DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 842 FL 019 294

AUTHOR McKeon, Denise; Malarz, Lynn
TITLE School Based Management: What Bilingual and ESL Program Directors Should Know. Program Information Guide Series No. 5.
INSTITUTION National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 91
CONTRACT 289004001
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Guides; Administrator Role; *Bilingual Education; Change Strategies; Curriculum Development; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); *Organizational Change; Parent Role; Program Administration; Program Development; *School Based Management; School Community Relationship; Second Language Programs; *Staff Utilization; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

A discussion of the school based management movement outlines the forces influencing the movement, examines the process of change as a key factor in implementation of school based management, discusses how roles of key personnel and key players shape the design and implementation of school based management, and describes the steps that bilingual and English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) project directors must take to ensure the continued viability of instructional programs serving limited-English-speaking students in those contexts. The history of the movement since 1983 is briefly chronicled, and the process of changeover to school based management in a district is described, with reference to research on organizational change and adjustment in roles. The possible specific effects of school based management on bilingual and ESL programs are then discussed in greater detail, focusing on role changes for the program director or coordinator, the bilingual or ESL teacher, and parents and community members. Potential administrative, programmatic, and curricular changes in bilingual and ESL programs are also addressed. Finally, what the bilingual or ESL program director can do to prepare for school based management is outlined, including a checklist for program directors to use in implementing school based management. Contains 30 references. (MSE)

NCBE

5

National
Clearinghouse
for
Bilingual
Education

Program
Information
Guide
Series

Summer
1991

School Based Management: What Bilingual and ESL Program Directors Should Know

by

[redacted]

Denise McKeon

[redacted]

Lynn Malarz

The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE) is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) and is operated under Contract No. 289004001 by The George Washington University's Center for the Study of Education and National Development, jointly with the Center for Applied Linguistics. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Education, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government. Readers are free to duplicate and use these materials in keeping with accepted publication standards. NCBE requests that proper credit be given in the event of reproduction.

Introduction

This paper outlines the forces which have influenced the school based management movement as it stands today, examines the process of change as a key factor in the implementation of school based management, discusses how the roles (and changes in roles) of key personnel and key players shape the design and implementation of school based management, and describes the steps that bilingual and English as a Second Language (ESL) project directors must take to ensure the continued viability of instructional programs that serve limited English proficient (LEP) students in contexts where school based management is practiced.

> *Significant educational improvement of schooling, not mere tinkering, requires that we focus on entire schools, not just teachers or principals or curricula or organizations or school-community relations but all of these and more.* (Goodlad, 1984, p. xvi)

With these words, Goodlad and others concerned with the quality of American schooling (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Marburger, 1985; Sizer, 1984) signaled the beginning of the school based management movement. It should be noted that school based management is not a new idea. Its antecedents may be found in the demands for decentralization and community control of schools in the 1960s (Cunningham, 1971) and the school-site budgeting plans of the 1970s (David, 1989). In 1990, however, school based management has emerged in response to evidence that our educational system is not working, and that strong central control contributes greatly to this fact. The definition of school based management revolves around the central theme of moving the decision-making process closer to those educators the decisions will ultimately affect. Marburger (1985, p. xi) sees school based management as a "decentralized form of organization, in which decisions are made by those who know and care most about the quality of education students receive—the principal, teachers, parents and citizens, and the students themselves."

Lindelow (1981) defines school based management as a system of educational administration in which the school is the primary unit of educational decision-making. David (1989, p. 3) states that "the backbone of school based management is the delegation of authority from district to schools." Clune and White (1988) report that school based management appears to be a superior blend of autonomy and accountability characterized by increased school decentralization, flexibility, and shared decision-making.

These general definitions represent a broad theme which runs throughout the implementation of school based management, but they do not convey the breadth and depth of diversity seen in various school based management designs.

School Based Management in the 1990s: How Did We Get Here?

The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, issued in 1983, was the first of a series of critical reports on public schooling in the United States. *A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* contained an open letter to the American people which described the educational foundations of this country as being "eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity." In an attempt to discover ways to stem that tide, policymakers began examining the research which described schools that seemed to be operating effectively. This effective schools research (Brookover and Lezotte, 1979; Purkey and Smith, 1982) was generally characterized by listings of features that all effective schools seemed to exhibit (i.e., strong leadership on the part of the principal, high expectations for all students). Many schools planned and began to carry out reform efforts using the effective schools research to guide them. This move toward school improvement began at the single school level, largely ignoring the central office and bypassing the local school board (Lieberman and Miller, 1981; Neale, Bailey and Ross, 1981). School improvement tended to be seen as a series of "prescriptions" which if administered in correct doses would result in more effective schools (D'Amico, 1982). As school improvement efforts became more seasoned, both researchers and policymakers began to realize that creating an effective school requires the leadership, collaboration, and support of the school board and the central office, as well as change at the whole-school level (Lezotte, 1989). School based management appears to be a marriage of the findings of effective schools research and the lessons learned from the early school improvement movement. Today, school based management requires that school improvement begin with whole-system change. This is generally characterized by three elements: a restructuring of personnel roles, the decentralization of three critical elements of schooling (the budget, the curriculum, and the selection of staff), and shared decision-making. Changes in any of these three elements will ultimately affect the implementation of ESL and bilingual programs as well.

