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ABSTRACT

EXAMINING THE MOTIVATIONS OF INDIVIDUALS' INVOLVEMENT IN SITE-BASED PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

By
Judith Lynne Massey

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education
Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto

This study examines the link between individual values and the choice resulting from their application using the vehicle of school-based planning and management. The more specific focus is the examination of the beliefs that underlie individual action.

A conceptual framework based on Hodgkinson's Analytical Model of the Value Concept (1991, p.97) has been developed to examine the motivation for participation. Three sets of responses, gathered over a three month period of time were analyzed to determine what motivated individuals to participate in the initiative. Responses were also examined to see if there was support for Hodgkinson's (1991, p.103)
three postulates. This was not the case. His first postulate, that type 1 values are superior to type 2 and they to type 3, and his second postulate, that values lose their level of grounding and force over time and weaken did not occur to any extent. In both instances individual value choices over time had a centering affect and values shifted towards the middle of Hodgkinson’s hierarchy, to type 2a values of consequences. His third postulate, that value conflicts will be resolved at the lowest level to avoid moral issues, also was not supported. In this study, all conflicts were resolved by type 2b, values of consensus.

Conclusions drawn from the research suggest that type 1 values of principle, and type 3 values of personal preference are more likely to be selected when there is a lack of information needed to make a decision. These value types are also more likely to be chosen when the benefits leading to a particular decision are unconvincing or unclear. Early and ongoing dialogue, sharing of information with all stakeholders, as well as positive and enthusiastic leadership may help influence individual choice, particularly when there is little or no information on which to base the decision.
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CHAPTER ONE

Context for the Study

Introduction

This study began from my personal and professional involvement in site-based planning and management. I was a new principal in an urban Canadian school in Central Ontario. As a new administrator, I was eager to unite school stakeholders in support of a common set of goals. I therefore volunteered to be trained as a facilitator for site-based planning and management by my School Board. This involvement increased my interest in site-based planning and management as a vehicle for collaboration and the development of long and short-term educational goals.

At the request of the Board, I then began making presentations to individual school groups and to my administrative colleagues explaining the site-based planning and management process and answering any questions or concerns that were posed. Many of my colleagues were less than enthusiastic. Concerned myself about the time commitment and value of this process
as opposed to others, I began to read current literature on the topic and critically analyzed specific site-based models as well as their general effectiveness.

Using the Cambridge Model designed by Bill Cook (Cambridge Group, Inc., 1990), I had an opportunity to facilitate the planning process for one school and three community groups and the review process for two schools, a total of five times. I also took part in the planning and the review process twice, as a participant. These hands-on experiences inspired me to read more widely in related site-based planning and management literature. It was my hope that the information I gathered would help me to understand the process better and as a result be able to answer not only my own questions but those of my colleagues as well.

The literature did not always provide any clear answers since the process varied greatly in many ways, such as the length of time commitment, process specifics, stakeholder involvement, access to resources and decision-making authority. This made comparisons and definitive conclusions very difficult. Controversial issues emerged such as finance, power and control, community and staff commitment and goodwill. These factors greatly impacted the degree of
success of the projects and brought individual participants as well as researchers to various conclusions and levels of support.

Current literature and my personal experience suggest that site-based planning and management has the potential to bring forth new levels of commitment, thinking and relationships. However, it may often fail to bring about any significant change and little if any movement toward greater empowerment of schools and decentralization of Boards. Schools struggling to implement site-based planning and management may become caught up with a multitude of rapid educational changes. These changes may interrupt and supersede the move towards the completion of site-based goals. Individuals may also have insufficient knowledge, commitment, collaborative skills, or power to follow through with their goals and dreams.

It follows then, that this dissertation deals more specifically with the impact of values, support and leadership than with structures and design. It does not provide a model for the successful implementation of site-based planning and management, but rather some insights
into what skills, attitudes, and experiences foster commitment and ultimately some success.

**School-based Planning and Management**

School-based planning and management has become a currently popular educational reform. It takes many forms and has been used increasingly by a large number of Boards of education to attempt to bring about school improvement. Its process is set-up to include a cross-section of school staff, students, parents and community members in school-wide decision making. It not only encourages Central Board Offices to give individual schools greater decision making authority but it also requires that schools increase the involvement of their stakeholders in the making of the decisions. This is based on the premise that those who are closest to the decisions and most affected by them will make the most sound and appropriate choices. Therefore, the decisions made at the school level should most closely fit the wishes and needs of the individuals involved in the school. However, decisions must continue to reflect the policies and parameters of the Ministry of Education and Training and the local Board of Education, as well as accommodate each individual school's culture and make-up.
School-based planning and management is a radically new way of operating for many Boards. There may be numerous reasons for choosing to implement it. These may be economically or politically motivated with pressure coming from a Board's senior administration or from the Ministry of Education and Training. The process may also be adopted to renew or invigorate existing school cultures at a time of dwindling resources and increased criticism of the public school system. It is hoped by those who support the process that it will be a proactive method of encouraging a better relationship between schools and the public. The transformation from top-down to school-based planning and management necessitates a change, however in the role, function and responsibility for both the principal and the school staff. The objective of this change is to let schools become more flexible, diverse and responsive in their approach.

School Boards who undertake the school-based planning and management process usually begin with the development of a Board level strategic plan. Once the Board plan has been established, each school goes through a process that must follow three guidelines.
Its plan must be consistent with the Board's strategic plan; it must actively contribute to achieving the mission, objectives and strategies of the strategic plan; and it must focus on issues which need to be addressed at the specific site (Cambridge Group Inc., 1990, Site-Based Planning, pp. 6-7).

According to procedural guidelines, participants in the planning process (Cambridge Group Inc., 1990) must understand and support the Board's mission and belief statements before they proceed to develop their own mission statement. This understanding is followed by an internal analysis that highlights the school's strengths and weaknesses. Next, an external analysis is developed to create an awareness of those external factors that impact the school. These include social, political, economic technological, demographic, educational trends and competition along with other outside factors over which the school has no control. School objectives are then developed based on these earlier analyses. They are written in terms of long range plans to determine what needs to be achieved in order for the school to move closer to accomplishing its mission. Objectives are measurable, demonstrable and observable.
Only two to three primary objectives are recommended in order to avoid the over-extension of human resources, especially staff, and allow time and energy to focus on those areas that are top priority. The objectives drive the tactics. Once the tactics are established, they provide the long-term means of achieving the objectives. Action plans are then developed for each tactic. Each aspect of those plans includes a specific objective as well as the steps needed to achieve it. The school-based plan will ultimately define the long-term direction for the school.

Although the overall structure of school-based planning and management may vary slightly from Board to Board, it is consistent in that its main focus is the decentralization of power. By giving increased authority to individual schools, the presumed result is that each school would exercise more control over the use of its resources and activities. Ideally, this should generate greater flexibility and efficiency in the use of those resources and so transform the school into one that is more in touch with its clientele.

Success of the school-based planning and management process depends on the good will and active participation of the
school's stakeholders and is presumed to be influenced by the personal value system of each individual. Therefore leadership, parental involvement and values will be of critical interest. This school-based planning and management process has been mandated in one Urban Board in Central Ontario and will be the focus of this study.

History of Site-based Planning and Management in One Urban Central Ontario Board

After discussion at the superintendent's council, which includes all superintendents and the director, a decision was made to proceed with system-wide goal setting. Under the direction of one superintendent of schools a committee was formed with a cross-section of representation. An outside facilitator, using the Cambridge Model, was brought in to lead a group of twenty-eight Board stakeholders in the development of a strategic plan for the Board. Once this process was completed, the strategic plan was reviewed and ratified by the Board in December 1993.

The next step was to proceed to implement the plan in schools and other Board sites such as the transportation department. It was determined that eleven individuals would be chosen to be trained as site-based planning and
management facilitators using the Cambridge Model. Six elementary school principals/vice-principals, two secondary school principals/vice-principals, a superintendent and two program consultants were chosen. After the two-day training session, these individuals returned to the Board to assume leadership roles in the site-based planning and management process under the direction of the steering committee and supervising superintendent. During the next year several of the newly trained facilitators would provide inservice training for principals and vice-principals and for personnel in interested schools and sites.

In the winter of 1994, four schools agreed to be pilot schools for the site-based planning and management process. These schools were required to meet two criteria for readiness. The first was principal, parent and staff support and the second was superintendent support. It was critical to the outcome of site-based planning and management in the Board that the pilot schools were successful.

