SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT AND SCHOOL COUNCILS: HISTORY AND IMPACT ON EDUCATION

BARBARA CAUL

Site-Based Management and School Councils: History and Impact on Education

By
Barbara Caul, B.A. B.Ed.

A paper folio submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education

Department of Educational Leadership
Memorial University of Newfoundland
April 2000

Abstract

Over the past two decades, there has been a growing concern in many western industrialised countries over the failure of schools to provide students with the quality of education needed to compete in today's global workforce. Responding to these concerns, many educational policy makers initiated reform in the hopes of improving educational outcomes. In the early 1980s, most educational reform efforts focused on increasing central bureaucratic control of education. Research showed that these early reform efforts were not very successful. In order to be productive, researchers advocated that educational reform efforts must focus less on stricter bureaucratic control, and more on giving control to the individual school site. In the mid-to-late 1980s, decentralization of school systems became a popular reform strategy. One such form of decentralization is the implementation of site-based management (SBM). SBM is a process which gives teachers, parents, community representatives and students more control in managing their local schools. The structure that SBM usually takes is that of a local governing, decision making or advisory committee, commonly referred to as a school council.

The first paper of this folio focuses on the history of school councils in Atlantic Canada. Each of the four Atlantic provinces has their own unique justifications for adopting school councils and SBM as an educational reform strategy, but there are common factors which seem to have influenced their decisions. All four provinces heavily relied on research conducted elsewhere which supported SBM and school councils as an effective reform strategy. These provinces also responded to the public's general dissatisfaction with educational outcomes, and to parental and public pressure for more voice in education. It is too early to tell if their decision to adopt this reform strategy was the right one.

The second paper of this folio discusses the impacts, both positive and negative, that SBM and school councils have on education in general. The literature in this area is ambiguous, and the research mixed. In general, research has not shown that parental and community involvement in a decision making capacity; i.e., through school councils, has had a positive effect on student achievement. Research does support, however, using school councils as a means for promoting other types and levels of parental and community involvement, which could have positive effects on student achievement.

Many researchers blame the ineffectiveness of SBM and school councils on poor implementation procedures and / or lack of support for their proper maintenance. Policy makers have been criticized for setting up structures which have the potential to be quite effective, and then not committing to providing the necessary time or support needed to sustain them. Critics question the real purpose of SBM and school councils, suggesting that this reform strategy was chosen simply as a cost efficient and popular response to public pressure for reform.

The third paper of this folio discusses the impact that SBM and school councils have on the role of the principal. This reform strategy alters the context of schooling significantly. Schools have become more democratic, with more and more people becoming involved in their management. The traditional control oriented leadership style of the principal is not congruent, nor effective in this new environment. Principals need to adopt a more democratic, facilitative, collaborative style of leadership if they wish to be effective leaders of site-based managed schools.

Paper # 1 of Paper folio

History of Site-Based Management and School councils in Atlantic Canada

Introduction

For almost two decades, concerns over education have received increasing attention in most western industrialised countries. It has become widely recognized that traditional educational systems are failing and reform, for the purpose of educational improvement, is urgently needed (House, 1992). There are various means of achieving this reform, one of which is through the introduction of school councils. This paper focuses on the history of school councils in Atlantic Canada, but before doing so, it takes a brief look at the history of educational reform in North America.

History of Educational Reform in North America

Contemporary educational reform began in North America with the release of the commissioned report *A Nation at Risk*, released by the United States' government in 1983. Through this document, the United States' government called for major educational reform to address its economic problems and to help maintain its place as a leading nation. Steinberg (1996) called *A Nation at Risk* "the rallying document for the current school reform movement" (p.47).

Subsequent to the release of *A Nation at Risk* (1983), educational reform went through two principal movements, often referred to as waves (Cistone, 1989; Griffiths, 1993). The first wave of the reform movement in the early 1980s consisted of major state level legislation, mandates, rules and regulations expected to be implemented at the local school or school district level. Reform was mandated, by centralized authorities, in all areas of education such as curricula, instruction, scheduling, and teacher certification and training. Legislators wanted to see higher academic standards for students, assessed by state-wide basic competency tests, and

higher teaching standards for teachers, assessed through standardized tests and stricter standards for teachers entering the teaching profession (Cistone, 1989; Griffiths, 1993). This first wave of reform was not very effective (Griffiths, 1993), and the public began sensing that these mandated efforts were not resulting in the positive educational outcomes sought (Carlson, 1996; David, 1989; Goodlad, 1984).

The second wave of educational reform had its foundations in three national reports released in the United States; *The Carnegie Report, A Nation Prepared, Teachers for the 21st Century (1986); Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group (1986); and The Governors Report, Time for Results(1986)*. One of the many recommendations stemming from these reports was for restructuring of schools and the adoption of school site management (Griffiths, 1993). Subsequent to these reports, emphasis on reform shifted from greater bureaucratic control to reform through restructuring schools and school systems. Restructuring, generally defined as broad systemic changes in an organization, including changes in the roles and responsibilities of its members, and in its organizational and governance structures (Carlson, 1996), soon became a major educational reform strategy in North America.

The second wave of reform has been described by many writers as a reaction to previous reform efforts that have failed. Conley (1989) wrote: "Recommendations made during the second phase of the reform movement were in large part a reaction to the centralizing tendencies of the early proposals" (p. 366). David (1989) reinforced this idea, "Current interest is a response to evidence that the education system is not working and, in particular, that strong central control actually diminishes teachers' morale and, correspondingly, their level of effort" (p. 45). Carlson (1996) wrote: "School restructuring in many ways grew out of the perceived problems with

educational bureaucracies and failures of previous efforts at school reform" (p.239). Schedd (1988) described the second wave: "With remarkable swiftness, the debate over how to 'reform' American public education has shifted from strategies that would have strengthened the bureaucratic controls that boards and central administrators exercise over their subordinates to strategies designed to 'empower' those very same subordinates" (p.409). Cistone (1989) wrote that "Interest in restructuring stems from a growing conviction that education reform efforts, to be productive and substantial, must be targeted to the individual school and the creation of institutional arrangements and organizational structures that will maximize the effectiveness of the school center" (p.363).

One of the strategies that became popular as a means to accomplish restructuring is known as site-based management (SBM). Other terms used interchangeably with SBM include school-based management, shared decision making (SDM), school-site management, school-centred management, shared governance, site-based decision-making and administrative decentralization (Cistone, 1989; Herman & Herman, 1993).

Site-based management has been defined in various ways in the literature. Herman (1990) describes it as "a structure and process which allows greater decision making power related to the areas of instruction, budget, policies, rules and regulations, staffing, and all matters of governance; and a process which involves a variety of stakeholders in the decisions related to the local individual school building" (p.3).

Hiatt (1994) wrote: "School restructuring advocates site-based management, in which school districts return control to school sites. Each school is to have a governing board whose membership must include a majority of local school parents. This governing board would

determine curriculum, create budgets, hire faculty, and organize the school facilities, students and faculty. This movement holds promise to restore local parental control" (p. 37).

Reitzug and Capper (1996) define it as " the devolution of decision-making authority from the district level to the individual school site. SBM is the most recent (and perhaps, most promoted) in a long history of organizational participatory decision making initiatives. Its primary objective is to bring about significant change in educational practice by providing school staffs sufficient autonomy from external regulation to modify and restructure services traditionally mandated from above and, by alleviating the morale-diminishing and effort-reducing effect of strong central control" (p.56).

Gamage, Sipple, and Partridge (1996) describe SBM as " a pragmatic approach to a formal alteration of the bureaucratic model of school administration with a more democratic structure. This form of decentralization identifies the individual school as the primary unit of improvement and relies on the redistribution of decision making authority through which improvements in the schools are stimulated and sustained. It is believed that democratic devolution leads to more effective decision making resulting in increased autonomy, flexibility, productivity and accountability" (p.24).

Essentially then, SBM can be defined as a process which allows teachers, parents, community representatives and students more control in managing their local schools. It gives them more power to make decisions based on their local needs, and more authority to govern over a wide range of educational issues. SBM makes schools more autonomous, democratic and accountable. Its ultimate goal is to increase school effectiveness and student achievement.

School Councils

The structure that SBM usually takes is that of a local governing / decision making or advisory committee, commonly referred to as a school council. The composition of these councils varies across regions. They may include some or all of the following: teachers, parents, school administration, support staff, community representatives, and students. These councils meet regularly to discuss and make decisions on educational issues pertinent to their school. The amount of authority and decision making power accorded to them could range from advisory status only, to full fledged authority. Their mandates could include anything from fundraising to hiring and firing staff (David, 1996).

House (1992) defines a school council as "a legislated school-level administrative committee structure enabling representatives of the local school community to have a real voice in educational decision making. This council serves as the primary forum at the school level and, as the mechanism for implementing shared decision making, is the key feature for the decentralization of authority over the management of the local school" (p.43).

This paper discusses the rationale behind the decisions of the four Atlantic Canadian provinces to adopt school councils as a means to educational reform.

The Move Towards School Councils in Atlantic Canada

Each of the four Atlantic provinces set up commissions or task forces to examine their respective educational systems, focusing particularly on their structure. They released reports on their findings, drafted proposals and called for legislation based on their reports. Generally, recommendations were put forth for restructuring education systems by reducing the number of school boards and by establishing school councils in each school. The most comprehensive

report was Newfoundland's Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Delivery of programs and services in Primary, Elementary and Secondary Education *Our Children, Our Future* released in 1992. New Brunswick's Commission on Excellence in Education released a commissioned report that same year entitled *Schools for a New Century (1992)*. Prince Edward Island released their final report on the structure and governance of the PEI education system entitled *Towards Excellence* in 1993, and in 1995 Nova Scotia's Department of Education released a White Paper on restructuring the education system entitled *Education Horizons*.

All four provinces made recommendations to have school councils introduced in each school. The provinces have embraced the idea of using school councils as a strategy of educational reform. They believe that by increasing parental and community involvement in schools, and decentralizing some decision making power to the local school level, schools will be more effective and educational improvement will occur. The Atlantic provinces have drafted proposals, followed by legislation which allows parents and other community representatives to take part in school level decision making, and to play an advisory role in school-related issues.

Rationale behind school council introduction in Prince Edward Island

Educational reform work began in July, 1990, when the government of PEI established the Cabinet Committee on Governmental Reform. The committee's goal was to find out how to restructure government to meet the needs of the next century. Education was one area to be examined. In February, 1991, a committee representing members of the educational community was set up to identify key issues. In June, 1991, the committee submitted a report entitled *Education for the 90s and Beyond*. Four key areas were identified for study, structure being one of them. In July, 1991, a task force on education was set up to examine and report on the issues

discussed in this report. The task force held public consultations, and subsequently submitted its own report in March, 1992. This report contained many recommendations including a call for a new four-level structure of governance. The four levels would be: elected councils at each school, elected regional boards, a central agency to take over some functions from the regional boards and the department, and a redefined department of education. In response to this task force recommendation, the Ministry of Education established a Steering Committee to oversee work groups, each focusing on different aspects of the task force report. A workgroup on structure and accountability reported that basic structural and governance issues needed to be further examined. In February, 1993, a study on the structure and governance of the PEI educational system was initiated and the report *Towards Excellence* was released in June, 1993. The purpose of the study was to identify and examine all aspects of the structure and governance issue, carry out research and data collection, consult with various stakeholders in education, develop sound options, and finally, recommend the most appropriate structural and administrative model for PEI (Fogarty, 1993).