What Happens When a District Moves to School Based Management?

The successful restructuring of a school district to a school based management system has, in general, been initiated through a careful examination of the notion of such a change and its potential impact. Some of the most frequently used change models are presented below.

Most school districts begin by restructuring key personnel roles such as those of the superintendent, central office staff, the principal, and the faculty. The role played by parents and community members in

making critical decisions is also modified and, in most cases, greatly enhanced (Clune and White, 1988).

Increased parental and community involvement is often accomplished through the establishment of school site councils (also known as school based management councils). These councils operate on a school campus level. Their membership, which may vary from district to district, generally consists of the principal, faculty representatives, parent representatives, community members, and support staff representatives. Many school site councils also include student members. Membership on a school site council is determined by either election; appointment by the principal, faculty council, or other existing groups such as the PTA; or volunteerism.

The function of the school site council is to govern the school; it determines program priorities and allocates the school's budget accordingly. Responsibilities of the school council may also include development of a school improvement plan, assessment of the effectiveness of the school, negotiation with teachers on the goals of the school's educational plan, and personnel selection (Clune and White, 1988).

Because these "mainstream" role changes have a significant impact on school governance, in general, and may have a significant impact on the implementation of bilingual and ESL programs, it is important to understand the ways in which roles change. Some general characteristics of key role changes will also be discussed in this section.

Initiating School Based Management: The Process of Change

> *The ultimate power to change is—and always has been—in the heads, hands, and hearts of the educators who work in the schools. . . . Decisions must be made where the action is.*
> (Sirotnik and Clark, 1988, p. 33)

Over the last few years a plethora of research has emerged on the topic of change in education and its linkage to school based management (Fullan, 1982; Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin and Hall, 1987). We now know a great deal about how schools can be changed, how ownership can be shifted, and how those responsible for decision-making can be made part of the process of change.

Authors on planned change in education point to a variety of considerations seen to be important for change to be successful. These are expressed in several different models of change. School districts considering a shift to school based management generally explore these

models, adapting them to meet local standards and conditions.

One of the best known strategies for change is Organizational Development (OD). OD had its beginnings in business settings and, in the late 1960s, was adapted for use in schools (Schmuck, Runkel, Arends and Arends, 1977). The focus of change for OD is the group(s), not the individual. OD views schools as systems of people working interdependently, eventually moving into collaboration with other sets of individuals. Successful implementation of OD is dependent on strong support from top management and building principals, the guidance of trained and skilled OD consultants and the dedication of sufficient time by school staff to OD work (about 160 hours would be an appropriate amount of time for the first year in a moderately large school) (Schmuck, et al., 1977).

A second model of change is presented in the Rand Change Agent Study (Berman and McLaughlin, 1977). The Rand study examined four federally-funded "change agent programs" between 1973 and 1977. The first phase of the study examined initiation and implementation of the projects; the second phase focused on incorporation and continuation of innovative educational practices. Successful implementation efforts were characterized by constant planning to adapt a change to a local setting, extensive staff training, and a "critical mass" of innovators who provided support for the project and for one another (Hall and Hord, 1987). Implementation outcomes depended on such internal factors as organizational climate, motivation of participants, implementation strategies, and the scope of the change. In terms of organizational climate, the active support of the principal was central. In addition, the Rand study suggested that the process of adapting an innovation to local conditions was critical to the successful implementation of the change (Berman and McLaughlin, 1977).

A third highly regarded and frequently used model of change is the Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM) (Hord and Loucks, 1980). The CBAM was designed to provide an understanding of the dynamics of the target audience's perceptions of change. This understanding helps change facilitators (i.e., persons trying to effect change) adjust the form and function of their interventions so that the audience receives timely information and assistance that they perceive to be relevant and useful (Hall and Hord, 1987). Specific conclusions emerged from an initial study of the CBAM which form the basis of this change model (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin and Hall, 1987, pp. 5-6):

1. Change is a process, not an event;

2. Change is accomplished by individuals;

3. Change is a highly personal experience;

4. Change involves developmental growth;

5. Change is best understood in operational terms; and

6. The focus of change facilitation should be on individuals, innovations, and the context in which change will take place.

Finally, Rogers and Shoemaker (1971), cited in Hall and Hood (1987), suggest that the perceived attributes of the innovation itself affect its adoption; it is defined from the adopters' point of view and is organized into five categories:

1. *Relative Advantage*. If the innovation is perceived as having a relative advantage over present practice it is more likely to be adopted.

2. *Compatibility*. Innovations that are compatible with current practice are more likely to be adopted.

3. *Complexity*. Innovations that are perceived as complex or difficult tend to be adopted at a slower rate.

4. *Trialability*. If one or more components of an innovation can be tried out, the innovation is seen as less risky; trialability, therefore, produces higher adoption rates.

5. *Observability*. The more observable features and benefits of an innovation are, the more likely the innovation is to be adopted.

