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During the Kentucky Association of School Administrators Conference, July 1990, principals from across Kentucky were surveyed by a questionnaire to determine their perceptions and preparedness to assume their role under the newly mandated law, House Bill 940, specifically school-based management.

It was the assumption of the researcher that principals across Kentucky have very little background or training in the use of group processes and strategies needed to make school-based management a successful part of Kentucky's educational process.

Based on a statistical analysis of the collected data the research would appear to support the researcher's assumption. Principals indicated a need for staff development in the area of group processes and organizational strategies. They also indicated a basic knowledge of the concept of school-based management but were uncertain about the processes to achieve effective school-based management with school-based councils.
CHAPTER I

Introduction

In 1989, Judge Corns ruled Kentucky’s schools unconstitutional. This ruling was brought about from a class action suit from sixty-six of Kentucky’s poorer school districts, based on inequitable funding and the quality of districts across the Commonwealth. The subsequent change in the Kentucky educational process is as yet unforeseen. House Bill 940 mandated that the Kentucky Legislature create an entirely new and more equitable system of financing and governing education across the Commonwealth. The task force on education hired consultants from outside Kentucky to make recommendations in the areas of finance, governance and curriculum. There was very little input received from the educators of Kentucky.

Based on recommendations from consultants, House Bill (H.B.) 940 emerged. House Bill 940 was signed into law in April, 1990, and contained numerous changes in school law. One of those changes mandated how local schools would be governed, specifically with regard to the building principal. In essence, it removed the principal as the sole administrator of the school and created provisions for a school-based council which would function as the policy making body for the school.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research was to investigate how principals across the Commonwealth of Kentucky perceived their preparedness to assume their new role under the law.

At the time this mandate came into existence, there was little previous research on the role of a principal as a council member. However, other areas in the United
States have used a form of site based decision making, but nowhere else has a model like this one been implemented (Hornbeck, 1990). School-based management and shared decision making are foremost among the structural and process changes now in vogue (Moorman and Egermeier, 1989).

According to Moorman and Egermeier (1989) only 1-2 percent of the schools in the country are involved in some kind of restructuring endeavor. Three nationwide restructuring projects stand out: 1) The NEA sponsored Mastery in Learning, a demonstration project in 26 schools, the Team Approach to Better Schools, a school-based management effort in 37 districts in 17 states, and Learning Laboratories Initiatives, where one district in each state serves as a laboratory for restructuring; 2) The Coalition for Essential Schools, based at Brown University, engages over 50 schools in a coalition guided by the basic principles (Moorman and Egermeier, 1989) outlined in Horace’s Compromise; and 3) Re:Learning-- From the Schoolhouse to the Statehouse, a joint effort of the Coalition in which five states-- Arkansas, Delaware, Illinois, New Mexico, and Rhode Island-- will examine the policy and regulatory structure in effect in each state (Moorman and Egermeier, 1989).

Very little systematic thought has been given to the administrator’s role and training to this point (Nallia, 1990). Some recent thoughts arising from a LEAD study group and from other anecdotal observations suggest that:

The leadership role of the administrator must be emphasized over the merely managerial or administrative. Capacity to find or craft problems, to create, share, and generate commitment to a significant vision, to make sense of ambiguity are paramount.

But if this leadership role is cast in terms of instructional leadership, that term must be broadly enough construed to encompass the
functions of visioning, culture-shaping, negotiating with school district and community environments, etc.

Many of the skills and functions of leaders in common usage today are in fact what the leader of the restructured school needs: human relations skills, participatory decisionmaking, culture-building, visioning, coaching, etc. No mysterious or arcane new skills are necessarily called for.

Formal preparation and development in these areas will help, but the task of the leader in restructuring calls as much for collegial interaction, support, reflection, networking, and trust. Opportunities to see and experience on site and from colleagues will be very important.

The ability to form and articulate a vision of restructured education that will work--and a way of getting there--entails a clear understanding of the conditions and elements that produce or constrain different kinds of school outcomes. Leadership teams, if not each individual leader, must be able to call upon such knowledge and bring it to bear on the situation at hand in a coherent way (Moorman and Egermeier, 1989).