Work on the report *Towards Excellence* (1993) included informal and formal consultations throughout the education system, on-site research, theoretical research, literature reviews, and a review and analysis of documents from earlier reform initiatives, such as those carried out by the task force and work groups. Findings from this study, which is based upon two years of educational reform work in PEI, follow.

Public concerns raised during discussions of educational reform in PEI tended to focus on structure, accountability and consistency. There was public unease that no one was in control of the education system, and roles and responsibilities within it were too vague. There was a general

belief that the centralized structure was not accountable overall, many parts of the system being accountable to no one. Many felt that there was not enough focus on monitoring and evaluating the efficiency and cost effectiveness of the system. The public called for greater consistency. It was felt that the curriculum was not based on goals and outcomes, but rather on teaching materials available. The public wanted to see goals defined and standards of excellence set and measured. More emphasis on evaluation for accountability, consistency and results was called for.

During consultations, it was also revealed that the people of PEI were dissatisfied with the hierarchical nature of schools and school boards. Schools were not parent friendly, and boards were accused of acting in the system's interest rather than that of the public. People felt that the whole system was too passive about the quality of education and service it was providing. They wanted a more open education system responsive to the public it served, elected regional school boards which listened to their needs and wants, and finally, they wanted to participate in education at the regional and local school level.

It became apparent as well that the roles and responsibilities of the school were changing. Schools were expected to take on a broader, more custodial role, providing for example, health and social services. Schools gradually were taking over responsibilities formerly held by parents and the community. It was felt that the role of schools should be expanded to serve the needs of not only its students, but also of the larger community, and this broader role should be reflected in its governance structures. Better links between schools, parents, service providers and communities were needed, and the school advisory council was recommended as the preferred means to achieve this. "A school advisory body offers some potential benefits, as a vehicle for

these various services to more effectively tailor the specific services and resources available in each community to the unique needs of the school" (Fogarty, p.41).

According to the committee's research review, participation through school councils "has been widely shown to have major educational benefits" (Fogarty, p.41). Rationale for recommending the establishment of school councils in every school can be summed up in this statement, "We can no longer afford to let schools wall themselves off from their communities. The school is such a valuable community resource, the community in turn is such a valuable school resource, and parental participation is so vital to the quality of education, that action must be taken to develop strong partnerships between every school and its community"(Fogarty, p.71). The committee's recommendation # 31 calls for legislation in the School Act which would mandate the establishment of school advisory councils in every school in the province of PEI (Fogarty, 1993).

Based on the recommendations in *Towards Excellence*, school councils were introduced through the Education Act in September, 1993 (Collins, 1998).

Rationale behind school council introduction in Nova Scotia

Nova Scotians province wide were consulted on educational matters in 1991-1992 by the Select Committee on Education of the Nova Scotia Legislature, again in 1993 during government's 30-60-90 economic initiative, and in early 1994 through the Department of Education's Strategic Plan. In June 1994, a discussion paper was released outlining proposals on how to address previously identified concerns. This led to a white paper on restructuring the education system entitled *Education Horizons* published by the Nova Scotia Department of Education in February, 1995. This document addressed the concerns of Nova Scotians and

proposed restructuring their education system with the goal of offering a higher quality education for Nova Scotia's students. Along with amalgamating school boards, government proposed the establishment of school councils which would allow parents, teachers, students, and community members to participate more fully in educational matters. The reasoning behind the recommendation for school councils in Nova Scotia, as outlined in the white paper *Education Horizons,* follows (Nova Scotia, 1995).

One of the first issues addressed in this document is the changing world. Traditional patterns of work and employment were being transformed, and social and cultural issues were becoming more complex. Educational policies and practices had to keep up with these changes. Students needed to be highly educated with teamwork skills, literacy and mathematical abilities, problem solving skills and technology application skills. Through consultations, Nova Scotians revealed concerns that the education system was not adequately preparing graduates with these skills needed to compete in the global marketplace. They felt that educational standards were too low and higher expectations were needed. Consultations with teachers, administrators, parents, students, business and community representatives in 1994 revealed that these groups understood that change was needed in their education system to make it more adaptable and responsive to the rapidly changing environment. These groups also indicated that they wanted to be a part of that change, being given more influence over the programs, services and decisions that affect them. One of the themes that emerged from the consultations was that students, parents, teachers and business / community representatives should be given a greater role in the education system, through involvement in decision-making and participation on school councils. At this time, the school system was very centralized, with most decision making authority residing with school

boards or the Department of Education. This centralized structure limited meaningful participation and input of parents, community members, students, and even teachers in school related matters. Those consulted felt that school councils, composed of elected representatives working in an advisory capacity, yet with some direct responsibilities, would allow all stakeholders more voice in school decision-making, and allow them to be part of the school improvement process. "The school, in partnership with parents and the community, should have primary responsibility for student learning. To effectively and efficiently exercise that responsibility, schools, parents and the community must be given sufficient authority to make decisions through school councils" (Education Horizons, 1995, p.25).

Nova Scotians felt that school councils would represent the community, be accountable to the community, and provide input on local community needs and goals. Councils would also enable schools to provide more health and community-related services, and be the means for better communication, coordination, and planning to meet students' needs. "Stronger links between schools and their communities will improve communications, decision-making, and accountability which are essential ingredients in achieving the vision of continuous school improvement"(Education Horizons, 1995, p.25).

The government felt that improving the structure of the education system would enable them to reach their goal of higher quality education, and they stated in their white paper that improving the system begins with creating effective schools. Effective schools were defined as ones where all education partners work together to create the best learning environment possible, where students are active learners, parents participate in decision-making, teachers are recognized as professionals, principals have adequate authority, schools are accountable, and

communities are given appropriate responsibility as partners. The government wanted to avail of the expertise, energies and interests of parents, teachers, students and the community in the creation of these effective schools, so they recommended the establishment of school councils. School councils would advise on school related matters, have some input into decision-making, and also be given certain direct responsibilities. This decision to establish school councils was part of government's overall restructuring plan to create a more efficient and cost-effective system in a time of declining fiscal resources (Education Horizons, 1995).

Subsequent to the release of the white paper, government proposed the establishment of school advisory councils, and in 1995, they were mandated through the Education Act (1995).

Rationale behind school council introduction in New Brunswick

In November 1991, the Commission on Excellence in Education was created in the province of New Brunswick with the purpose of "fostering excellence in education, training and human resource development in New Brunswick through a broad consultative process" (Schools for a New Century, 1992, p.7). The commission distributed an issues paper, and consultations around the province were held over a five-month period. The commission did not have the time nor the money to conduct its own research, but it consulted published studies of research conducted on this continent and elsewhere. In 1992, a commissioned study entitled *Schools for a New Century* was released which recommended changes for the education system. Many concerns and issues were raised, as well as resulting recommendations (Schools for a New Century, 1992).

Public consultations revealed an emerging feeling in New Brunswick that significant change was needed in the education system. Schools were not perceived to be doing enough to

foster students' full development. They were being blamed for students' lack of social skills and moral values, and lack of skills needed to lead productive and successful economic lives. Standards and expectations were too low; the basics were no longer sufficient. Children needed to be challenged to think critically and creatively. These deficiencies were not totally blamed on the organizational structure of the school system, although there was a general consensus that improving the structure could lead to some improvement.

New Brunswickers consulted in this report felt that there should be more focus on the curriculum, with the social responsibilities of schools being delimited. Schools could not be expected to do everything for everyone and certainly could not do it alone. Teachers needed to be freed from many of the custodial and social responsibilities that they had taken on over the years and their primary focus should be on educational goals and the curriculum. The commission expressed the opinion that there should be a shift towards shared authority, with teachers in particular being given more voice in decisions that affect them and their students. Parents, trustees, community, business and labour leaders, universities, educational associations, government agencies, and the department of education must also take their share of responsibility. "In order for the public school system to fulfil its mandate, education has to be a societal project, through which many groups forge alliances to create the common cause and provide the human and material resources that are necessary" (Schools for a New Century, 1992).

Although there were already educational partnerships in place in New Brunswick, through the Home and School Association and the Comité de Parents, the degree of parental and community involvement was not consistent throughout the system. The commission heard from

parents and others that they wanted to be allowed to participate more in the education system. Many parents consulted felt that their participation was not welcomed by the schools. The commission expressed the opinion that parents must assume greater responsibility for the education of their children and that schools and the education system must be more open and inviting to parents who wish to get involved. They felt that a structure was needed to facilitate parental and community participation in education, and to ensure consistency and effectiveness throughout the system, the structure agreed upon should be formalised through legislation. Based on these reasons, recommendation number 36 of this report called for school advisory committees to be prescribed by legislation. Their duties would include such things as participation in goal setting; discussion and advice on curriculum, school regulations, discipline, and the community use of the school; liaison with the community, school boards and government; and the training of volunteers to work in the schools. Following this commissioned report, the government released a *Report to Parents (1996)* calling for parents to get involved in education through School Parent Committees and District Parent Advisory Councils. In 1996, legislation was passed requiring school council implementation in every school (New Brunswick, 1992).

Rationale behind school council introduction in Newfoundland

Before educational reform took place in Newfoundland, the educational system was based on a top-down model, where decision making power was held by central authorities (Department of Education, Denominational Education Councils, district level school boards) with little or no local school input (House, 1992). There were many indications that parents in Newfoundland felt isolated from the school system. They felt intimidated when approaching

teachers and principals, frustration at being unable to influence the system, helpless when dealing with children's learning problems, and some even felt that schools were discouraging parental involvement. It was thought by many that the bureaucratic nature of the education system was the cause of these feelings (Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, 1994). There were also declining enrolments in schools due to a declining population in the province. This was particularly the case in rural Newfoundland, where many people had to move to larger centres or out of the province to look for work. Two studies of Newfoundland's education system, *Education for Self-Reliance (1986) and Education and Labour Market training (1990)*, both noted the importance of an education system that is tailored to the needs and lifestyles of Newfoundlanders living in outports, as well as those living in towns (House, 1992).

The Newfoundland school system was also cost-inefficient. It was a denominational education system with twenty-seven school boards. There were many redundancies within the system, including duplication of resources. Bussing costs alone were a big concern. In many communities, children did not attend schools closest to their homes, rather they were bussed to schools further away so that they could be educated in their own religion.

A study of the Newfoundland education system was commissioned, and in 1992, Newfoundland's Royal Commission report in education was released. It was the most ambitious, comprehensive report on education of the four Atlantic provinces. It reviewed studies on the Newfoundland education system and made recommendations for reform. According to the Terms of Reference for this Royal Commission's study, some concerns to be addressed were: (I) increasing demands for continued improvement in the quality of education; (ii) geographic and demographic realities which were resulting in small schools and declining enrolments; and (iii)

the effectiveness and cost-efficiency of the province's school system. Along with studying Newfoundland's education system, chapter six of this report included research on school councils in North America and elsewhere. One of the Royal Commision's recommendations stemming from these educational studies and reviews was for a decentralized education system that included the establishment of school councils. The commission concluded:

> "A single centrally administered system with no local decision making or advisory structures, and no value placed on participation by parents or other community members, is not designed to adapt to the needs of individual school communities. A less centralized system that included and valued public participation at every level (school, district and central) could use local level decision making through school councils, to mobilize all the support needed for an effective education system. This structure would be well suited to the difficulties of the thinly-populated rural areas of the province" (p.54).