The four schools, three elementary and one high school, completed the two-day site-based planning session and follow-up action plans between March and June in 1994. The
rest of the schools would follow until all of the plans were completed by June 1998. Three to five years of implementation followed the completion of these action plans. Since the process was mandated by the Board, all schools were required to complete the process during the established timeline of four years. The cycle was then expected to repeat itself site by site on an individual basis, every three to five years.

The primary focus of this dissertation is on two schools. The first school was a Pilot School and one of the first schools to complete the site-based planning and management process. The second school was the very last school to complete the process. Because of a lack of interest and desire, the second school waited until the very last possible moment to participate and undoubtedly would not have taken part in the process at all had it not been mandated.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to examine the link between individual values and the resulting choices of their application using the vehicle of school-based planning and management. It will examine the beliefs that underlie
individual action. Hodgkinson's Analytical Model of the Value Concept (1991, p.97) will be used as a basis to examine the motivation for the participation of staff, students, parents and community members who are actively involved in school-based planning and management in two schools in Central Ontario.

**Detailed Questions and Specific Methodologies**

The research will focus its investigation on three questions:

**Question One:** What motivated school stakeholders to participate in their school’s school-based planning and management process?

**Question Two:** What values were manifested by the stakeholders?

**Question Three:** To what extent are Hodgkinson’s three postulates supported over a period of time by the findings in the research?

It is hoped that data gathered from these three questions will provide further support for the purpose of this study.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Hodgkinson's Conceptualizations

Although many theorists have contributed values theories in the field of educational administration, the most influential may in fact be Christopher Hodgkinson (1978, 1991) who is concerned about the motivational base that determines individual values, actions and beliefs. Values are defined by Hodgkinson (1978, p.89) as "concepts of the desirable with motivating force". His definition is derived from Kluckhohn (1951, p.395) who defines values more specifically as "a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable that influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action". Rokeach (1973, p.5) similarly characterizes a value as:

...an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence.
Hodgkinson makes a valuable contribution to the field of educational administration by moving away from scientific theory towards a role played more by values, morals and ethics in decision making. He argues that motives are at the root of values which, in turn, drive decision-making (Hodgkinson, 1978). Hodgkinson (1991, p. 12) believes that:

...leadership is not and cannot be a science: it is a humane and practical art—perhaps the greatest of the art forms. And art proceeds always from the subjective or conceptual to the objective or real.

His philosophy has impacted the way we reflect on educational leadership and has greatly expanded our understanding of the role of the administrator. This is supported by a growing number of theorists (Greenfield, 1986; Campbell-Evans, 1991; Begley, 1995) who believe that the examination of personally held values and a more subjective look at what motivates behaviour have too long been overlooked and are essential in allowing researchers to gather rich information about motivators of human behaviour.

Hodgkinson's Analytical Model of the Value Concept (1978, p.101) is a typology which has three different types of
values. Hodgkinson bases his model on the motivation behind the value. He is interested in the reason(s) that an individual has that value rather than in the specific value itself.

In Hodgkinson's model type 1, values of principle, as shown in FIGURE 1, are at the top of the typology and are transrational and unverifiable by science. They represent the concept of what is "right" and include deeply held beliefs such as higher principles of spiritual faith, justice and honour. Type 1 values are grounded in principle and require commitment and faith since they are not based on rational thought. The true indication of type 1 values is a willingness to die for these beliefs. Type 1 values are at the highest level of Hodgkinson's typology and are based on will rather than logic.

Type 2 values fall in the centre of the typology and differ from type 1 and type 3 values in that they are based on reason and so more rational in nature. They include both 2a, consequences, and 2b, consensus. Values of consequences are values based on some future desired state or consequences that may result from the value judgement.
Values of consensus are those values that reflect the will of the majority.

**FIGURE 1**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 1-Principle</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transrational</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 2a-Consequences</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cognitive and Rational</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 2b-Consensus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cognitive and Rational</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 3-Preferences</strong></td>
<td><strong>Affective and Subrational</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hodgkinson’s type 3 values are subrational and are at the lowest level of his typology. These are values of personal preference, those things that individuals find desirable or pleasurable and to the individual taste. They represent for Hodgkinson the notion of what is “good”. “Good” refers to what is preferred, the type 3 values of personal preference and subrational values, while “right” moves through rational type 2 values to the transrational type 1 values.

Although type 3 values conflicts are more difficult to solve, as they are subrational, they are also not as critical and those involved may be less likely to die for them than for type 1 values. Criticism of this stance is presented later in this dissertation.

Conflicts of type 1 values of principle and type 3 values of personal preference are the most difficult to solve as they are not based on rationality (Hodgkinson, 1991, p.150). These values are not objective with some being universally more important than others, but are subjective in nature. Type 1 values are often evident when there is lack of information, clarity or time to apply a more rational decision making process. This, then, leads some individuals to draw on higher level ethics in order to make
their decisions. Several people who hold the same value may, in fact, have it for entirely different reasons. The motive behind the value is central to Hodgkinson’s model.

Unlike Beck’s model (1993) Hodgkinson’s values are not objective but are subjective in nature, with some being universally more important than others. Beck (1993, p.2) discusses specific values that are related to what he calls “basic values”. These basic values such as survival, health, and happiness are those that we all pursue. Beck (1993, p. 3) defines these values as basic as “they are largely ends in themselves; ultimately, they are what makes life seem good and worthwhile. Together, they define well-being or the good life”. Beck is also concerned with the values that lie behind human action.

Unlike Beck’s model (1993) which is based on the particular nature of the value, Hodgkinson (1991) bases his model on the motivation behind the value. He is more interested in the reason an individual holds a particular value than the specific value itself. Hodgkinson says, (1991, p.140) “...we must remember that the root and source of all true action is inner”. Individual “... value orientations depend upon their holder’s circumstances, biography, and culture”
Hodgkinson (1991, p.95). These values act as standards that guide individual thought and action (Feather, 1975).

Hodgkinson (1991) differentiates between value types using a hierarchy of motivational bases. "A categorical organization of values allows for the investigation of preference for some value types over others" states Campbell-Evans (1991, p.168) "and may explain the variation between individual's actions". Hodgkinson makes the distinction between those values that are desirable and right, and those that are desired and good.

Hodgkinson (1991, p.103) also proposes three postulates. The first is that type 1 values are superior to type 2 values and they to type 3 values. The second postulate is that values will lose their level of grounding and force over time and weaken. The third postulate is that conflicts will be resolved at the lowest level on the typology. "We seek to avoid moral issues," says Hodgkinson, who feels that this is especially true for administrators (1991, p.103).

Hodgkinson believes that values are central to administrative behaviour and experience. This perspective
is well respected and supported by a great many academics and researchers (Greenfield, 1986; Campbell-Evans, 1991; Begley, 1995), although the literature suggests that there are those who also have some difficulties with several of his assumptions (Evers, 1993; Van de Pitte, 1993; Williams, 1993;). Justification of Hodgkinson's postulates, especially the notion of a values hierarchy, have provided for much disagreement and discussion (Evers, 1993). All the same, Williams (1993) suggests that:

It is important to note the spirit in which Hodgkinson offers this model and advice. It is a template, if you will, that allows the leader to more clearly see the value dimension of decisions that are being considered and a procedure that might be invoked. It is not a formula to be followed. (p.257)

Despite some differing opinions from sparring partners such as Colin Evers, Christopher Hodgkinson is well respected and his ideas have provided "...an elegant and important statement on the nature of administrative leadership in educational contexts" (Evers, 1993, p.259). Hodgkinson's analytical model acts as a suitable basis for a framework developed to examine individual values, one which will more than adequately support this specific study.
Hodgkinson's (1991) three postulates have also generated much controversy and discussion (Evers, 1985, 1993; Begley, 1988, 1996a; Lakomski, 1987; Evers & Lakomski, 1993; Van de Pitte, 1993; Williams, 1993). His first postulate "that type 1 values are superior, more authentic, better justified, and of more defensible grounding than those of type 2," while, "type 2 values that are perceived as superior to type 3" have fallen under the greatest attack.

Begley and Leithwood (1990) found that values displayed by those in roles such as that of a school administrator did not always support all parts of Hodgkinson's hierarchy of values. Their research revealed a higher frequency of type 2a values of consequences and type 2b values of consensus.

Hodgkinson's (1991) second postulate is that "values tend to lower their level of grounding over time". This second postulate has received support from Begley (1988). Begley's research found that principals' type 1 transrational values were, in time, replaced by type 2 rational values as their knowledge and experience of computer technology as an innovation increased.

Begley's (1988) research in computer adoption and use found that principals' dominant values were grounded in type 2
values of consequences and consensus with few motivated by type 3 values of personal preference. He indicates that type 1 values were applied by administrators primarily in the absence of domain specific knowledge. Principals who initially chose type 1 values of principle or type 3 values of personal preference moved to more rational type 2a values of consequence over time. Begley suggests that this was the outcome of the administrators' increased understanding of computers and their use.