Any effort that is made to move toward School-Based Management, which depends upon the collective vision of diverse constituent groups, must include a significant commitment in the staff development arena. We cannot expect significant and exciting modifications for improvement if we do not provide those charged with creating the opportunity to become acquainted with at least a portion of the possibilities that currently exist (Golarz, 1989).

Historically, there is probably no more difficult role to perform in a school district than that of building principal. Responsibility for the total operations of that building falls on the principal, and yet we have never given the building principal the resources necessary to adequately perform that function. If the district has any discretionary resources, it remains in the hands of the central office personnel, the superintendent and/or the board. Most building principals clearly understand this, and in good faith, continue to give it their "best shot." If any role is perceived as
particularly vulnerable with the onset of School-Based Management, it is the role of the building principal. Most process designs in operation today for School-Based Management, involve the sharing of decision making at the building level and have the appearance of having an adverse impact on that principal's already misunderstood authority and role. Prior to any movement toward the initiation of School-Based Management, considerable time should be spent discussing with building principals the implications of this design for their role and authority. In addition, the board, superintendent and central office need to reflect and model their willingness to modify authority in a way which is consistent with their expectations for authority and role modification at the building level. If, for example, it is the superintendent's exclusive authority to interview and recommend employees for hiring, the superintendent should consider sharing such authority as a model of commitment prior to implementation of this concept at any school-based operational level. There are modifications that can be made by the board and central office that can send a clear message of commitment, particularly to those front line supervisors who are so important to successful implementation (Golarz, 1989).

One of the tragedies in collective perceptions about schools is that we tend to think of them in the same way that we think of assembly lines. Each individual on the assembly line has a function to perform, resulting in a product produced which fully meets all predesigned expectations. Parents, teachers and building principals tend to use that same industrial-based assembly line model when we think of the operations of schools. The building principal almost naturally carves out his perceived assembly line role and, when faced with the possibility of school-based decision making, sees the potential for a distortion of what he or she perceived the role to be. Yet most any principal could easily generate an extensive listing of the things that he or she would like to do and would prefer doing if time permitted (Golarz, 1989).
If School-Based Management is to work, the building principal must somehow be convinced that this strategy will, in reality, create the opportunity for allowing the real possibility for finally getting to that preferred list that new role that he or she has always wanted to perform. Those building principals who have embraced the School Based Management concept have found that this does happen, and it would be wise when initiating this process to provide building principals unfamiliar and naturally edgy about this direction with an opportunity to meet with building principals who have already been involved in the process. Finally, and of critical importance, is that school boards, superintendents, and central office administrators clearly understand that School Based Management teams who accept authority for decision making must also accept, in part, the responsibility for those same decisions. It would be grossly unfair to endorse and implement a strategy of shared decision making and then hold accountable the building principal for any implementation strategy that did not work (Golarz, 1989).

School-based management intensifies the need for leadership from the principal, who functions like a chief executive officer. Ultimately, the degree to which school-level authority is shared and how it is shared are in the hands of the principal. Districts with a history of successfully decentralizing authority are characterized by strong superintendents who use training, hiring and evaluation criteria, and incentives to develop strong site managers. These superintendents send clear signals to principals that they value and reward those who involve teachers in decision making (David, 1989).

Statement of the Problem

How do the present Kentucky school principals perceive their role, and how well prepared are they to meet the school based management section of H.B. 940?

Even though this action has been mandated by H.B. 940, it is extremely important to know how Kentucky principals will ultimately react. Based on this
research, the Kentucky Department of Education will have relevant information regarding areas for staff development. The research sample includes principals from the seven Congressional Districts of Kentucky and from schools with kindergarten through twelfth grade. The subjects were selected by a random sampling of K-12 principals within these districts of Kentucky.

This research will provide the Kentucky Department of Education baseline data for staff development programs planned for Kentucky principals. It has importance for instructors of higher education in providing an insight for preparing students seeking educational administrative certifications. It also serves to enlighten present principals across the Commonwealth as to how other professional administrators are receiving and perceiving the new mandates.