The Royal Commission' report states several general reasons why school councils are advantageous, including benefits such as increased accountability of schools, increased parental and community involvement in education, an increase in local problem solving strategies, and a more democratic education system. The commission also advocates school council implementation based on a 1986 survey on public opinion about denominational education, which showed that people in Newfoundland placed more importance on having their children attend school in the community than in their own religion. House advocates that school councils could represent all members of the larger community, including people of different religious denominations, ensuring that all the various groups at the community level could be represented (House, 1992).

Subsequent to the release of the Royal Commission's report were other reports recommending the establishment of school councils. In 1993, *Adjusting the Course: Restructuring the School System for Educational Excellence* was released, followed by *Adjusting the Course Part Two: Improving the Conditions for Learning* (1994). Pilot school councils were set up in seven schools across Newfoundland and two reports stemming from these were released in October, 1995 and November, 1996. Steering committees on school council implementation were also established to examine educational issues, and numerous articles on the matter were published.

The Steering Committee on School Council Implementation (1994) supported the establishment of school councils. The committee felt that there were philosophical, social, and political arguments supporting the rights of parents to advocate on their children's behalf. They also felt that at a time when Newfoundland's economy was dwindling, and competition for scarce resources was increasing, schools could depend more and more on the public support of parents and the community. They felt that school councils could be the forum for engaging this support.

Collins, Harte & Cooper (1994) linked school councils with school board restructuring in Newfoundland. The Newfoundland government decided to restructure because of declining enrolments due to a declining population, parental and public pressure for reform, and economic concerns. They decided to consolidate the twenty-seven school boards into ten, and closed or slated for closure several schools. One of the effects of this restructuring was the need and the demand for school councils. "The move to larger school boards and the increase in the number and geographic distribution of schools, necessitates a structural change that will enable local

input in decision-making. For the system to work effectively, site based management must be embraced"(Collins, Harte & Cooper, 1994, p.4).

Collins (1995a) suggested that legislation and regulation of school councils could be powerful motivators for developing and supporting parental involvement. Parental involvement could be more effective when parents are given a variety of roles to play, and when the involvement is better planned, more comprehensive, and longer lasting, as would be the case with a school council.

The culmination of all this research on school councils was the introduction of legislation in 1996 which mandated the establishment of school councils in every school in Newfoundland.

Summary

Though each of the four Atlantic provinces have their own unique justifications for recommending the establishment of school councils, there are common factors which seem to have influenced their decisions to introduce councils. Parents and interested members of the general public were expressing increasing dissatisfaction with education systems and their outcomes. They were pressuring school boards and departments of education to reorganize to give parents and other community members more voice in education, particularly at the school level. Educational administrators needed to find an effective reform strategy which was not too costly and which would be satisfactory to parents and other community members. Because the Atlantic provinces do not have a substantially large research budget, nor can they rely on a national ministry of education, they looked to other, more progressive provinces and more progressive countries for input into their own decisions. All four provinces heavily relied on research conducted elsewhere. Research coming from the United Kingdom, the United States,

Australia and other parts of Canada indicated that restructuring education systems to give greater local autonomy to schools and their respective communities could help to improve those schools, and ultimately lead to improved educational performance (House, 1992). Educators and policy makers in the Atlantic provinces began valuing the potential benefits of school councils, particularly at a time when financial resources were lacking, and they chose to adopt them as an important strategy of educational reform (Education Horizons, 1995; Fogarty, 1993; Schools for a New Century, 1992; Steering Committee on School Council Implementation , 1994).

This decision by Canadian provinces, including the Atlantic ones, to adopt SBM as an educational reform strategy has been criticized. Peters (1997) believes that Canadian provinces adopted this reform strategy from other countries without fitting it into the Canadian context. He accuses provincial governments of opting for SBM based on their financial situation at the time. He believes that SBM is a response, not to the public's dissatisfaction with education, nor to a public outcry for higher student achievement, but a response to their own fiscal situation. He states that the move toward SBM "is more of a political expedient to co-opt public support for public education at the same time as the purse strings are being tightened and financial resources to schools are being curtailed" (Peters, 1997, p.17).

School councils in Atlantic Canada have been in place for a relatively short period of time, and there is thus far not enough research done to determine if they will have a lasting, meaningful impact on student achievement or school improvement in general. Furthermore, as opposed to many school councils elsewhere, school councils in Atlantic Canada and across most of the country are accorded advisory status only. School councils in New Brunswick have significant advisory roles at the school and district level, but in Newfoundland, Prince Edward

Island and Nova Scotia their advisory roles are fairly limited (Collins, 1998). Peters (1997) questions the mandate of advisory councils: "If they are purely advisory in nature, will they be able to sustain the interest and the involvement of a sufficiently broad-based constituency so that they do not simply become special interest groups focused solely on narrow aspects of the school's operation? (Peters, 1997, p.18)". From this author's experience as an educator in Newfoundland, it seems that school councils in this province have not yet had the opportunity to delve into major school improvement initiatives. Faced with major restructuring of the education system, many school councils in Newfoundland have focused a large part of their time rallying support from parents to fight school district's decisions to close schools or to cut back on programs. Many have not yet had the opportunity to focus on curriculum issues or school improvement, dedicating a lot of their energies to simply remaining viable.

Although the reason for their establishment may be in question, school councils have been legislated in all four Atlantic provinces, and are probably going to exist for quite a while. The amount of decision making authority accorded to them could increase or decrease over the years, depending on their effectiveness and public pressure. Only time will tell whether they will be a successful reform strategy leading to higher student achievement.

References

Carlson, R. (1996). Reframing and reform: Perspectives on organization, leadership, and school change. New York: Longman.

Cistone, P.J. (1989). School-based management/shared decision making: Perestroika in educational governance. Education and Urban Society, 21, 363-365.

Collins, A. (1995a). Exemplary models of parental and community involvement: Ten Newfoundland and Labrador schools. Total Quality Leadership for Learning Project. St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Collins, A. (1995b). Enhancing local involvement in education through quality leadership. School councils: A pilot study. Total Quality Leadership for Learning Project. St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Collins, A. (1996). School councils and principals: Issues and challenges. The Canadian School Executive, 16 (4), 3-6.

Collins, A. (1998, April). Paper presented at the conference of the Society for the Advancement of Excellence in Education on Shared School Decision-Making in Vancouver, British Columbia.

Collins, A., Harte, A. & Cooper, J. (1994). Enhancing local involvement in education through quality leadership. Prospects, 1 (3), 2-4.

Conley, S.C. (1989). "Who's on first?" School reform, teacher participation, and the decision making process. Education and Urban Society, 21, 366-379.

David, J. (1989). Synthesis of research on school-based management. Educational Leadership, 46 (8), 45-53.

Fogarty, A.P. (1993). Towards excellence: Final report on the structure and governance of the PEI educational system. Charlottetown, PEI.

Fleming, T. (1993). Canadian school policy in liberal and post liberal eras: Historical perspectives on the changing social context of schooling, 1846-1990. In Y.M. Martin & R.J.S. Macpherson (Eds.), Restructuring administrative policy in public schooling: Canadian and international case studies (pp. 57-76). Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.

Gamage, D.T., Sipple, P., and Partridge, P. (1996). Research on school-based management in Victoria. Journal of Educational Administration, 34 (1), 24-39.

Goodlad, J.I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw Hill.

Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. (1994). Adjusting the course: Restructuring the school system for educational excellence. St. John's. Queen's Printer.

Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. (1994). Adjusting the course: Part 2: Improving the conditions for learning. St. John's. Queen's Printer.

Griffiths, D.E. (1993). School administrators and the educational reform movement in the United States. In Y.M. Martin & R.J.S. Macpherson (Eds.), Restructuring administrative policy in public schooling: Canadian and international case studies (pp. 35-56). Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.

Hess, G.A., Jr. (1994). School-based management as a vehicle for school reform. Education and Urban Society, 26, 203-219.

Herman, J.J. (1990). School-based management. Instructional Leader, III (4), Texas Elementary Principals and Supervisors Association. 1-4.

Herman, J.J., & Herman, J.L. (1993). School-based management: Current thinking and practice. Springfield, Ill:Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Hiatt, D.B. (1994). Parent involvement in American public schools: An historical perspective 1642-1994. School-Community-Journal, 4 (2), 27-38.

House, J. (1992). School councils. In William, L. & Press, H. Our children, Our future? The Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Delivery of Programs and Services in Primary, Elementary, Secondary Education.. St. John's, NF: Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

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

New Brunswick. (1992). Schools for a new century. Fredericton, NB: Commission on Excellence in Education.

Nova Scotia. The Education Act (1995).

Nova Scotia. (1995). Education horizons: White paper on restructuring the education system. Halifax, NS: Department of Education.

Peters, F. (1997). School based decision-making - The Canadian perspective. School Business Affairs 63 (11), 16-21.

Reitzug, U., and Capper, C. (1996). Deconstructing site-based management: Possibilities for

emancipation and alternative means of control. International Journal of Educational Reform, 5 (1), 56-69.

Scane, J. (1996). The path to school councils. Orbit, 27 (4), 6-12.

Schedd, J.B. (1988). Collective bargaining, school reform, and the management of school systems. Educational Administration Quarterly, 24 *(4)*, 409.

Shafritz, J.M., & Ott, J.S.(1996).Classics of organization theory (4th Ed.). Orlando, Fl: Harcourt Brace & Company.

Steering Committee on School Council Implementation. (1994). Working together for educational excellence: A consultation paper on school council operations. St. John's. Queens Printer.

Steinberg, L. (1996). Beyond the classroom: Why school reform has failed and what parents need to do. New York: Simon & Schuster.

United States Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. Carnegie Corporation of New York, NY.

United States Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI.: Erickson Hall.

United States National Governors' Association. (1986). Time for results: The governors' report on education.. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association Publications Office.

Paper # 2 of Paper Folio

The Impact of Site-Based Management and School Councils on Education

Introduction

During the mid-to-late 1980s and early 1990s, many jurisdictions across North America and elsewhere decided to restructure their educational systems as a means to educational reform. Restructuring took on many forms, including centralizing some aspects of educational systems, while decentralizing others. One such type of decentralization that received widespread attention is site-based management (SBM). Support for SBM was abundant in educational literature at this time. Research suggested that by engaging teachers, parents, community representatives, and even students in managing schools, and giving them more input into local decision-making, schools would be more accountable and student achievement would increase. In many jurisdictions, educational policy makers legislated the establishment of school councils as the structure used to implement SBM in schools.

Is SBM an effective means to educational reform? Researchers are now suggesting that school councils and SBM are not as effective as educators hoped they would be (Conway and Calzi, 1996; Gleason, Donohue, and Leader, 1996; Guskey and Peterson, 1996). While research still strongly supports the benefits of parental and community involvement in education (Collins, 1995; Fullan & Quinn, 1996), research has not shown that parental and community involvement in a decision making capacity i.e., through school councils, has had a positive effect on student achievement (David, 1996; Leithwood, 1998; Parker, 1999; Sheppard and Devereaux, 1997).