From the literature on change and innovation, it is clear that any attempt to implement school based management must carefully consider its introduction, adoption, and eventual institutionalization. School based management not only proposes change which concentrates on such visible forms of innovation as instruction or school climate, but also proposes change which affects deep patterns of school culture and the mind-sets which underlie everyday behavior and functioning in many school systems. Cuban (1984) refers to these more complex changes as "second order" changes which require the transformation of the basic character or identity of public education as it functions today. Second order changes require a "fundamental renegotiation of cherished myths and sacred rituals by multiple constituencies": parents, citizens, local politicians, teachers, staff, administrators, and students. "The entire community must reweave or reshape the symbolic tapestry that gives meaning to the educational process, and

this takes time" (Deal, 1990). For school districts to avoid initial failure in their restructuring efforts, they must manage change by offering intervention strategies.

The first step in offering such strategies requires that districts remember that *individuals* will be in charge of making the switch to school based management. Because of this individual involvement, all terms and end results must be explicitly defined. (What is meant by school improvement, restructuring, and site-based management? Do some staff members see school based management as school improvement?) Since these terms will influence important decisions about the quality of education within schools, individuals involved in school restructuring (including ESL and bilingual program directors) must insist that all terms be clearly defined.

Shifts in Key Personnel Roles

In addition to examining and implementing various models of change, school districts often begin the restructuring process by modifying many "classic" personnel roles. From the superintendent down, roles are inevitably altered to provide those closest to the students with a stronger voice in the decision-making process. While this modification is certainly the most characteristic change of school based management, it is also one of the most problematic. Key players must substitute new skills, attitudes, and behaviors for those to which they have grown accustomed. Changes in roles do not come easily; yet school based management cannot succeed without them.

The Superintendent

> *. . . a superintendent cannot embrace this more democratic form of leadership without undergoing significant role changes.*
> (Ingwerson, 1990, p. 11)

In this time of innovation in education as districts move toward school based management, the job of the superintendent is an especially difficult one. In most cases, however, it is the superintendent who initiates school based management.

Currently most school systems operate under highly centralized forms of management. The superintendent serves as the chief executive officer of the Board of Education with responsibility for executing board policy. Under school based management, the "top-down" hierarchical authority of the superintendent and central office staff is replaced with a "bottom-up" approach built on shared decision-making

(Curran, et al., 1990). For a district to successfully initiate and maintain school based management, the superintendent must support the innovation, develop mechanisms which facilitate implementation (such as school based budgeting), and provide the leadership needed for change.

Superintendents in this new era must become good listeners. They must learn not only to give up some power, but also to cope with the notion of shared decision-making in which principals, teachers, and parents assume decision-making responsibility and control. They must also learn to collaborate with other district leaders.

Central Office Staff

> *"The changes have required me to be a creative problem solver, a coalition builder, and an entrepreneur."* (Delehant, 1990, p .16)

Depending on the size of the district, a varying number of central office staff members hold assorted titles and perform more or less specialized functions: curriculum specialists, special project directors (such as bilingual or ESL program directors), special services personnel such as Speech and Language Specialists and Special Education personnel, the Personnel Department, and the Business Office staff. Traditionally, central office has controlled a large number of decisions made on behalf of those in any given system.

Decisions on budgeting and the allocation of funds have usually been placed in the hands of a business manager whose role has become solely that of a fiscal agent. The business manager has been described as a "money manager . . ., a protector of district funds with a ready negative response to every request" (Prasch, 1990). Functions most likely to be centralized are usually assigned to the business manager. For this reason, the business manager tends to gather power and have the most difficulty playing the power-sharing role required under school based management. The role of the business manager in a school based management system shifts to that of enabler, one who shares fiscal data so that school site managers can stretch their dollar resources.

The personnel director must also play a role that enables others to take part in the decision-making process of staff recruitment and selection. Under a centralized school system, the personnel director had a strong hand in hiring staff at the school site. In a school based management system, however, some of this responsibility for hiring shifts to the school site manager, while the personnel director must assume a

larger role in creating better selection and interviewing procedures throughout the district. The personnel director becomes a resource for those sites in need of personnel by maintaining a comprehensive list of qualified applicants, current vacancies and results of exit interviews conducted with staff and faculty members leaving the school district. The Personnel Department becomes a storehouse of current research on effective personnel management practices, thus allowing managers of individual school sites to access the information they need to perform effectively in personnel matters.

Subject matter specialists and special program personnel (like ESL and bilingual program personnel) have long operated out of a centrally-based office. Frequently, teachers in such programs who work in one or more schools report to a central office director. Central office programs have been seen as a way of providing highly specialized instructional assistance to small numbers of students in a cost-effective way. They have also been seen as a way of providing specialized subject-matter resources to the general population of teachers and students. Frequently, principals of schools where specialized programs are placed have neither the desire nor the ability to provide instructional direction or control to either the teachers or the programs. Therefore, central office placement of the program has been seen as a way of providing support and leadership to teachers working in highly specialized areas of instruction.

However, this central office placement of instructional programs often created problems. In the worst of scenarios, small "instructional islands" sprang up. These instructional islands had the effect of separating the program, the teachers, and the students from the rest of the instruction occurring in the school. Principals, feeling that they had no control over the programs, often abandoned them. This often had the effect of creating a "we vs. they" outlook throughout the school. Vital programs specifically designed to remedy highly specialized instructional problems faced by the schools often languished without the principal's support.