The research findings of this project will be submitted to the Deputy Superintendent of Instruction for the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the Kentucky State School Board for Elementary and Secondary Education, Kentucky Association of School Administrators, and the Kentucky Association of School Executives for use in professional development.

Questions To Be Answered

The following questions need to be answered in order to better understand the needs of Kentucky's principals.

1. What is the knowledge base of current principals regarding site-based management?
2. How do Kentucky principals perceive team leadership/management?
3. What is the current level of knowledge regarding group process and organizational communications among Kentucky principals?
4. Have Kentucky principals had training in consensus building techniques?
5. As a school principal what is the greatest concern about site-based
management?

6. In the principals' opinion, will site-based decision making, as presented in H.B. 940, bring about effective change?

Hypothesis

The assumption was that Kentucky principals had very little background or training in the use of group processes and strategies needed to make school-based management a successful part of Kentucky's educational reform.

Procedures and Limitations

Principals were randomly selected from the seven Congressional Districts of Kentucky to receive a questionnaire. The questionnaire yielded data to be analyzed that would gauge the present perception and preparation level of principals in their role as members of site-based decision making teams.

Questionnaires were presented to principals and used as initial knowledge surveys at Kentucky Association School Executives (KASE) workshops. The percentage of returned surveys and the use of a Likert scale, which tends to reveal regression toward the mean, are limitations.
CHAPTER II
Review of Literature

The Law - House Bill 940

The report of the Council on School Performance Standards states in recommendation three: "that the Commonwealagh of Kentucky should encourage and support innovative efforts by local schools to adopt new professional roles, organizational structures, and institutional strategies that promote student achievement of the six goals of the Common Core of Learning." (Pankratz, 1990).

These include:

a. new roles for principals as leaders who will involve teachers in decision making and encourage teamwork;

b. new roles for teachers as organizers, leaders, and facilitators of learning experiences and resources;

c. school-based management that encourages professional judgment and accountability for the flexible use of space, time, equipment and materials;

d. greater involvement of parents, community, business, and industry in planning and implementing local school curricula (Pankratz, 1990).

This section is more explicit in House Bill 94
Section 14-(1)j:

(j) The school council shall adopt a policy to be implemented by the principal in the following additional areas:

1. Determination of curriculum, including needs assessment, curriculum development, alignment with state standards, technology utilization, and program appraisal within the local school
board's policy;

2. Assignment of all instructional and non-instructional staff time;

3. Assignment of students to classes and programs within the school;

4. Determination of the schedule of the school day and week, subject to the beginning and ending times of the school day and school calendar year as established by the local board;

5. Determination of use of school space during the school day;

6. Planning and resolution of issues regarding instructional practices;

7. Selection and implementation of discipline and classroom management techniques, including responsibilities of the student, parents, teacher, counselor, and principal; and

8. Selection of extracurricular programs and determination of policies relating to student participation based on academic qualifications and attendance requirements, program evaluation and supervision.

2) The policy adopted by the local board to implement school-based decision making shall also address the following:

   (a) School budget and administration, including: discretionary funds; activity and other school funds; funds for maintenance, supplies and equipment; and accounting and auditing;

   (b) Assessment of individual student progress, including testing and reporting of student progress to students, parents, the school district, the community and the state;

   (c) School improvement plans, including the form and function of strategic planning and its relationship to district planning;

   (d) Professional development plans developed pursuant to Sections 12 and 13 of this Act;

   (e) Parent, citizen, and community participation
including the relationship of the council with other groups;

(f) Cooperation and collaboration within the district, with other districts and with other public and private agencies;

(g) Requirements for waiver of district policies;

(h) Requirements for record keeping by the school council; and

(i) A process for appealing a decision made by a school council.

3) In addition to the authority granted to the school council in this section, the local board may grant to the school council any other authority permitted by law. The board shall make available liability insurance coverage for the protection of all members of the school council from liability arising in the course of pursuing their duties as members of the council (Kentucky General Assembly, 1990).

The Principal's Role - Creating a Vision

Just as there is no one image of a restructured school, there is also no one right way to go about restructuring. As Michael Fullan (1982b) points out,

There can be no one recipe for change, because unlike ingredients for a cake, people are not standard to begin with, and the damned thing is that they change as you work with them in response to their experiences and perceptions (p. 129).