This paper explores SBM and school councils, discussing both the positive and negative impacts they have had on education, as well as problems associated with them. It begins with a discussion of the purpose of SBM and school councils.

Purpose of SBM and school councils

The ultimate purpose of SBM and school councils is increased student achievement. Trying to show, however, whether SBM through school councils directly leads to increased student achievement is very difficult. For one thing, there are innumerable factors which affect student achievement, and trying to show a direct link between it and SBM and school councils is complex. The literature on SBM and school councils is also ambiguous. SBM is described in so many different ways, and to varying degrees across countries and within, that studying its overall effects has not been easy. Most of the literature consists of articles advocating SBM based on an individual school's or school district's success stories, and there are relatively few longitudinal studies on SBM and school councils (Bauer, 1988).

The purpose, itself, has also been questioned. Some writers suggest that SBM and school councils are political ends in themselves, and not a means to desired ends such as increased student achievement. David (1996) suggests that there are often underlying motives behind SBM, "less lofty aims, such as weakening entrenched and distrusted school boards, creating the illusion of reform without investing additional resources, putting a positive spin on central office downsizing by calling it decentralization, or simply trying to shift the blame for failure to the school itself" (p.6). Leithwood and Menzie (1997) accuse school systems and governments of using site-based management as "a popular symbol of progressive and responsive practice within a public rhetoric of improving student achievement" (p.48). They suggest that there are perhaps other faster and more direct reform strategies available. Leithwood (1998) took an even harsher stance when he wrote that school councils "may well stand in the way of enhancing student achievement" (p.34) and "evidence mounts that school councils are more complicated to implement and, by itself, less powerful a source of school improvement than its advocates

suggest" (p.35). Ken Jesse, in a presentation to Alberta educators, called the introduction of school councils "a transfer of power and authority as a policy solution for an undefined problem" (Knight & Steele, 1996, p.11). Carlson (1996) after an extensive review of site-based management, writes that it may be "nothing more than smoke and mirrors that give the impression that something important is being done when little or no evidence can be found to support these claims" (p. 279). Fullan & Quinn (1996) make the distinction between school councils as ends in themselves (the compliance orientation) and school councils as a means to involve parents and the community in helping to enhance the learning of students (the capacity-building orientation). They suggest that school councils become ends in themselves simply because it is easier to focus on compliance, and much harder to work in collaboration to build new relationships between parents, communities and schools. They believe that school councils were intended to be a means to educational improvement, but unfortunately, "complex innovations often unwittingly become ends in themselves" (p. 2).

Though their reason for existence may be questionable, the fact remains that school councils and SBM have been established in many educational jurisdictions. The next section discusses the impact they are having on education.

Impact of SBM and school councils on education

Research on the impact SBM and school councils have had on student achievement is mixed. Some research has shown no impact on student achievement (Rondeau, 1998), while other research has shown that school councils may even have had a negative impact (Leithwood & Menzie, 1997). Bauer (1998) writes: "studies of the implementation of various forms of site-based management show that there is at best mixed evidence of any explicit connection between governance, participation, and student performance and achievement" (p.108).

Leithwood & Menzies (1997), in a review of eleven studies on SBM, credit school councils with making schools more accountable and responsive to parents and the community. They found that when parents and community members have decision making power, schools are more responsive to local values and preferences, and consumer satisfaction rises. Their review overall, though, showed that SBM did not result in significant benefits for students. Evidence suggested in fact that "the effects on students are just as likely to be negative as positive" (Leithwood & Menzies ,1997, p. 48).

Rondeau (1998) found that decentralized decision-making leads to more commitment and cooperation between various groups, but found no proof linking it to student performance. Based on his review of a longitudinal study by Canada's General Accounting Office to determine if decentralization results in reduced costs and higher student achievement, the decentralized education systems studied "did not lead to net budget savings or better student performance" (p. 17). Two other studies reviewed by Rondeau revealed similar findings. Wohlstetter and Mohrman's (1994) study showed " 'scant evidence' that the schools will improve simply because decision making will be at the school level" and. Summers & Johnson's (1995) study found "virtually no evidence that SBM results in improved student performance" (Rondeau, 1998, p. 17).

Parker (1999) came up with similar results from her literature review: "There is little empirical evidence connecting structural reform and 'anything having to do with classroom instruction or the learning of students'" (p.24). She found from her review that overall, teachers did not feel that school councils nor SBM had a large influence on their teaching practices or curriculum. She notes, however, that there were some effective councils that had a positive influence on the school as a whole and on classrooms.

Murphy & Hallinger (1993) concluded from their research: "At neither the theoretical nor the conceptual levels was there much evidence to link restructuring efforts (such as school-based management) with changes in classrooms, relationships between teachers and students, and/or student outcomes"(p.254).

Research by Gleason et al. (1996) showed that while school councils led to improvements in perceptions about teacher work conditions and professionalism, and improvement in parental involvement, there was no impact on student achievement. Conway & Calzi (1996) also found improvements in teacher satisfaction, but this did not translate into higher productivity. Teachers who shared in the decision making felt more professional and liked having more authority, but this did not lead to increased emphasis on teaching. In fact, two other studies reviewed by Conway and Calzi revealed respectively that shared decision-making detracts from, rather than enhances, teacher work; and involving teachers in decision-making created, rather than solved, some school system problems.

Guskey & Peterson's (1996) research showed that few school councils actually took up learning-related topics associated with effective schools, nor did they have any clear goals for student learning. They found little evidence linking site-based decision-making to improvements in student outcomes.

Malen, Ogawa, and Kranz's (1990) case study of the literature examined three theories related to the indirect connection between SBM and school improvement; the *governance theory,* the *organizational renewal theory,* and the *effective schools theory.*

The governance theory suggests that because school councils are given more policy making influence, relations between administrators, teachers and patrons (parents and other community representatives) change. Teachers and parents have more influence, which should

result in more responsive and better quality decisions based on student needs. This, in turn, should translate into improved student performance and achievement.

Based on their research, Malen, Ogawa and Kranz (1990) concluded that little evidence exists linking site-based management to even this intermediate, or indirect outcome. As for the governance theory, they found that SBM results in more involvement, but not more policy making influence among stakeholders. Councils typically have limited influence because power still essentially remains with the principal and because councils do not have the necessary training, information, time or other resources to carry out what is expected of them. The organizational renewal theory suggests that by involving school staff in decision-making, morale will rise. Higher morale will lead to better quality planning, more commitment, more innovative teaching, better diagnosis of student needs, better instructional programs and practices, all this of course leading to improved student performance. Malen, Ogawa, and Kranz (1990) did not find sufficient evidence to support this theory either. They found that councils' impact on morale is limited. Enthusiasm is high at first, but gradually reduced due to factors such as the big time commitment, confusion over new roles, stress over high expectations, and limited resources available to sustain the process. There is little evidence linking SBM to better quality planning, for councils do not spend much time on instructional issues, nor try to come up with innovative teaching and learning strategies. They focus, rather, on the impact of current practices.

The effective schools theory suggests that more autonomous schools will adopt characteristics associated with effective schools such as the establishment of a clear school mission, the development of strong instructional leadership and high expectations for students. These effective schools characteristics will in turn lead to improved student performance.

Again, Malen, Ogawa, and Kranz (1990) did not find much support for this theory. They found little support for the idea that more school autonomy leads to the development of effective schools characteristics, and even less support that this improves student achievement and performance.

While little evidence exists thus far to prove a link between SBM, school councils and higher student achievement, this restructuring strategy is not a total failure. Much of the blame for its ineffectiveness can be attributed to lack of support for its proper implementation. Bauer (1998) writes: "The number and types of demands on the system, limited staff development, lack of time to discuss and develop alternative action plans, and the absence of funds for new programs conspire to limit the potential of school-based management to result in outcomes such as improved morale, innovation and effectiveness. Additionally, entrenched norms interfere with alterations in influence relations, although even here, capacity issues relating to staff development and training are said to contribute to the persistence of the problem" (p.110). Several researchers have found that SBM and school councils have the potential to be effective if properly implemented and sustained. The following section discusses some of their positive impacts on education.

Positive Impacts School Councils and SBM Are Having on Education

Parker (1999), who could not prove a link between SBM and increased student achievement, did note that there were some effective councils who fostered, among other things, strong school / community relationships, improved communication strategies and integrated learning centres. She wrote that councils could be effective when they focused clearly on children and school, discussing school direction and growth plans, and involving the community

in their efforts. Parker also found that schools with influential councils had a history of diverse and high levels of parental involvement.

Other researchers (Botrie, 1996; Fullan, 1991; Fullan and Quinn, 1996;) also found that SBM and school councils can be beneficial for students. While they agree that school councils by themselves do not significantly affect student learning, they advocate using them as a means for promoting other types and levels of parental and community involvement, which when properly managed, can positively affect student achievement. Fullan and Quinn (1996) found that when learning is valued by schools, families and communities working together in partnership, children are highly motivated. They believe that what makes a difference is "multiple forms of particular involvement deliberately fostered, developed and supported" (Fullan & Quinn, 1996, p.3). They also believe that these forms of involvement do not just happen on their own or even through invitation, but that schools must purposely solicit them. They advise educators to think of school councils as a means to desired educational ends, and to continually ask the question of what those particular ends should be. School councils need to be looked at as an opportunity to develop greater commitment and resources for improving teaching and learning in the schools. They suggest using "capacity-building strategies" such as: building shared purpose; developing knowledge and skills; leadership training; orientation; creation of networks; provision of resources; and provision of mechanisms for evaluation and dissemination. Their review of research stresses the importance of parental involvement due to the fact that parents have knowledge of their child that is not available to anyone else, and that parents vested interest in their child's success can be very beneficial.

Collins & Lube (1996) write: "school councils provide a vehicle for increasing involvement with parents and offering a link with community members who may not otherwise

be directly involved with the school" (p. 18). They advocate that enhancing communication with parents develops mutual respect and trust which is the basis of a strong partnership. Chrispeels (1996) reviewed numerous studies on effective schools and found that the experience of working with parents on important improvement goals has enabled teachers to redefine their relationships with parents and to begin working with them as partners. Heath & Vik (1996) describe councils as tools that help establish a strong sense of school community through wide participation, and they serve as a deterrent for schools to "just drift along" (p.28). House (1992) found that school councils allow for empowerment of the community which benefits everyone. A partnership between education and community fosters mutual trust and respect for literacy and skills retraining programs that could be part of the community school's program. She also found that local autonomy and accountability increase when parents and the community are part of the decision making process at the local level. Participation in decision making allows parents to have a better understanding of the issues before them and be more supportive of the decisions reached.

Botrie (1996) found that when parents feel welcome in the school, they become good public relations advocates for the school. They also inform schools about the local community and individual children, and can help develop enriched programs without the cost of additional educational support.

Epstein (1995) supports school councils as just one of six types of involvement needed to make partnerships between school, parents and community work towards increasing school effectiveness and student achievement. Besides involving parents in decision making and developing parent leaders, other types of involvement needed are: encouraging good parenting skills to improve the home environment; two-way communication between home and school;

solicitation and organization of parent aides and volunteers; promotion of home-tutoring assistance so parents know how they can help their children learn at home; and working in cooperation with community agencies and services.

