ED 417 480   EA 028 942

AUTHOR   Bernal, Ernesto M.
TITLE   Site-Based Decision-Making: Achieving a New Level of
                Professionalism.
PUB DATE   1996-04-00
NOTE   9p.; Keynote address presented at the Annual Curriculum and
                Instruction Conference of the Edgewood Independent School
                District (2nd, San Antonio, TX, April 5, 1996).
PUB TYPE   Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Decentralization; Decision Making; *Educational Objectives;
                Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education;
                Participative Decision Making; School Administration;
                *School Based Management; School Organization; *School
                Supervision
IDENTIFIERS   *Texas

ABSTRACT
        This paper addresses briefly the responsibilities which
site-based decision-making (S-B D-M) imply and presents the many
opportunities to innovate collaboratively as a way to achieve greater
professionalism. Texas' Senate Bill 1 (199) and House Bill 2885 (1991) set
into motion two important aspects of educational reform, the decentralization
of the Texas Education Agency's supervisory/compliance power to permit
greater flexibility to response at the local level, and the authorization for
local education agencies to conduct site-based management. As with any
educational innovation, S-B D-M requires training effort, and time to
implement well. Some schools who rushed into S-B D-M assumed that they could
do whatever they wanted, while other schools merely allowed the principal to
dominate the work of classroom teachers. The essence of S-B D-M is
school-level autonomy plus participating decision-making. Minimally the site
plan must include: collaborative goal setting; curriculum; staffing; budget
development; program implementation; and evaluation. S-B D-M is not a
panacea, but it is an attempt to reform and improve education for creating
empowered and collaborative groups of reflective practitioners in the
schools. (Author/RJM)

Site-based Decision-Making:

Achieving a New Level of Professionalism

by

Ernesto M. Bernal, Ph.D.

The University of Texas-Pan American

Keynote address to the Edgewood Independent School District's Second Annual C&I

Conference, San Antonio, TX. April 5, 1996.

2

Abstract

Texas' Senate Bill 1 (1990) and House Bill 2885 (1991) set into motion two important aspects of educational reform, the decentralization of the Texas Education Agency's supervisory/compliance power to permit greater flexibility of response at the local level, and the authorization for local education agencies to conduct site-based management. As with any educational innovation, site-based decision-making (S-B D-M) requires training effort, and time to implement well. Some schools who rushed into S-B D-M assumed that they could do <u>whatever</u> they wanted, while other schools merely crowned the principal. This paper adumbrates the responsibilities which S-B D-M implies and presents the many opportunities to innovate collaboratively as a way to achieve greater professionalism.

Site-Based Decision-Making:

Achieving a New Level of Professionalism

by

Ernesto M. Bernal, Ph.D.

Professor, Educational Psychology

The University of Texas-Pan American

A great pleasure to be here to commence the theme of this staff development day, "Together Everyone Achieves More," by talking to you about site-based decision-making as a way to achieve a new level of professionalism among educators and a closer involvement of our school's constituent communities with education.

In 1990, Texas' Senate Bill 1 and in 1991 House Bill 2885 opened the door to this collaborative process, S-B D-M. Together these pieces of legislation provided for two very important changes in the ways schools carry out their business. <u>On the one hand</u>, there was a move to remove the compliance role of the Texas Education Agency; <u>on the other</u>, there was a move to decentralize control of the school district's central office so that local school would enjoy greater autonomy. <u>Since then</u> there has been, on the whole, <u>some confusion</u>, since the roles of principals and teachers have been considerably altered.

I hope that my presentation today helps to remove some of this confusion and to inspire you to work in a new and exciting, collaborative professional role, a role that can raise expectations for yourself and the students in your care.

Here are some common misconceptions about S-B D-M:

1. The principal now acts like yesteryear's assistant superintendent

for instruction, dominating the work of classroom teachers, telling them what to implement and how to do it. [Unfortunately, too many teachers are comfortable with this type of subordination, since it protects them from the responsibility of taking charge of instruction, and too many principals feel too vulnerable to TAAS accountability to empower their teachers to take the academic reins.]

2. The site-committee can decide pretty much whatever it wants to do with instruction, so long as it is accountable for results. [It is important to keep the distinction between freedom and reckless-ness in mind.] Consider this watchword: By the time the TAAS results are back, you might have wasted a year's efforts.

The current spirit of educational reform has wrought S-B D-M, but we need to remind ourselves--our perhaps to find out for the first time--what this entails. As Jane David put it, "the essence of [S-B D-M] is school-level autonomy plus participating decision-making." She should have included "professionally guided" or "pro-fessionally based" as well, since no educator worthy of the name acts capriciously or even subjectively when weighing a course of action.

Here is the minimum that you must do; what your site plan must include:

1. Collaborative goal setting, preferably based in part on a needs analysis and data. Local preferences take a second place to needs.

2. Curriculum. S-B D-M is nothing if not to support instruction. Instruction must grow out of the knowledge base of the profession, and must not be subject to political influence, economic bribery,

or the agendas of special interest groups. Curricular features need to be specified so that at least minimal implementation can be checked.

3. Staffing. Goals and curriculum imply staffing. N.B.: A staff's composition may not need to be permanent. For example, one may need certain specialists or an extra counselor during certain stages of implementation, but not for others.

4. Budget development. Goals + curriculum + staffing imply budget. Budgets, ideally, should not be uniformly allocated to campuses according to a fixed rule, e.g., by head count, but according to the central administration's judgment of the local school's need and the feasibility of its site committee's plan. Always keep an amount in reserve to help high need schools with highly respon-sive, highly feasible plans. Schools with high needs and poor plans need to be reorganized.