Nevertheless, there is a considerable body of research and experience that has arisen through recent school improvement efforts that provides an impressive point of departure in efforts to restructure.

In many respects, restructuring can be approached in a fashion similar to implementing multiple, intertwined school improvement efforts, with the understanding that they are incredibly more massive and complex and require much more than making a minor change in one aspect of the school. It requires rethinking and redesigning the entire system. Clearly the need is to begin
somewhere -- and that somewhere may be with changing only one aspect of the school -- but vision must encompass the overall system and a plan for restructuring it.

It is recommended that one begin by establishing a multiconstituent building level restructuring team to provide leadership and guidance in the effort. Leadership is critical to the success, or failure, of any restructuring effort. To take a lesson from school improvement efforts, Fleming and Buckles (1987) warn that,

An increasing number of leaders report that the success of their efforts depends on the composition, influence, and skill on the staff assigned to steer complex projects. For leaders who will be working with school improvement teams for the first time, the selection and guidance of team members and the establishment of ground rules for discussion, decision-making, and workscope, are essential (p. 3).

Harvey and Hergert (1986) emphasize a number of relevant points in their discussion of the fundamental role people play in change efforts,

First, particularly in major change efforts, everyone has some type of role, e.g. teachers, trainers, administrators, policy makers, parents. The use of multiple strategies can involve many people doing many things. . . .
Second, forceful leadership, usually by a district-level administrator or building principal, is "the factor that contributes most directly . . . to major, effective changes in classroom practice that become firmly incorporated into everyday routines" . . .
Third, sticking with the effort rather than transferring responsibilities entirely to users can make a difference (Crandall and Loucks, 1983, p. 10, 294-295).

One of the first and most crucial tasks of the restructuring team is to create a vision of the "restructured school". It is absolutely critical to develop a shared vision of the restructured school at the outset. The vision must be one that both the school community and the community at large can endorse and support. Given the
radical departure from the norm that restructuring efforts represent, the more concrete the vision, the better (Harvey and Crandell, 1988).

The Kentucky Principals Institute believes schools must be led and staffed by people who have the ability to see past today's situation, to take what is known today and constantly plan the strategy to attack tomorrow's problems. Round buildings, team teaching, and site-based management are examples of visions which have become reality. Most of these innovations proved not to be the panacea their inventors imagined for them, yet all of them have added some useful aspects to the field of education.

Vision may often be accompanied by risk taking. Principals and all members of the participatory decision-making team need support and encouragement to take the risks necessary to translate vision into reality (Kentucky Principals Institute, 1990).

Given the long-term nature of restructuring, one must be prepared for an extensive, intensive implementation phase, requiring constant attention and vigilance. Fleming and Buckles (1987) suggest a number of strategies for "keeping the flame burning" including continuous staff development opportunities for staff in successfully implementing the effort; regular progress reports and/or meetings; an active communications campaign to publicize successes and reward participation; and frequent replanning sessions. Pairing and sharing with another school, undergoing similar activities will help offset the inevitable feeling that "I'm all alone out there" and "nobody could be having this much trouble." A well-planned communications and public relations campaign is crucial to maintain and foster community and political interest and support as well as to enhance faculty and student morale (Harvey and Crandall, 1988).
**School Based Management/ Shared Decision Making**

School-based management does not, in and of itself, necessitate shared decision making. The effective schools' research concludes that a good principal is the essential element for a good school and a good principal can conceivably be more authoritarian than democratic (Nallia, 1990).

However, in a restructured school that adheres to the school-based management model (and its underlying philosophy that those who are closest to the problems should make the decisions), it seems unthinkable that teachers, students, or parents should be excluded from decision making. Their expertise in various matters would be indispensable to the principal of a restructured school (Kentucky Principals Institute, 1990).

The question does arise, though, as to the extent of involvement in decision making. Should everyone be involved in every decision? The premise is that "people should be involved in a decision if it is important to them, if they are competent in that particular area, and if they have the recognized power to act on the decision" (Kentucky Principal's Institute, 1990).