In school based management, central office programs and instructional specialists can play a unique role in the life of a school. By encouraging the principal to serve as an instructional leader and facilitator for all students, and by holding him/her accountable for doing so, school based management offers central office instructional staff the opportunity to become sought-after resources. Since the perceived need for central office instructional programs and the perceived expertise of central office instructional personnel influence the degree of

leverage achieved in any given school, central office-based program staff must work hard to integrate their programs into a whole-school setting.

The Principal

> . . . *"sharing the role of change agent within the school was downright frightening, counter to my ego, and extremely uncomfortable."* (Daniels, 1990, p. 23)

The traditional role of the principal has included supervising instruction, ensuring the safety and productivity of students and staff, maintaining the building, and promoting positive school and community relations (Marburger, 1985). Principals set the tone for the educational climate in the school, the school's openness to the community, and the quality of teaching. In this, they functioned autonomously. They made the most of the critical decisions affecting the operation of their school and were not accountable to others (Curran, et al., 1990).

The growing centralization of many school systems resulted in principals becoming part of a long chain of command which included the superintendent, assistant superintendents, area superintendents, business managers, and central office program directors and specialists such as bilingual and ESL program personnel. As Marburger (1985) points out, principals no longer had significant input in collective bargaining negotiations. They were often presented with a budget under which they had to operate with little or no flexibility. They often had little discretion in the selection of personnel. They were frequently required to go through formidable channels in order to obtain building repairs and services. Curriculum may have been dictated to them.

Principals who have gone through the change to school based management seem to agree that the move to shared decision-making is a process, not an event. As Daniels (1990, p. 23) points out, it is "not a quick fix for all of public education's ills." However school based management does offer many positive benefits, giving principals the necessary vehicle for improving education at the school site.

In school based management, the principal's new role is that of change facilitator. The principal creates a climate that conveys participatory management in which other stakeholders (teachers, custodians, food workers, parents, etc.) feel that they share responsibility for all aspects of school life, including budget, discipline, textbook adoption, and cafeteria food.

The principal serves on a school council which includes parents,

teachers, and often students. These individuals are no longer seen as representatives of groups that have nothing more to offer than advice. They are viewed as essential resources, colleagues, and fellow decision-makers. The principal provides information to the school site council regarding current issues affecting the school, as well as information on federal, state, and district regulations. While decisions made by the council offer strong direction, the principal, who is ultimately accountable and legally responsible for such decisions, may vote on or veto decisions made by the council, taking care not to undermine the general authority granted to such councils (Marburger, 1985).

Shared decision-making does not imply that the principal loses power under school based management. Rather, it implies that the principal works in an indirect manner to increase his/her sphere of influence. Initiative is extended by the principal to the greatest number of people possible. A principal who succeeds in extending this initiative gains a different sort of power—the power gained through consensus building.

The Teacher

> *With empowerment, the role of the teacher requires a redefinition from the custodial job of dispensing information to the more sophisticated one of facilitating growth.*
>
> (Moses and Whitaker, 1990, p. 32)

Schools have been organized and run in the same way as long as many teachers can remember; a teacher's place is traditionally within the walls of the classroom. Teachers implement programs and practices mandated by the central office. They very often have little say in textbook selection and adoption, no say in budget allocation, staff selection, and hiring. Teachers work with students; they rarely work with other teachers.

In school based management, teachers gain a greater voice in decisions that affect the school. They begin to work collaboratively with administrators, other teachers, parents, and community members in the selection of goals and objectives for the school. Teachers also take on new responsibilities as instructional specialists, serving as mentors, coaches and evaluators. They assist in determining staffing needs and may play a major role in defining positions and selecting staff.

Initially many teachers may be suspect of the change to school based management. They may view their new "empowerment" as a burden: as more duties imposed upon already busy schedules. How-

ever, as teachers observe the changes taking place and understand that they have clout in determining the future directions of their school, most come to accept the challenge willingly.

Parents and Community Members

> *. . . if parents are to be involved, they must shift from the narrow concern, 'What's good for my child?' to the broader concern, 'What's good for all children?'* " (Prasch, 1990, p. 26)

The role of parents in schools is one which has been generally restricted, although research consistently points to increased parental involvement on a number of levels as a necessary component of school success. Parents have held the traditional roles of PTA member, field trip chaperone, class "mother," and, sometimes vocal advocate or opponent of school programs or policies. But in every case, the role of parent is that of an outsider who has been invited in briefly to serve some limited purpose.

The most evident change in the role of parents and other community members under school based management is increased communication and school involvement. The involvement of community members *per se*, as suggested by advocates of school based management, is due to demographic changes associated with lower birth rates, employment outside the home of both parents, single parent families, and the increased emphasis on school partnerships with business. Parents and other community members become involved in establishing the school's vision, mission, and programs through their role on the school council. In some schools, parents and community members, through their roles on the council, make decisions on how the budget is spent and who is hired (David, 1989). While parents understandably respond to the idea of having a greater influence in determining school policies that better meet the needs of their children, the success of school based management depends on whether parents play a more selfless role. Although school councils are formed for the specific purpose of promoting a given school, their activities should not promote one school at the expense or detriment of other schools in the district (Prasch, 1990).

