

INVESTIGATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF
PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS ON SITE-BASED DECISION MAKING

A Record of Study

by

SANDRA DESHON OWENS

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Chair of Committee,	Carol L. Stuessy
Co-Chair of Committee,	Dianne S. Goldsby
Committee Members,	Timothy P. Scott
	Cathleen C. Loving
Head of Department,	Yeping Li

December 2013

Major Subject: Curriculum and Instruction

Copyright 2013 Sandra Deshon Owens

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this record of study was to investigate the nature of relationships between the perceptions of principals and teachers on site-based decision making (SBDM) and to uncover patterns existing in relationships between and among state school ratings, principals' and teachers' perceptions of SBDM decision making at their schools, and school outcomes of discipline referrals and attendance percentages. The investigator chose four schools with different state school ratings as sites for investigating these relationships. Participants in the study were principals and teachers selected from four school types: Exemplary, Academically Recognized, Academically Acceptable, and Academically Unacceptable.

The research design was a non-experimental and descriptive design focused on the four selected elementary school types. The descriptive statistic of mean was used to determine the strengths of relationships between these variables. Results of the investigation identified various trends between principals' and teachers' perceptions about SBDM at their schools. Outcomes from discipline referrals and attendance percentages in the four types of schools did not show a noteworthy difference.

Overall, the data were an indication that elementary principals and teachers embrace the idea of SBDM at levels between 30% and 69% or at a higher level of 70% or above, regardless of the state's rating of school type, number of student discipline referrals, or percentage of student attendance. This was demonstrated by the vast

number of “strongly agree” and “agree” responses to survey items among the four schools with different ratings.

Using this study as a baseline, recommendation is made to conduct a study of all district schools using a more precise survey to determine the effects of principals’ and teachers’ perceptions of SBDM on student achievement. Additional recommendation is made for a study to determine whether common variables other than SBDM exists in high performing Texas elementary schools that could possibly have an impact on student achievement. Although achievement objectives and instructional activities may vary as described in a state’s curriculum, this particular research could be accomplished without regard to a particular state.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this record of study to the superintendent of the cooperating school district for allowing me to conduct my research and providing all assistance requested and to the principals in the district who are committed to ensuring that all children in their care receive the best education possible. Classroom teachers are the real heroes of today's education as they arrive daily for work to give their very best in an effort to ensure that children are provided the necessary tools to be productive in society for the long term.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As I reflect on the start of this journey, there are numerous people who influenced me along the way. My thanks to them will remain insufficient; however, I first thank God for allowing me to rely on him through faithful prayer during every step of this journey. My family and friends have been steadfast in their support and encouragement throughout this journey as well. Sadly, over the course of working on this record of study I lost my father (Oren Alfred Williams, Sr.) and two brothers (Ardre and Paul). A reminder of their belief in me as well as my ability to complete my study has supported me in their absence. My mother (Dorothy Love Williams), children (Brizhette, Branden, and Briana), remaining brothers (Charles, Harold, and Oren, Jr.) and sisters (Shirley, Elaine, Debbie, and LaNetia) provided their prayers and belief in me as well as their occasional prompting when I became overwhelmed. I am grateful for their steadfast love and encouragement. Special friends also encouraged and provided spiritual support over the years. Their heartfelt questions helped keep me focused on my goal.

I thank my committee co-chair, Dr. Dianne Goldsby for her continuous support over the past few years as I have struggled to make my way through the journey of completing my record of study. Completing this study would have been impossible without God's grace and the support of everyone involved.

NOMENCLATURE

ADA	Average Daily Attendance
AEIS	Academic Excellence Indicator System
AYP	Annual Yearly Progress
CPA	Core Practice Audit
NCEA	National Center for Educational Achievement
NCEE	National Commission on Excellence in Education
TEA	Texas Education Agency
TEAMS	Total Education Administration Management Solutions
TEC	Texas Education Code
SBDM	Site-Based Decision Making
SBOE	State Board of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
NOMENCLATURE	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Questions	6
Significance of the Study	7
Limitations of the Study	7
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW	9
CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY	14
Research Design	15
Population	15
Instrumentation	17
Data Sources	19
Procedure	20
Data Collection	21
Data Analysis	22
Summary	23
CHAPTER IV RESULTS	25
Introduction	25
Research Question One	26
Research Question Two	33
Research Question Three	40
Research Question Four	56

Research Question Five.....	57
CHAPTER V CONCLUSIONS	61
Introduction	61
Summary of Findings	62
Research Question One	64
Research Question Two	68
Research Question Three	71
Research Question Four	72
Research Question Five.....	74
Literature Based Recommendations for Practice	76
Implications for Further Study	77
Concluding Remarks	78
REFERENCES	79
APPENDIX A	84
APPENDIX B	88

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1	Principals and Teachers at Four Schools Participating in Study	17
2	Site-Based Decision Making Survey Components	18
3	Research Questions, Data, Source, Method of Collection, and Analysis	19
4	Trend Analysis of Principals' Perceptions of Site-Based Decision Making in Four Types of Schools	27
5	Trend Analysis of Teachers' Perceptions of Site-Based Decision Making at Four Types of Schools	34
6	Mean Responses Regarding Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Site-Based Decision Making at Exemplary School	42
7	Mean Responses Regarding Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Site-Based Decision Making at Recognized School	44
8	Mean Responses Regarding Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Site-Based Decision Making at Acceptable School	47
9	Mean Responses Regarding Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Site-Based Decision Making at Unacceptable School	49
10	Trends in Differences Between Principals' and Teachers' Responses on Items Regarding Their Perceptions About Site-Based Decision Making at Their School.....	51
11	Mean Responses Regarding Principals' Perceptions, Student Attendance Percentages, and Number of Discipline Referrals	57
12	Mean Responses Regarding Teachers' Perceptions, Student Attendance Percentages, and Number of Discipline Referrals	58
13	Percentage of Participants' Survey Demographics.....	59

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Educators have been rethinking and redesigning public schools to increase their effectiveness through the process known as restructuring or systemic reform (Fiske, 2005). According to Mohrman (2004), site-based decision making (SBDM) is one of the most frequently used approaches to school reform. Short and Greer (2007) cite moving decision-making control from the level of central office to the level of the individual local campus as the major objective behind the SBDM approach. Short and Greer (2007) view SBDM as a way to build relationships between school districts and school campuses; placing greater power, authority, and accountability at the school level. Also, Short and Greer (2007) believe the potential of SBDM's ability to enable comprehensive reform holds promise for schools and districts seeking to improve the education system and help students reach higher levels of achievement. Additionally, Short and Greer (2007) recommend districts ensure buy-in of all stakeholders, a well-defined vision, and the time and training for implementation before implementing SBDM.

The mandate for implementation of SBDM in all Texas school districts became effective in 1992. Site-Based Decision Making (SBDM), as defined by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) is a process for decentralizing decisions to improve the educational outcomes at every school campus through a collaborative effort by which principals, teachers, campus staff, district staff, parents, and community representatives assess educational outcomes of all students, determine goals and strategies, and ensure

that strategies are implemented and adjusted to improve student achievement (TEA, 2008).

The problems schools face are spread throughout entire school systems and will not be resolved by reverting to past conditions. School populations could be without uniform structure. Structure associated with the nuclear family and how well children do in school is necessary for schools to thrive. History confirms the repetition of social problems continuing to resurface in schools. In order to achieve success in dealing with these and many other issues both require and benefit from the involvement of all stakeholders and participants. The decision schools face is not whether to involve stakeholders but, how to involve them.

According to Bredeson (1999), empowerment of teachers, parents, and the community has been linked to effective school practices. Bredeson (1999) asserts such schools have a positive climate, commitment, professionalism, ownership of problems, and independent problem solving. Additionally, Bredeson (1999) determined within these schools was a relaxing of the hierarchical lines of governance, an increase in teacher collaboration, and willingness campus-wide for all voices to be heard. Some evidence exists that SBDM is linked with better student attendance, lower suspension rates, and lower drop-out rates (Mohrman, 2004). Myers and Stonehill (2003) contend beyond the school setting, the school board and superintendent must also be supportive of the SBDM paradigm. Principals and SBDM committees must be trusted to implement the goals of the district at the individual schools in an effective manner (Myers & Stonehill, 2003).

Guthrie (2006) suggests each school have some form of annual performance and planning report that encompasses the extent to which a school is meeting its goals, how monies are being spent, and future plans for the school. Furthermore, Myers and Stonehill (2003) proclaim training in the areas of decision-making, group dynamics, and problem solving for SBDM committee members should be provided during the early implementation stages of SBDM. The quality of a decision made by committee members may be impacted by the dynamics of the decision-making group. A review of literature revealed that group members having similar opinions, engage in less discussion, are more harmonious, and ask few questions tend to make decisions of poorer quality than groups whose members ask numerous questions, engage in discussion, and offer different opinions. Also, crucial to the decision-making process is the availability of accurate information that can be shared with all members of the decision making group in a timely manner that allows for sufficient review.

Statement of the Problem

SBDM is intended to address the need to include those people closest to the problems, issues, and situations in decision-making at the local school level (Goodman, 2004). “Although site-based management appears in many guises, at its core is the idea of participatory decision making at the school site” (David, 2006, p. 6). A Core Practice Audit (CPA) conducted by the National Center for Educational Achievement (NCEA) for the selected school district during the second semester of the 2010-2011 school year resulted in a report of findings and recommendations. The audit focused on the fundamental principles of teaching and learning as identified from the study of

consistently higher performing school systems and represented in the NCEA Core Practice Framework. Upon completion of a site visit, the review team placed 20 Critical Actions in one of three categories:

- Establishing Practices (strongest progress)
- Developing Practices (neither great strengths nor challenged areas)
- Using Leverage Points (focus of primary effort and attention)

Among the 17 elementary schools in the district, data from seven showed higher student attendance, lower suspension rates, and higher standardized test scores.

Additional comparisons provided evidence that these seven schools participated in more SBDM interventions than the remaining 10 campuses. Recommendations were made to study and share the most effective practices in use by the seven campuses.

The 1983 release of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) report, *A Nation at Risk*, prompted a widespread call for education reform (NCEE, 1983). David (1989) emphasized the goal of SBDM should empower school staff by providing authority, flexibility, and resources to solve the education problems specific to schools. This goal is supported by reform efforts of the 1980s and 1990s which focused on changes necessary for improving the quality of education; specifically, changes in organization, curriculum, and instruction. Literature supporting national reform efforts advocates modifying and intensifying teacher involvement in the decision-making process as a means to encourage needed changes within schools.

Results from the previously mentioned CPA conducted by NCEA prompted the school superintendent to assign as my internship project, a study of our campus

principals' knowledge and practice of SBDM. Data collected from online surveys and personal interviews afforded me the opportunity to identify patterns, trends of strength, and areas of need with SBDM as a means to drive instruction to meet the needs of students. Resulting data from my internship experience confirmed an imbalance among campus principals in knowledge of and active participation in SBDM that involved sharing decisions regarding curriculum and instruction. The data further helped identify current practices utilized by campus SBDM committees in the school district.

This record of study investigated the relationship between the perceptions of principals and teachers on SBDM. Perceptions of principals and teachers participating in SBDM on campuses with varying degrees of success on state measures were investigated with the intent of identifying trends among the perceptions. Completed data and analyses from the record of study will be shared initially with the district superintendent and later with campus administrators during a time determined by the Director of Elementary Education.

Purpose of the Study

Additionally, this record of study sought to uncover patterns existing in relationships between and among state school ratings, principals' and teachers' perceptions of SBDM in addition to the number of discipline referrals, and attendance percentages in four schools with different state school ratings. This exploratory study made no attempts to generalize beyond the four schools in the study. The objective was to reveal trends in principals' and teachers' responses to survey items regarding their perceptions of SBDM and its use in their schools. From these findings, the study

highlighted major discrepancies between principals' and teachers' responses. This study also served to pilot instruments and research protocols in order to determine whether a full study of all elementary schools, principals, and teachers is likely to reveal differences that have educational significance in terms of mentoring and professional development.

Research Questions

The guiding questions for this exploratory investigation were: Do consistent relationships exist between school ratings (high to low), teachers'/principals' SBDM perceptions (high to low), student discipline referrals (low to high), and attendance percentages (high to low)? Specifically, this study addressed the following questions:

1. Do state school ratings correspond to school principals' perceptions about SBDM making at their school? In what ways?
2. Do state school ratings correspond to teachers' perceptions about SBDM at their school? In what ways?
3. In what ways do principals' and teachers' perceptions about SBDM at their school agree and disagree?
4. How do principals' perceptions about SBDM at their school correspond to the schools' history (over the past three years) in two outcomes: (a) percentage of student attendance and (b) number of student discipline referrals?
5. How do teachers' perceptions about SBDM at their school correspond to the schools' history (over the past three years) in two outcomes: (a) percentage of student attendance and (b) number of student discipline referrals?