School-based management encompasses a wide variety of practices. Most manifestations have one or more of the following: (1) some marginal choices about staffing; (2) a small discretionary budget for materials or staff development; (3) a mechanism for teachers to be involved in certain decisions; (4) an annual performance report; and (5) a role for parents, either through an advisory group, membership on a decision-making group, or through some form of parent choice (David, 1989).

Although school-based management takes many forms, the essence is school-level autonomy plus participatory decision making. In districts that practice school-based management essentials, research studies find a range of positive effects, from increased teacher satisfaction and professionalism to new arrangements and
practices within schools. These findings apply to districts with decentralized systems whether or not they carry the "school-based management" label (David, 1989; Sickler, 1988).

Shared decision making does not necessarily bring benefits to those involved. It depends on the decision concerns, who participates, in what capacity, for what reason, and at what stage (Miles, 1981). When schools are given only marginal authority (e.g., a small discretionary budget) and are asked to form site councils, develop annual plans, and prepare annual reports, teachers perceive these requests as yet another set of top-down demands. This perception is intensified when districts retain tight control over accountability (Cororan et al., 1988).

In practice, teacher input in decision making often substitutes for delegated authority, which contributes to the blurring of labels between school improvement programs, shared decision making, and school-based management (Kolderie, 1988). When the authority and resources to act are not provided, district efforts can actually backfire (Meier, 1987). Asking people to participate in decisions about which they have no information is frustrating, not empowering. Participating in planning committees, in contrast to action committees with specific agendas, increases alienation because it uses up time and energy with no visible results (Kanter, 1983).

School-based management is not a fixed set of rules. It is the opposite of prescription and, in fact, by definition operates differently from one district to the next and from one year to the next. The goal is to empower school staff by providing authority, flexibility, and resources to solve the educational problems particular to their schools (David, 1989).

For some school board members and administrators, it is difficult to share authority for fear that power is lost. Principals are reluctant to give up authority or power for fear that they will lose control of the school and will not measure up to
the expectation of the superintendent, parents or the board. Sharing of power and authority with teachers and others is essential if school-based management is to be successful. Superintendents and boards of education must communicate clearly what authority they are willing to delegate to the school. The principal must be willing to share authority with teachers and others or traditional forms of bureaucracy will shift from the central office to the school (Nallia, 1990).

New Leadership for Principals

Lewis (1990) discusses techniques on moving principals to new leadership. Another commentary on how to release the “extraordinary leadership capabilities” of teachers comes from Barth (1988) who helped established the nation’s first university-based principals’ academy. A school should become a community of leaders, where leadership is defined as “making what you believe in happen.” His ideas on how principals can move toward shared leadership include (Barth 1988):

Articulating the goal. Principals may not be certain of their vision or may be reluctant to share it with others, but “the involvement of teachers in school leadership is much more likely to occur when the principal openly articulates his or her vision...”

Relinquishing. The popular, and conservative, view of leadership is that “one should accumulate and consolidate, not relinquish,” but to be an effective principal in a school that fosters leadership, a principal must relinquish authority in order to release the latent talents of teachers.

Entrusting. If, when the going gets rough, the principal retracts what he or she has relinquished, it won’t be long before a school faculty will secede from the community of leaders, says Barth.

Involving teachers in decision-making. This means turning over important, not “maintenance” decision-making to teachers -- before the principal has decided upon a solution.

Assigning responsibilities wisely. Rather than overburden a selected few teachers, it would be
better to match an important school issue with a
teacher who cares about that issue. "Innovative
solutions come more often from teachers who don't
know how to handle a problem but desire to learn." "The moment of greatest learning for any of us comes
with a need to seek assistance; then we are ready to learn."

Sharing responsibility for failure. Rather than ask
who was at fault when something goes wrong, it is
better to ask, "What happened, what can we learn
from it, and how can we do better the next time?"
The principal who shares the foxhole with teachers
will develop collegiality and higher morale.

Attributing success to the teacher. It is equally
important that a principal allow successes to
reflect upon the teachers involved. Good
principals, "are more often hero-makers
than heros."