Leithwood and Steinbach's (1991) research support these findings as they discovered that type 1 values were utilized when domain specific knowledge was absent or unavailable. They observed that this was also the case when time was of the essence and there was little or no opportunity for more rational decision making and when the situation appeared to be ambiguous.

Hodgkinson's (1991, p.103) third postulate states that "there will be a natural tendency to resolve value conflicts at the lowest level of hierarchy possible in a given situation". His rationale for this postulate is that he feels that individuals try to avoid moral issues.
Hodgkinson thinks that this is especially true for administrators.

Although not all researchers fully support Hodgkinson’s values’ theory, it has been influential in the field of educational administration and is considered by some as “the best known, most influential and specifically focused values theory applicable to educational administration” (Begley, 1996b, p.10). Even though Hodgkinson has also been criticized by Evers (1985) and Lakomski (1987) for the hierarchical structure of his values model and the difficulty in distinguishing transrational type 1 values from subrational type 3 values, his influence in promoting the study of values in the field of educational administration has been significant.

Traditionally ignored by empirically driven positivists and postpositivist theorists, the examination of personally held values and a more subjective look at what motivates behaviour is now being recognized for its importance. "It can be argued that all human behaviour is value-laden simply by virtue of the fact that, random activity excluded, it is motivated" (Hodgkinson, 1991, p.114). Knowledge of personal and professional values is seen as
essential in providing rich information about what motivates human behaviour. As well, many researchers now believe that much can be learned from the previously unexamined area of individual values.

**Educational Leadership**

Many principals will explain that the current role of a school administrator has become more challenging and complex in nature. The increased burden of leadership is the result of a variety of factors that originate both inside and outside of the school itself (Fullan, 1996; Goldring & Sullivan, 1996). These pressures have arisen not only from government and Board mandates, both of which set the parameters and guidelines that schools must follow, but also as a result of the diverse and pluralistic nature of the communities which schools serve. These communities vary in attitudes, beliefs and cultures and have a great many forces that impact upon them.

Many current researchers in the field of educational administration support the notion that improving schools is contingent upon understanding why the stakeholders in schools think the way they do (Begley, 1995). Contrary to Simon's (1965) belief of a value-neutral administrator,
many educators now believe that personal values cannot be separated from fact and so are important influences on administrative behaviour. If this were indeed true, it would then follow that values would also play an important role not only for the school administrator, but also for each member of the school staff and other school stakeholders who are actively involved in school-based decision making.

More than ever before, administrators recognize that the values manifested by individuals, groups, and organizations have an impact on what happens in schools, chiefly by influencing the screening of information or definition of alternatives (Begley, 1996a, p.405).

"In administration, the making of choices is usually termed decision making and/or problem solving, an activity familiar to most administrators" (Begley, 1996a, p.407). Today, administrators are willing to readily admit the influence that personal and professional values play in their day-to-day decision making. "The more reflective among administrators are also conscious of how their own personal values may blind or illuminate the assessment of situations" (Begley, 1996a, p.405).
The nature and influence of values in educational administrative decision making are now frequently acknowledged by practitioners who recognize that value conflict is also "a part of the everyday work world of school leaders" (Leithwood, Begley & Cousins, 1994, p.112). The increase in complexity in the administrative role may often be the result of conflicting values arising among the administrator, the organization, and the parents and/or community. Value conflicts occur when two or more competing values are encountered (Leithwood, Begley & Cousins, 1994).

"Values are those concepts of the desirable which motivate individuals and collective groups to act in particular ways and to achieve particular ends" (Begley & Johansson, 1998, p.399). However, several individuals or groups may in fact act in a similar fashion, but for entirely different reasons. Therefore to truly understand a set of issues or circumstances, administrators, along with other school stakeholders, must be fully aware of what motivates individual action and decision making.

There are numerous reasons for an aspiring leader to study values according to Hodgkinson (1991, p.11).
First, by doing so he or she may gain self-knowledge and self-understanding. Secondly, it should lead to a better understanding of one’s fellows thus enhancing the possibility of greater empathy, sympathy and compassion but also of gaining a sophisticated acceptance and recognition of the negative side of human character. Thirdly, a knowledge of value theory is necessary if we are to make progress with the problems of division, antagonism and conflict that beset organizations and societies.

Begley (1996c) also promotes the study of the nature and function of values stating seven key points. He begins by saying that educational leadership involves the making of decisions where one or more alternatives are chosen over others. His second point states that traditionally non-rational moral values have been overlooked with the focus placed on the more rational and scientific. Thirdly, value conflicts are a part of today’s complex school environment, and fourthly, administrators may articulate values that differ from those committed to by individuals and groups. Fifthly, administrators need to be aware that conflicting values may exist between their own personal values and those of the organization and community. His sixth point suggests that the effectiveness of administrators will increase when they more fully understand what motivates the
actions of others and what causes and reasons lie behind value conflicts. Begley states that it would be advantageous for administrators to learn to distinguish between personal, professional, organizational and social values in order to be more effective in resolving value conflicts.

Educational leaders must try to become more cognizant of the differing values surrounding them. With the critical need today for educational stakeholders to work together to support school goals and directions, school administrators must be sensitive to the values orientation of staff, students and parent/community members. Leithwood and Stager (1989) assert that those administrators who are expert problem-solvers have a greater awareness of their own values as well as the value orientation of others.

Leadership is particularly crucial during times of stress or change. Schein (1984, p.43) states:
Leadership will always play a key role during those times when the group faces a new problem and must develop new responses to the situation. In fact, one of the crucial functions of leadership is to provide guidance at precisely those times when habitual ways of doing things no longer work, or when a dramatic change in the environment requires new responses.

Schein’s comments are central to this study and emphasize the important role that the principal has to play in new initiatives and school reforms such as site-based planning and management. The principal’s role in bringing together a shared vision, necessary resources and providing day-to-day support is not to be underestimated.

Serious reform, as we have seen, is not implementing single innovations. It is changing the culture and structure of the school. Once that is said, it should be self-evident that the principal as head of the organization is crucial (Fullan, 1991, p.169).

Leadership is needed not only to sustain new initiatives, or what Schein (1984, p.43) calls “the invention of new”, but also to provide security and stability when giving up the old and familiar for something new. The school principal may influence early value choices by providing information, support and a context that nurtures change.
It is not always as easy as it seems to pull a school staff and its community together to work towards common goals and objectives. Many principals do not have the skill or interest it takes to make it work. Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi and Steinbach (1993, p.19) report that having "a warm, open and inviting style is likely a prerequisite for exercising more specific, goal directed leadership practices in schools". It is also critical for the principal to be consistent in his or her vision and actions (Leithwood et al., 1993).

Leithwood et al. (1993, p.18) state that "people in formal leadership roles are capable of enormous influence on the success of their schools". The role of the leader has greatly changed and strong leaders with a vision are needed (Fullan, 1996). Much criticism exists, however, of the dominant role that principals play in the control of information and agendas during school-based decision making as well as their preoccupation with management policies and programs (Malen & Ogawa, 1988; Radnofsky, 1994).

Saxe (1993) points out that administrators must achieve a delicate balance between professional autonomy and parental involvement. Administrators must be able to establish a
positive climate for change in the school, as well as emphasize the importance of parent and community involvement. They must also be able to articulate persuasively the advantages of this increased participation to the rest of the school staff. Parents and other community members must be convinced of the importance of the role that they play in the school and the teachers must come to believe that this increased involvement will not threaten their authority.

Principals are seen by many as the main influence in school change (Edmonds, 1979; Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Clark, Lotto & McCarthy, 1980). They have enormous influence over the direction and the extent of the change that will take place in the school where they are administrators. Davies (1992, p. 137) says:

The backing of the school principal appears to be essential in reaching out strategies because they require extra work on the part of school staffs and they represent clear deviations from standard operating procedures in traditional schools.

**Summary**

There is much interest and belief today in the critical role that values play in school-based decision making.
The school principal is key to the successful implementation of new initiatives and school reforms such as school-based planning and management. Implementation of school reforms such as site-based planning and management may fail, even when mandated from above, if the principal does not value and support the implementation. Too often change is mandated from a distance, either by the Ministry of Education and Training or the local Board of Education, without the full understanding of what motivates the actions of those who must implement and sustain the new initiative. When this occurs, the chance of successful implementation is unlikely.