There seems to be general agreement among writers that simply involving parents and the community in a decision-making or managing capacity on school councils is just one form of involvement that, by itself, is not sufficient to bring about significant educational improvement. Using school councils in a broader role, however, as a forum for engaging other diverse types and levels of parental and community involvement, and giving them the necessary support, training, time and resources to sustain the whole process of site-based management may lead to school improvement and improved student achievement.

Additional benefits of school councils and SBM

In his book *Reframing and Reform* Carlson (1996) discusses some benefits of site-based management, one of which is that it permits schools to be unique. Not all schools have the same problems or needs. SBM allows schools to identify local problems and needs, and to develop strategies to deal with them. Schools have greater flexibility and potentially more creativity in solving their problems, and their knowledge of resources, including teacher competence, can lead to better quality decision making. This idea is reinforced in House's (1992) research, which shows that local representative decision making allows schools to more effectively deal with their problems on their own, and makes them less dependent on outside groups to solve their problems.

School councils and SBM make educational institutions more open and democratic (House, 1992). Traditional "top-down", bureaucratic educational systems stress hierarchical control and leave parents and students feeling powerless, alienated and frustrated. SBM and

school councils allow a more "bottom-up" approach which stresses autonomy, participative decision making and collaboration by all those involved (House, 1992).

School councils can also allay people's general fear and distrust of professionals. Parents and other community members are more educated than ever before and less inclined to accept without question centralized authority over local educational issues. School councils give them the opportunity to question decisions affecting their children, and to give their input. They also serve as a forum for parents to vent their frustrations without resorting to drastic actions such as protests or keeping their children at home. School councils can be the means for addressing all sorts of problems (House, 1992).

Finally, SBM can be cost efficient and effective. Schools can wisely and prudently allocate resources and monies where and when needed, as opposed to just indiscriminately using up funds and resources sent from central authorities.

Problems With School Councils and SBM

As with any type of educational change, there are barriers to its effectiveness. Excessive time and energy demanded for SBM and school councils is identified as a major obstacle (Carlson, 1996; Knight and Steele, 1996; Leithwood and Menzie, 1997). Time demands are excessive on teachers, parents and especially administrators. Finding time for meetings is especially difficult for council members who have obligations and commitments to their jobs and families (Heath and Vik, 1996). Participation on councils increases everyone's workload, leaving less time for other important things, including teacher preparation.

Lack of experience, training and technical assistance is another obstacle. Parents, teachers, administrators and other community representatives are all brought together to advise or govern a school. They have varying backgrounds and levels of experience behind them, and

different reasons for choosing to be on school councils. According to Collins (1997), each group represented may have its own agenda. Teachers are said to be concerned mainly about how school councils will personally affect them, while parents are accused of looking out for their own child's interest ahead of the whole school's. The school board may be concerned with its own survival and control, and government seems interested only in efficiency. Community leaders seem to have a self-serving business driven agenda, and principals are perceived to favour one group over the other. Without a common purpose and a clear direction of how to get there, councils may end up wasting precious time. What councils need to work on developing is a shared vision; a goal that all council members regardless of their personal agendas will strive to reach together. They also need adequate training in developing skills in interpersonal communication, collaborative goal setting, conflict resolution and decision-making. Heath & Vik (1996) warn that unless council members have training in collaborative leadership, they can get bogged down in the decision-making process.

Another major obstacle to effective SBM is resistance to sharing power (Sheppard & Devereaux, 1997). Traditionally, principals have had full decision-making responsibility in schools, although those decisions are often influenced by pressure from teachers or parents. School councils shake up power distribution in schools. New players come on the scene and are expected to take on new formal roles and responsibilities for the running of the school. Parents, teachers, community representatives and sometimes students are given power and decision making authority (levels vary according to jurisdiction) which they are not used to having. Conflict and confusion often arises over the new roles each group must take on, and there often exists the tendency for council members to adhere to the traditional roles with which they are most comfortable. Administrators may be reluctant to give up power, and parents or others may

not feel ready to take it on. According to the Canadian Education Association Newsletter (1998), there is evidence, in fact, that parents are not necessarily in favour of decision making mandates. Parents who have responsibilities to employers and families revealed concerns over their ability to take part in decisions formerly made by school administrators. Others worried that if participation is limited to those with sufficient time and resources, the council may not democratically represent all parents. Some expressed reluctance to participate because they were unsure of what being a council member entailed. More feared that legislating councils may actually reduce parental involvement. Again, information, training and support in helping councils understand and adapt to their new power relationships, roles and responsibilities would be beneficial.

Fullan & Hannay (1998) believe that reform strategies such as school councils "often fail because they are piecemeal, attaching only one part of a set of factors that must converge" (p.8). School councils operating in isolation within a system are not effective. Fullan & Hannay blame the problem on public policy making. Whenever there are problems and public pressure for improvement, the government policy makers desperately seek an idea, whether it be from another country, state or province, or perhaps the brainchild of one of their own researchers, and they impose it without taking into consideration the local context. They do this in a relatively short-term time period, dictated by their mandate. They end up focusing too much on structural changes and formal requirements, their main concern being to get the policy drawn up. What often results is a reform strategy that is all structure and no substance. School councils acting purely in a decision making capacity can be just that, and relying solely on them to bring about improvement will not work. As previously mentioned, there needs to be a broader effort to engage parents and the community to work together with schools in several capacities, at several

levels, and with a shared goal in mind. Setting a policy without facilitation to sustain it is not sufficient. "Since capacity-building really requires a strong vision of why it is crucial, and a corresponding set of specific strategies, there is virtually no chance that the policy will produce good results (Fullan & Hannay, p. 8).

Although school councils are hailed as a means to make education more inclusive and democratic, care needs to be taken to ensure that the process remains just that. In a discussion on parent councils in Alberta, equity concerns were raised (Knight & Steele, 1996). Some participants raised fears about the capacity of special interest groups to dominate decision making within councils. Because councils are often composed of people who have the time, money and resources to be elected, some feared the interests of an elite could prevail. Non-working women who volunteered for councils were stereotyped as "women with time" (p. 17) and it was felt by some that the nature and value of their participation could be characterized by gender and not by the expertise they offered. Concerns were also raised for immigrant and lower income groups who are often under represented. At school meetings, these groups tend to participate less, often being too intimidated to speak up. Carr (1997) found that schedules for council meetings "encourage differential power distributions skewed towards nonworking mothers, upper and middle-class fathers, interested business people, and professional educators" (p. 156).

Carlson (1996) discusses equity concerns as well, not within schools, but between them. "Too much local discretion or decentralization can lead to enormous differences in educational opportunities between schools. Less aggressive and politically weak schools do not get as much as stronger schools " (p. 264). Fundraising by school councils could also lead to inequities, for poorer school districts may find it harder to raise as much money as richer ones.

At the same discussion on school councils in Alberta, ethical concerns were also raised. There was fear by some participants over the fact that parents, who may have equal or greater say in the decision making at school, are not bound by a professional code of conduct as teachers or administrators are. They fear parents involved in decisions about staffing may do so based on gender, sexual orientation, or race. There was a call for the development of some rules of ethical behaviour to ensure non-discriminatory decisions and actions (Knight & Steele, 1996).

Training to help council members deal appropriately with equity and ethical concerns is needed, as well as some form of monitoring by central authorities to ensure all children and staff, in every school and between schools, receive fair and equitable treatment.

Conclusion

Although insufficient evidence exists thus far to prove a link between SBM / school councils and higher student achievement, this educational reform strategy is far from a total failure. In the first part of this paper, reasons were given why it is difficult to make the link between them. The ambiguous nature of the concept SBM itself, the inconsistencies throughout the literature, the numerous others factors involved, and the various forms and compositions of both SBM and school councils make it difficult to reach a definite conclusion on the impact they have had or are having. Blame for much of their ineffectiveness lies with poor implementation procedures. Educational policy makers set the policies, implementing SBM, but then do not commit to, nor facilitate the long process needed to effect change. They do not provide necessary assistance such as time, skills training, or resources to sustain the process. Policy makers have set up structures, which have the potential to be quite effective, but unfortunately many of them have not committed to helping these structures effect the necessary changes expected of them.

Even though SBM and school councils have not yet been proven to fulfil their ultimate purpose of higher student achievement, they do have numerous benefits. Besides making schools more accountable and responsive to local community needs, and allowing for local problem solving, they can foster a great sense of community and engage more parents and community members to become involved in education and the efforts to improve it.

Education which was once fully controlled by the educators, is now the shared responsibility of all stakeholders in education; teachers, parents, administrators, students and members of the community. Responsibility and accountability no longer rest with one group. SBM and school councils give all members of the community a chance to be involved in education. This, of course, is a good thing because everyone in society benefits from a good education system, not just those directly involved in it.

References

Bauer, S. (1998).Designing site-based systems, deriving a theory of practice. International Journal of Educational Reform, 7 (2), 108-121.

Botrie, M. (1996). Parental involvement part 2: Teachers perspective. Home and School, 3 (2), 20-23.

Canadian Education Association Newsletter (1998 , 80, 1-3.). School councils and parental control: A cross country overview.

Carlson, R. (1996) . Reframing and reform: Perspectives on organization, leadership, and school change. New York: Longman.

Carr, A. (1997). Leadership and community participation: Four case studies. Journal of Curriculum and supervision. 12 (2), 152-168.

Chrispeels, J. (1996). Effective schools and home school partnership roles. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 7 (4), 297-323.

Collins, A. (1995). Exemplary models of parental and community involvement: Ten Newfoundland and Labrador schools. Total Quality Leadership for Learning Project. St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Collins, A. (1996). School councils and principals: Issues and challenges. The Canadian School Executive, 16 (4), 3-6.

Collins, A. (1997). School councils: What's on the agenda? Canadian Association of Principals, 7 (1), 28–29.

Collins, A. (1998, April). Paper presented at the conference of the Society for the Advancement of Excellence in Education on Shared School Decision-Making in Vancouver, British Columbia.

Collins, G., & Lube, L. (1996). School councils - building partnerships. FWTAO Newsletter, 15 (1), 18-23.

Conway, J.A., & Calzi, F. (1996). The dark side of shared decision making. Educational Leadership, 53 (4), 45-49.

David, J. (1989). Synthesis of research on school-based management. Educational Leadership, 46 (8), 45-53.

Epstein, J.L. (1995). School/family/community partnerships. Caring for the children we share. Phi Delta Kappan, 76(9), 701-711.

Fullan, M. (1991). The new meaning of educational change, 2nd Ed. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M., & Hannay, L. (1998). Good reform / bad reform. Orbit, 29 (1), 7-9.

Fullan, M., & Quinn, J. (1996). School councils: Non-event or capacity building for reform ? Orbit, 27 (4), 2-5.

Gamage, D.T., Sipple, P., and Partridge, P. (1996). Research on school-based management in Victoria. Journal of Educational Administration, 34 (1), 24-39.

Gleason, S.C., Donohue,N., & Leader, G.C. (1996). Boston revisits site-based management. Educational Leadership, 53 (4), 24-27.

