percent. Fifty-five respondents indicated that they had no Native-American students, and one indicated that 7% of their student body was Native-American. The mean percentage was 0.16, while the 50th percentile corresponded to the zero percentage value.
Table C.6: Percentages and Frequencies of "Other" Students Who Were Members of the Schools' Student Body at the Time of Funding for the First-Round Funded Secondary Venture Capital Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Percentage of Student Body</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses regarding the percentage of their student body that might be classified as "Other" ranged from 0-10%. Forty-eight respondents indicated that they had no students who might be classified as other, and one indicated that 10% of their student body was other. The mean percentage was 0.40, while the 50th percentile corresponded to the zero percentage value.
APPENDIX D

Letters
Dear @S

Congratulations on your building's receipt of Ohio's Venture Capital Grant! As a principal in one of the few schools 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. 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 principals in these winning schools will help us have a better understanding of the role of the principal 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

275
Dear @S

Congratulations again on your building’s receipt of Ohio’s Venture Capital Grant. Only a small number of schools in the entire state of Ohio received this grant. Because there are so few schools that displayed this level of educational excellence, it is extremely important to have a good understanding of their shared characteristics and attitudes.

We are asking the principal of each of the schools that received the Venture Capital Grant to respond. It is extremely important that you personally respond because knowledge about the opinions of the principals in these winning schools will help us have a better understanding of 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 for your assistance.

Sincerely.

Dr. Kathleen Carr
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