Believing in teachers. If principals believe that
all teachers can lead, they will seek to use the
individual strengths of teachers.

Admitting ignorance. Teachers understand that
principals don't know everything -- but principals
do not often admit that. If a principal "invites"
leadership on the part of a teacher by saying,
"I've got some ideas about this but I don't know
exactly how to go about it," the way is open for
teachers to work collaboratively with that
principal. (p. 239).

Barth (1989) notes that many schools and organizations around the country are
successful with the idea of a "community of leaders," admitting, however, that the
idea "is as perilous as it is promising" (p. 238). A vision of shared leadership can
help teachers and principals "respond less randomly and more coherently and
cooperatively to the thousands of situations they face every day in the schools" (pp.
238 - 240).
CHAPTER III
Report Of The Data

On July 21, 1990, the researcher met with principals from across the Commonwealth at the Kentucky Association of School Administrator's conference in Louisville, Kentucky, for the purpose of conducting a research study. The study was to determine how principals perceived and how well prepared they were to assume school-based management as set forth in House Bill 940. The researcher designed and developed a questionnaire (Appendix A) to collect the data. The questionnaire consisted of ten questions and demographic data to which the principals could respond. The questions were subjective in nature and rated on a Likert scale which included: strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat agree, agree, and strongly agree.

During a workshop for principals the purpose for the research was explained and questionnaires distributed to each principal. The questionnaires were collected at the end of each session. The researcher used frequency counts, percentages and demographic distributions to analyze the data. Bar graphs were used to indicate the frequency by percentage on each statement. Seventy-two percent of the distributed questionnaires were returned from the one hundred and twenty-six distributed.

Responses to Survey Questions

Each statement of the questionnaire was analyzed based on the frequency and percentage of responses. The categories of response (i.e. strongly disagree, disagree) were grouped into "disagreement" with the statement and agree and strongly agree were grouped into "agreement" with the statement. The "somewhat agree" category was treated separately. The choice of somewhat agree indicates that
while the participant may agree there is still some doubt or uncertainty and therefore could not be tabulated as being in agreement or disagreement with the statement.

Figure 1 displays the percentage of responses to each statement on the questionnaire.
## Response Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Percentage Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 1</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 2</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 4</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 6</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 7</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 8</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 9</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 10</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Principals 71
Total Responding 99.02%

*Figure 1. Response Summary*
Demographic Data

The principals were surveyed regarding their experience, levels of principalship, and congressional district residency.

The years of experience of the responding principals reflected a range of experience with 60.5 percent in the 0-5 year range as shown in Figure 2.
Figure 2. Percentages of years of experience of respondents.
School-level of the respondents revealed the highest percentage (64.7) in the elementary principalship as shown in Figure 3.
Figure 3. Percentages of school-levels of respondents.
Congressional districts of residency of the respondents revealed the highest percentage (28.2) in the Second Congressional District as shown in Figure 4.
Figure 4. Percentages of congressional residency of the respondents.
Question Number 1:

I understand the concept of school-based management.

As shown in Figure 5, there was a one hundred percent response to this statement with 15.4% in disagreement; (i.e. not understanding the concept of school-based management) while 40.8% agreed with the statement, understanding the concept of school-based management. There were 43.8% in the somewhat agree category.
Figure 5. Percentage of response regarding understanding the concept of school-based management.
Question Number 2:

School-based management as presented in H.B. 940 will bring about effective change at my school.

As shown in Figure 6, there was a 97.2% response to this statement with 21.7% being in disagreement; i.e. will not bring about effective change in their school, while 29% were in agreement with the statement that effective change would occur. Nearly half of those responding, 49.3%, seem to think it may bring about effective change but only agree with the statement in a partial degree.
Figure 6. Percentages of responses regarding school-based management bringing about effective change.
Question Number 3:

Teachers perceive school-based management as a means of constructively adding to the management of schools.