Guskey,T.,& Peterson,K.D.(1996). The road to classroom change. Educational Leadership, 53 (4), 10-14.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (1998). What's worth fighting for out there. Toronto, Ont: Public Schools Teachers Federation.

Heath, J.A., & Vik, P. (1996). School site councils: Building communities of leaders. Principal, 75 (3), 25,28.

Herman, J.J. (1990). School-based management. Texas Elementary Principals and Supervisors Association: Instructional Leader, III *(4)*, 1-4.

Herman, J.J., & Herman, J.L. (1993). School-based management: Current thinking and practice. Springfield, Ill:Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

House, J. (1992). School councils. In William, L. & Press, H. Our children, Our future? The Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Delivery of Programs and Services in Primary, Elementary, Secondary Education.. St. John's, NF: Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Kannapel, P.J., Moore, B.D., Coe, P. & Aaagaard, L. (1995). Six heads are better than one ? School-based decision-making in rural Kentucky. Journal of Research in Rural Education, 11(1), 15-23.

Knight, K., & Steele, U. (1996). Parent councils. Challenge in Educational Administration, 33 (1), 10-18.

Leithwood, K. (1998). Educational governance and student achievement. Orbit, 29 (1), 34-37.

Leithwood, K., & Menzies, T. (1997). Research on school based management and school councils. Orbit, 28 (2), 46-48.

Malen, B., Ogawa, R., and Kranz, J. (1990). What do we know about school-based management? A case study of the literature- A call for research. In W. Clune and J. Witte (Eds.), Choice and control in American education, Volume 2: The practice of choice, decentralization and school restructuring. London: The Falmer Press.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1993). Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts. In J. Murphy and P. Hallinger (Eds.), Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts, (pp.251-271). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

National Parent Teacher Association, Chicago, IL.(1998). Standards for parent / family involvement programs. Canadian Association of Principals, 7 (3), 34-39.

Parker, K. (1999). The critical role of principals in developing school councils. Orbit, 30 (1), 24-26.

Peters, F. (1997). School based decision-making - The Canadian perspective. School Business Affairs, 63 (11), 16-21.

Reitzug, U., and Capper, C. (1996). Deconstructing site-based management: Possibilities for emancipation and alternative means of control. International Journal of Educational Reform, 5 (1), 56-69.

Rondeau, J.C. (1998). La décentralisation produit-elle des écoles de qualité supérieure? Education Canada, 38 (3), 14-17.

Ryan, J. (1999). Leadership and diversity: Establishing and maintaining relationships with school communities. Orbit, 30 (1), 16-18.

Sheppard, B., & Devereaux. (1997). Leadership training is essential to effective site-based management. Canadian School Executive, 16 (8), 3-6.

St. John, E., Griffith, A., & Haynes, L. (1997). Families in schools: A chorus of voices in restructuring. Portsmouth, NH: Reed Elsevier.

Paper # 3 of Paper folio

The Impact of Site-Based Management and School Councils on the Role of the Principal

Introduction

Before the current emphasis on restructuring, most schools operated within formal bureaucracies (Blase,1995; Oneida & Heflin, 1995). Decisions, policies, rules and regulations were made at the top of an educational hierarchy by school boards and top level administrators, and then passed down to principals who were responsible for ensuring they were carried out at the local school level (Lieberman, 1996). The leadership styles of principals reflected this bureaucratic nature of schools. Their thoughts and behaviours were shaped by the values and beliefs inherent in a bureaucratic organization (Goldman, 1998), and many of them were trained to lead bureaucratically (Oneida & Heflin, 1995). Principals played a central role in schools (Oneida & Heflin, 95), were responsible to a centrally controlled bureaucracy, and protected by centrally determined rules and regulations (Ford & Bennett, 1994).

The traditional leadership role associated with principals was control-oriented (Blase, 1995; Oneida & Heflin, 1995). As the administrator and formal head of the school, the principal had final decision-making authority, with input from parents and teachers being limited and mainly consultative. The principal was expected to follow directives from higher authorities, and ensure teachers and students did the same. Effective principals were typically described as "strong, decisive, directive, take charge visionaries who tend to be control oriented in their relationships with teachers (Blase, 1995, p.2). The means used by principals to control was not necessarily direct or domineering. Control was often accomplished through subtle, diplomatic and ideological means. Some approaches employed by principals were political, problem-solving oriented, humanistic, cultural, authoritarian, collaborative, open and quasi-participatory.

Whatever approach was used, control was generally manifested through some form of manipulation or influence by the principal of teachers' and students' behaviours, thoughts and values (Blase, 1995). This control oriented approach has been labelled by some as "power over" (Blase, 1995; Sheppard and Devereaux, 1997).

Educational reform, in particular the introduction of school-based management and school councils, alters the context of schooling, and hence requires a change in the leadership approaches principals must employ (Collins, 1995; Delaney, 1997; Fullan, 1991; Murphy & Beck, 1994; Sheppard & Devereaux, 1997). Organizational bureaucracy, with its established norms, routines and expectations, is breaking down and schools are becoming more democratic. There is increased involvement in decision-making of teachers, parents, community representatives, and in some cases students (Murphy, 1994). Authority and decision-making are no longer centralized at the top of a hierarchy to be passed down through it, but now come from the bottom up. Principals must answer to school councils' concerns and can no longer just carry out central office directives (Ford & Bennett, 1994).The school community has expanded, and the boundaries have opened up (Fullan, 1998). Government policies, parental and community demands, demands for accountability, corporate interests and pervasive technology are increasingly affecting the work environment of schools (Fullan, 1998). The role most affected by these changes is that of the principal (Collins, 1995; Ford & Bennett, 1994; Fullan, 1998; Tanner & Stone, 1998; Terry, 1995). Principals must not only adjust and adapt to the rapidly changing work environment and the new tasks it brings, but also are expected to initiate and lead others through structural changes at the school level, and broaden their role to include the wider school

community (Fullan, 1991). No longer protected by bureaucratic structures, rules and regulations, they must find creative ways to coordinate different groups of stakeholders in education, all of whom have different interests and opinions on the direction the school should take (Ford & Bennett, 1994). Principals must relinquish some of their authority to these groups (Benson, 1998; Lambert, 1998; Murphy, 1994), thus opening up traditional school policies and practices to inspection and influence (Ford & Bennett, 1994). Their role in determing the success of SBM and school councils in schools is crucial (Fullan, 91; Sheppard & Devereaux, 97).

This paper discusses how the leadership role of the principal is changing from the traditional control oriented style described above, to a more democratic, facilitative and collaborative style which would be more suited to the new school environment created with the introduction of SBM and school councils (Benson, 1998; Bolender, 1996; Collins, 1996; Leithwood & Menzies, 1997; Murphy, 1994; Parker, 1999). It begins with a discussion of the importance of rethinking the concept of leadership itself, followed by seven leadership strategies that principals can employ to make SBM and school councils successful for their schools. The final part of the paper discusses potential problems for principals, as well as suggestions on how to make this role transition a little easier.

Rethinking leadership

Before principals can successfully take over their new roles as leaders of site-based managed schools, they must first rethink their views on leadership (Lieberman, 1996). They must begin by reflecting and bringing to the surface the values, beliefs and underlying assumptions that shape their views on what leadership actually is (Murphy & Beck, 1994). Most

school leaders have been trained to assume a centralized, authoritarian role at the head of the school. They associate leadership with this formal role, and associate leading as an exercise of power and authority over followers, in this case, teachers and students. If principals want to bring about successful and meaningful change within the new democratic context of schooling, they must abandon the deeply embedded values and practices associated with bureaucracies (Rusch, 1998). They need to rethink leadership in new terms (Lambert, 1998; Oneida & Heflin, 1995), and commit to learning a new set of democratic leadership behaviours (Oneida & Heflin, 1995).

Leadership for today's schools should be seen as a reciprocal learning process that can be performed by various individuals with or without formal authority. School leaders should be thought of as anyone who participates in leading the school community towards a common purpose. It should not be seen as limited to or contained in specific roles (Crow, 1998; Lambert, 1998). Principals need to abandon the idea that they need to be in charge, and that leadership is a function to be performed solely by them (Rusch, 1998). They need to be aware, and then comfortable with the idea that by relinquishing some of their power and authority to others, they can achieve more good for the school. They need to look at teachers, parents, students, and community representatives in a new light, as potential and valuable informal leaders in schools. Leadership needs to be recognized as a democratic relationship based upon mutual influence rather than control over. It's source can come from several directions and levels (Crow, 1998; Rusch, 1998).

When principals can rethink leadership in these terms, they can then reconceptualize their role as one of leading not from the top, but rather leading from the center (Murphy, 1994). By

sharing their authority and empowering others in the school community to assume some of the leadership responsibilities, principals can create a community of leaders. This community, working together, can make SBM and school councils successful for their schools.

To help achieve success, the following democratic, facilitative and collaborative leadership strategies are suggested for principals: building a team of leaders, facilitating collaborative decision making, setting a vision for the school, connecting with the public, promoting equality, and supporting teachers.

Building a team of leaders

With the introduction of school councils and SBM, more people, including parents and representatives of the community, get involved in running the school. The principal has the very important and challenging task of bringing these groups together with teachers, administrators and sometimes students to work as a leadership team towards some shared vision for the school. Principals can begin by assessing where leadership is already provided and where it is lacking (Crow, 1998). They should take the time to get to know the people who make up the school community. Once they recognize informal leaders already in place, they can encourage these leaders to take on more active leadership roles, and reward their efforts with recognition. They can also begin to develop the leadership skills and potential of non-leaders (Blase, 1995) .

To encourage others to participate in the shared leadership of site-based managed schools, the culture of the school i.e., the norms, values, assumptions and expectations present in the school, may have to be transformed. Principals may need to foster the development of more collegial, collaborative norms such as trust, openness, risk-taking, mutual influence and equality

(Blase, 1995; Murphy, 1994; Rusch, 1998). They can begin with themselves by foregoing the need for security and power of their positions (Rusch, 1998). By relinquishing some of their authority and delegating authentic leadership responsibilities to others, they put themselves on a more equal level with teachers, parents and others. They let teachers know that they trust in their professionalism, and let parents, students and other community members know that they trust in their good judgement. Principals should try to trust in others' motives (Blase, 1998), and then empower those trusted with meaningful tasks (Murphy, 1994). They should support and facilitate others to lead, while still maintaining their own leadership responsibilities and organizational focus (Sorenson, 1995).They can encourage risk-taking, expression, and experimentation (King, 1996), so others feel free to explore new, on the cutting edge ideas and programs for school improvement. They can be advocates for others' work, coach others and look for opportunities to positively interact (Tanner & Stone, 1998).

To create a climate of team spirit, principals need to discourage internal politics and games (Rusch, 1998). They should encourage others to work together as a team, and not in competition with one another for personal advancement or other rewards. When recognition for good performance is given to the school, the principal can be humble and give credit to all (Rusch, 1998). He or she can ensure that everyone involved feels ownership and pride for a job well done. When the school is not performing as it should, he or she should not accept full responsibility either. Accountability, like credit, must be shared with everyone (Murphy, 1994).