Significance of the Study

This study could determine whether learner outcomes and SBDM can be correlated, supporting the notion that school administrators need to understand the importance of staff input into decision-making at the campus level and its effects on student outcomes. If teachers feel empowered to participate in decision making, they may be more committed to the goals of education and to providing quality educational experiences to all students. Superintendents, central office administrators, principals, and other building level administrators could find the results of this study helpful when making the decision to implement SBDM in their schools.

Limitations of the Study

The size of the population in this study presented one limitation. Of the 17 elementary schools in the district, four participated in the study. As these schools may represent a different population from campuses across the district, the results may not be generalized beyond these four schools. This limitation also extends to the entire staff of principals and teachers in the school district. As a result, findings may not reflect perceptions of SBDM from the perspective of other teachers and principals on other campuses or in central office positions within the participating school district. Asking parents and additional administrators and teachers about their perspectives on SBDM could have provided additional dimensions to the study. Additionally, there is the idea that teachers might be teaching to the state assessment by which schools are rated. In Texas, superintendents, principals, and teachers are at risk of losing their jobs if their

school's standardized test scores don't meet expectations. Such practice would make it difficult to compare schools.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to review relevant literature on site-based decision making (SBDM). This includes effective implementation and characteristics, as well as the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders. The researcher reviewed literature relative to the influence that SBDM has on the functioning of the school and how SBDM influences school outcomes. Also, the researcher reviewed the principal's role and the influence that SBDM has on the role of the principal as an instructional leader. National and international research on the principal's role in SBDM is considered noteworthy and is included in a section of this review.

In a review of the literature, Kolsti and Rutherford (1991) surmised the effect of SBDM on students seldom appears. Research completed by Johnson (1991) further supports assertions that research studies have failed to identify a relationship between SBDM and student achievement. She particularly noted patterns of directionality identified in her study of middle school achievement. Specifically, in schools where students were achieving, Johnson cited a less than noteworthy difference in levels of shared decision making and central control. Most significant in the literature were reports of what was learned during implementation of SBDM at campus and district levels.

Jenni (1991) conducted a four-year longitudinal study of two Minnesota school districts in which she concluded that issues of power tend to interfere with a school's

goal of SBDM. Also, Jenni (1991) reasoned individuals in schools tend to resist change, regardless of their position. Additionally, Jenni (1991) noted activities of SBDM councils tend to be observational and discussional rather than advisory and decisional (p. 137).

Hill and Bonan (1991) conducted a study of five school systems across the nation including documentaries of additional communities which focused on the relationships between the school district, schools, and parents. These authors surmised:

- SBDM is a reform of the whole school system even though it focuses on individual schools;
- change at the school level will result if SBDM is the school system's basic strategy for reform, rather than one of several projects for reform;
- site-based managed schools that have their own unique attributes and operations are likely to develop over time;
- the balanced relationship of the district SBDM system and individual schools that represent variety, not uniformity, will require new thinking about accountability; and
- parental choice, where parents are free "to move among schools," is the ultimate means of accountability for site-managed schools.

Conley (1991) conducted a study of 14 schools in Oregon in which results revealed changes in behaviors of principals and teachers. Instead of acting as "bosses", principals in the schools exhibited behaviors reflective of developers and facilitators. This outcome resulted from the successful development of a common vision through the use of a wide array of participation. Needed resources were provided to support and achieve the goals of the vision. Managing groups were broadened through the

development of specific committees and governing groups. Teachers were encouraged in becoming authorities by way of district administration and informing the entire school community about the municipal functions of the school (needed resources, staffing, scheduling, financial allocations, etc.). Changes resulted in areas of peer relationships, job proficiency, attitude, and different roles. Also, teachers increased their effectiveness and authority, in addition to their ability to impact their school setting. Teachers commenced experiencing greater interaction and enjoyment. Their increased stamina, they speculated, seemed to impact their student-teacher relationships and instructional methods.

There was no conclusive estimate of how long it takes to establish a successful site-based managed school. Oswald (1995) suggests a commitment of three to 15 years. Research literature confirmed SBDM is not an effortless change in practice or process. Ultimately the “long-term pain” of maintaining the existing condition would be more adverse than the “short-term pain” of transformation (Patterson, 1997). Fortunately, SBDM suggests improvement in educational settings if situated prudently.

Practical application of SBDM has exhibited many positive outcomes. Utilizing SBDM resulted in increased collaboration and lowered rate of absenteeism (Nobel, Deemer, and Davis, 1996). These findings are supported in a review of 83 research studies on SBDM conducted by Leithwood and Menzies (1998). Positive effects for teachers included increased collegiality, transformation in classroom instruction, a heightened sense of power over individual work, and a sense of elevated personal responsibility. School administrators were found to take on a more supervisory role,

disseminate more information, and to have elevated personal ownership. Parents demonstrated a heightened contentment in their schools. Although the effects of SBDM appear to have boosted the comprehensive nature of the educational environment, not one of these results revealed changes in student achievement.

Odden and Wohlstetter (1995) identified two aspects significant for SBDM to increase student achievement. Initially, members on SBDM committees must have genuine authority over budget, personnel, and curriculum. Second, only changes precisely affecting teaching and learning should be introduced. These researchers cited other common attributes for successfully implementing SBDM including dissemination of authority throughout schools; continuous professional development for teachers; construction of knowledge base, and effective leadership willing to delegate responsibility. Successful schools were also more proactive in identifying resources for teachers and seeking grants (Wohlstetter & Mohrman, 1996). Less successful schools were inclined to focus on authority and management issues (Holloway, 2000; Odden & Wohlstetter, 1995) and had inadequate systems of communication, often resulting in erroneous information (Wohlstetter & Mohrman, 1996).

David (2006) maintains the ultimate goal of all SBDM efforts should be to improve student achievement. He further states curriculum and learning issues as well as assessment of progress toward district and school learning goals should be optimum. Schools should be cognizant of the needed effort to connect decisions with developing conditions that maximize student learning opportunities despite the fact not all issues discussed may appear to have an explicit effect on student learning (David, 2006).

Jenni (1991) echoed the views of many authors noting teachers' reluctance to accept unfamiliar roles as decision makers in the SBDM process, as they view the principal as the authority and their fundamental role in the classroom. Continuous training is crucial in the success of SBDM programs although often nonexistent. Decision making and accountability roles are often unclear, with the principal rather than the SBDM team shouldering the fundamental responsibility. In order for the SBDM group to serve a real function, responsibility for decisions must dwell within the goals of the SBDM group. Parameters for SBDM teams must be clearly outlined with explicit purpose and direction established.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The guiding question for this exploratory investigation was: Do consistent relationships exist between school ratings (high to low), teachers'/principals' site-based decision making (SBDM) perceptions (high to low), student discipline referrals (low to high), and attendance percentages (high to low)? Specifically, this study addressed the following questions:

1. Do state school ratings correspond to school principals' perceptions about SBDM at their school? In what ways?
2. Do state school ratings correspond to teachers' perceptions about SBDM at their school? In what ways?
3. In what ways do principals' and teachers' perceptions about SBDM at their school agree and disagree?
4. How do principals' perceptions about SBDM at their school correspond to the schools' history (over the past three years) in two outcomes: (a) percentage of student attendance and (b) number of student discipline referrals?
5. How do teachers' perceptions about SBDM at their school correspond to the schools' history (over the past three years) in two outcomes: (a) percentage of student attendance and (b) number of student discipline referrals?

Methods used to answer these questions in terms of collecting and analyzing data are discussed in this chapter. Discussion includes: procedure, research design, population, instrumentation, data sources, data collection, and data analysis.

Research Design

A non-experimental, descriptive research design was used for this study, with data collected using an online survey completed by principals and teachers in four elementary schools using SBDM. Using a Likert-style scale, principals and teachers were asked to respond to a list of statements regarding their perceptions about SBDM. A short demographic survey requested information to determine each participant's campus role (principal or teacher), number of years in present position, and number of years at present campus.

Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) suggest using a quantitative design when the research objective is to test theories or hypotheses, gather descriptive information or examine relationships among variables. Such variables are measured and produce numeric data that can be analyzed statistically. Quantitative data have the potential to provide measurable evidence, help establish trends, determine probable cause and effect, and provide insight into a wide range of experiences (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). Descriptive surveys are typically utilized for qualitative approaches.

Population

Table 1 shows the number of principals and teachers at four schools participating in the study. The population defined in this study included elementary school principals (including assistants) and teachers in four schools practicing SBDM. Principals were included in the population if they were full-time employees assigned to the same building on a full-time basis. Also, teachers were included in the population based on full-time employment on a single campus. First year teachers were excluded from

participation because of their lack of experience with SBDM. Para-professionals were also excluded from the population.

Participants were selected from campuses with Texas Education Agency (TEA) academic ratings of Exemplary, Recognized, Acceptable, and Unacceptable (see TEA, 2008). Of the 211 respondents, 26.5% (n=53) were from a campus rated Unacceptable; 26.6% (n=54) were from a campus rated Acceptable; 21.8% (n=43) were from a campus rated Recognized; and 25.1% (n=50) were from a campus rated Exemplary. Of the 211 participants in the study, 94.79% (n=200) were teachers, while 5.21% (n=11) were principals. For the purpose of this study, high performing campuses were campuses receiving an Exemplary or Recognized rating. The investigator decided to select principals at high and low performing schools to include all perspectives and obtain a full picture that could be communicated regarding the participants' relevant construction of reality (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993).

Additional demographic data collected from respondents included years of experience, years at present school, and campus name. Respondents were asked to select a range representing their years as a teacher or administrator. Of the 211 total participants, 2.8% (n=6) were in their role for the first year, 10.9% (n=23) had been in their role 1-3 years, 38.4% (n=81) had been in their role for 4-10 years, 33.2% (n=70) had been in their role for 11-20 years, and 14.7% (n=31) had been in their role for more than 20 years. Also, respondents were asked to select a range representing the number of years at their present school. Of the 211 participants, 9% (n=19) were on campus for the first year, 21.3% (n=45) were on campus from 1-3 years, 20.5% (n=106) were on

campus from 4-10 years, 17.1% (n=36) were on campus from 11-20 years, and 2.4% (n=5) were on campus for more than 20 years. Of the 211 participants, 26.5% (n=56) were from a campus rated Unacceptable, 25.1% (n=53) were from a campus rated Exemplary, 26.5% (n=56) were from a campus rated Acceptable, and 21.8% (n=46) were from a campus rated Recognized.

Table 1

Principals and Teachers at Four Schools Participating in Study

<i>School Rating</i>	<i>Principals at School</i>	<i>% Responding to Survey</i>	<i>Teachers at School</i>	<i>% Responding to Survey</i>
Exemplary	3	100	51	98
Recognized	3	100	43	100
Acceptable	2	100	56	96
Unacceptable	3	100	55	96
<i>Total</i>	11	100	205	98

Instrumentation

Table 2 shows contents by section and type of item included in the survey. The instrument used in this research was a survey developed from a chart by Duke, Showers, and Imber (in Purkey & Smith, 1993) that showed categories of decisions made within a school that could jointly involve teachers and administrators. Respondents were asked to rate items based on their perceptions about SBDM on their campuses. Content validity was established by having three non-participating principals examine the scale to evaluate the included items, determine whether or not each item was helpful for

SBDM information and whether the words reflected enough specificity to avoid confusion. Survey items were drawn from a review of related research literature and considered to be representative of the types of decision making that may be used in typical school settings. The survey consisted of 37 items. Using a Likert-style scale, principals and teachers were asked to respond to a list of statements regarding their perceptions about SBDM. Response choices for each survey item included “strongly disagree”, “disagree”, “agree”, and “strongly agree”.

Survey items were divided into four categories: Perceptions of SBDM (items 1-12), Involvement (items 13-16), Areas of Decision Making (items 17-33) and Demographic Data (items 34-37; see Appendix A). In sections one, two, and three, respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with statements about SBDM. In section four, participants were asked to indicate their role, number of years as a principal or teacher, number of years at present campus, and campus name. Elements of the survey were forced-choice items and Likert-style items. Validation was achieved by applying a Cronbach's alpha test to the initial sample group.