As shown in Figure 7, there was a 100% response to this statement with 18.3% in disagreement; i.e. teachers see school-based management as something other than a means of constructively adding to the management of schools. However, 40.9% were in agreement with the statement, i.e. teachers will constructively add to the management of school through school-based management. A very similar percentage, 40.8%, only somewhat agree that teachers perceive school-based management as constructively adding to schools.
Figure 7. Percentages of responses regarding principals’ opinions on teacher perceptions of school-based management constructively adding to school management.
Question Number 4:

I like the idea of sharing the decision authority with a school based council.

As shown in Figure 8, there was a 100% response to this statement with 18.4% in disagreement, i.e. they do not like the idea sharing the decision authority while 56.3% agree that they like the idea of sharing the decision authority, with the school council. However, 25.3% only somewhat agree, which would indicate indecision on their part or that they are not sure whether they would like it or not.

Statements five through eight were designed to determine to what extent principals were familiar with certain group processes and if they felt a need for improvement in this area. (See Questionnaire Appendix A and Chapter IV for a summary, conclusion and researcher's recommendation on statements).
Figure 8. Percentages of responses regarding the sharing of authority with school-based councils.
Question Number 5:

Consensus building problem solving technique will be the best format to manage the school based council.

As shown in Figure 9, there was a 100% response to this statement with 14.1% in disagreement, i.e. this will not be the best format to use, while 52.1% felt it would be the best format to use with the school councils. Those who somewhat agreed with the statement represented 33.8% of those surveyed.
Figure 9. Percentages of responses regarding the use of consensus building problem solving technique as the best format.
Question Number 6:

Nominal group problem solving technique will be the best format to manage the school-based council.

As shown in Figure 10, there was a 93% response to this statement with 36.4% in disagreement, i.e. this will not be the best format to use, while 19.8% felt it would be the best format to use. Forty-three point eight (43.8%) percent only somewhat agreed that this was the best format.
Figure 10. Percentages of responses regarding the use of nominal group problem solving technique as the best format.
Question Number 7:

Democratic vote technique will be the best format to manage the school-based council.

As shown in Figure 11, there was a 100% response to this statement with 57.7% in disagreement, i.e. this will not be the best format to use, while 14.1% agreed it would be the best format to use. Twenty-eight point two percent (28.2%) only somewhat agree on this being the best format to use with the school-based council.
Figure 11. Percentages of responses regarding the use of democratic vote technique as the best format.
Question Number 8:

I would like to see a staff development program for principals solely on school-based management, i.e. group management and processes.

As shown in Figure 12, there was a 100% response to this statement with 7.1% in disagreement, i.e. they would not want staff development in this area, while 80.2% felt staff development was needed with group management and processes. Twelve point seven (12.7%) percent only somewhat agreed this was needed.
Figure 12. Percentages of responses regarding the desire for staff development on school-based management and group processes.
Question Number 9:

My role as a leader has been greatly reduced, if not done away with, due to the school-based management section of H.B. 940.

As shown in Figure 13, there was a 100% response to this statement with 63.4% in disagreement, i.e. their role as a leader was not affected as stated, while 14.1% felt their role as stated would be affected. Twenty-two point five (22.5%) percent somewhat agreed with the statement.
Figure 13. Percentages of responses regarding the principals' perception of their leadership role due to House Bill 940.
Question Number 10:

A firm, concrete vision must be in place in order for school-based management to succeed.

As shown in Figure 14, there was a 100% response to this statement with 9.9% in disagreement (i.e. it is not necessary to have a concrete vision for school-based management to succeed) while 77.4% agreed there needed to be a concrete vision in order for school-based management to succeed. Twelve point seven (12.7%) percent only somewhat agreed that there needed to be a concrete vision for successes.
Figure 14. Percentages of responses regarding the importance for a concrete vision in order for school-based management to succeed.
CHAPTER IV
Summary, Conclusions, And Recommendations

Summary

During the Kentucky Association of School Administrators' Conference in July 1990, principals were given a questionnaire to determine their preparedness and perception of school-based management as set forth in H.B. 940. The following information was generated from analyses of the data as it related to the questions presented in Chapter I:

1. What is the knowledge base of current principals on school-based management?

More than 43% of the responding principals only somewhat agreed they understood the concept of school-based management. This would indicate they may agree with the concept but are unsure about the process to achieve effective school-based management.