Principals must understand the underlying values that motivate not only their own actions but also those of school staff and parent/community stakeholders. Understanding the values behind individual action may be the only way that the successful implementation of change will take place. Hodgkinson (1991, p.89) reflects that "...all the discussion to this point has shown one thing: that administration or leadership in its fullest sense is more concerned with values than facts".
Parental Involvement in the Change Process

Although administrative support is essential in influencing change, and also, it can be assumed, individual values choice, it is important to recognize, say Fullan (1993) and Hargreaves (1994), that change is most effective when it takes place at the grassroots. Change such as that of more parental involvement, can be mandated by the Ontario Ministry of Education and Training but is unlikely to occur successfully unless those involved in the change see a need for and relevance of the change. Individuals must feel motivated to change (Fullan, 1993; Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi & Steinbach, 1993; Hargreaves, 1994). This change in value type may be difficult to encourage without convincing administrative support and each individual’s understanding of the change and benefits it may provide.

Fullan (1993, p.21) states eight basic lessons which support change:

Lesson One: You can’t mandate what matters.
Lesson Two: Change is a journey not a blueprint.
Lesson three: Problems are our friends.
Lesson Four: Vision and strategic planning come later.
Lesson Five: Individualism and collectivism must have equal power.
Lesson Six: Neither centralization nor decentralization works.
Lesson Seven: Connection with the wider environment is critical for success.
Lesson Eight: Every person is a change agent.

Individual staff and parents/community have their own unique values that they bring to each decision they make or problem they solve. Values according to Hodgkinson (1991, p.95) are a source of attitudes. It is these attitudes which impact upon whether or not change will occur. Beyond the individual or the self, the group, organization and community will also bring pressure to bear on individual values. The individual’s connection to the larger environment, as Fullan (1993) argues, is also critical to change.

Hargreaves (in press) contributes several suggestions for influencing change. He states that the mission and visioning stage should be in a constant state of motion reflecting ongoing dialogue and responses. His second point is that those closest to the change and most affected by it should be the ones involved in policy development. Thirdly, those involved must have opportunities to collaborate, work
together to build trust, and to combine expertise and resources as well as share problems and provide each other with moral support. Hargreaves (in press) suggests in his fourth point that restructuring will not happen if change is not encouraged and, moreover, that learning organizations develop when individuals work together towards change. His last point is that individuals must develop their own politics. They must develop a greater understanding of hidden relationships and subvert the existing structures of the institution such as established rules and norms.

The shift from centralized authority to that of school sites has been referred to as site-based management, school-based planning and management, school-based or decentralized decision making, along with a number of other terms. All of these suggest a shift in responsibility for the school and its stakeholders and for those making decisions that affect the school. These stakeholders include not only the school staff but also students, parents and other community members. Parents make up a major portion of this group and their talents are often underutilized.
"Linking schools, families, and communities is a fundamental part of education", say Goldring and Sullivan (1996, p. 175), but unless there is some support, interest and reasonably high skill level in stakeholders, it is unlikely that it will be successful.

When parents show a strong interest in their children's schooling, they promote the development of attitudes that are key to achievement, attitudes that are more a product of how the family interacts than of its social class or income. If schools treat parents as powerless or unimportant, or if they discourage parents from taking an interest, they promote the development of attitudes in parents, and consequently their children, that inhibit achievement (Henderson, 1981, p.3).

This transfer of authority can take many forms, ranging from mere tokenism to a high degree of school autonomy where parents participate in all aspects of school decision making. There is a large body of evidence that attests to the importance of parental involvement in education and the need to increase the amount and type of involvement that currently exists.

School Councils must not be the only area of parental and community involvement in the school. Educators must move beyond what is mandated by the Ministry of Education and
Training as well as the local Board to develop a more inclusive and all-encompassing model of school involvement.

Mandating School Councils is one way that the Ontario Ministry of Education has tried to encourage more involvement in schools. Yet, it will not bring about effective parental involvement in schools unless a number of criteria are met. These include central office support, clear goals and objectives; further skill development; improved communication and commitment at all levels to increase involvement; the development of a more welcoming school environment; more opportunities provided for parent and community participation and a serious respect for parents and community members as partners. This will not only provide an educational advantage for students, particularly if student achievement is an important objective, but also generate satisfaction among the public and educators with our school system.

All parent participation should, however, be valued and examined with careful consideration inasmuch as participation on decision making bodies such as the School Council does not necessarily guarantee a strong home-school partnership. When reviewing the research, Fullan (1991,
p.237) found "virtually no relationship between the amount of parent participation on advisory councils and student achievement". There is no direct evidence to indicate that parent participation in school decision-making influences student learning, although there is some evidence that it positively affects the participating adults (Fullan, 1991). Schools that work well with parents also have improved staff morale and are more highly rated by parents and the community (Henderson & Beria, 1994).

Much of the parental involvement in schools in the past has probed peripheral areas such as fundraising, assisting on school trips and helping with homework. However, today some of the new roles include parent, student and community input on school policy, curriculum and codes of conduct as well as participation in special school events and in direct classroom support.

Epstein (1994) delineates six different types of parental involvement. The first is school assistance for families in assuming basic responsibilities. The second is communication to the home from the school and, third, the involvement of parent and community volunteers to assist teachers. The fourth is the support of learning activities
at home and the fifth is parental involvement in governance, decision making and advocacy. The last is collaboration and support of programs and services using community resources.

In this vein, Henderson (1988, p.150) states that "parental involvement works better when parents are given a variety of roles to play". He goes on to say that:

For the wheel to turn, parents must play all the roles. The conclusion of this series of studies is that the better planned, the more comprehensive, and the longer lasting the parent involvement, the more effective the schools in the community become. (p.151)

Becher (1984, p.19) concurs with Henderson (1988) that all forms of parental involvement are important but that those that "...offer more types of roles for parents to play, and occur over an extended period of time appear to be more effective".

While many teachers solidly support more parental involvement in the schools, they also acknowledge their lack of experience in working collaboratively with parents (Parnell & Gotts, 1985). Greater skill development in areas
such as conflict resolution, participatory management and shared decision making would be of great assistance to all staff members regardless of their current skills, as they begin to work more closely in partnership with parents and community members. Fullan (1993, p.18) says:

> Without collaborative skills and relationships it is not possible to learn and to continue to learn as much as you need in order to be an agent for social improvement.

Some school staffs without any formal training and only limited experience with parental involvement may view increased parental involvement as a threat to their professional autonomy and judgement (Winter, 1994). They may also have a certain amount of apprehension about the form and the extent in which the involvement may occur (Goldring, 1990; Radnofsky, 1994). While some educators acknowledge the positive impact that parental involvement can make, such as increased equity of educational opportunity (Henderson, 1988; Epstein, 1995), others fear it and assert that it must be controlled, formalized and standardized (Goldring, 1990). Opportunities for shared professional development and team building for school staff, including administrators, along with parents,
students and community members would be of great long term benefit to everyone involved.

Parents (Malen & Ogawa, 1988) often lack information about school operations, and are not always clear about the role they should play and the parameters of their power. While some parents, community members or students may hesitate to express their feelings and preferences, others may lack the skills and training to work effectively as a team and may come with expectations which are very different from those around them. Many barriers may also arise within even the best organized and well intentioned schools. Barriers such as those of language, lack of skills and confidence, difference in culture, limited time and energy, school phobia, and insufficient information generate real concerns that must be addressed. Therefore, effective communication with all school stakeholders is of the utmost importance.

Williams and Chavkin (1989) describe seven keys to success for strong parental involvement. These are written policies, administrative support, training, partnership approaches, two-way communication, networking and evaluation.
Parental involvement in almost any form is more critical to a child’s success in school than income and is the single most effective strategy for helping a student improve in motivation, application and achievement (Ziegler, 1987). If the educational objective of greater academic achievement is to be realized, then improved home-school interaction and increased parental involvement must be priorities. This appears to be especially crucial for those from poor and minority families (Etheridge, Hall & Etheridge, 1995).

The amount of power and influence felt by parents may be the result of both their social status and the school context (Goldring, 1990). Teachers and administrators must make an even greater effort with under-represented groups to encourage active participation. School decisions made by some distant power such as the Central Board Office may leave those most affected by the decisions feeling powerless and out of control (Hargreaves, 1995). It is therefore essential that all parents feel welcome and are given the opportunity in some form to participate in their child’s education.
Other research by Grolnick and Slowiaczek (1994) did not find a clear and direct relationship between parental involvement and student achievement. They did, however, find an indirect connection between some types of parental involvement and student motivation and improved performance. Although they do believe that student attitudes and beliefs about themselves in school are strong indicators of school success, Grolnick and Slowiaczek (1994) found that not all types of parental involvement lead to improved school performance. Ford (1989) and Geyer and Feng (1993) identified no significant correlation between parental involvement and student achievement. Most studies according to Epstein and Conners (1992, p.5):

...focus on the well-proven family influence on achievement and not on effects of school practices to involve families who would not otherwise be involved. Most omit measures of direct connections between particular school and family practices and longitudinal measures of achievement to determine whether students improve over time because of these partnerships.