Table 2

Site-Based Decision Making Survey Components

<i>Survey Section</i>	<i>Contents of Survey</i>	<i>Item Type</i>	<i>Number of Items</i>
Section One	Perceptions of SBDM	Likert-style Forced Choice	12
Section Two	Involvement	Likert-style Forced Choice	4
Section Three	Areas of Decision Making	Likert-style Forced Choice	17
Section Four	Demographic	Forced Choice	4

Data Sources

Table 3 lists research questions, data, sources, methods of collection, and analysis. In order to answer the five research questions, data pertaining to school ratings were derived from the Texas Education Agency (TEA). A Likert-style online survey was used to obtain principals' and teachers' perceptions of site-based decision making (SBDM) and demographic data. Discipline and attendance data were extracted from the Total Education Administration Management Solutions (TEAMS) data base.

Table 3

Research Questions, Data, Source, Method of Collection, and Analysis

<i>Research Questions</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Method of Collection</i>	<i>Analysis</i>
1,2	State school ratings	Texas Education Agency (TEA)	TEA Data base	Mean
1	Principals' perceptions of SBDM	Likert-style survey	Online	Mean
2	Teachers' perceptions of SBDM	Likert-style survey	Online	Mean
3	Principals' and teachers' perceptions of SBDM	Likert-style survey	Online	Mean
4a, 4b	Principals' perceptions of SBDM	Likert-style survey	Online	Mean
4a	Student attendance	Total Education Administrative Management Solution (TEAMS)	School district TEAMS data base	Mean
4b	Discipline referrals	TEAMS	School district TEAMS data base	Mean
5a, 5b	Teachers' perceptions of SBDM	Likert-style survey	Online	Mean

Table 3 Continued

<i>Research Questions</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Method of Collection</i>	<i>Analysis</i>
5a	Student attendance	TEAMS	School district TEAMS data base	Mean
5b	Discipline referrals	TEAMS	School district TEAMS data base	Mean
Demographic Data	Principals	Likert-style survey	Online	Mean
Demographic Data	Teachers	Likert-style survey	Online	Mean

Procedure

November 2012, the link to the SBDM survey was distributed electronically to principals on each of the four designated school campuses. The survey was divided into four sections. Section one (perceptions of SBDM) required respondents to indicate their level of agreement with several statements about SBDM. Section two (involvement) asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with four statements about teachers' and administrators' involvement in SBDM at their school. Section three (areas of decision making) required respondents to indicate the degree in which information is shared on their campus. In section four (demographic information), respondents were asked to indicate their role on campus; number or years in their present role; number of years at their present campus; and name of their present campus. Data collection resulted with completed surveys from 211 respondents (see Appendix B).

Data Collection

Participant selection was purposeful through a specific population and limited to principals and teachers at four elementary school campuses. Participants were contacted initially via letter which explained the nature of the research and why the investigator sought their participation. Identification of participants resulted from state school ratings and experience with SBDM. Initially, four campuses were selected based on having an average of one of four academic ratings from the TEA. Letters were mailed first to the superintendent requesting permission to conduct the campus surveys. Principals of each of the four campuses received letters requesting permission to conduct surveys on each of their campuses. Teachers were sent letters of invitation to participate after approval was received at the campus level. The letters of invitation explained the importance and purpose of the survey and included assurances that participant names and names of schools would not be reported or identified. The survey was made available electronically to principals and teachers in the participating schools with three weeks for completion. Participants received an email with a link to the survey and instructions for completion. A reminder was sent to principals two weeks after the first email with the link to the survey. All participants were advised of the voluntary nature of the study with the completion of the online survey as evidence of their willingness to participate (see Appendix B).

Data were collected online using Kwiksveys.com. Survey items included four categories: Perceptions about SBDM (items 1-12), Involvement (items 13-16), Areas of Decision Making (items 17-33) and Demographic Data. Responses from

participating principals and teachers were imported to an Excel spreadsheet then organized according to survey categories. Mean responses from principals who strongly agreed and/or agreed with survey statements regarding perceptions about SBDM and mean responses of teachers who strongly agreed and/or agreed with survey statements regarding perceptions about SBDM are displayed in tables that are included in this study.

Data Analysis

Responses from the survey were electronically tabulated online from QuickSurveys.com. Resulting data were transferred to an Excel spreadsheet and organized based on roles of respondents. Patton (1990) cited the “purpose of classifying qualitative data for analysis is to facilitate the search for patterns and themes within a particular setting or across cases” (p. 384). To answer Research Question One and Two “Do state school ratings correspond to school principals’ perceptions about SBDM at their school? In what ways?”, and “Do state school ratings correspond to teachers’ perceptions about SBDM at their school? In what ways?” the investigator applied descriptive statistic of mean to calculate the three-year average state rating for each school using the following scale: Exemplary (4), Recognized (3), Acceptable (2), and Unacceptable (1). Responses indicating principals’ and teachers’ perceptions were analyzed based on a four-item Likert-scale with choice responses of Strongly Agree (3), Agree (2), Disagree (1), and Strongly Disagree (0). Principals’ and teachers’ response data were compared using the same descriptive statistics. Both data sets were compared to determine correspondence.

The investigator used a four-item Likert-scale with choice responses of Strongly Agree (3), Agree (2), Disagree (1), and Strongly Disagree (0) for Research Question Three “In what ways do principals’ and teachers’ perceptions about SBDM at their school agree and disagree?” Descriptive statistic of mean were applied to principals’ and teachers’ survey responses with resulting data analyzed then compared to determine areas of agreement and disagreement. To answer Research Question Four and Five, “How do principals’ perceptions about SBDM at their school correspond to the schools’ history (over the past three years) in two outcomes: (a) student attendance and (b) number of student discipline referrals?”, and “How do teachers’ perceptions about SBDM at their school correspond to the schools’ history (over the past three years) in two outcomes: (a) percentage of student attendance and (b) number of student discipline referrals?” the investigator applied and analyzed descriptive statistics of mean and percent for the dependent variables, number of student discipline referrals and percent of student attendance. Principals’ and teachers’ perceptions were analyzed then compared using the same descriptive statistics to determine correspondence.

Summary

SBDM has been fundamental to education reform in the United States, being enforced in nearly thirty-three percent of the nation’s school districts between late 1980s and early 1990s (Holloway, 2000; Ogawa & White, 1994). Over time SBDM has received varied reviews as a reform strategy. Research acknowledges various ways SBDM can be implemented due to its complicated nature. Additional consideration of

this education reform initiative is fitting. It is important to note that the principal is pivotal for successful implementation of SBDM. The principal's role changes most under SBDM. This record of study was based on principal perceptions and practices in SBDM and compiled using a survey of principals and teachers.

This chapter described the methodology that was used to investigate the relationship between the implementation of SBDM and successful school practices. The investigator designed a descriptive research study, developing and administering a survey to a population of principals and teachers in four elementary schools with different state ratings. The investigator analyzed data using descriptive statistics as appropriate to answer questions.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this investigation was to uncover patterns of relationships between and among state school ratings, principals' and teachers' perceptions of site-based decision making (SBDM) at their schools, and school outcomes of discipline referrals and attendance percentages in four schools with different state school ratings. There is the idea that teachers might be teaching to the state assessment by which schools are rated. In Texas, superintendents, principals, and teachers are at risk of losing their jobs if their school's standardized test scores don't meet expectations. Such practice would make it difficult to compare schools. This chapter is organized according to research questions posed in Chapter One and Chapter Three. The guiding question framed five research questions for this study. Guiding Question: Do consistent relationships exist between school ratings (high to low), teachers'/principals' SBDM perceptions (high to low), student discipline referrals (low to high), and attendance percentages (high to low)? Specifically, this study addressed the following questions:

1. Do state school ratings correspond to school principals' perceptions about SBDM at their school? In what ways?
2. Do state school ratings correspond to teachers' perceptions about SBDM at their school? In what ways?
3. In what ways do principals' and teachers' perceptions about SBDM at their school agree and disagree?

4. How do principals' perceptions about SBDM at their school correspond to the schools' history (over the past three years) in two outcomes: (a) percentage of student attendance and (b) number of student discipline referrals?
5. How do teachers' perceptions about SBDM at their school correspond to the schools' history (over the past three years) in two outcomes: (a) percentage of student attendance and (b) number of student discipline referrals?

Research Question One

Results of principals' perceptions of SBDM in four types of schools are reported in Table 4. In order to determine whether state school ratings correspond to school principals' perceptions about SBDM at their school and in what ways, the investigator designed an instrument in which principals responded to 12 statements regarding SBDM. The instrument requested responses in the form of a four-item Likert-scale with choice responses of Strongly Agree (3), Agree (2), Disagree (1), and Strongly Disagree (0). The descriptive results of each item used in the Perceptions portion of the survey are discussed in this section.

Table 4

Trend Analysis of Principals' Perceptions of Site-Based Decision Making at Four Types of Schools ($N = 11$)

Survey Item	Exemplary ($n = 3$)	Recognized ($n = 3$)	Acceptable ($n = 2$)	Unacceptable ($n = 3$)
1. SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding operations.	2.56	2.39	3.00	2.83
2. SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the staff.	2.81	2.44	2.02	2.97
3. Enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased.	3.00	2.66	3.00	2.44
4. Adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration.	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.73
5. SBDM has resulted in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods of school administration.	3.00	2.90	2.05	2.97
6. SBDM is an efficient means of school administration.	2.93	3.00	2.66	1.80
7. The collegiality between teachers and staff and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM.	3.00	2.90	2.90	1.58
8. Administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM.	2.24	2.25	1.33	2.62
9. Teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires.	2.79	2.66	2.37	2.64

Table 4 Continued

Survey Item	Exemplary (<i>n</i> = 3)	Recognized (<i>n</i> = 3)	Acceptable (<i>n</i> = 2)	Unacceptable (<i>n</i> = 3)
11. Teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes.	2.74	2.43	2.43	2.64

Note. *n* = number of respondents.

It is important to note that neither the Texas Education Agency (TEA) nor the State Board of Education (SBOE) has any rule-making authority in the area pertaining to SBDM. It is the responsibility of each school district to interpret and implement the provisions of the Texas Education Code (TEC) in a manner consistent with the statute that will best serve the school district's unique characteristics (TEA, 2008). Diversity in interpretation and implementation of SBDM are reflected in principals' perceptions. The high and low performing schools echo differences in the decision-making process. Respondents provided information proportionate to their perspectives and experiences in the decision-making process. Responses were compared resulting in noticeable trends as a result of using SBDM including wider staff participation (item 5), introduction of different school practices (item 6), improved collegiality (item 8), consideration of new ideas (item 11), and more commitment to school outcomes (item 12).

Principals from schools rated acceptable and unacceptable (mean responses 3.00 and 2.83) perceived SBDM as providing a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations (item 1) as opposed to principals from exemplary and

recognized schools (mean responses 2.56 and 2.39) who were not as agreeable to this approach. Survey item two indicated a greater discrepancy in agreement with a 3.00 mean principal response from exemplary and recognized campuses in favor of using SBDM when generating new ideas; however, only a mean response of 2.37 from principals at the campus rated acceptable and a mean response of 2.15 from principals at the campus rated unacceptable strongly agreed or agreed. To the contrary, a mean response of 3.00 from respondents at campuses rated exemplary and acceptable noted decreased enthusiasm for SBDM (item 4) whereas agreement was much lower (mean responses 2.66 and 2.44) for respondents at campuses rated recognized and unacceptable. Survey item five resulted in a mean response of 3.00 from respondents at three of four campuses strongly agreeing or agreeing SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration.

Differences between respondents' agreement with SBDM resulting in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods (item 6) were statistically noteworthy. Schools rated exemplary (mean response 3.00), recognized (mean response 3.00), and unacceptable (mean response 2.97) indicated a large discrepancy compared to the campus rated recognized (mean response 2.08). Both high performing campuses (exemplary, mean response 2.93 and recognized, mean response 3.00) strongly agreed or agreed SBDM is an efficient means of school administration (item 7), whereas a mean response of 2.66 from respondents on the campus rated acceptable and only a mean response of 1.80 from the campus rated unacceptable shared this belief.