2. How do Kentucky principals perceive team management?

Question numbers 3, 4, and 9 on the questionnaire address the principals’ perception of teachers in team management. The majority of responding principals viewed the teachers’ perception of school-based management and sharing of authority in a positive manner and they did not feel their role as a leader was going to be greatly affected.

3. What is the current level of staff development in group and organizational communication among Kentucky's principals?

Question number 8 addressed the need for staff development in the area of group management and processes as it relates to school-based management. More than 80 percent of the responding principals agreed or strongly agreed on the need
for staff development in this area.

4. Do principals have or have they had training in consensus building techniques?

Question numbers 5, 6, and 7 of the questionnaire were designed to gather data with respect in knowledge of the techniques. Ideally, consensus building and nominal group techniques should have received the strongest agreement and democratic the least. Based on the results of the data, it would appear that Kentucky's principals agree with the use of consensus building technique. However, nominal group technique revealed that over 40 percent of the responding principals were only somewhat in agreement with the use of this technique. This shows a need for instruction in the use of nominal group techniques.

5. As a school principal, what is the greatest concern about school-based management?

Based on the analyses of the data, it would appear that a need for staff development exists. It appears that principals have a fairly good grasp on the concept of school-based management but are unsure about the processes in making it an effective tool in Kentucky's schools.

6. In the principal’s opinion, will school-based management as presented in H.B. 940, bring about effective change?

Based on the data, it appears that the majority of principals responding somewhat agreed with the statement. Perhaps this is caused by uncertainty about the process to achieve effective school-based management.

Conclusions

General conclusions to be drawn from this research are as follows:

1. Kentucky's principals have a basic knowledge about the school-based management concept.

2. Kentucky's principals are unsure about the processes needed to make the school-based concept effective in Kentucky's schools.
3. Kentucky's principals strongly agree a sound concrete vision is going to have to exist in order for the school-based management concept to succeed.

4. Kentucky's principals feel a great need for staff development in the processes needed to achieve an effective school-based management approach.

Recommendations

Recommendations made by the researcher based on this research are as follows:

1. Kentucky should require staff development programs for all principals stressing processes and techniques in group and organizational management.

2. Kentucky should require educational administrative courses at the graduate level to instruct group and organizational management strategies in Kentucky universities and colleges.

Hypothesis

Based on the data presented in this research project, the hypothesis is an accurate statement. Kentucky's principals have very little background or training in the use of group processes and strategies needed to make school-based management a successful part of Kentucky's educational process.
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Appendix A

QUESTIONNAIRE
SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT
JULY 1990

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine how principals perceive their role and how well prepared they are to assume school-based management as set forth in House Bill 940.

Please respond to the items in terms of your present opinion regarding school-based management. Each item varies in degree of intensity from 1 to 5.

Example:

I strongly agree with this statement.
1 2 3 4 5

I somewhat agree with this statement.
1 2 3 4 5

I strongly disagree with this statement.
1 2 3 4 5

Please remember to respond in terms of your present opinion.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Somewhat Strongly
Disagree Agree Agree

1. I understand the concept of school-based management. 1 2 3 4 5

2. School-based management as presented in H.B. 940 will bring about effective change at my school. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Teachers perceive school-based management as a means of constructively adding to the management of schools. 1 2 3 4 5

4. I like the idea of sharing the decision authority with a school-based council. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Consensus building problem solving technique will be the best format to manage the school-based council.

6. Nominal group problem solving technique will be the best format to manage the school-based council.

7. Democratic vote technique will be the best format to manage the school-based council.

8. I would like to see a staff development program for principals solely on school-based management, e.g. group management and processes.

9. My role as a leader has been greatly reduced, if not done away with, due to the school-based management section of H.B. 940.

10. A firm, concrete vision must be in place in order for school-based management to succeed.

Please circle the appropriate response.

Years as a principal:

A. 0 - 5 years
B. 6 - 10 years
C. 11 - 15 years
D. 15 - 20 years
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present principalship:</th>
<th>A. Elementary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. High school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Congressional District: | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 |