Facilitating collaborative decision making

Whether school councils are advisory or full fledged decision-making structures, they

must be collaborative and democratic (Collins, 1996). Creating and maintaining such structures does not just happen automatically with implementation. It takes time and energy, and commitment to shared decision making. Since principals exert a big influence on the nature, extent and pattern of participation in decision making, their role in this task is central (Murphy, 1994). Principals need to initiate, implement and maintain workable and democratic forms of shared decision making at the school level using a power-with approach, as opposed to a power over one (Blase, 1995). Power should be shared equally among all school council representatives. The latter must feel that their invitation to share in the leadership of the school is sincere, and not simply tokenism. Principals should empower and enable council members to participate meaningfully in school based decision making. The traditional authoritarian style of leadership is not suitable nor effective with school councils. What is needed is a facilitative, consensus building style (Benson, 1998; Bolender, 1996; Leithwood & Menzies, 1997). Principals can model democratic and collaborative kinds of behaviour (Murphy, 1994), such as encouraging, empowering, facilitating, and supporting (Oneida, 1995). They can set direction for the council without being directive (Flynn, 1998). They should not override council decisions, but realize that they will not always agree with all decisions (Blanchard, 1995). When decisions are reached through consensual and collaborative means, principals should ensure their effective implementation in the school (Murphy, 1994).

Principals can facilitate sound decision making by helping council members obtain necessary information, training and skills (Murphy, 1994). Principals play an important role as information providers for the council, and their willingness to share information will largely

determine the success of collaboration (Crow, 1998). They should keep council members informed about things such as current educational issues, discussions of school plans (Parker, 1999), school board activities, ongoing communications with committees and external groups (Murphy, 1994), legal considerations regarding student management and instruction, school district policies (Crow, 1998), demographic information about students, test scores, community information, enrollment growth or loss patterns, strengths and weaknesses of the district, and possible plans of action to remediate weak areas (Sorenson, 1995). This information, whether negative or positive, needs to be discussed and analysed openly and honestly (Sorenson, 1995). Principals must also keep council abreast of its duties and ensure that councils work within their mandates (Murphy, 1994).

Principals can facilitate and direct dialogue between teachers, parents, students and others, leading them to collectively find needs and create solutions (Delaney, 1997). They can help council members get the training needed to develop collaborative decision-making skills such as group problem solving, negotiation, reflection and consensus building (Crow, 1998). Principals should encourage council members to attend board in-service sessions on school councils and arrange for in-service on curriculum changes (Parker, 1999). They should encourage and support council members to participate in decisions and discussions, and acknowledge individual contributions (Murphy, 1994). Principals can provide motivation and ideas, while still allowing others to make decisions (Blanchard, 1995). They can encourage the council to focus their efforts on children and academics (Ford & Bennett, 1994), keeping in mind that decisions must also address community needs and local problems (Lieberman, 1996).

Principals need to reflect on and develop their own communication and people skills (Blanchard, 1995). They must be able to listen and communicate openly, and be willing to acknowledge other perspectives as equally important and valid as their own. To reduce frustration and anxiety, principals can work on developing and exhibiting personal traits such as patience, tolerance, respect and the ability to handle uncertainty (Hoyle, 1994).

A big problem with collaborative decision-making structures is that they are very time-consuming. Because more people are involved in making decisions, the process and therefore progress is slower (Hoyle, 1994). Extraordinary demands on time create stress, causing council members to be less efficient (Sorenson, 1995). Feelings of disappointment arise when ideas are not brought to life quickly enough, and members may become cynical, questioning whether the excessive time and energy spent is worth it. Principals have to be practical and realize that involving everyone in every decision is impossible. Agreement must be reached on the decisions, with whom they should lie, and what communication is required to keep other members of the organization informed. Operating principles which identify the respective roles of organizational members in decision-making can be put in place to make the process a little easier (Sorenson, 1995).

Another problem with collaborative decision-making is that it can cause strains in relationships between participants. "The process of building consensus often requires participants to confront and resolve conflict, and candidly express divergent opinions" (Sorenson, 1995, p.16). Equally troublesome is the possibility that the quality of decisions reached through consensus may be inferior due to group think. Members who don't wish to offend each other

may tend to settle for lesser quality decisions or ideas at the expense of more creative ones. To avoid this, the principal can continually work on fostering an open climate where council members feel free and non-threatened to express their true opinions, whether or not their views are the same as those of the rest of the group (Sorenson, 1995).

Setting a vision for the school

Empowerment for educational stakeholders means including them in important decisions about the future of schools. Parents, teachers and other community representatives can be involved in the development of a school improvement plan with a vision in mind. They can collectively set a vision that transforms the school's culture and redefines the school community. In redefining the community, thought must be given to: the shared values, purposes and commitment that bond the community together; the relationships among parents, students, teachers, administrators and others needed to be a community; and the means used to bring all community members together to embody these values (Sorenson, 1995). Involving everyone in developing the vision results in a broader and potentially better perspective on which direction the school should take, a direction based on community needs. It also makes everyone in the community feel valued because their input and participation in school discussions and decisions is considered important.

In developing the vision, principals, with school councils, can initiate an environmental needs assessment plan to see where the school's strengths and weaknesses lie (Ford & Bennett, 1994). They can use the information and knowledge gained to inform their activities and influence the direction the school may take. They can then collectively set in motion a school

improvement plan with a vision in mind. The principal can facilitate the creation of a shared vision (Crow, 1998). He or she can allow the vision to be shaped and modified by everyone involved (Crow, 1998), but also ensure that the vision remains focused on children and learning (Blase, 1995; Leithwood & Menzies). So that others do not lose sight of the vision once it is set, the principal can continually model and reinforce vision-related behaviours (Murphy, 1994), and articulate school goals. The principal can be the " keeper and promoter of the vision" (Murphy, 1994, p.32).

Connecting with the public

With the introduction of SBM and school councils, there is much more interaction between the school and the surrounding community. More and more parents and external agencies are becoming involved in education and the efforts to reform it. The public is more informed about schooling and parents are more informed about their rights. School accountability has increased; hence principals have to justify school practices and decisions more frequently than they did before school restructuring (Murphy, 1994). They are also expected to promote the school image, market and sell the school and its programs to the community, and get the community interested and involved in the school (Parker, 1999; Murphy, 1994). Because of this, the principal's role in public relations has increased significantly.

To carry out this new public relations role, the principal should know how to interact with and establish meaningful relationships with all members of the school community (Clark, 1995). They should try to take time away from the daily grind of administrative work to do people work. Being visible around the school and letting community members know that they are

accessible is a good first step. Principals should try to make time to learn about the community and the various groups within it. They can take the initiative to approach others, listen to what community members have to say, conduct questionnaires, send out informative newsletters and display signs (Ryan, 1999).

Principals should also become more attuned to external stakeholder groups such as social service agencies, educational and community advocacy groups, colleges, universities, professional educational organizations, political, religious and commercial business groups (Carr, 1997; Ford & Bennett, 1994; Murphy & Beck, 1994). Many of these groups have interests in the school or are affected by the education system, and ignoring them could be harmful to the school's decision making efforts (Carr, 1997). Principals must be able to develop strong relationships and form new alliances with these groups, inviting and encouraging their genuine involvement in school planning (Fullan, 1998; Murphy & Beck, 1994). Most importantly, the principal has to coordinate the efforts of all these groups to serve children well (Murphy & Beck, 1994).

Connecting effectively with others requires people skills such as tact, diplomacy and political sensitivity (Bolender, 1996). It also requires traits such as honesty, friendliness, sincerity, and enthusiasm (Blase, 1995). Murphy & Beck (1994) suggest that principals become aware of their own humanity in order to understand and honour that of others. They should try to be sensitive and responsive, see people as deeply interrelated, and recognize the uniqueness, strength and richness of others.

Promoting Equality for All Members of the School Community

The opening up of the school community to external groups from various sectors of society places yet another responsibility upon the principal- that of ensuring fair and equitable treatment for all. Certain stakeholder groups may have more real or perceived power within the community. For example, some elite parent groups may have the potential to influence school policies and programs more than other disadvantaged groups such as minorities, and business leaders' statements, and agendas may be accepted more readily over parents' ideas (Carr, 1997). Principals need to give due recognition to all groups. They need to develop trusting relationships with the various stakeholders, and facilitate the development of trust among them. They can exhibit the types of behaviour and values that they wish their community groups to exhibit, for example open-mindedness, global thinking and promotion of group (not individual) interests (Carr, 1997).They should promote justice and equity for all groups, ensuring everyone is represented equally in the school community. "They must be critical of social arrangements, pedagogical strategies, and organizational designs that perpetuate unjust, dehumanizing conditions, and they must be creative and politically astute developers of equitable alternatives" (Murphy & Beck, 1994, p.9). They must also be moral leaders, concerned with critical ethical issues and compassionate justice in schools and communities (Murphy & Beck, 1994).

Supporting teachers

Structural changes such as the introduction of SBM and school councils have enhanced teacher professionalism, autonomy and empowerment (Blase, 1995), and changed the relationships between principals and teachers. Because of their knowledge and expertise in

curriculum, teaching and learning, teachers are expected to participate more actively in school-based decision making (Blase, 1995). They have been empowered to decide and ask for what they need (Lieberman, 1996) as opposed to simply being told. Principals must respect teacher professionalism, and allow them greater control of their work. They can help teachers reach a level of professional growth where they are willing and able to be self-directed (Kirby & Bogotch, 1996). They can work with teachers as peers in collegial relationships, and work cooperatively to analyse school problems, resolve issues, and set school improvement priorities based on needs (Tanner & Stone, 1998).

Principals should take on a more supportive role in regards to teachers. They should constantly ask themselves what they can do to help their staff. They can be resource providers, as well as knowledgeable instructional leaders themselves (Kirby & Bogotch, 1996). They can encourage and facilitate teachers' professional development (Parker,1999), creating opportunities for them to grow and develop (Lieberman, 1996). They can seek grants for teachers (Lieberman, 1996). They should find time and resources for teachers to discuss and develop new instructional practices, skills and abilities (King, 1996). They should free teachers up so that they can observe one another, visit other schools, and attend workshops and in-service activities (Murphy, 1994). They need to select teachers who can work together effectively, and empower them with meaningful assignments and working arrangements that bring them out of their isolated classrooms (Murphy, 1994). Principals should promote risk-free environments, modelling risk-taking themselves, to increase creativity and innovation in the classroom (Blase, 1995). They can act as buffers, protecting teachers from external pressures and demands. They should find ways

around procedural regulations, getting waivers when necessary, so teachers are free to innovate (King, 1996). They can assist in classrooms, encourage open communication, offer ideas collegially, respect and trust teachers as professionals, provide recognition and praise, and seek external recognition for teachers.

Problems for Principals

The process of managing site-based schools is not an easy endeavour. Conflict emerges because there are many more people involved in managing schools, and there is constant interaction among them (Rusch, 1998; Hoyle, 1994). The role of the principal is much more complex and potentially very stressful. Administrative demands and the principal's workload have increased, and their work environment is rapidly expanding and changing. On top of their existing administrative, instructional and traditional leadership responsibilities, they must spend a substantial amount of time on managing reform. They are expected to implement and sustain SBM in their schools and lead others through it. They must spend a lot more time consulting with the community, recruiting involvement of parents and community groups in the school, and setting up and involving others in collaborative decision making structures such as school councils. If they are responsible for budgeting, they must take on financial managerial tasks as well. Because of the high turnover on school councils, they must repeatedly educate new council members. They may also have to spend more time on policy formation. Fullan (1998) writes: "They are on the receiving end of externally initiated changes, new tasks, continual interruptions, fragmented and incoherent demands, and initiatives dropped in favour of the latest new policy" (p.6). With so many more demands and responsibilities put on them, and a lack of time,

principals often feel frustrated, pressured and anxious (Fullan, 1998; Sorenson, 1995; Bennett, 1994; Ford & Bennett, 1994; Oneida, 1995; Murphy, 1994; Fullan, 1991).