The campus rated unacceptable showed a markedly low mean response of 1.58 that collegiality between teachers and staff and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM (item 8) as compared to the campuses rated exemplary (mean response 3.00), recognized (mean response 2.90), and acceptable (mean response 2.90). Survey item nine regarding the option of using SBDM, resulted in noteworthy differences of agreement with a mean response of 2.24 from campuses rated exemplary and recognized; a mean response of 2.62 from the campus rated unacceptable, and a mean response of 1.33 from the campus rated acceptable. It is notable that respondents averaged a high mean response indicating principals strongly agreed or agreed SBDM provided a good approach for making routine decisions (item 1); resulted in wider staff participation (item 5); is an efficient means of school administration (item 7); should be used when generating new ideas (item 2), and has improved collegiality (item 8); however, had a noteworthy low mean response from principals agreeing SBDM should be optional (item 9).

Only the campus rated acceptable had a noticeable difference (mean response 2.37) in response to teachers and staff being willing to accept responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires (item 10). Respondents on campuses rated exemplary (mean response 2.76), recognized (mean response 2.90), and acceptable (mean response 3.00) agreed strongly or agreed that shared decision making allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision (item 11) as opposed to the campus rated unacceptable in agreement with a mean response of 2.38. Survey item twelve (teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more

committed to school outcomes) showed less than noteworthy differences among campuses (mean responses 2.74, 2.43, 2.43, and 2.64). It is somewhat surprising that the campus rated unacceptable had low means of agreement regarding the effects of SBDM; however, principals responded with a positive outlook on its possibilities.

Principals from schools rated exemplary and recognized strongly agreed or agreed with more survey items regarding SBDM than principals from schools rated acceptable and unacceptable. Principals from schools rated acceptable and unacceptable strongly disagreed or disagreed with more survey items than principals from schools rated exemplary and recognized. Principals from the school rated exemplary strongly agreed or agreed with more survey items than principals from the school rated recognized. Principals from the school rated acceptable strongly agreed or agreed with more survey items than principals from the school rated unacceptable.

Survey responses from low rated schools (acceptable and unacceptable) that addressed SBDM being used to generate new ideas (item 2); not relieving the principal of accountability (item 3); resulting in different practices than could have been possible under traditional methods (item 6); collegiality between teachers, staff and administrators (item 8), and administrators, teachers, and staff having the option of using SBDM (item 9) had extremely low values that were very different from data values for schools rated exemplary and recognized. These survey items focused on the principal's role in the decision making process. Survey item one (SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations.); item three (SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the

staff.); item seven (SBDM is an efficient means of school administration.), and item eleven (SBDM allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision.) shared no commonality in responses among the four types of schools.

Principals from the school rated exemplary strongly agreed or agreed to all survey items except item one (SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations.), and item nine (Administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM.). Both survey items focused on structure rather than flexibility in decision making. Principals from the school rated recognized strongly agreed or agreed with six of the twelve survey items: 2) SBDM should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year; 5) Adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration; 6) SBDM has resulted in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods of school administration; 7) SBDM is an efficient means of school administration; 8) The collegiality between teachers, staff, and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM, and 11) SBDM allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision. These survey items focused on the principal's role as an effective leader in the SBDM process. The remaining six survey items: 1) SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations; 3) SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the staff; 4) Enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased; 9) Administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM; 10) Teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using

SBDM requires, and 12) Teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes, received responses of strongly disagree or disagree. This group of survey items focused on SBDM as a process.

Schools with higher ratings (exemplary and recognized) strongly agreed or agreed SBDM should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year (item 2), and SBDM is an efficient means of school administration (item 7). On the contrary, principals from schools rated acceptable and unacceptable strongly disagreed or disagreed with these survey items. Both survey items focused on the aspect of problem solving in shared decision making. Principals from schools rated acceptable and unacceptable strongly agreed or agreed SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations (item 1); however, principals from schools rated exemplary and recognized strongly disagreed or disagreed with the same survey items. Overall results show a decrease in principals' mean responses from schools rated acceptable and unacceptable as the focus of survey items changed from SBDM as a process in shared decision making to SBDM implementation and involvement.

Research Question Two

Trend analyses of teachers' perceptions in four types of schools are reported in Table 5. In order to determine whether state school ratings correspond to school teachers' perceptions about site-based decision making (SBDM) at their school and in what ways, the investigator utilized the same instrument in which principals responded to 12 statements regarding SBDM. The survey instrument requested responses in the

form of a four-item Likert-scale with choice responses of Strongly Agree (3), Agree (2), Disagree (1), and Strongly Disagree (0). The descriptive results of teachers' perceptions of SBDM are discussed in this section.

Table 5

Trend Analysis of Teachers' Perceptions of Site-Based Decision Making at Four Types of Schools (N = 200)

Survey Item	Exemplary (n = 50)	Recognized (n = 43)	Acceptable (n = 55)	Unacceptable (n = 52)
1. SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations.	2.06	2.50	3.00	3.00
2. SBDM should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year.	2.24	3.00	2.43	2.00
3. SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the staff.	2.80	2.54	2.52	2.57
4. Enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased.	3.00	2.54	3.00	2.00
5. Adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration.	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00
6. SBDM has resulted in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods of school administration.	3.00	3.00	2.52	3.00
7. SBDM is an efficient means of administration.	2.00	3.00	2.56	2.80

Table 5 Continued

8. The collegiality between teachers and staff and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM.	2.90	3.00	3.00	1.75
9. Administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM.	2.54	2.50	2.43	2.52
10. Teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires.	2.42	2.76	2.00	2.76
11. Shared decision making allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision.	2.56	3.00	2.80	2.80
12. Teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes.	2.34	3.00	2.52	2.74

Note. n = number of respondents.

Teachers from schools rated acceptable and unacceptable (mean response 3.00) perceived SBDM as providing a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations (item 1) as opposed to teachers from campuses rated exemplary and recognized (mean responses 2.06 and 2.50) who were not as accepting of this statement. Survey item two shows a discrepancy in agreement with a 3.00 mean response from teachers on the campus rated recognized in favor of using SBDM when generating new ideas; however, only a mean response of 2.24 of teachers from the campus rated exemplary, a mean response of 2.43 of teachers from the campus rated acceptable, and a mean response of 2.00 of respondents from the campus rated unacceptable strongly agreed or agreed.

A precise mean response of 3.00 for respondents at exemplary and acceptable campuses noted decreased enthusiasm for SBDM whereas agreement was much lower (mean responses 2.54 and 2.00) for respondents at campuses rated recognized and unacceptable. Survey item five resulted in a mean response of 3.00 for respondents from three campuses strongly agreeing or agreeing SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration. Respondents from the campus rated unacceptable were in agreement with a mean response of 2.00. Differences between respondents' agreement with SBDM resulting in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods (item 6) were statistically noteworthy. Schools rated exemplary (mean response 3.00), recognized (mean response 3.00), and unacceptable (mean response 3.00) indicated an isolated discrepancy from the campus rated recognized (mean response 2.52). Only a mean response of 2.00 from teachers on the campus rated exemplary strongly agreed or agreed SBDM is an efficient means of school administration, whereas a mean response of 3.00 from respondents on the campus rated recognized, (mean response 3.00) of respondents on the campus rated acceptable, and a mean response of 2.80 from respondents on the campus rated unacceptable strongly agreed or agreed with this statement.

The campus rated unacceptable shows a markedly low mean response (1.75), agreeing collegiality between teachers and staff and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM (item eight) as compared to the campuses rated exemplary (mean response 2.90), recognized (mean response 3.00), and acceptable (mean response 3.00). Survey item nine regarding the option of using SBDM, resulted in noteworthy

differences of agreement with mean responses of 2.54 and 2.50 from campuses rated exemplary and recognized; a mean response of 2.52 from the campus rated unacceptable, and a mean response of 2.43 from the campus rated acceptable. It is notable that a high mean response indicated respondents strongly agreed or agreed SBDM provided a good approach for making routine decisions (item 1); resulted in wider staff participation (item 5); is an efficient means of school administration (item 7); should be used when generating new ideas (item 2), and has improved collegiality (item 8).

Only responses from the campus rated acceptable had a noticeable mean difference (2.00) in response to teachers and staff being willing to accept responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires (item 10). Respondents on campuses rated recognized (mean response 3.00), acceptable (mean response 2.80), and unacceptable (mean response 2.80) agreed strongly or agreed that shared decision making allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision (item 11) as opposed to the campus rated exemplary in agreement having a mean response of 2.76. Survey item twelve resulted in one outstanding difference among campuses strongly agreeing or agreeing teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes (respective mean responses 3.00, 2.74, 2.52).

Teachers from schools rated exemplary and recognized strongly agreed or agreed with more survey items regarding SBDM than teachers from schools rated acceptable and unacceptable. Teachers from schools rated acceptable and unacceptable strongly

disagreed or disagreed with more survey items than teachers from schools rated exemplary and recognized. Teachers from the school rated exemplary strongly agreed or agreed with more survey items than teachers from the school rated recognized. Teachers from the school rated unacceptable strongly agreed or agreed with one more survey item than teachers from the school rated acceptable. Survey responses from the school rated unacceptable that addressed collegiality between teachers, staff, and administrators (item 8), had an extremely low value (mean response 1.75) compared to schools rated exemplary, recognized, and acceptable. Survey responses from schools rated low (acceptable and unacceptable) that addressed SBDM being used to generate new ideas (item 2); SBDM as an efficient means of school administration (item 7), and teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes (item 12), had no commonality in responses among the four types of schools.

Teachers from schools rated exemplary and recognized rated survey item one (SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations.) low; however, this same item was rated high by both acceptable and unacceptable schools. Survey item six (SBDM has resulted in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods of school administration.) was also rated high by respondents from schools rated exemplary, recognized, and unacceptable. Both survey items focused on teachers' perceptions of the principal's role in the decision making process. Only respondents at the school rated exemplary rated item three (SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision

making is shared with the staff.) high. This survey item focused on accountability of the principal as leader in the shared decision making process. Teachers from the school rated recognized rated item two (SBDM should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year.) high, whereas the remaining schools rated this item somewhat lower. This survey item focused on teachers' perceptions of problem solving as a component in shared decision making.

Survey item one (SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school.) was scored low by teachers from schools rated exemplary and recognized; however, teachers from the school rated exemplary rated this item lowest. This particular survey item focused on teachers' perception of SBDM as a process for decision making. Teachers from schools rated unacceptable rated survey item one (SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations.); six (SBDM has resulted in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods of school administration.); seven (SBDM is an efficient means of school administration.), and eleven (Shared decision making allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision.) high; however, item two (SBDM should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year); four (Enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased); five (Adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration.); eight (The collegiality between teachers, staff, and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM.), and nine (Administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM) were rated low. Item eight had a noteworthy low rating of

1.75 and item nine was rated low by respondents from all four schools. These survey items focused on teachers' perceptions of the principal's role as an efficient leader in the SBDM process.

Teachers from schools rated acceptable and unacceptable responded with high ratings for survey item one (SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations.); six (SBDM has resulted in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods of school administration.); seven (SBDM is an efficient means of school administration.), and eleven (SBDM allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision.). These survey items focused on teachers' perceptions of the principal's role as an effective leader in the SBDM process. Overall results showed common response rates to item six (SBDM has resulted in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods of school administration.); eight (The collegiality between teachers, staff, and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM.); nine (Administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM), and item eleven (Shared decision making allows for ideas to be considered when making a decision.). These survey items also addressed teachers' perceptions of the principal's role as an effective leader in the SBDM process.

Research Question Three

Mean responses regarding principals' and teachers' perceptions of SBDM from the school rated Exemplary are reported in Table 6. An asterisk (*) is used to indicate differences of $>$ or $=$ to 0.25. Item 15 was reversed scored because of its negative

response. In order to determine ways principals' and teachers' perceptions about SBDM at their school agree and disagree, the investigator designed an instrument in which principals responded to twelve statements regarding perceptions about SBDM with an additional four statements regarding involvement in SBDM. The instrument requested responses in the form of a four-item Likert-scale with choice responses of Strongly Agree (3), Agree (2), Disagree (1), and Strongly Disagree (0).

Concerning ways principals' and teachers' perceptions about SBDM at their school agree, both strongly agreed enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased (item 4); adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration (item 5); SBDM has resulted in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods of school administration (item 6), and teachers and staff are given the opportunity to have input into most decisions made at this school (item 16).