Greater involvement of both parents, as well as school staff, has the potential to lead to a richer resource base and a more meaningful monitoring of the education system by stakeholders (Epstein, 1992). Parents may also benefit from their involvement as some will feel a greater sense of
commitment towards the school and a greater sense of control when they contribute positively to their child's educational experience (Lareau and Benson, 1984). This participation may give these parents a better feeling about themselves as parents and make them feel more closely connected to the school.

We might then conclude that people in general are more supportive of social institutions in a great many areas, when they have direct involvement with them. The more involvement the taxpayers have with the school, the more positive their attitude towards it (Gray, 1984). Therefore, when parents become more actively involved in the school, both they and the school are said to benefit.

Fullan (1991) also discerned that multiple types of parental involvement resulted in an increased positive impact on children. These two factors make it clear that parental, student and community involvement must be more than just tokenism. That involvement must include clearly defined aims and objectives and play an integral part in school decision making if it is to be truly effective.
Although studies on parental involvement require further study and follow-up to be conclusive, most research supports parental involvement in schools, particularly in the area of school reform. Commitment of school staff to work together with parents may be one of the keys to success as educators begin to work towards the difficult task of that reform.

Further study of values, such as the motivation behind individuals' involvement in site-based planning and management may assist administrators in more fully understanding their schools' stakeholders. Lack of understanding of individual values and the impact they have upon what influences and drives school stakeholders' decision making and commitment may lead to declining support and failure to successfully implement changes such as new school initiatives and reforms.

Site-Based Planning and Management

Although values are central to this study, understanding the site-based process is also advantageous when analyzing the research data. This researcher benefited greatly from her participation in, and understanding of, the site-based process. Site-based planning and management was the vehicle
used to examine individual values and their resulting behaviours.

Clearly a large amount of research literature explores the area of school-based planning and management. It takes the form of a collection of position papers, project and progress reports and surveys with few systematic empirical studies. The term "school-based planning and management" can be found in indexes under key words such as school-based decision making, school self-management, site-based management, school restructuring and decentralized management. The term school-based planning and management will be used for the purposes of this study.

This extensive amount of information, although interesting, also presents some difficulties since it is very broad in nature. This makes it difficult to utilize, since interpretation and the process for implementation may vary greatly from Board to Board and even from school to school. Although much of the school-based literature has no direct bearing on this study, it does provide a framework for understanding the site-based planning and management process as well as the broader parameters, which include the role of school administrative leadership as well as
greater parental involvement in educational decision making. In addition, the human factors not so readily found in the literature, those of personal values, also play a critical role in understanding the school-based planning and management process.

One of the many definitions of school-based planning and management which exist in the literature is given in the RAND Report.

Site-based management shifts decision making responsibility and authority from the central office to the school. It reverses a trend, evident at least since the mid 1960s, to try to improve school performance through general purpose instruments of public policy-regulation, mandate, enforcement, and legal action. According to the theory of site-based management, all decisions of consequence are to be made at the school and none may be compelled by regulation in the school district (Hill & Bonan, 1991, p.4).

Definitions differ in the extent to which they are influenced by the realities against which they must be implemented. Governance issues, fiscal implications, accountability concerns, relationships with the community, parental involvement, the role of teacher unions, and Ministry of Education and Training and Board restrictions
all play roles in the way the process is viewed and carried out.

Advocates argue that greater involvement of school staff, parents and community members in all avenues of school life, including policy making, will increase student achievement and make for more effective schools. They also argue that change is more likely to occur and be productive when those expected to produce the change are involved in deciding what changes are necessary and how they should be brought about (Reed and Mitchell, 1975; Ornstein, 1983; David and Peterson, 1984). Nevertheless, despite the broad girth of information, there is little evidence that indicates that the implementation of school-based planning and management has indeed resulted in improved instruction, increased student achievement or staff development. This may be due to the fact that many schools face numerous restrictions as a result of lack of autonomy, and consequently, they are blocked in their ability to implement any decisions as fully as they might like.

The extent of school-based planning and management varies greatly as some schools may have greater resources and decision making powers than others. Lack of full authority
to make changes may in fact be the rationale for some individuals' lack of involvement in the process. Also, redistribution of authority is not always easy and many principals, as well as administrators from the Central Board Office, often find it difficult to relinquish control over budget, policy and other areas of school management (Malen & Ogawa, 1985). Accountability is often more difficult to assess when each school has increased autonomy.

An additional block to implementation may include lack of enthusiasm by teachers for increased parent participation, especially in the area of policy making (Tisdale, 1971; Crosby, 1977; Foster, 1984). Significant training with all stakeholders may also fail to take place and hinder success (Foster, 1984; Goodlad, 1984, 1987; Seeley, 1984, 1986; Davies, 1987).

Although school-based planning and management is thought to be a collaborative process, in reality almost as many models of this process exist as there are schools that implement it. This results in such wide variance that only two factors remain constant; these are decentralization of decision making and the establishment of a formal council
that meets to determine school focus and direction. Few school stakeholders may truly "realize the extent of system wide change that SBM entails" (Wohlstetter, 1995, p.22).

It is no wonder then that with lack of evidence, training, resources and money, many individuals are unwilling to invest the huge amount of time necessary to commit to the school-based planning and management process. Therefore the question, of "What motivates staff, parents and community members to devote extensive time and energy to this process"? is an important one.

Despite differences from school to school, individual motivation may be the key to determining what it is that actually leads to the successful implementation of school-based planning and management. The success may indeed be found in the examination of individual school stakeholders' values.

Summary

Educational reform takes a variety of shapes and forms, many of which are unsuccessful. Greater understanding of what makes some of these reforms work, while others fail, is critical to avoid wasting scarce financial resources as
well as decreasing the morale, trust and energy of school stakeholders.

A more in-depth look at leadership and the role that the school administrator plays as well as that of parents, who are the prime stakeholders, is essential. Increased understanding of what motivates individuals to become involved in a reform such as site-based planning and management may assist in shedding some light in this area. The values underlying the actions of individuals may provide further insight into why people make the choices and commit the actions they do. Also, in a more practical sense, a more thorough understanding of individual values may assist in providing information that will result in the more successful implementation of school reforms such as school-based planning and management.
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology and Analysis of the Data

Qualitative Study

The use of a qualitative method of research allows the researcher to "deal with multiple, socially constructed realities or qualities that are complex" and so may be difficult to measure (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p.6). It provides for a greater understanding of data by giving detailed descriptions and patterns and an enriched comprehension of meaning beyond mere statistics and numbers.

Qualitative research includes studies in which:

(a) an alternative to the positivist paradigm is used, (b) words, behaviours, actions, norms and gestures are data, (c) a primarily inductive or interpretive approach to data analysis is used, (d) there is a focus on action and change in everyday life, (e) the emphasis is on understanding and description, and not on prediction (Rothe, 1994, p.21).
The research problem in this study lends itself to the appropriate and successful use of a qualitative method for the gathering of information. The task in qualitative research is "to understand and interpret how the various participants in a social setting construct the world around them" (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p.6). Therefore, the rich descriptions, observations and written responses in this study are helpful in drawing conclusions and making educated generalizations. They increase our understanding of individual values and the motivation that lies behind each individual's decision to participate or not participate in the educational reform of site-based planning and management. The information gathered in this personal and in-depth manner contributes to the ever-growing current literature on values as well as forms a potential database for future research.

A qualitative study is particularly appealing to this researcher, as it has provided her with an opportunity to interpret and apply direct feedback to educational practice. "Anchored in real-life situations, the study results in a rich and holistic account of a phenomenon" (Merriam, 1988, p.32). The combined methods of participant observer and questioner, using written questions and
follow-up interviews, falls within the scope of qualitative research. There are both advantages and disadvantages to using these methods for gathering information.

Participant observers have the opportunity to be completely immersed in the research process. The tremendous advantage to this is that the researcher is on the inside and therefore may more fully understand the intricacies of what is happening. This may provide a more accurate reading of the study participants' motivations and actions, and help determine why those individuals behave the way they do. Although the researcher may gain a greater perspective from being on the inside, there may also be a disadvantage. "A danger in doing complete participant observation is the potential to become so involved with the group that we develop blinkers" (Rothe, 1994, p.89).