The most difficult change for principals is the role change itself (Sorenson, 1995; Murphy, 1994). Principals experience insecurities, negative feelings and doubts about the role they are asked to fill. They have trouble understanding and adapting to their new leadership role in a non-hierarchical organization (Murphy, 1994; Oneida, 1995), and they may not have a clear understanding of what it takes to be a facilitative and democratic leader of a site-based school. Limited by their own knowledge, training, experience and beliefs (Murphy, 1994; Sorenson, 1995), principals may have difficulty envisioning the school's future as being different from what it already is (Blase, 1995). Traditional hierarchical norms, routines, expectations and values are deeply rooted in the school system, and reflected in their behaviour. Their leadership style may not be congruent with the more collaborative, facilitative, democratic style needed for effective leadership of site-based schools (Murphy & Beck, 1994). With the implementation of SBM, they are expected to alter their leadership style without ample time or support for their own role adjustments (Murphy, 1994). Principals need time, training and resources to reconceptualize their leadership role and develop new attitudes, behaviours and skills necessary to be a leader in the new context of schooling. Depending on their personalities, principals may also have to work on developing and exhibiting personal traits more conducive to the new type of leadership required. Expecting principals to change their personality to suit a new role they must assume can be very stressful (Murphy, 1994).

Empowering others is a very difficult part of the role change (Murphy, 1994). Giving up

control, especially in areas where they have traditionally had autonomy, for example in curriculum selection, is very difficult. Principals may feel a sense of loss of power, coupled with fear of being unable to effectively run the school and meeting the obligations for which they were hired (Crow, 1998; Murphy, 1994; Sorenson, 1995). When control is shared, it tends to be role specific (Crow, 1998). The level of ambiguity in the community rises, particularly in regards to who is responsible for what. The principal may feel that with so many people possessing authority over various school matters, things may not get done, school problems will not be successfully resolved, and the organization will suffer (American Association of School Administrators, 1994).

Empowering others is especially difficult if there is no trusting relationship between principals, teachers and others. If principals feel that the latter are not ready, able or committed to take on extra leadership responsibilities, they may be reluctant and apprehensive about delegating to them (Murphy, 1994). It is difficult for the principal to have and maintain collegial relationships with others without trust on both sides (Oneida, 1995).

It may also be hard for the school community to accept control (Murphy, 1994). They too are used to a certain way of running things, and may wish to maintain the status quo (Sorenson, 1995). The community may be unwilling to abandon traditional methods of managing schools. They may find security and comfort in leaving decisions up to the principal, finding it easier to criticize decisions in which they have had no input (Sorenson, 1995). Some of them may not want to take on the extra time, effort and responsibility of leadership. Many teachers, for example, feel that involvement in managing schools, particularly the time consuming task of

collaborative decision-making, is not worth their time or energy. They only want to manage what is needed to effect change in teaching and learning, that which most affects them professionally (Blase, 1995; Sorenson, 1995). Unless they are convinced that the change is appropriate and necessary to their professional practice, they will resist it. It is up to the principal to convince others that empowerment benefits everyone (Bennett, 1994).

A final problem principals must deal with is conflicting expectations coming from their employers (the school board), and the school community (represented by the school council) (Bennett, 1994; Murphy, 1994). They must answer to the school council's concerns, but also follow central office directives, the two of which may be in conflict. Principals are accountable to both the school community, which operates in a democratic, grass-roots fashion, and the school board / district, which still operates within a traditional, hierarchical and bureaucratic fashion. This ambiguity causes feelings of frustration, anxiety and pressure for principals.

Help for Principals

Fullan (1998) gives advice on how principals can deal more effectively with change. He believes that principals are too dependent and waste too much time looking for packaged solutions. Principals need to realize that in uncertain, changing conditions, there are no clear answers. He suggests that in dealing with change, principals must become less dependent on external answers, and get involved as learners in real reform situations. Principals must develop their own theories of change and test them in new situations. He gives four guidelines to principals. First, they must learn from those who disagree with them. Being exposed to different perspectives of an issue leads to a better understanding, and possibly better solutions to a

problem. Second, if principals don't have a strong relationship with the community, instead of avoiding them, move toward them. They should actively seek parental involvement and participation, address state policy, take school accountability to the public, and reach out and form new alliances. Third, principals must manage emotionally as well as rationally. This entails fostering a school culture that is conducive to better working conditions and less anxiety. Finally, they must fight for lost causes i.e., have and display hope. They must be able to see problems as minor obstacles on the journey towards a larger purpose.

Principals also need training and professional development to ease their transition into SBM (Sheppard & Devereaux, 1997). They need theoretical knowledge and practical skills in employing democratic, facilitative and consensual leadership styles (Collins, 1996; Oneida, 1995). Faculties of education need to assess their educational leadership programs to see if they are congruent with current perspectives on the type of leadership needed in today's democratic schools, and consider including in their courses the relevant knowledge and skills (Benson, 1998; Tanner & Stone, 1998). These include theory and practice in areas such as; collaborative problem solving, shared decision-making, group dynamics and processes, conflict management, communication skills, reflection and assessment of one's own interaction style, building consensus, and team building (Matthews, 1998; Tanner & Stone, 1998).

Summary

The implementation of SBM and school councils has had a significant impact on the role of the principal. Principals have been forced to make a major adjustment to their leadership role. Used to leading from the top using a control-oriented, "power over" leadership style, they must

now relinquish that control and adopt a more facilitative, democratic "power with" style. Adopting a new leadership style is not a simple task. Principals need to reflect on their views of leadership, and become consciously aware of the deeply embedded traditional values and behaviours that shape those views. They must try to unlearn those values and behaviours, and rethink leadership in terms of a shared endeavour, not to be performed solely by one person in a formal position, but a collective responsibility to be carried out by members of the whole school community. Principals must not only be able to reconceptualize their role, but they may also have to change their personalities to suit the new role. Without adequate time or support, and laden with numerous new responsibilities and expectations that come with educational reform efforts, this role adjustment is potentially very difficult and stressful.

Principals need support to make this role change. Their employers should ensure they have sufficient time and support to ease into their new role, and adequate training in collaborative, facilitative and democratic leadership approaches. Educational leadership programs' objectives should match current perspectives on leadership, and prepare principals appropriately. Without the professional and personal support needed to become and remain effective leaders of site-based managed schools, high stress and frustration levels may render principals inefficient.

References

American Association of School Administrators. (1994). Local school councils: Where we stand. American Association of School Administrators, Arlington, VA.

Bennett, C. (1994). The New Zealand principal and post-picot. Journal of Educational Administration. 32 (2), 35-44.

Benson, D. (1998, April). Ambushed by the principal: Parents and school councils. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Blanchard, C., & Karr-Kidwell, PJ. (1995). Site-based management: Teachers attitudes and administrative style. A Literary Review and Recommendations.

Blase, J. (1995). Democratic principals in action: Eight pioneers. CA: Corwin Press.

Bolender, M. (1996). Leadership for change in a growing school. The Canadian School Executive. 16 (6), 14-17.

Brouillette, L. (1997). Who defines democratic leadership? Three high school principals respond. Journal of School Leadership. 7 (6), 569-591.

Carr, A. (1997). Leadership and community participation: Four case studies. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. 12 (2), 152-168.

Clark, S. (1995). What leadership skills do principals really need? The School Administrator. 52 (5), 8-11.

Collins, A. (1996). School councils and principals: Issues and challenges. The Canadian School Executive. 16 (4), 3-6.

Crow, G. (1998). Implications for leadership in collaborative schools. In Diane Pounder (Ed.), Restructuring Schools for Collaboration: Promises and Pitfalls (pp. 135-153). Albany: SUNY Press.

Delaney, J. (1997). Principal leadership: A primary factor in school based management and school improvement. NASSP Bulletin. 81 (586): 107-111.

Flynn, P. (1998). Ready, set, decide! The School Administrator. 55 (3), 14-16.

Ford, D., & Bennett, A. (1994). The changing principalship in Chicago. Education and Urban Society. 26 (3), 238-247.

Fullan, M. (1991). The new meaning of educational change (2nd Ed.). New York: Teachers

College Press.

Fullan, M. (1998). Breaking the bonds of dependency. Educational Leadership. 55 (7), 6-10.

Goldman, E. (1998). The significance of leadership style. Educational Leadership. 55 (7), 20-22.

Hoyle, J. (1994). Can a principal run the show and be a democratic leader? NASSP Bulletin. January, 1994, 33-39.

King, M. (1996). Participatory decision making. In Fred M. Newmann & Associates. Restructuring for Authentic Student Achievement: The Impact of Culture and Structure in 24 Schools (Ch. 10). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kirby, P., & Bogotch, I. (1996). Information utilization of beginning principals in school restructuring. Journal of Educational Administration. 34 (2), 5-23.

Lambert, L. (1998). How to build leadership capacity. Educational Leadership. 55 (7), 17-19.

Leithwood, K., & Menzies, T. (1997). Research on school based management and school councils. Orbit. 28 (2), 46-48.

Lieberman, A. (Ed.). (1995). The work of restructuring schools: Building from the ground up. New york: Teachers College Press.

Matthews, J. (1998). Implications for collaborative educator preparation and development: A sample instructional approach. In Diane Pounder (Ed.) Restructuring: Schools for Collaboration: Promises and Pitfalls. (pp 155-171). Albany: SUNY Press.

Murphy, J. (1994). Transformational change and the evolving role of the principal: Early empirical evidence. In Murphy, J., & Louis, K., Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts. CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J., & Beck, L. (1994). Reconstructing the principalship. In Murphy, J., & Louis, K., Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts. CA: Corwin Press.

Oneida, M., & Heflin, J. (1995, November). Redefining leadership roles for site-based management systems. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Biloxi, MS.

Parker, K. (1999). The critical role of principals in developing school councils. Orbit. 30 (1), 24-26.

Rusch, E. (1998). Leadership in evolving democratic school communities. Journal of School

Leadership. 8 (3), 214-250.

Ryan, J. (1999). Leadership and diversity: Establishing and maintaining relationships with school communities. Orbit. 30 (1), 16-18.

Sheppard, B., & Devereaux. (1997). Leadership training is essential to effective site-based management. Canadian School Executive. 16 (8), 3-8.

Sorenson, L. (1995, February). Site-based management: Avoiding disaster while sharing decision making. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, New Orleans, LA.

Tanner, K., & Stone, C. (1998). School improvement policy: Have administrative functions of principals changed in schools where site-based management is practised? Education-Policy-Analysis-Archives. 6 (6), 1-26.

Terry, P. (1995). Managing change toward site-based management. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, Indian Wells, CA, August.