Principals and teachers strongly agreed or agreed SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations (item 1); SBDM should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year (item 2); SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the staff (item 3); SBDM is an efficient means of school administration (item 7); the collegiality between teachers and staff and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM (item 8); administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM (item 9); teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires (item 10); shared decision making allows for new ideas to be considered when making a

decision (item 11); teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes; (item 12) building administrators share most decisions with teachers and staff (item 14), and teachers and staff are seldom consulted before most decisions are made (item 15).

Table 6

Mean Responses Regarding Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Site-Based Decision Making at Exemplary School

Survey Item	Principals	Teachers
1. SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations.	2.56*	2.06
2. SBDM should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year.	3.00*	2.24
3. SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the staff.	2.81	2.80
4. Enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased.	3.00	3.00
5. Adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration.	3.00	3.00
6. SBDM has resulted in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods of school administration.	3.00	3.00
7. SBDM is an efficient means of school administration.	3.93*	2.00
8. The collegiality between teachers and staff and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM.	3.00	2.90
9. Administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM.	2.24	2.54*
10. Teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires.	2.79*	2.42
11. Shared decision making allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision.	2.76	2.56

Table 6 Continued

Survey Item	Principals	Teachers
12. Teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes.	2.74*	2.34
13. Teachers and staff members have input into most decisions made in this school.	2.50*	2.20
14. Building administrators share most decisions with teachers and staff.	2.50*	2.00
15. Teachers and staff are seldom consulted before most decisions are made.	2.40*	2.10
16. Teachers and staff are given the opportunity to have input into most decisions made at this school.	3.00	3.00

Note. * Differences of > or = to 0.25.

Mean responses regarding principals' and teachers' perceptions of SBDM from the school rated Recognized are reported in Table 7. An asterisk (*) is used to indicate differences of > or = to 0.25. Item 15 was reversed scored. Principals and teachers strongly agreed SBDM should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year (item 2); adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration (item 5); SBDM has resulted in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods of school administration (item 6); SBDM is an efficient means of school administration (item 7); collegiality between teachers and staff and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM (item 8); shared decision making allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision (item 11); teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes (item 12);

teachers and staff members have input into most decisions made in this school (item 13); building administrators share most decisions with teachers and staff (item 14), and teachers and staff are given the opportunity to have input into most decisions made at this school (item 16).

Areas in which principals and teachers agreed included SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations (item 1); SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the staff (item 3); enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased (item 4); administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM (item 9), and teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires (item 10). Fewer principals than teachers agreed teachers and staff are seldom consulted before most decisions are made (item 15).

Table 7

Mean Responses Regarding Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Site-Based Decision Making at Recognized School

Survey Item	Principals	Teachers
1. SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations.	2.50	2.50
2. SBDM should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year.	3.00	3.00
3. SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the staff.	2.54	2.54
4. Enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased.	2.54	2.54
5. Adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration.	3.00	3.00
6. SBDM has resulted in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods of school administration.	3.00	3.00

Table 7 Continued

Survey Item	Principals	Teachers
7. SBDM is an efficient means of school administration.	3.00	3.00
8. The collegiality between teachers and staff and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM.	3.00	3.00
9. Administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM.	2.50	2.50
10. Teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires.	2.76	2.76
11. Shared decision making allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision.	3.00	3.00
12. Teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes.	3.00	3.00
13. Teachers and staff members have input into most decisions made in this school.	3.00	3.00
14. Building administrators share most decisions with teachers and staff.	3.00	3.00
15. Teachers and staff are seldom consulted before most decisions are made.	2.10	2.50*
16. Teachers and staff are given the opportunity to have input into most decisions made at this school.	3.00	3.00

Note. * Differences of > or = to 0.25.

Mean principals' and teachers' perceptions about SBDM from the school rated Acceptable are reported in Table 8. An asterisk (*) is used to indicate differences of > or = to 0.25. Item 15 was reversed scored. Concerning ways principals' and teachers' perceptions about SBDM at their school agree or disagree, both groups of respondents strongly agreed SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations (item 1); enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased (item 4), and

adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration (item 5). Teachers disagreed with principals that administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM (item 9). With item 15 being reverse scored, teachers, unlike principals expressed agreement that teachers and staff are seldom consulted before most decisions are made (item 15).

Respondents strongly agreed or agreed SBDM should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year (item 2); SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the staff (item 3); SBDM has resulted in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods of school administration (item 6); SBDM is an efficient means of school administration (item 7); collegiality between teachers and staff and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM (item 8); teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires (item 10); shared decision making allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision (item 11); teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes (item 12); teachers and staff members have input into most decisions made in this school (item 13); building administrators share most decisions with teachers and staff (item 14); teachers and staff members have input into most decisions made in this school, and staff are given the opportunity to have input into most decisions made at this school (item 16).

Table 8

Mean Responses Regarding Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Site-Based Decision Making at Acceptable School

Survey Item	Principals	Teachers
1. SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations.	3.00	3.00
2. SBDM should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year.	2.37	2.43
3. SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the staff.	2.02	2.52*
4. Enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased.	3.00	3.00
5. Adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration.	3.00	3.00
6. SBDM has resulted in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods of school administration.	2.05	2.52*
7. SBDM is an efficient means of school administration.	2.66	2.56
8. The collegiality between teachers and staff and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM.	2.90	3.00
9. Administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM.	1.33	2.43*
10. Teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires.	2.37*	2.00
11. Shared decision making allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision.	3.00	2.80
12. Teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes.	2.43	2.52
13. Teachers and staff members have input into most decisions made in this school.	3.00	2.78

Table 8 Continued

Survey Item	Principals	Teachers
14. Building administrators share most decisions with teachers and staff.	3.00	2.79
15. Teachers and staff are seldom consulted before most decisions are made.	2.60*	1.20
16. Teachers and staff are given the opportunity to have input into most decisions made at this school.	3.00	2.76

Note. * Differences of > or = to 0.25.

Resulting mean responses regarding principals' and teachers' perceptions of SBDM at the school rated unacceptable are displayed in Table 9. An asterisk (*) is used to indicate differences of > or = to 0.25. Item 15 was reversed scored. There were no areas in which principals and teachers strongly agreed. Areas in which principals and teachers agreed included SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations (item 1); SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the staff (item 3); enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased (item 4); adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration (item 5); SBDM has resulted in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods of school administration (item 6); teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires (item 10); administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM (item 9); teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires (item

10); shared decision making allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision (item 11); teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes (item 12); teachers and staff are seldom consulted before most decisions are made (item 15), and teachers and staff are given the opportunity to have input into most decisions made at this school (item 16).

Principals disagreed with teachers that SBDM is an efficient means of school administration (item 7). Teachers disagreed with principals that teachers and staff members have input into most decisions made in this school (item 13), in addition to building administrators share most decisions with teachers and staff (item 14). Both groups of respondents disagreed collegiality between teachers and staff and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM (item 8).

Table 9

Mean Responses Regarding Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Site-Based Decision Making at Unacceptable School

Survey Item	Principals	Teachers
1. SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations.	2.83	3.00
2. SBDM should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year.	2.15	2.00
3. SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the staff.	2.97*	2.57
4. Enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased.	2.44*	2.00

Table 9 Continued

Survey Item	Principals	Teachers
5. Adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration.	2.73*	2.00
6. SBDM has resulted in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods of school administration.	2.97	3.00
7. SBDM is an efficient means of school administration.	1.80	2.80*
8. The collegiality between teachers and staff and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM.	1.58	1.75
9. Administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM.	2.62	2.52
10. Teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires.	2.64	2.76
11. Shared decision making allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision.	2.38	2.80*
12. Teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes.	2.64	2.74
13. Teachers and staff members have input into most decisions made in this school.	3.00*	1.20
14. Building administrators share most decisions with teachers and staff.	3.00*	1.50
15. Teachers and staff are seldom consulted before most decisions are made.	2.20	2.10
16. Teachers and staff are given the opportunity to have input into most decisions made at this school.	3.00	2.40

Note. * Differences of > or = to 0.25.

Variations were observed between the two categories of respondents, prompting further analysis of the results of the survey items in an effort to achieve a better understanding of the location of differences. Individual variables were analyzed and Table 10 summarizes the results.

An asterisk (*) is used to indicate differences of > or = to 0.25. Mean responses regarding principals' and teachers' perceptions of SBDM items one through sixteen were analyzed for trends. Each variable was measured using a test of significance (0.25). Respondents were required to choose the appropriate level of agreement with various aspects of involvement in and perceptions of SBDM. This component of the survey correlated to respondents' perceptions regarding the degree of decision-making practices of principals and teachers and range of participation in decision-making. As previously stated, the purpose of this set of items was to determine the presence of correspondence between principal perceptions and teacher perceptions regarding these issues. Of the sixteen elements in this portion of the survey, each of the four types of schools yielded one or more noteworthy differences between principal respondents and teacher respondents.

Table 10

Trends in Differences between Principals' and Teachers' Responses on Items Regarding Their Perceptions about SBDM at Their School

Survey Item	Higher (>0.25) Principals' Responses				Higher (>0.25) Teachers' Responses				Agreement = or Differences < 0.25			
	E	R	A	U	E	R	A	U	E	R	A	U
1. SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations	2.56	2.50	3.00	2.83	2.06	2.50	3.00	3.00	.50*	.00*	.00*	.17*

Table 10 Continued

Survey Item	Higher (>0.25) Principals' Responses				Higher (>0.25) Teachers' Responses				Agreement = or Differences < 0.25			
	E	R	A	U	E	R	A	U	E	R	A	U
2. SBDM should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year.	3.00	3.00	2.37	2.15	2.24	3.00	2.43	2.00	.76*	.00*	.06*	.15*
3. SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the staff.	2.81	2.54	2.02	2.97	2.80	2.54	2.52	2.57	.01*	.00*	.05*	.40*
4. Enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased.	3.00	2.54	3.00	2.44	3.00	2.54	3.00	2.00	.00*	.00*	.00*	.44*
5. Adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration.	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.73	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	.00*	.00*	.00*	.73*
6. SBDM has resulted in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods of school administration.	3.00	3.00	2.05	2.97	3.00	3.00	2.52	3.00	.00*	.00*	.47*	.03*
7. SBDM is an efficient means of school administration.	2.93	3.00	2.66	1.80	2.00	3.00	2.56	2.80	.93*	.00*	.01*	1.0
8. The collegiality between teachers and staff and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM.	3.00	3.00	2.90	1.58	2.90	3.00	3.00	1.75	.10*	.00*	.10*	.17*

Table 10 Continued

Survey Item	Higher (>0.25) Principals' Responses				Higher (>0.25) Teachers' Responses				Agreement = or Differences < 0.25			
	E	R	A	U	E	R	A	U	E	R	A	U
9. Administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM.	2.24	2.50	1.33	2.62	2.54	2.50	2.43	2.52	.30*	.00*	1.1	.10*
10. Teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires.	2.79	2.76	2.37	2.64	2.42	2.76	2.00	2.76	.37*	.00*	.37*	.12*
11. Shared decision making allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision.	2.76	3.00	3.00	3.38	2.56	3.00	2.80	2.80	.20*	.00*	.20*	.42*
12. Teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes.	2.74	3.00	2.43	2.64	2.34	3.00	2.52	2.74	.40*	.00*	.09*	.10*
13. Teachers and staff members have input into most decisions made in this school.	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.20	3.00	2.78	1.20	.30*	.00*	.22*	1.8
14. Building administrators share most decisions with teachers and staff.	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.79	1.50	.50*	.00*	.21*	1.5
15. Teachers and staff are seldom consulted before most decisions are made.	2.40	2.10	2.60	2.20	2.10	2.50	1.20	2.10	.30*	.40*	1.4	.10*

Table 10 Continued

Survey Item	Higher (>0.25) Principals' Responses				Higher (>0.25) Teachers' Responses				Agreement = or Differences < 0.25			
	E	R	A	U	E	R	A	U	E	R	A	U
16. Teachers and staff are given the opportunity to have input into most decisions made at this school.	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.76	2.40	.00*	.00*	.24*	.60*

Note. * Differences of > or = to 0.25.

Results indicate principals from the school rated exemplary were more positive that SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations (item 1); SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the staff (item 2); SBDM is an efficient mans of school administration (item 7); teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires (item 10); teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes (item 12); teachers and staff members have input into more decisions made in this school (item 13), and building administrators share most decisions with teachers and staff (item 14). The study revealed that teachers reacted more positively to the belief that administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM (item 9), and teachers and staff are seldom consulted before most decisions are made (item 15). The study also found that teachers from the school rated recognized responded more positively to the statement indicating teachers and staffs are seldom consulted before most decisions are made (item 15). No additional items from the campus rated recognized showed noteworthy differences.