Questioning study participants is an effective way of gathering data. This researcher selected a structured set of questions with an open-ended component to them as the basis for her questioning techniques. There are many ways in which to construct a set of questions and some researchers may use pre-set categories around a framework to organize the information they receive (Rothe, 1994,
Hodgkinson’s Analytical Model of the Value Concept (1991, p.97) was chosen for the conceptual framework in this research study. Using a supporting framework was particularly helpful in sorting out numerous and varying responses. Hodgkinson’s framework was instrumental in categorizing participant and non-participant values’ choices.

In qualitative research, written responses are frequently used as the key method of gathering data. The primary advantage of using written questions to solicit responses is that it is an unobtrusive way of discovering what an individual is thinking. It also provides a vehicle for participants to contribute information privately by sharing their thoughts and feelings. In some cases, this may be the only way to be sure of what an individual’s thoughts actually are as many actions may be difficult to interpret solely through observation. One disadvantage of written responses, however, is that they may at times be vague or difficult to interpret. Researcher participation in a study may therefore be extremely useful when successfully combined with a set questions. This combination may provide the researcher with a more detailed and accurate understanding of the motivation for individual action.
Literature (Rothe, 1994; Glesne & Peshkin 1992) suggests that interviews may also be helpful in reinforcing a researcher's interpretations of his or her observations or solicited written responses. The semi-structured interview style may also provide an effective follow-up to participants' written responses such as in this study. The one-on-one follow-up interviews allowed this researcher to focus on the information that was still needed from each individual in order to provide a clearer understanding of his or her value choices. Rothe (1994, p.97) suggests that in an interview "Wherever or whenever more information is required, we use probes or follow-up questions".

One major advantage to a semi-structured interview is that it helps focus on specific areas of interest and instantly clarifies any areas of uncertainty. The semi-structure allows for some researcher and participant flexibility. The researcher may begin by structuring several questions to ensure that the necessary information is obtained. By allowing adequate time for discussion, the interview is open-ended enough for the interviewer to ask directed questions, while still allowing for those being interviewed to share the key ideas they think are important. A
disadvantage to this method is that the interviewer may knowingly or unknowingly direct the interview and interpret the answers in a manner which supports his or her own area of bias (Rothe, 1994).

Patton (1980, p.196) says that interviews are a "conversation with a purpose," which, "allow us to enter into the other person's perspective". Such interviews permit the researcher to gain more information about individual values that could not always be readily observed from the site-based process, or fully elicited from written responses.

Either done in isolation or combined with other forms of data collection, interviews provide valuable information. Written responses can be supported by both researcher observation and follow-up interviews. This combination can be very helpful in drawing conclusions. Glesne and Peshkin (1992, p.39) state that "interview questions that develop through observation are connected to known behaviour, and their answers can therefore be better interpreted." When identifying participant value choices, data from a variety of perspectives were of great assistance to this researcher.
Summary

The way in which people make sense of their lives, define and interpret their experiences, as well as structure their world is central to a qualitative study. This approach is ideal for supporting the research problem and clearly compatible with this researcher's goals. Hodgkinson's (1991, p.97) Analytical Model of the Value Concept, with some modifications, provides the basis for the conceptual framework used in this study for analysis.

Although Hodgkinson provides us with a valuable philosophical framework, his model has been modified for this particular study. It is hoped that the adapted model (FIGURE 2- Individual Motivational Schemata, p.60) will provide greater ease in understanding and a more practical application of educational practice.

The adapted model (FIGURE 2) incorporates four circular rings. Beginning in the centre is self, enclosed by succeeding rings representing the group, organization and community. Each of the rings represents the many influences that impact on decision making. Self includes factors such as age, experience, gender, needs, preferred motivational base and leadership style. Group includes personalities on
staff which expand beyond the school in the organization ring to represent principal groups such as those organized in the Board and beyond and teacher organizations such as federations. It may also include those policies and guidelines passed down by individual Boards and the Ministry of Education. The outer ring is the community that involves geographical implications such as economics as well as broader social issues.

Information in terms of amount, complexity and time needed to make a decision, enter the schemata from all sides and filter from the outside in towards the self. All of the surrounding outer influences impact the decision making of the individual in the centre. These data are then processed by the individual and are the motivating force in determining what value type is chosen by the individual.
FIGURE 2

Individual Motivational Schemata

Note: 1. Each ring represents an influence upon decision making.
   2. Information filters in from the outside towards the self.
Site Selection

Two school sites were chosen for the purposes of this research because of the accessibility of data and for specific similarities in school population and background. They were also selected because of the particular order in which they participated in the site-based planning and management process. One participated at the beginning of the process, while the second chose to wait until the end. Both schools were in the same large public Board of Education and their boundaries include families with a similar demographic, socioeconomic and educational base.

First School

The first school's enthusiastic principal promoted the virtues of the school-based planning and management process. The school was one of the first to become a pilot school for the process (April, 1994) as a result of strong school staff and Parent-Teacher Organization support.

"Pilot School" was a term used by the Board when referring to the first four schools to enter into the site-based planning and management process.
School One was the second school in the Board to participate in site-based planning and management. It was hoped by the Board's senior administration that the knowledge gained and support generated by the initial four schools would positively assist and encourage other schools when their turn came to participate in the process.

Second school
The second school in this study differed from the first in that it was the last school to participate in the mandatory Board process of school-based planning and management, becoming involved only in May, 1998.

The administrator in this second school was opposed to the process and openly voiced both his opposition to it and concerns about it to the staff and other principals. As it happened, this administrator retired the September before the two-day school-based planning and management process took place. Prior to his retirement, the staff received less information about the process than the first school and the information that was received was presented in a negative light.
Research Participation

Both schools agreed to participate in this research process. The first agreed enthusiastically while the second agreed only with a push from the new principal and some discussion with the site-based facilitator/researcher.

Limitations to the Research

This research sheds further light on the school-based planning and management process and, more specifically, adds to the knowledge and information in this area. The findings are not widely generalizable inasmuch as there are only two schools in the sample. They are, however, reliable in that the data provides a suitable micro-sample of what realistically may be expected if the research was undertaken on a much larger scale.

There may also be some researcher bias as the researcher has been very closely involved with each of the two schools, both as the principal of the first school and also the project facilitator in the second school. As well as my personal bias as researcher, the examined Board of Education’s stance must be considered.
Trained to facilitate the site-based planning and management process by the Board, and as a principal encouraged to promote school-based planning and management, I was biased early in the process to be strongly supportive of the site-based planning and management process. Although aware of many of the difficulties that would be associated with the implementation of the process, I fully supported the mandate by the Board, particularly in its initial stages.

My close involvement had its advantages. It allowed me as researcher to have access to information I might not otherwise have been able to acquire or, if acquired, might not have fully understood if I had not been so active a participant in the process. The disadvantage is that my positive stance is a possible limitation to the study in that there is the possibility that I could have unintentionally influenced the responses of some of the participants.

Acting as a facilitator for the final school to complete the process in May 1998 was very valuable for me as it helped temper my exuberance. The time period between my involvement as the principal of a pilot school and as the
facilitator for the final school charged with completing the mandated site-based planning and management process, gave me an opportunity to reflect and reconsider some of my initial thoughts. I believe the breadth and length of my involvement ultimately benefited my research by helping to remove some of my early bias. It allowed me to complete the research with a more moderate outlook, and with a more thoughtful and balanced understanding of the process.

Reliability and Validity

There is always the fear with any research that the conclusions drawn by the researcher may not be as valid as presumed. This study is not exempt from those concerns. Although it is my belief that reliability of the data has been achieved through a thorough analysis of available documents, interviews and external evaluator verification, there still remain some reasonable areas of doubt.

Written and spoken information included the minutes from staff and Parent-Teacher Association/School Council meetings, knowledge gathered from observations, in-depth interviews and authored comments from both those who chose to participate and those who chose not to participate in the process. Although this provided a significant amount of
data, along with researcher insider knowledge, some doubt may still remain as to the validity of the conclusions. Individuals may have in fact provided data they felt they should in order to please the researcher and/or answer appropriately as part of a study. Questions as to the accuracy of the information being presented by study participants, and whether the impressions the researcher received were in fact the truth, are inevitable.

The data were collated and categorized according to Hodgkinson's value types and conclusions drawn to either support or refute his three postulates. A number of study participants stated or wrote statements that reflected more than one value type. When this occurred the value type chosen most frequently was selected. This was not a major concern when coding as both value type evaluators noted that almost all study participants chose predominately one value type. An outside evaluator with knowledge and experience of Hodgkinson's model was the external evaluator. He repeated the coding of all of the responses to ensure reliability. Individual responses were reassessed when discrepancies were found by the external evaluator.
Researcher bias, especially when I had a close connection to each school, although an advantage in terms of trust and better understanding of the big picture, may also have been a disadvantage by creating a limited perspective.