The fact that school based management requires such comprehensive changes in the roles and responsibilities of so many key people opens the way for possible large-scale confusion. The risks of misunderstanding are great; there is the potential for personal insecurity and feuding among staff. Therefore, districts opting for school based management should ensure that *each personnel role is carefully spelled*

out. Responsibilities should be clearly defined well in advance of any initial change. Districts must also accept the fact that preparation for new roles and responsibilities *requires extensive training and retraining:* Initial training will be required to launch school based management, and ongoing staff development and support for school councils will be required to sustain it.

Possible Effects of School Based Management on Bilingual/ESL Programs

Just as school based management has an overall effect on school district organization and school site functioning, it also promises to affect the way in which specialized instructional programs, such as bilingual and ESL programs, are structured and operate. The changes that school based management brings will vary greatly from district to district, and may vary from school to school within a district. These changes will, in turn, affect the roles of bilingual and ESL program personnel as well as the roles of parents and community members. School based management may also have an impact on the administration and conduct of bilingual/ESL programs, and may result in certain curricular changes.

This section will therefore describe possible changes in the roles that bilingual/ESL program personnel have traditionally played, administrative changes that may occur in the bilingual/ESL program and curricular changes that may result from a move to school based management.

ESL and bilingual program directors should recognize that when school based management comes to a district, it *will* touch their lives and the lives of the students they serve. In order to cope effectively with these changes, program directors should understand what generally happens in school based management; they should recognize that individual district differences will affect how school based management is implemented; they should anticipate the form that school based management might take in their district in order to ensure that LEP students receive the benefits that school based management may offer.

Role Changes in Bilingual/ESL Programs

While the previous section described role changes for mainstream personnel, changes in the roles and functions of the superintendent, central office programs, the principal, teachers, and parents and community members will also have a dramatic impact on the roles and functions of those who work closely with bilingual and ESL programs: the program director or coordinator, bilingual and ESL teachers, parents of LEP children, and members of the ethnolinguistic communities from which LEP students come.

The Program Director/Coordinator

Bilingual and ESL program directors/coordinators currently function in a variety of different roles. Some are classified as administrators with the ability to hire staff and control their own budgets. Others are classified as "specialists" or "teachers on special assignment," with administrative duties, but without administrative authority. This difference is due, in large, to the placement of the program within the larger district organization. The ESL/bilingual program director may report directly to the superintendent, to an assistant superintendent for curriculum, to a director of federal programs, to a director of special education, to a director of compensatory education or to a district-level English or foreign language curriculum specialist. While most ESL and bilingual program directors operate out of a central office location, their staff is placed in schools throughout the district. The bilingual/ESL program staff may consist of resource teachers, classroom teachers, aides or instructional assistants, community liaisons, psychologists, counselors, and social workers. The number and kind of staff found in any bilingual/ESL program varies greatly. The authority of the bilingual/ESL program director with regard to the staff also varies greatly. Some program directors are responsible for supervising and evaluating staff members, others are not. Some are solely responsible for recommending staff to be hired; some share that responsibility with either the principal of the school where the staff member will be placed or some other member of the central office.

Many bilingual and ESL program directors, particularly those who have federal or state funding, have ultimate responsibility for the instruction to be implemented under the program. They make recommendations on curriculum and textbooks, and are responsible for student testing and assessment, as well as program evaluation. Most ESL and bilingual program directors also assume ultimate authority for communication with the parents of students served within the program. While individual schools send out parent notices, letters, and newsletters, it is often the ESL/bilingual program director who is charged with the responsibility of seeing that such notices are translated into the home language of the children served by their program.

Under school based management, many of the responsibilities of the bilingual/ESL program director will be modified. Program directors, therefore, must insist on receiving a comprehensive description of their newly defined roles. Since many central office program functions may shift to the individual school level, the bilingual/ESL program director should request that the new role description contain a clear

listing of all tasks for which he/she will retain responsibility. The program director may then decide to share this list of tasks with school principals in whose buildings the program operates so that there are no misunderstandings about the division of tasks. The program director should also carefully examine restructuring plans to assure that district plans do not conflict with any legal obligations the district must meet with regard to providing a program for LEP students.

Bilingual/ESL program directors must be prepared to share decision-making with those in the mainstream—primarily, principals. The bilingual/ESL program director may be asked to serve in an advisory role to the principal and the school site management council as the council makes decisions about the instructional program for LEP students in a given school. The bilingual/ESL program director, like the principal, must be a change facilitator. He/she must offer education, information and instruction to all those who will make decisions for LEP students. As he/she advises the principal and the school-site management council, he/she must help to ensure that legal requirements regarding the education of LEP students are understood and acted upon. He/she must challenge mainstream decision-makers to see the LEP students served by the program as he/she sees them—full of potential and capable of great things.

Since the principal, under school based management, is held accountable for the success of *all* students, the bilingual/ESL program director may find a more willing ally than in the past. He/she must assist the principal in building bridges to the "instructional islands" which may have developed by continuing to promote the idea that good ESL/bilingual education is simply good education. The ESL/bilingual program director can facilitate this change by emphasizing *commonalities as well as differences* among LEP and mainstream students. In doing so, he/she helps de-mystify the LEP student, allowing those in the mainstream to become more confident in their ability to serve the student well.