Principals from the campus rated acceptable were more positive in their perception that teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires while the teachers' perceptions were less positive (item 10). The study found that teachers reported more positive perceptions that SBDM has resulted in different school practices than could have been possible under traditional methods of school administration (item 6) and administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM (item 9). Principals prevailed in their perceptions that SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the staff (item 3); enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased (item 4); adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration (item 5); teachers and staff members have input into more decisions made in this school (item 13); building administrators share most decisions with teachers and staff (item 14), and teachers and staff are given the opportunity to have input into most decisions made at this school (item 16). Study results established teachers also responded positively to the idea that SBDM is an efficient means of school administration (item 7) and shared decision making allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision (item 11).

Overall, principals and teachers agreed on most items; however, principals and teachers at campuses rated recognized and acceptable agreed more on perceptions about SBDM, whereas respondents on campuses rated exemplary and unacceptable were least likely to agree on these same perceptions. No noteworthy differences existed among principals and teachers with regard to their perceptions of the collegiality between

teachers, staff, and administration having improved since the implementation of SBDM (item 8).

Research Question Four

Mean responses regarding principals' perceptions, student attendance percentages, and number of discipline referrals for the four types of schools are shown in Table 11. In order to determine how principals' perceptions about site-based decision making (SBDM) at their school correspond to the school's history (over the past three years) in two outcomes: (a) student attendance and (b) number of student discipline referrals, the investigator compared mean responses regarding principals' perceptions to student attendance and number of student discipline referrals. Attendance data were rated as High (90% - 100%), Average (80%-89%), Low (70%-79%), and Critical (<70%). Discipline data were rated High (100+), Average (51 - 99), and Low (1 - 50).

Discipline and attendance data for this investigation were taken from the Total Education Administrative Management Solution (TEAMS) database of information with permission from the school district's Director of Student Services. Averages of measures of state ratings were acquired from the TEA data base. Three consecutive years of data for average daily attendance (ADA) and number of discipline referrals were collected and compiled beginning with the year 2008.

A comparison of mean responses from principals' perceptions of SBDM indicated a higher mean response from campuses rated Exemplary and Recognized as compared to Acceptable and Unacceptable. Student attendance percentages show the campus rated Recognized with a slightly higher percentage than the remaining three

types of campuses. The number of discipline referrals for campuses rated Exemplary and Recognized was less than the number for campuses rated Acceptable and Unacceptable.

Table 11

Mean Responses Regarding Principals' Perceptions, Student Attendance Percentages, and Number of Discipline Referrals

Type of School	Mean Responses	Student Attendance Percentages	Number of Discipline Referrals
Exemplary	2.61 = H	97.11 = L	106 = H
Recognized	2.67 = H	97.42 = H	89 = L
Acceptable	2.44 = L	97.13 = L	129 = H
Unacceptable	2.42 = L	97.14 = L	138 = H

Research Question Five

Mean responses regarding teachers' perceptions, student attendance percentages, and number of discipline referrals for the four types of campuses are shown in Table 12. In order to determine how teachers' perceptions about site-based decision making (SBDM) at their school correspond to the school's history (over the past three years) in two outcomes: (a) student attendance and (b) number of student discipline referrals, the investigator compared mean responses regarding teachers' perceptions to student attendance and number of student discipline referrals. Attendance data were rated as High (90% - 100%), Average (80%-89%), Low (70%-79%), and Critical (<70%). Discipline data were rated High (100+), Average (51 - 99), and Low (1 - 50).

Discipline and attendance data for this investigation were taken from the Total Education Administrative Management Solution (TEAMS) database of information with permission from the school district’s Director of Student Services. Averages of measures of state ratings were acquired from the TEA data base. Three consecutive years of data for average daily attendance (ADA) and number of discipline referrals were collected and compiled beginning with the year 2008.

Mean responses regarding teachers’ perceptions from campuses rated Exemplary and Recognized compared to Acceptable and Unacceptable were higher than campuses rated Exemplary, Recognized, and Acceptable. Student attendance percentages indicated the campus rated Recognized had a slightly higher percentage than the remaining three types of campuses. The number of discipline referrals for campuses rated Exemplary and Recognized was less than the number for campuses rated Acceptable and Unacceptable.

Table 12

Mean Responses Regarding Teachers’ Perceptions, Student Attendance Percentages, and Number of Discipline Referrals

Type of School	Mean Responses	Student Attendance Percentages	Number of Discipline Referrals
Exemplary	2.57 = H	97.11 = L	106 = H
Recognized	2.82 = H	97.42 = H	89 = L
Acceptable	2.64 = H	97.13 = L	129 = H
Unacceptable	2.49 = L	97.14 = L	138 = H

Table 13 shows resulting data for the percentage of participants' survey demographics. The campus rated Recognized ideally shows high mean responses from teachers' perceptions, high attendance percentage, and low number of discipline referrals by comparison. However, the campus rated Unacceptable shows low teacher perception, low student attendance percentage and a high number of discipline referrals. School achievement statistics are easily attainable and often the targets of news media, making it essentially futile for administrators to conceal evidence indicating their campuses are not meeting levels of expectation. Campuses rated Exemplary and Recognized were constructed within the last six years. By comparison, the remaining two campuses rated acceptable and unacceptable are part of a current bond election for replacement and/or remodeling.

Table 13
Percentage of Participants' Survey Demographics

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Principal</i>	<i>Teacher</i>
First year in role	0.0%	20.0%
1-3 years in role	0.9%	10.0%
4-10 years in role	0.9%	37.0%
11-20 years in role	0.9%	32.0%
>20 years in role	2.0%	12.0%
First year on campus	0.9%	80.0%

Table 13 Continued

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Principal</i>	<i>Teacher</i>
4-10 years on campus	1.0%	49.0%
11-20 years on campus	1.0%	16.0%
>20 years on campus	0.0%	2.0%
Campus rated Exemplary	1.0%	24.0%
Campus rated Recognized	1.0%	20.0%
Campus rated Acceptable	0.9%	26.0%
Campus rated Unacceptable	1.0%	25.0%

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to uncover patterns existing in relationships between and among state school ratings, principals' and teachers' perceptions of site-based decision making (SBDM) at their schools, and school outcomes from discipline referrals and attendance percentages in four elementary schools. A review of the literature was conducted to obtain an in-depth look at several positive effects of effective implementation of SBDM. The review examined characteristics of successful SBDM as well as implications for schools leaders brought about by successful implementation.

Five questions were posed to investigate the research. They were:

1. Do state school ratings correspond to school principals' perceptions about SBDM at their school? In what ways?
2. Do state school ratings correspond to teachers' perceptions about SBDM at their school? In what ways?
3. In what ways do principals' and teachers' perceptions about SBDM at their school agree and disagree?
4. How do principals' perceptions about SBDM at their schools correspond to the schools' history (over the past three years) in two outcomes: (a) student attendance and (b) number of student discipline referrals?
5. How do teachers' perceptions about SBDM at their schools correspond to the schools' history (over the past three years) in two outcomes: (a) of student attendance and (b) number of student discipline referrals?

Summary of Findings

This study was designed to uncover patterns existing in relationships between and among state school ratings, principals' and teachers' perceptions of site-based decision (SBDM) making at their schools, and school outcomes from discipline referrals and average daily attendance in four schools. Perceptions about SBDM were measured through the administration of an online survey. Using a Likert-scale instrument of 16 items, principals and teachers were asked to respond to a list of statements regarding their perceptions of SBDM. A short demographic survey to determine campus role, number of years in present position, and number of years at present campus was also included to further identify respondents. Participants returned a total of 211 surveys.

The first and second research questions required an examination of principals' and teachers' perceptions about SBDM and state school ratings at their school. Perceptions about SBDM were measured through the administration of an online survey. Student performance data were obtained from Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) reports for each participating campus. An analysis of data comparing means from principals' and teachers' responses regarding perceptions about SBDM and state school ratings indicated strong evidence that principals and teachers share common support of site-based decision making (SBDM) on their campuses regardless of state rating.

Research question three was an examination of ways principals' and teachers' perceptions about SBDM at their school agree and disagree. Overall, principals and teachers agreed or strongly agreed that SBDM provides a good approach for making

routine decisions regarding school operations; SBDM has resulted in different school practices than would have been possible under traditional methods of school administration; teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires, and SBDM is an efficient means of school administration. Principals and teachers also agreed or strongly agreed that adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration. Principals and teachers had opposing responses regarding decreasing enthusiasm for SBDM in schools. On a Likert scale of 1-3, principals' responses resulted in a mean of 1.41 disagreeing while an almost equal mean response from teachers indicated agreement. Results from this portion of the survey confirmed overall strong support of SBDM exists among both groups of respondents.

Research questions four and five examined principals' and teachers' perceptions regarding how SBDM at schools corresponds to the schools' history (over the past three years) in two outcomes: (a) student attendance and (b) number of student discipline referrals. The school rated Recognized had an average of 89 referrals in the three-year period while the remaining three schools (Exemplary, Acceptable and Unacceptable) averaged over 100 discipline referrals in the three-year period. The overall average for discipline referrals for all schools was 97.25%. Total percentages for the four schools were equal to or greater than the overall district average of 96%. Each of the four campuses met or exceeded state attendance requirements and had no excessive discipline referrals. The four campuses met or exceeded state requirements for attendance and

discipline regardless of adverse survey responses regarding roles in the decision making process.

Research Question One

Research Question One asked “Do state school ratings correspond to school principals’ perceptions about site-based decision making (SBDM) at their school?” An approximate mean response of 2.75 from principals at schools rated Unacceptable and Exemplary agreed SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations while the mean response of 2.69 indicated SBDM should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year. Principals’ mean response of 2.72 indicated agreement SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration. Additionally, a mean response of 2.75 indicated administrators at schools rated Acceptable and Recognized agree SBDM has resulted in different school practices than would have been possible under traditional methods of school administration. An equal mean response from principals indicated agreement that SBDM is an efficient means of school administration while a mean response of 2.64 indicated agreement that collegiality between teachers, staff, and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM. A mean response of 2.72 from principals indicated the level of agreement that teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires. Finally, a mean response of 2.71 represents the level of agreement that teachers and staff members who are involved in SBDM are more committed to school outcomes.

In general, principals' perceptions about SBDM were positive. Among the highest mean response score of 3.0 on a three-point scale, a mean response of 2.97 represents principals strong agreement or agreement that SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations; should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year; is an efficient means of school administration; allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision, and the collegiality between teachers and staff and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM. Next, a mean response of 2.88 indicated agreement to the following survey items: SBDM has resulted in different school practices than would have been possible under traditional methods of school administration; teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires, and teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes. While a mean response of 2.86 from principals indicated agreement that administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM, a mean response of 2.83 from principals indicated enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased and adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration. These items were scored in reverse.

A mean response of more than 2.75 from principals indicated agreement SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations; should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year; does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making shared

with the staff; has resulted in different school practices than would have been possible under traditional methods of school administration; is an efficient means of school administration; teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires; allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision, and teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes.

Among the group of 11 principals, 1.58 indicates the mean response in agreement that enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased, whereas the mean response of 1.42 represents disagreement to this survey item. A noticeable low mean response (1.50) indicated disagreement that the collegiality between teachers, staff, and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM. No noteworthy correlation was identified between school ratings and principals' perceptions about SBDM at their schools. A mean response of at least 1.50 represented disagreement that the adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration.

Results suggest schools with a higher state rating have a higher perception of SBDM. The level of agreement among campus administrators demonstrates a correlation of shared perceptions of SBDM to state ratings. Kaner (2011) declares it wiser to have a greater number of minds working together in decision-making to reach consensus as opposed to one. This can be accomplished by acknowledging that some teachers may have better ideas than principals or have worked at other campuses where successful decision-making has been implemented (Donaldson and Sanderson, 1996). It is important to note that at least part of the success from the two high achieving

campuses could be attributed to their agreement to the need to facilitate a process for shared decision-making when generating new ideas.

This may provide evidence that the effects of SBDM management will only be evident in a term longer than what was measured. There is no clear cut conclusion on a timeline for developing a successful site-based governed school. Researchers suggest a commitment of three to 15 years (Oswald, 1995). Research literature confirms SBDM is not an effortless change in practice or process. Ultimately the “long-term pain” of maintaining the existing condition would be more adverse than the “short-term pain” of transformation (Patterson, 1997). Fortunately, SBDM suggests improvement in educational settings if situated prudently.