In order to try to counteract these limitations and increase research reliability, those being interviewed were probed through questioning. Interviews allowed for more clarification of written answers. Also, review of Appendix G during the interview allowed an opportunity for those participating in the study to either confirm or disagree with the value type placed on each of the responses given.

The external evaluator was of great assistance as he challenged or confirmed each value type when it came time for me as researcher to do a final review of the match I had made between participant comments and value type.

Also by using two schools, one of which volunteered to be a pilot for the initiative and one that participated in the process because it was mandated, greater depth of conclusions may be drawn. Despite some differences in the schools, important patterns emerged from the data.
Validity may also be achieved in the future through duplication of the research process at a later date. Although this is not the intent of this particular research, data may be easily replicated to confirm any of the findings that are presented.

**Hodgkinson’s Three Postulates**

Hodgkinson’s postulates are as follows (Hodgkinson, 1991, p.107):

a) Type 1 values are superior to type 2 values and they to type 3 values.

b) Values lose their level of grounding and force over time and weaken.

c) Value conflicts will be resolved at the lowest level of the typology to avoid moral issues.

These three postulates were considered when analyzing the data obtained from the individuals in the two schools participating in the school-based planning and management initiative. Similarities and differences have been reflected upon in this research.

Data collected from the participants were analyzed using a conceptual framework developed from Hodgkinson’s model.
(1991, p.97) which was then used to organize the data in order to provide a clearer picture of each individual's underlying beliefs. These underlying beliefs helped clarify why individuals chose to participate or not participate in the school-based planning and management process. Also examined were any changes in these values that occurred over the short period of time during which the data were collected.

**Response One**

School staff, a former student and the Parent-Teacher Organization/School Council were asked to respond at three different times in written form to question one. Response one occurred before the school-based process began in order for staff, the former student and the Parent-Teacher Organization/School Council members to express why they wished or did not wish to take part in the two-day planning process. This written response was private and each person individually submitted it to the researcher.

The specific sub-questions asked of the stakeholders as part of question one were:

a) Are you willing to participate in the two-day planning session?
b) Please indicate the reasons for your choice.

Response Two

The second response was requested after the two-day planning session. This was also a private response and was asked of those who participated, immediately after the process. As soon as the planning information had been shared at the staff meeting and Parent-Teacher Organization/School Council meeting, the non-participants were also asked to respond and give their impressions and feelings about the process as they understood it from the participants' feedback. The specific questions asked of stakeholders were:

a) How do you feel about the site-based planning process?
b) What do you feel has been accomplished? Explain.
c) Reflect on your past and present involvement in the school-based planning process. If your thinking has changed at all, why has this happened?

Response Three

The information for the third response was gathered at the school-based review of the action plans. The reviews began with twenty-minute presentations given either by the co-chairs or one of the co-chairs from each action team. The
presentations described the progress that each action team had made and recommended a course of action for the upcoming year. The planning team then had twenty minutes for discussion and an opportunity to ask for any clarification that was needed. After each group had finished its presentation and the discussion was completed, the plans were ratified or ratified with some modifications. If the plans had not been ratified they would have been sent back to the action team or action teams for further modifications. The action plans were ratified in both schools with only minor modifications. During the review a secretary recorded minutes.

The planning team was then asked at the completion of the process to give a written description of their feelings regarding the process. This information was gathered by the researcher and assessed along with the first and second responses in order to try to capture what motivated the participants to become involved in the process. Individual feelings about site-based planning and management assist in understanding the process and are very important both to its success and to the future directions it will take.
Non-participants were also asked to respond to the completed action plans in order to determine if talking to colleagues and reflecting on the planning team minutes and outcomes had had any impact on their thinking and, if so, how.

The specific questions asked of each individual were:

a) How do you feel about the site-based planning process?

b) Do you feel anything has been accomplished? Explain.

c) Reflect on your past and present involvement in the school-based planning process. If your thinking has changed at all, why has this happened?

The collected information from the three responses was then coded and assessed by the researcher for value type and frequency of comment.

**Data Collection**

Although this research primarily reflects a qualitative approach, a quantitative gathering and analyzing of data has been used as well. This allowed for multiple avenues of data collection to strengthen the reliability of the research. Solicited written and oral input from both participants and non-participants in two schools were the
primary source of data. One-on-one interviews and individual school-based reviews were taped and minutes from staff and Parent-Teacher Organization/School Council meetings were recorded for ongoing reference.

Hodgkinson's three postulates formed the basis against which the data obtained from the individuals in the selected two schools participating in the school-based planning and management initiative were analyzed. These data have been examined to see if the conclusions drawn from them are consistent with or contrary to those presented in Hodgkinson's three postulates.
CHAPTER FOUR

Data Analysis

Question One and Two

The reasons for individual participation or nonparticipation in the site-based planning and management process varied greatly in the two examined schools. The motivation behind the choices the individuals made also revealed for most of them significant change over time.

First School- Response One

Each participant in the first school privately completed the responses to the three proposed questions. The principal was looking for not only a consensus of positive opinion, if the school was going to volunteer immediate involvement, but also individual commitment. Both these actions were forthcoming. Support was further endorsed by an agreement to participate in a Friday and Saturday planning session where a school mission statement and a set of beliefs and tactics would be developed by a team. The timeframe was from 8 a.m. until 10 p.m. on the Friday and from 8 a.m. until 6 p.m. on the Saturday. This willingness to give of their personal and professional time was perhaps the greatest indication of staff commitment.
Reasons given by each person in these initial responses varied. From the staff ten votes emerged for participation and five against. One of the negative votes, which indicates type 3 values of personal preference, stated that the respondent did not think the school should be a pilot nor did the person want to be involved in the two-day planning session. She did, however, offer to be on one of the follow-up action teams. The four other negative votes also indicated type 3 values of personal preference such as "I don’t think I would be a good candidate to sit on this committee. I don’t feel good about a lot of outside intervention. I’ve seen this kind of thing in operation and I didn’t like what I saw" (type 3, Ned J.).

Four of the staff who gave positive votes held type 2a values, which stated either the positive consequences of being involved or the negative consequences of not being involved in the initiative. An example of this was:

Yes we should go first and get the full support available; there might be extra funding or more Occasional Teacher Days available. We may miss out on some funding or extra assistance if we wait (type 2a, Sady R.).
Two positive votes stated type 3 values of personal preference such as "Yes let's be first, I feel like trying something new" (type 3, Sidney A.). Two individuals indicated type 1 values of principle such as:

I believe it is our responsibility as educators to respond to the wants and needs of the students and families we provide for. If school-based planning will bring us closer to this objective then the only professional thing to do whether we want to or not is to become involved (type 1, Sally G.).

The remaining two people, one being the principal, expressed type 2b values of consensus.

I would like to proceed with staff support. If the staff or at least the majority of the staff agree, we will proceed and offer to be a pilot school. I am excited about the prospect of site-based planning and management but feel we need the support of staff and parents/community if we are going to be successful (type 2b, Andrea J.).

The principal vouched that she would support the consensus of the staff, an indication of values type 2b. The role of the principal, however, did not allow her the same flexibility as the rest of the staff in making a decision. Her decision was not based on what she personally wished, as it was her responsibility to look at the whole picture and to do what was best for the school. Therefore, although
the principal indicated type 2b values of consensus in her response, it can be argued that she was actually functioning using type 1 values of principle. Her principle was that of job responsibility. This particular principal, although very eager to have the school participate as the pilot school in the project, would staunchly stand behind the staff's decision since she felt it would be in everyone's best interests.

At the principal's suggestion, staff members agreed they would use consensus to make the final decision. From the feedback of early ongoing discussion and written comments, the staff decided to offer to be a pilot school. This decision reflected the opinion of the majority of school staff who indicated their desire to go ahead and were willing to commit themselves to the process. Those on staff, who did not agree, felt they could live with the majority decision. Conflict of opinion was, therefore, settled when the staff as a whole supported consensus in its final decision, although earlier members may have personally indicated other motives for their choice.

The Parent-Teacher Organization agreed by consensus, during one of its monthly meetings, rather than handing in their
individual response sheets to the principal. Its members supported the decision of the staff that the school strive for early involvement in the school-based planning and management process. On behalf of her group, the Parent-Teacher Organization president noted that she felt that the school would make an ideal pilot site and wanted to become involved. Another member claimed that "We are already a community school but I think we would all be glad to be involved even more if it was offered to us" (type 3, Penny S.).