The Bilingual/ESL Teacher

The role of the bilingual/ESL teacher, like that of the mainstream teacher, is a greatly expanded one under school based management. ESL/bilingual teachers have traditionally played an unusually large part in the education of LEP students, serving as counselor, translator and advocate in the larger school community. They assist the school in reaching parents and identifying special education needs and serve as a resource for mainstream classroom teachers.

Under school based management, however, the role of the bilingual/ESL teacher takes on even greater dimensions. Participation as a member of the school site management council offers the bilingual/ESL teacher a new opportunity to mediate the context of schooling for the LEP students he/she serves. Since the school site management council serves as the decision-making authority for the school, the involvement of the bilingual/ESL teacher helps ensure that the needs of LEP students will be considered. In addition, by serving on the council, the ESL/bilingual teacher begins to build coalitions with other members of the council and the school staff. In doing so he/she can encourage mainstream staff members to take on greater responsibilities for the education of LEP students.

The ESL/bilingual teacher can advise the council as it considers the adoption of various instructional programs, curricula, and materials by indicating which programs and products are more likely to provide effective instruction for LEP students. By informing council members and colleagues about the features of instructional programs that are especially effective for LEP students, the ESL/bilingual teacher provides essential peer training that permits the whole school to sustain more effective instruction for LEP students.

Since the school site council often has a hand in recommending staffing patterns and making hiring decisions, the ESL/bilingual teacher can help the council see that traditional staffing patterns may need to be revised to include bilingual aides or instructional assistants. In school sites where the LEP population is growing, the ESL/bilingual teacher can point out to the council that it also makes good sense to hire teachers who are bilingual or who possess additional ESL endorsements when openings occur in regular classroom positions. Such hiring practices give the school greater flexibility in dealing with changing student populations without diminishing cost-effectiveness.

In districts where the LEP population is not sufficiently large to result in each school having an ESL/bilingual teacher who can serve on the council, the ESL/bilingual teacher must seek out representation through other council members. In this case the ESL/bilingual teacher must work to stay informed of the actions the council is preparing to take and to offer opinions and advice to all council members on the effects of such actions on the education of LEP students. Through this gradual process, the ESL/bilingual teacher can build support and understanding for LEP students in council members, ensuring that students' needs are considered.

Parents and Community Members

While parents of monolingual, English speaking students have typically been afforded a rather limited role in the life and governance of schools, parents of linguistic minority students have often faced even more severe limitations. The linguistic and cultural differences that exist between home and school have often been difficult for schools to accommodate. Parents of language minority students are frequently precluded from participation in school functions because of language, cultural traditions, or the demands of living and surviving in the United States.

In school based management, however, the role that parents or community members must play necessitates that parents are able and willing to participate in the decision-making process. The expanded role of parents hinges on their ability to commit the time necessary to consider educational, budget, and staffing issues. Even though a basic tenet of school based management is that parents and others close to students (such as teachers) know what is best for the students, it remains to be seen if most parents have the time and desire to rise to the task. Parents must find ways to have their views represented on the school site council. In cases where linguistic minority parents feel uncomfortable with English, they may need to encourage the school to provide translators, or to find a community member who will agree to serve on their behalf. In other cases, parents, like ESL/bilingual teachers, will need to build coalitions with other parents who are on the council to serve as their voice. In any event, parents of linguistic minority students should insist that the school find some way of seeing that their views are *systematically* sought and considered.

An additional way that schools may choose to elicit opinions which are sensitive to the needs of LEP students is by including formerly or currently (in the case of secondary schools) enrolled linguistic minority students on the school site council. These students often provide great insight into instructional and curricular decision-making; their first-hand experience with the school conveys a brand of expertise which is hard to match.

Administrative/Programmatic Changes

As programs shift from the central office to the individual school level, functions that have been carried out by centrally located bilingual/ESL program staff may also shift. Centrally based intake and assessment centers may move to the schools; ESL/bilingual programs and curricula may vary from school to school, and parental involve-

ment may center around individual school sites rather than emanate from one central location.

An important detail for ESL/bilingual program directors to remember is that any changes to the structure and goals of the program must be reflected in equivalent changes in the design of program evaluation (J.M. O'Malley, personal communication, 1991). Evaluation of ESL/bilingual programs that operate in school based management settings should develop strong "process" components which reveal and examine not only the nature of the programs, but also the degree to which shared-decision making has influenced the implementation of instruction. The formative nature of such evaluation components allows bilingual/ESL program directors to make needed programmatic adjustments on an ongoing basis.

Curricular Changes

As schools take over decisions regarding instructional programs, bilingual/ESL programs may also face curricular changes. It may become increasingly difficult to maintain an instructional program which is philosophically different from the one selected by the school site council for schoolwide implementation. Although ESL and bilingual students may, in some settings, function independently of the mainstream classroom curriculum, in the majority of cases students interact with the mainstream philosophy and approach on a daily basis.