Practical application of site-based management has demonstrated considerable positive outcomes. Einarsen, Aasland, and Skogstad, (2007) perceived implementation of site-based management increases cooperation and minimizes teacher absenteeism. Leithwood and Menzies (1998) substantiated these conclusions in their report of 83 research investigations on site-based management. Positive effects for teachers included increased collegiality, transformation in classroom instruction, a heightened sense of power over individual work, and a sense of elevated personal responsibility. School administrators were found to take on a more supervisory role, disseminate more information, and to have elevated personal ownership. Parents demonstrated a heightened contentment in their schools. Although the effects of SBDM appear to have boosted the comprehensive nature of the educational environment, not one of these results revealed changes in student achievement.

Research Question Two

Research Question Two posed the question “Do state ratings correspond to teachers’ perceptions about site-based decision making (SBDM) at their school?”

Similar to principal ratings in Research Question One, overall teacher perceptions about SBDM were positive. The highest mean response of 3.0 on a three-point scale, a mean response of 2.80 indicated teachers strongly agreed or agreed SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations. Next, a mean response of 2.79 indicated strong agreement or agreement that SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the staff.

Roughly, a mean response of 2.78 indicated teachers strongly agreed or agreed SBDM should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year and is an efficient means of school administration.

When addressing whether or not administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using SBDM, results showed a mean response of 2.77 indicating teachers strongly agreed or agreed. A mean response of 2.75 represented teachers’ strong agreement or agreement that teachers and staff members are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires. A mean response of 2.69 represented strong agreement or agreement that collegiality between teachers, staff, and administration has improved since the implementation of SBDM. More than half of teacher respondents strongly agreed or agreed adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration (mean response 2.65). Less than half of

teacher respondents strongly agreed or agreed enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased (mean response 2.48). The two latter items were scored in reverse.

As a group having a mean response of 2.52, teachers strongly disagreed or disagreed enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased, whereas the remaining mean response of 2.48 reflected teachers strongly agreed or agreed with the statement. This is a notable comparison to total principal perceptions showing a mean response of 2.42 indicating strong disagreement or disagreement and a mean response of 2.58 indicating strong agreement or agreement. The highest mean response (2.80) was in agreement that SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations. The remaining survey items reflected mean responses of 2.65 or higher reflecting strong agreement or agreement. These noteworthy splits in responses could be attributed to individual campus leadership and expectations. That is, campuses rated lower could be lacking in professional development or support in areas of team building, developing consensus, and problem solving (Cromwell, 2000). Teachers could be ill-prepared to take initiative in making routine decisions on their campuses. Likewise, teachers on higher performing campuses likely do not remain idle and assume positive outcomes will occur only through SBDM (Fullan, 2005).

The low mean response from the campus rated unacceptable could be unique to the selective group of nominated and elected participants on the SBDM committee. Considering committee members' roles and participation often impact the whole campus, some teachers may not have buy-in based on trust decisions of committee members (Portin, 1998). The lowest mean response could be attributed to differing

views and transient staff members over time at the campus rated unacceptable.

Although respondents from the campus rated unacceptable averaged a mean response of 2.67 in agreement, the investigator is prompted to question whether or not the principal values the stakeholders' opinions highly enough to encourage participation (Fullan, 2005).

Results suggest state school ratings correlate to perceptions about SBDM. As with campus principals, the level of agreement among campus teachers demonstrates shared perceptions of SBDM with correlation to state ratings. It appears schools with a higher state rating have a higher perception of SBDM. Kaner (2011) declares it wiser to have a greater number of minds working together in decision-making to reach consensus as opposed to one. This can be accomplished by acknowledging that some teachers may have better ideas than principals or have worked at other campuses where successful decision-making has been implemented (Donaldson and Sanderson, 1996). It is noteworthy that a portion of the success from the two high achieving campuses could be attributed to their agreement to participate in a procedure for shared decision-making when generating new ideas.

As previously noted, each of the four schools improved and/or maintained their state rating over the three-year period in which data was acquired. It may be possible that the effects of SBDM will only be evident in a term longer than what was measured.

Research Question Three

Research Question Three inquired “In what ways do principals’ and teachers’ perceptions about site-based decision making (SBDM) at their school agree and disagree?” Overall, principal and teacher perceptions about SBDM were positive and mostly parallel. With the highest mean response of 2.78, principals and teachers agreed or strongly agreed that SBDM provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations; has resulted in different school practices than would have been possible under traditional methods of school administration; teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires, and SBDM is an efficient means of school administration. Also, a mean response of 2.77 indicated principals and teachers strongly agreed or agreed that adoption of SBDM has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration and should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during the school year. Additionally, administrators and teachers expressed strong agreement or agreement that SBDM does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the staff; teachers and staff are willing to accept extra responsibility that assignment to a school using SBDM requires, and teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes. Administrators’ mean response of 3.00 was in agreement that determining strategies for improving student success and for improving AYP were often shared.

Principals and teachers had few opposing perceptions about SBDM; particularly, decreasing enthusiasm for SBDM in schools. An approximate mean response of 2.41

from principals reflected disagreement while a mean response of 2.40 from teachers reflected agreement that enthusiasm for SBDM in schools has decreased. Opposing views were also evident regarding improvement of collegiality between teachers, staff, and administrators. The investigator does not view this as reflective of the principal's inability to lead and/or facilitate decisions, but instead could be the result of negative interactions among a small group prompting negative feedback from respondents.

A mean response of more than 2.40 indicated principals strongly agreed or agreed collegiality improved with SBDM, whereas a mean response of 2.23 indicated teachers strongly disagreed or disagreed collegiality had improved. These differences could indicate some principals' unwillingness "to share or to surrender their control, rather than involving school staff in the collaborative decision-making process" (Einarsen, Aasland, and Skogstad, 2007). Overall, the level of agreement among administrators' and teachers' demonstrates shared perceptions and alignment of SBDM as a method to support student success.

Research Question Four

Research Question Four posed the question "How do principals' perceptions about site-based decision making (SBDM) at their school correspond to the school's history (over the past three years) in two outcomes: (a) student attendance and (b) number of student discipline referrals?" The purpose of SBDM is to improve educational outcomes for all students. It seems likely that SBDM will be more successful on a campus where principals and teachers function as a team in the decision making process (Austin and Hawkins, 2008). Results from this study suggest this is not

the case. In this study, a mean response of 1.50 indicated participating administrators from the school rated Unacceptable reported making decisions about determining strategies for improving student success and determining budgets for improving AYP (Annual Yearly Progress) was always shared whereas an equal mean response indicated such decisions are never shared. These perceptions do not adversely reflect three-year attendance ratings or discipline referrals as totals were well within the average for the school district and the state.

Data collected from the school rated Exemplary reflects a mean response of 1.50 indicating decisions about determining strategies for improving student success and determining budgets for improving AYP was always shared whereas an equal mean response reflected such decisions are never shared. Outcomes show no correlation to the 97% average attendance rate. Although the number of discipline referrals decreased over the three-year period, evidence of correlation proved uncertain. Campuses showed an unequal distribution of discipline referrals. A high number of referrals from a high rated school could be the result of low tolerance for inappropriate behavior; however, high numbers of discipline referrals on a low rated campus could reflect high tolerance and low expectations (Austin and Hawkins, 2008). Principal responses from the school rated Acceptable resulted in a mean response of 3.00 in agreement of their role in decision making in the areas of improving student success and determining proper resources for maintaining AYP.

Although correlation was not determined, a mean response of 3.00 showed principals at the school rated Recognized agreed information regarding improved student

success was always shared; only a small mean response (1.25) indicated principals strongly agreed such sharing of information took place regarding improving AYP. Overall, principals averaged higher response means than their campus teachers when responding to the survey.

Research Question Five

Much like the previous question, Research Question Five inquired “How do teachers’ perceptions about site-based decision making (SBDM) at their school correspond to the schools’ history (over the past three years) in two outcomes: (a) percentage of student attendance and (b) number of student discipline referrals?” Teachers expressed mixed responses to questions 13 and 14. More than half of teachers from the school rated Unacceptable reported information relating to improving student success and determining funds for improving AYP were seldom shared. This feedback showed no correlation to the school’s three-year attendance rate. Furthermore, teachers responding from the school rated Exemplary rated the areas of decision making almost identical to that of their campus principals. A mean response of 2.75 or higher indicated agreement that determining strategies for improving student success and improving AYP was often a shared responsibility. The high attendance rate and average number of discipline referrals indicate possible differences between the high rated school and the low rated school. Likewise, resulting data from the school rated Acceptable shows an undetermined correlation with attendance or discipline data over the past three years.

Responses from the school rated Recognized show a discrepancy in how teachers view SBDM as compared to principals. While a mean response of 2.80 supported the

idea that teachers believe decision making for determining budgets for improvement of AYP is often shared, a mean response of only 1.60 indicates teachers view shared decision making as a means to determine strategies for improving student success. As with administrators, teachers' perceptions of SBDM do not reveal correspondence to percentage of student attendance or number of discipline referrals. Each of the four campuses met or exceeded state attendance requirements and had no excessive discipline referrals.

One possible explanation for the campuses rated acceptable and unacceptable having low mean responses, low attendance percentages, and high number of discipline referrals by comparison, could be an inescapable absence of confidence in the school's capacity to provide an acceptable education. School achievement statistics are easily attainable and often the targets of news media, making it essentially futile for administrators to conceal evidence indicating their campuses are not meeting levels of expectation. Further, it becomes problematic for any school in which the community loses faith. Perceptions of negativity of schools could present a considerable hardship on school improvement (National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2004).

Campuses rated Exemplary and Recognized were constructed within the last six years. By comparison, campuses rated acceptable and unacceptable are part of a current bond election for replacement. Learning is difficult in classrooms that are crowded and unsightly. Such school environments are inclined to communicate a message that no one has a personal interest in them. Inadequate facilities for campuses rated Acceptable and Unacceptable could hinder achievement and potential turnaround efforts (Blasé, 1991).

Literature Based Recommendations for Practice

Data from this study revealed positive relationships between principals' and teachers' perceptions of site-based decision making (SBDM) and a not so noteworthy relationship between school outcomes of number of school discipline referrals and attendance percentages in four schools with different state school ratings. The review of literature confirms the existence of a relationship between principals' and teachers' perceptions SBDM. In a more extensive review of the literature about SBDM, Kolsti and Rutherford (1991) proclaim such information about effects on student achievement rarely appears. Research reports from Johnson (1991) indicate studies have failed to identify a relationship between SBDM and student achievement. She did, however observe patterns of directionality in her study of middle schools. A noteworthy level of shared decision making and less central control was recognized in schools where students were achieving. Throughout the literature are multiple reports of lessons learned while implementing SBDM at district and campus levels.

There was no conclusive estimate of how long it takes to establish a successful site-based managed school. Oswald (1995) suggests a commitment of three to 15 years. Research literature confirms SBDM is not an effortless change in practice or process. Ultimately the "long-term pain" of maintaining the existing condition would be more adverse than the "short-term pain" of transformation (Patterson, 1997). Fortunately, SBDM suggests improvement in educational settings if situated prudently. As mentioned in Research Question Four, the condition of the learning environment is

believed by many educators to be a factor altering student achievement (National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2004).

The literature reviewed for this study in addition to findings of this research is the basis for the following recommendations:

1. Superintendents and essential central office staff should communicate with appropriate campus leaders to structure meetings to study curricular connections to ensure that learning transitions across schools in the district are seamless. Smooth transitions from school to school to ensure that achievement gains accomplished at one level are not lost at the next.
2. Superintendents and essential central office staff should set the goal to forge a PreK-12 team of principals to study the progress of students from kindergarten through graduation. Each principal should view his/her student performance data relative to this continuum. Student performance data (i.e., do student achievement scores dip when they change school levels?) as well as teacher feedback should be considered.
3. Principals should ensure that time has been allocated for teachers to meet collaboratively to discuss and plan for appropriate remediation in the areas of academics, attendance, and behavior.
4. Principals should rely on evidence of student learning, behavior, and attendance as the means for identifying the best instructional practices in a school.