On a different note, one of the acid tests for S-B D-M is whether a school committee has real budget authority. If a school committee cannot decide how to spend its money to support its plan, the school is not site-based. If the school committee cannot direct that money be spent to support its plan, it is not empowered, it is not collaborative.

5. Program implementation. This is the heart of the S-B rationale. Once decisions have been made about what to do and how to do it, everyone must do her/his best to "get on with the program." The principal or a designated assistant along with the "executive

committee" of the site-committee must <u>ensure implementation</u>, even if fairly extreme measures need to be taken, <u>for without at least minimal levels of implementation</u>, adaptive changes or modifications in the program cannot be made, since you will not know just what it is that you have in place. The extent of program implementation is called <u>implementation success</u>.

Warning: Do not try anything that is too ambitious without first doing lots of training, parental preparation, and determining that the plan has a high likelihood of success based upon pilot efforts at your site.

Should implementation of any of the essential or many of the the supporting parts of the program fall short of the minimal levels specified in the curriculum, the principal and the site committee need to have the flexibility to call an emergency meeting of the site's faculty and staff to adapt the plan, rekindle enthusiasm, and ask for help even if it means adding a few days to the school calendar or canceling scheduled workdays later in the year!

If necessary, return some of the money to central office and concentrate on training or retraining.

6. <u>Evaluation</u>. The site committee needs to designate qualified personnel to handle the formative or ongoing evaluation as well as the summative or sunset or final evaluation <u>for each major component</u> of the site's plan. Formative evaluations allow for mid-course corrections, as it were, whereas summative

evaluations determine whether a program or any of its major components should continue, undergo basic revisions, or be discontinued. One way to get a team leader for this important function is to hire an administrator, support person, or teacher who is skilled in evaluation or at least in its rudiments and who can double in brass, as it were.

But this work--evaluation--cannot be left to second place. Evaluation has objective and intuitive elements, and a considerable portion of the lead evaluator's job has to be clearly devoted to these tasks. It cannot be "extra" or "beyond" the person's regular duties.

Evaluation should dedicate itself to

    a. student outcomes and expectations for their success

    b. implementation success

    c. school climate

    d. anticipated outcomes/goals-objectives

    e. unanticipated outcomes, positive and negative

    f. narrative descriptions to supplement numerical data

    g. the search for and exposure of tacit beliefs and practices that facilitate or inhibit student's success

    h. disaggregation of student data to study impacts on subpopulations of students.

This kind of evaluation can tie tacit practices, school climate, and implementation success to student outcomes, and can

therefore serve to guide the next round of decisions about
program adjustments and modifications.

Sometimes current educational practices seem incompatible with previous ones that were demonstrated to be successful. The notion of the "least restrictive environment" for handicapped students, for example, flew in the face of separate schools for the disabled, but now seems to have proven itself once it underwent certain changes, such as adequate "staffings" to support the IEP. Now, however, the notion of de-tracking students--the practice of "inclusionism"--is gaining ground, although it has not yet been demonstrated effective with special populations and clearly runs the well documented risk that many teachers will either "teach to the middle group" or find ways to group students within class or share students with other teachers in ways that will keep this innovation from being implemented even to a minimal level.

Similarly, some site-based reforms run historically documented risks of over looking or slighting certain subpopulations in favor of general results. We know, for example, that historically certain subpopulations have not been equitably treated by the schools whenever an accrediting agency, like the State Department of Education-- the TEA in our case--has not closely monitored compliance with very specific pro- cedures to ensure the adequacy of the educational interventions for these subgroups. Migrant students, handicapped students, low-status immigrant children, and English- language learners have all suffered whenever schools have felt that they could be "flexible" with them.

Some of the current abuses that I have personally noticed during my frequent visits to the schools include the following tacit practices:

    a.   long-term assignment of immigrant students to

so-called Newcomer Centers.

b. exiting students from a bilingual program to the
    regular program but one or even two grade levels
    behind (or below) the level they had reached at the
    time they exited.

c. reestablishment of retention practices in the early
    grades, even at Kindergarten.

d. hiring only those teachers who agree to teach
    reading through only one method, the one espoused
    by the teachers in that school.

e. categorizing a classroom as "bilingual" merely
    because it has ELL children.

None of these practices has any credible support in the knowledge base of
teaching, all of these practices are actually, demonstrably counterproductive, and
some of them will only confuse the results of any evaluative study, will actually keep
reform from happening, since unknown or even deliberately masked influences will be
at work to defeat the process of innovation.

Finally, S-B practices run the risk of isolating role-alike teachers, so that they fail
to work with peers on other campuses. Hence the importance of conferences like this
and the necessity of maintaining your professional memberships.

Conclusion

S-B is not a panacea, but it is an attempt to reform and improve education by
creating empowered and collaborative groups of reflective practitioners in each of the
schools. Whether S-B will work depends on the level of personal and professional
response that you are willing to make.

EA 028942

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Site-based Decision-making: Achieving a New Level of Professionalism

Author(s): Ernesto M. Bernal, Ph.D.

Corporate Source: The University of Texas - Pan American

Publication Date: April 5, 1996

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 1** documents

☑

Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____Sample_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 2** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____Sample_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

☐

Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at **Level 1**.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature: Ernesto M. Bernal

Organization/Address: The University of Texas, Pan American

Printed Name/Position/Title: Ernesto M. Bernal, Ph.D., Professor

Telephone: (956) 1-3464

FAX: (956) 381-2395

E-Mail Address: ebernal@panam.edu

Date: 2-4-98

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2d Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

(Rev. 6/96)