Take, for example, a school that teaches reading using a whole language approach. Now imagine a structurally-based ESL program which also operates in the school. Picture a beginning first grade ESL student being pulled out for ESL instruction, then being sent back to the mainstream classroom for the rest of the day. Such divergent instruction may create problems for students and friction between ESL/bilingual and mainstream teachers. The notion of whole-school approaches to instruction, particularly to the instruction of LEP students, affords students valuable reinforcement of concepts. In addition, sharing curricular approaches among ESL/bilingual and mainstream teachers (especially those like whole language, which are beneficial to LEP students) provides a common ground for coordinating instructional efforts.

The bilingual/ESL program may also undergo a restyling that emphasizes curricular diversity, as school based programs select from among several viable instructional approaches. Therefore, ESL may be taught in one school using a whole language approach, and in another using a content-based approach. This curricular diversity offers the

advantage of providing students and teachers alike with a wide range of educational choices that may be "tried on" for the best possible fit.

When a district chooses to implement school based management, curricular, administrative/programmatic, and role changes may all interact to produce a bilingual/ESL program which appears very different from those that have operated previously. While no two districts will perform identically under a school based management system, preparation and planning will afford the bilingual/ESL program an opportunity to integrate instruction and build its capacity to serve students in a more meaningful way than before.

What Bilingual/ESL Program Directors Can Do to Prepare for School Based Management

Clune and White (1988) conducted a study of over thirty school based management programs examining not only the structure of school based management and changes in roles experienced by each of the programs, but also the implementation difficulties faced by each of the programs. Almost all the implementation problems experienced by personnel revolved around changes in roles. Survey respondents indicated that "one of the most serious problems in implementation is the apprehension on the part of principals, teachers, and others who are fearful of what might be required of them." They also indicated that they "had not been given an adequate orientation to the program; not enough time was allotted to create an environment of change" (Clune and White, 1988, pp. 27–28).

Bilingual/ESL programs in the midst of a change to school based management should consider these comments carefully. The bilingual/ESL program must insist that the district provide comprehensive training for its own staff and parent and community members, and that the district offer extensive training to mainstream personnel on issues affecting the education of LEP students.

Bilingual/ESL program directors can request the opportunity to participate in training or workshops that help prepare them for new roles. They can ensure that training is furnished to staff, parents, and community members. This training must provide a complete understanding of what school based management involves and how it will operate on the district or individual school level. Bilingual/ESL program directors may also want to provide staff and community members with somewhat more specialized training that spans those cultural and linguistic differences that make school based management a difficult proposition for those uncomfortable with participatory school management. All training provided should be frequent and ongoing, since real change takes time.

Since training will take place for mainstream personnel as well, bilingual/ESL program directors can take advantage of this opportunity to provide comprehensive information on the socioeducational needs and characteristics of LEP and linguistic minority students. Program directors and staff members can create linkages with principals and mainstream teachers that facilitate the provision of information on LEP students needed by school site councils to make decisions about instructional programs, budget allocations and hiring. Such linkages allow training to occur gradually.

ESL/bilingual programs can also ease the transition to school based management by creating broad-based advocacy for LEP and linguistic minority children. This means reaching out not only to parents of children in the program, but also to mainstream parents and community members. As members of school site councils, these parents and community members have the chance to influence programs and policies. By educating and informing these new key players in school decision-making, the ESL/bilingual program can create an unprecedented base of support for LEP students.

Summary

Bilingual/ESL program directors facing restructuring efforts within their school district clearly have their work cut out for them. The challenge of adjusting to substantially altered roles and responsibilities places a burden not only on directors, but on *all* program personnel. The challenge of responding to program adjustments, whether administrative or curricular, places an additional burden on program staff and directors alike. What follows, then, is a summary of key actions that may be initiated by bilingual/ESL program directors to ease the burdens which may be caused by a move to school based management.

School Based Management Checklist for ESL/Bilingual Program Directors

- ☐ 1. I understand what is meant by school based management in my school district (terms have been operationalized).
- ☐ 2. I have had input into my new role and job description under school based management.
- ☐ 3. This new role and job description has been shared with principals with whom I will be expected to coordinate, and with staff whom I will supervise.
- ☐ 4. I understand the process of change and how it may affect the reorganization of the district; I understand how the process of change may affect my program within the structure of the district.
- ☐ 5. I understand which functions of the bilingual/ESL program will be restructured or decentralized, and I have had input into this process.
- ☐ 6. I have established formal coordination linkages with all principals in whose schools bilingual/ESL programs will operate.
- ☐ 7. I have briefed principals about any legal or programmatic obligations which existing or new bilingual/ESL programs must meet.
- ☐ 8. Bilingual/ESL staff (techers, aides, community liaisons, etc.) have been made aware of coming changes, and have been informed how those changes may affect their roles and instructional programs.
- ☐ 9. Bilingual//ESL staff have been trained on the nature and operation of school site councils.
- ☐ 10. Bilingual/ESL staff have been provided with necessary training and resources to serve as consultants to school site councils on educational issues which affect LEP students.
- ☐ 11. I have informed parents and community members of the coming changes in the organization of schools and the bilingual/ESL program.
- ☐ 12. Parents and community members have had a formal opportunity to provide input on these changes.
- ☐ 13. Parents and community members have received training on the nature and operation of school site councils.
- ☐ 14. A system for soliciting regular feedback from parents has been developed and implemented.
- ☐ 15. The design and implementation of bilingual/ESL program evaluation has been modified to reflect administrative and programmatic changes.
- ☐ 16. Mainstream personnel have been trained on the characteristics and needs of LEP learners; practices whih enhance the academic achievement of LEP students have been incorporated into the instructional and administrative repertoires of mainstream personnel.