Implications for Further Study

Variations have the potential to alter SBDM attempts at different school levels. These variations include but are not limited to school capacity, sum of teachers and students, spectrum of subjects taught, and spectrum of instruction, each having their own benefits from SBDM (Hatry et al., 1993). The literature reviewed for this study in addition to conclusions from the research was used to determine the following implications for further study:

1. Using this study as a baseline, this investigator recommends a study of all district schools using a more precise survey to determine the effects of principals' and teachers' perceptions of SBDM on student achievement.
2. This investigator also recommends a study to determine whether common variables other than SBDM exist in high performing Texas elementary schools that could possibly have an impact on student achievement. This includes principals' leadership practices.

Concluding Remarks

The investigator, an educator who has worked with site-based decision making (SBDM) for over 30 years, has developed her own perceptions and beliefs of SBDM, making the study a labor of love. The study resulted from an internship spent designing SBDM training and materials for administrators and the superintendent's decision to question whether the school district is continuing to implement SBDM with fidelity. Reviewing the findings, the response would be, "yes". Based on feedback from campus administrators, decisive participants in its implementation, SBDM is being enforced as it was designed, to increase student success.

REFERENCES

- Austin, M., & Harkins, D. (2008). Shifting spaces and emerging voices: Participation, support, and conflict in one school administrative team. *Early Education and Development, 19*(6), 907-940.
- Blase, J. (1991). *The politics of life in schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bredeson, P.V. (1999). Empowered teachers-empowered principals: Principals' perceptions of leadership in schools. *Advances in Educational Administration 3*(5), 195-220.
- Conley, D. T. (1991). Lessons from laboratories in school restructuring and site-based decision-making, Oregon's "2020" Schools take control of their own reform. *Oregon School Study Council, 34*(7), 1-61.
- Cromwell, S. (2000). Site-based management: boon or boondoggle? *Education World*, Retrieved from http://www.educationworld.com/a_admin/admin/admin176.shtml
- Creswell, J., & Plano Clark, V. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- David, J. L. (2006). The who, what, and why of site-based management. *Educational Leadership, 53*(4), 4-9.
- David, J. L. (1989). Synthesis of research on school-based management. *Educational Leadership 46*(8), 45-53.
- Donaldson, G., & Sanderson, D. (1996). *Working together in schools: A guide for educators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Duke, D.L., Showers, B. K., & Imber, M. (1980). Teachers and shared decision making:

- The costs and benefits of involvement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 16(1), 93-106.
- Einarsen, S., Aasland, M., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behavior: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 207-216.
- Erlandson, D., Harris, E., Skipper, B. & Allen, S. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods*. Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fiske, E.B. (2005). *Systematic school reform: Implications for architecture*. In A. Meek (Ed.) *Designing places for learning*. (pp. 1-10). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Fullan, M. (2005). *Leadership and sustainability: System thinkers in action*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Corwin Press.
- Goodman, J. (2004). External change agents and grassroots school reform: Reflections from the field. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 9 (2), 113-135.
- Guthrie, J. W. (2006). School-based management: The next needed education reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 68 (4), 305-309.
- Hatry, H., Morley, E., Ashford, B., & Wyatt, T. (1993). *Implementing school-based management: Insights into decentralization from science and math departments*. Washington DC: The Urban Institute.
- Hill, P. & Bonan, J. (1991). *Decentralization and accountability in public education*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Holloway, J. (2000). The promise and pitfalls of site-based management. *Educational Leadership*, 57(7), 81-82.
- Hoy, W., Tarter, C., & Hoy, A. (2006). Academic optimism of schools: A force for

- student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(3), 425-446.
- Jenni, R. W. (1991). Application of the school-based management process development model. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 2(2), 136-151.
- Johnson, M. A. (1991). Principal leadership, shared decision making, and student achievement (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Texas at Austin.
- Kaner, S. (2011). *Facilitators guide to participatory decision-making*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kolsti, K., & Rutherford, B. (1991). *Site-based management: Definitions, implications, and indicators*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Education, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas.
- Leithwood, K., & Menzies, T. (1998). Forms and effects of school-based management: A review. *Educational Policy*, 12(3), 325-346.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K., Anderson, S., and Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of research: How leadership influences student learning*. Retrieved from <http://www.wallace foundation.org>
- Mohrman, S. (2004). *School based management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Myers, D., & Stonehill, R. (2003). School-based management. *Education Consumer Guide, No. 4*, Office of Research, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the Department of Education. ED/OERI 92-38.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress (2004). *The nation's report card*. U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington,

DC: Institute of Education Sciences.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Noble, A., Deemer, S., & Davis, B. (1996). *School-based management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Odden, E., & Wohstetter, P. (1995). Making school-based management work. *Educational Leadership*, 52(5), 32-36.

Ogawa, R. T. & White, P. A. (1995). School-based management an overview. In S.A. Mohrman & P. Wohlstetter (Eds.), *School-based management: Organizing for high performance*, 53-80. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Oswald, L. J. (1995). School-based management. *ERIC Digest*. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed384950.html

Patterson, J. (1998). Harsh realities about decentralized decision-making. *School Administrator*, 3(55). Retrieved from <http://www.aasa.org/sa/mar9801.htm>

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury, CA: Sage Publication Ltd.

Portin, B.S. (1998). Compounding roles: A study of Washington's principals. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 29 (4), 335-346.

Purkey, S., & Smith, M. (1993). Effective schools: A review. *The Elementary School Journal*, 83(4), 427-448.

Short, P., & Greer, J. (2007). Leadership in empowered schools: Themes from

innovative efforts. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Texas Education Agency (2008). Texas education code: State laws pertaining to district and campus advisory councils. Retrieved from <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/>

Wohlstetter, P., & Mohrman, S. A. (1996). *Assessment of school-based management*. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/SER/SchBasedMgmt/>

APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Dr. Reid,

I am a doctoral student at Texas A & M University completing my Record of Study on “Investigating the Relationship between the Implementation of Site-Based Decision Making and Successful School Practices.” As you are aware, much interest has evolved in recent years concerning site-based decision making. However, little data exist showing if this managerial change in the schools is effective in improving student outcomes. The purpose of this study is to determine for schools that vary in degrees of success on state measures, what are the perceptions of principals and teachers on site-based decision making and how do the perceptions vary.

The information generated from this study is important to our school district because implementation of site-based decision making has been mandated for all Texas school districts since 1992. Because of the lack of information available regarding the effect of site-based management on student outcomes, decisions regarding its continuance in our school district may not be based on empirical findings supporting its effectiveness.

Campus principals and teachers in 4 elementary schools in our school district will be asked to complete an online survey that should take no more than 20 minutes. Participation in the study would follow the guidelines of the Texas A & M University Human Subject Protection Program. The information obtained on the survey would be confidential and no individual school district or elementary school would be identifiable from the findings.

I am including a copy of the survey packet for your information. I anticipate beginning data collection in August, 2012. If you have any questions or would like to discuss this matter further prior to giving permission to use our school district in this study, please feel free to contact me at (903) 597-7733. If you would agree to have ten elementary schools in our district participate in this study, please respond in writing on district letterhead or email. You can send your letter directly to me at:

Andy Woods Elementary
3131 Fry Avenue
Tyler, TX 75701
Sandra.owens@tylerisd.org

Once the research has been completed, I will be sending a summary copy of the findings to you.

I appreciate your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,
Sandra D. Owens

TO: Elementary School Principals

I am a doctoral student at Texas A & M University completing my Record of Study on “Investigating the Relationship between the Implementation of Site-Based Decision Making and Successful School Practices.” The purpose of this study is to determine for schools that vary in degrees of success on state measures, what are the perceptions of principals and teachers on site-based decision making and how do the perceptions vary.

Four instruments are included in this study. They are the Perceptions of Site-Based Decision Making, Involvement, Areas of Decision Making, and a short demographic survey. These instruments should take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

I have received approval from the superintendent to request participation of you and teachers in your school in a survey and would like to ask your assistance in making this process as easy as possible. Please be advised that all responses for both your teachers and yourself will be confidential and no individual or school will be identifiable from the analysis that will be provided on the final report. No risks or additional effects are likely to result from your participation in this study.

Each principal and teacher will be asked to participate in an online survey. Your participation and participation of teachers in this study is voluntary, with the completion of the online survey as evidence of your willingness to participate in this study. Once the surveys are completed, teachers will be unable to withdraw information as no coding is included that would identify the respondents.

If you would like a copy of the results of this study, please notify me by email or phone. I will be happy to share the findings with you and your school.

Please complete the survey within ten working days of notification. If you have any questions regarding the items on the survey or the purpose of the study, please feel free to contact me at your earliest convenience. I can be reached at (903) 597-7733. This number is to my home where I have voicemail. I will return your call within 24 hours.

I appreciate your help with this project.

Sincerely,

Sandra D. Owens

TO: Elementary School Teachers

I am a doctoral student at Texas A & M University completing my Record of Study on “Investigating the Relationship between the Implementation of Site-Based Decision Making and Successful School Practices.” The purpose of this study is to determine for schools that vary in degrees of success on state measures, what are the perceptions of principals and teachers on site-based decision making and how do the perceptions vary.

Four instruments are included in this study. They are the Perceptions of Site-Based Decision Making, Involvement, Areas of Decision Making, and a short demographic survey. These instruments should take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

Please be advised that all responses will be confidential and that no individual will be identifiable from the analysis that will be provided on the final report. No risks or additional effects are likely to result from your participation in this study.

Your participation in this study is voluntary, with the completion of the online survey as evidence of your willingness to participate in this study. Once the completed surveys are completed, you will be unable to withdraw as no coding is included that would identify the respondents.

Please complete the survey within ten working days of notification. If you have any questions regarding the items on the survey or the purpose of the study, please feel free to contact me at your earliest convenience. I can be reached at (903) 597-7733. This number is to my home where I have voicemail. I will return your call within 24 hours.

I appreciate your help with this project.

Kind regards,

Sandra D. Owens

APPENDIX B

EXAMPLE OF ONLINE SURVEY

According to TAMU STANDARD ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

15.99.03.M1.03, normally, primary data and original documents should remain with the investigator or creative artist or in the department or laboratory for 7 years after the final publication from a project or as legally required to do otherwise.

Code of Federal Regulations Title 45 Part 46.115, states that records relating to research which is conducted shall be retained for at least three years after completion of the research. All records shall be accessible for inspection and copying by authorized representatives of the department or agency at reasonable times and in a reasonable manner.

Site-Based Decision Making in elementary schools is a system of providing individual school personnel with opportunities for greater control over issues that have previously been under the domain of central administration. This survey instrument was developed from a chart by Duke, Showers, and Imber (in Purkey & Smith, 1993). Please respond to each item.

1	2	3	4			
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree			
Perceptions of Site-Based Decision Making			1	2	3	4
Place a check mark in the column that most closely matches your level of agreement with each of the following statements.						
1. Site-based decision making provides a good approach for making routine decisions regarding school operations.						
2. Site-based decision making should be used when generating new ideas to address unique problems during a school year.						
3. Site-based decision making does not relieve the principal of accountability although decision making is shared with the staff.						
4. Enthusiasm for site-based decision making in schools has decreased.						
5. Adoption of site-based decision making has resulted in wider staff participation in school administration.						
6. Site-based decision making has resulted in different school practices than would have been possible under traditional methods of school administration.						
7. Site-based decision making is an efficient means of school administration.						
8. The collegiality between teachers and staff and administration has improved since the implementation of site-based decision making.						
9. Administrators, teachers, and staff should have the option of using site-based decision making.						
10. Teachers and staff are willing to accept the extra responsibility that assignment to a school using site-based decision making requires.						
11. Shared decision making allows for new ideas to be considered when making a decision.						
12. Teachers and staff members who are involved in shared decision making are more committed to school outcomes.						
13. Teachers and staff members have input into most decisions made in this school.						
14. Building administrators share most decisions with teachers and staff.						
15. Teachers and staff are seldom consulted before most decisions are made.						
16. Teachers and staff are given the opportunity to have input into most decisions made at this school.						

Demographic Survey

Please respond to the following as they relate to you. There are no correct or incorrect answers and all responses will be confidential. Results will be reported in summarized form, with no individual identifiable from the findings. Provide a response for each item.

Role

- Principal
- Teacher

Number of years as a teacher or administrator (include current year)

- First year
- 1 - 3
- 4 - 10
- 11 - 20
- >20

Number of years at present school (include current year)

- First year
- 1 - 3
- 4 - 10
- 11 - 20
- >20

Campus

- Griffin Elementary
- Jack Elementary
- Ramey Elementary
- Woods Elementary