Conclusion

School based management began as a way of making schools more accountable to society. For bilingual/ESL programs to take advantage of this new philosophy of schooling, several conditions must be met. Bilingual and ESL program directors must anticipate and prepare for the changes that school based management will bring by understanding the nature of the change itself. They must ask the district for clear descriptions of how central office programs such as bilingual and ESL programs will operate in the face of such changes. They must secure adequate representation on school site councils, either through the placement of program staff members and parents, or through the creation of linkages to mainstream advocates. They must prepare their themselves, staffs, parents, and community members for the changes in roles that accompany a move to shared decision-making. Above all, bilingual/ESL program directors must ensure that LEP students can reap the benefits that school based management may bring: the increased accountability of the school for *all* students; an increased responsiveness to the desires of parents and teachers who know the students best; and a dramatically transformed and improved educational system.

References

Berman, P., and McLaughlin, M.W. (1977). *Rand Change Agent Study—Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change: Vol Vii. Factors Affecting Implementation and Continuation.* Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Brookover, W.B., and Lezotte, L.W. (1979). *Changes in School Characteristics Coincident with Changes in Student Achievement.* East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.* Report of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. Washington, DC: Author.

Clune, W.H., and White, P.A. (1988). *School-Based Management: Institutional Variation, Implementation and Issues for Further Research.* New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.

Cuban, L. (1984). *How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1890–1980.* New York: Longman.

Cunningham, L.L. (1971). *Governing Schools: New Approaches to Old Issues.* Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing.

Curran, J., Juster, B., Lister, B., McKeon, D., Pugh, E., and Torrence, V. (1990). *School Based Management.* Unpublished manuscript. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

D'Amico, J. (1982). Using Effective School Studies to Create Effective Schools: No Recipes Yet. *Educational Leadership, 40*(3), 60–63.

Daniels, C. (September, 1990). A Principal's View: Giving Up My Traditional Ship. *The School Administrator,* 22–24.

David, J.L. (1989). Synthesis of Research on School-based Management. *Educational Leadership, 46*(8), 45–53.

Deal, T.E. (1990). Reframing Reform. *Educational Leadership, 47*(8), 6–12.

Delehant, A. (September, 1990). A Central Office Point of View: Charting a Course When Pulled in All Directions. *The School Administrator,* 16–19.

Fullan, M. (1982). *The Meaning of Educational Change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Goodlad, J. (1984). *A Place Called School*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hall, G.E., and Hord, S.M. (1987). *Change in Schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hall, G.E., and Loucks, S. (1980). *A Concerns-Based Model for the Delivery of Inservice*. Austin, TX: University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hord, S., Rutherford, W., Huling-Austin, L., and Hall, G. (1987). *Taking Charge of Change*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Ingwerson, D. (September, 1990). A Superintendent's Point of View: Learning to Listen and Trust Each School Faculty. *The School Administrator*, 8–11.

Lezotte, L. (1989, August). Base School Improvement on What We Know about Effective Schools. *American School Board Journal*, 18–20.

Lieberman, A., and Miller, L. (1981). Synthesis of Research on Improving Schools. *Educational Leadership, 39*(7), 583–586.

Lindelow, L. (1981). School-Based Management. In S.C. Smith, J. Mazzarella and P.K. Piele (Eds.), *School leadership: Handbook for survival*. Eugene, OR: Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Marburger, C.L. (1985). *One School at a Time. School Based Management: A Process for Change*. Columbia, MD: The National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Moses, M., and Whitaker, K. (September, 1990). Ten Components for Restructuring Schools. *The School Administrator*, 32–34.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. Washington, DC: Author.

Neale, D.C., Bailey, W.J., and Ross, B.E. (1981). *Strategies for School Improvement*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Prasch, J. (1990). *How to Organize for School-Based Management*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Purkey, S.C., and Smith, M.S. (1982). Synthesis of Research on Effective Schools. *Educational Leadership. 40*(3), 64–69.

Schmuck, R.A., Runkel, P.J., Arends, J.H., and Arends, R.I. (1977). *The Second Handbook Of Organizational Development In Schools*. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Sirotnik, K., and Clark, R. (1988). School-Centered Decision Making and Renewal. *Phi Delta Kappan, 3*, 33–38.

Sizer, T. (1984). *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American School*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

About the Authors

Denise McKeon is a Research Associate with the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. A former ESL/bilingual teacher, her areas of specialization include program design, teacher training, and effective instructional strategies. She is a doctoral candidate in Curriculum and Instruction at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Lynn Malarz is the senior program specialist at the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development in Alexandria, Virginia, and a former director of bilingual programs in California. Her research interests include school change, assessment, and how restructuring schools will affect the education of language minority students. She received her Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction from the University of Southern California.

ED/OBEMLA/95-3

The George Washington University
WASHINGTON DC

CAL
Center for Applied Linguistics