The principal had those interested members of the Parent-Teacher Organization and community members, as well as any former students who wanted to participate in the process, fill out a sheet of commitment. This was done in the hope that she would learn more about what each individual was feeling rather than just hearing the collective thoughts of the group, which were often articulated by just a few voices. The commitment sheet asked interested parents and community members along with former students:

a) Are you willing to participate in the two-day planning session?

b) Please indicate the reasons for your choice.
The first response from the one grade eight student, the trustee and the seven parents and community members indicated that three chose type 1 values of principle. One of these was the school trustee, the second a parent and the third was the grade eight student. The student stated "I and lots of other kids got a good start here and it is only right that I pay something back to the school. I'm in" (type 1, Kathy E.). Four of the parent and community members reflected type 2a values of consequences, while two articulated type 3 values of personal preference. This first set of responses was fairly brief and did not provide a great number of details. APPENDIX G gives a listing of individual responses; all non-relevant data have been excluded such as thank you comments to the facilitator for her efforts.

The nineteen people who volunteered to be part of the two-day school-based planning session included: nine parent and community members, one of whom was the local trustee; one student, who had attended the school and was now in grade eight; and ten staff members, one of whom was the school principal. Although five staff members did not volunteer to take part in the two-day planning session, four of the five
did participate in one of five follow-up school action teams. All of the nineteen participants plus the additional five staff members contributed to this research by sharing their thoughts and opinions regarding school-based planning and management.

Second School- Response One
The second school did not even consider the process until the four-year mandated timeframe had almost expired. The staff in this school continued to be most uninterested and negative towards the process. The only information they had received was through the principal and from specific individuals that several of the staff members had talked with, such as colleagues from other schools and the school's school-based planning and management facilitator/researcher.

During her first discussions with individuals on staff, the facilitator/researcher could not convince those she talked to of any of the benefits of the school-based planning and management process. One teacher even quoted several inaccuracies about the process as fact. Tammy M. told the facilitator of two unsuccessful and very difficult site-based planning sessions at two neighbouring schools. One of
the schools she mentioned had not yet even participated in the process while the second, according to the information the facilitator received, had been very successful. The Parent-Teacher Organization and greater community continued to have little or no information about the process. When the time came that they could no longer put off or ignore the school-based planning and management process, individuals offered a variety of responses for choosing to participate or not to participate in the two-day school-based planning retreat. Thirteen staff members chose not to participate, while seven agreed to take part along with the new principal and vice-principal. The total number of school staff participating was nine.

The two new administrators to the school were positive about the process. The pair had joined the school in September and had a much more proactive style and attitude towards the process than the earlier principal who had just retired. The shift in administrative attitude was reflected to a limited degree in a changed viewpoint of some of the staff. One staff member who had previously been altogether negative about the process volunteered to be a participant. She commented:
I don't know about this. I still have my doubts about this whole thing, that much will change but it is worth a try. I felt I might as well sign up because I figure it has to be better to be part of it, than be wondering what's going on (type 3, Tyler B.).

Both administrators chose consequences, type 2a values as the reason they were participating. One said, "It is not a choice to participate or not to participate as this has been mandated" (type 2a, Von P.) and the other held that "Although this has been Board directed and not popular with everyone, I hope there will be positive outcomes" (type 2a, Pam G.).

Those who voted not to participate primarily chose the type 3 values of personal preference. Twelve of the thirteen staff who chose not to take part in the two-day process made this selection, while the thirteenth chose the type 2a values of consequences. This individual opined that, "it will cause definite work overload and eat away even more at the already low staff morale" (type 2a, Millie H.).

The staff who agreed to participate in the two-day process had different reasons for their choices than did their negative voting counterparts. Two chose type 2b values of
consensus; four chose type 2a values of consequences, two of the four who made this choice were the principal and the vice-principal; finally three chose type 3 values of personal preference. One of the two non-administrators, who chose type 2a values of consequences, indicated that he was not certain that the process would have any lasting benefit. He said:

It has come from the top and the consequences of not doing it are greater than the consequences of doing it. I hope the changes made will be long lasting and worth the effort (type 2a, Todd, G.).

The three, who chose type 3 values of personal preference wanted to be part of the two-day planning session for various reasons such as, "I like to know what is going on" (type 3, Tammy M.).

Nine members of the parent/community volunteered to take part in the two-day planning process. These individuals were either parents of students in the school or members of the community who, although they did not have children in the school, were interested in what went on and wanted to participate. Seven of the nine indicated type 3 values of personal preference. They explained their choice with comments such as "I want to be involved in what goes on in
my child's school" (type 3, Cooba B.). Two of the nine
chose the type 2a values of consequences. Both of these
individuals felt that increased involvement in the school
would help make for a better school. The parent/community
members expressed greater motivation and commitment to the
process than the school staff. They also indicated a
willingness to rearrange job and babysitting schedules once
the date had been set.

Eighteen people volunteered in the second school to be part
of the two-day school-based planning session. The eighteen-
person team included nine parent and community members and
nine staff members, two of whom were administrators. The
responses they contributed, along with the thirteen staff
members who did not participate, provided the first set of
data. These initial responses were similar to those in the
first school in that they were very brief and lacked a lot
of detail.

Response Number Two
The next information gathering period followed the
two-day planning session. Following that planning session,
each of the nineteen participants in the first school and
eighteen in the second school were asked to write how they
felt about the process and to reflect upon present and future involvement. Most responses were lengthier and more detailed than the first ones.

First School- Response Number Two

All but two members of the school-based planning team expressed the feeling that it was a "wonderful" opportunity to work together and described some of the benefits that would be reaped, type 2a values of consequence. These individuals on the planning team felt that everyone would benefit from the increased lines of open communication and the chance to discuss issues, share information and, to work "hard on our decision making [in the process of which] a lot of excellent discussion, decision making and sharing took place" (type 2a, Sandy K.).

Two parent/community members and four teachers mentioned the consequences for those who were not involved (type 2a values). These individuals might not, they felt, have the same sense of ownership and commitment to the school-based initiative. These six emphasized their strong desire to continue to be involved and contribute to the process and as a result volunteered to be a member of an action team.
Four staff and four parent/community members who originally chose consequences (type 2a values) in their first response, continued with this choice. Each, however, included significantly more reasons for involvement in school-based planning and management in the second response than in the first response. This may be partially due to increased ownership, commitment and knowledge of the process.

The response from the student, two staff members and one parent/community member who initially indicated type 1 values of principle, moved down the hierarchy to type 2a values of consequences in their second response. The grade eight student came to the two-day planning session because she had good memories of the school and wanted to give something back to the school, a type 1 values of principle. After the two-day planning session, however, her motivation for continued involvement was primarily of a type 2a values of consequences. Her shift in values type along with those of the two staff members and one parent/community member may have been the result of increased knowledge and experience with the process. Although the school trustee commented on many of the benefits of school-based planning and management, his claims remained grounded in those of
type 1 values of principle reflecting the strong responsibility he felt in his role as trustee.

One staff member did not shift her 2b values position but continued to support consensus. This staff member, commenting after the two-day planning session in her second response, acknowledged that "to be totally honest, I don't really know at this point how I feel". The additional comments she makes, however, are central to consensus. For example, she says "I am relieved to have come to consensus on the mission statement, objectives and tactics" (type 2b, Susan J.). The two-day planning session was long and arduous and her fatigue may partially explain her adherence to consensus.

Two parents, one more strongly than the other, indicated a change to type 2a values of consequence with respect to continued and increased parent involvement and more school-based control of resources and decisions. They had stated type 3 values of personal preference in their first response and although their primary objectives had changed very little, in their second response they had moved up the hierarchy and begun to articulate type 2a values of consequence. One of the main interests of the more vocal
parent, other than wanting to support his child’s education, was to be part of the move back to local school-based decision making and the decentralization of Boards.

Two staff who had stated type 3 values of personal preference in the first response also changed their values position to move up the hierarchy to type 2a values of consequence. It can only be assumed that increased knowledge and understanding of the school-based planning process led to this change.

The principal also changed her value type during the second set of responses. Her opinions continued to reflect Hodgkinson’s type 2 values but shifted from type 2b values of consensus to type 2a values of consequence. Once she was assured of staff commitment to the initiative, she could change her initial position and begin to evaluate the consequences of the process on the school. Again, it may be argued that although the principal was operating out of type 2a values of consequence, she was actually motivated by job responsibility, a type 1 value of principle.

Of the nine participants who changed their value choice, four moved up Hodgkinson’s hierarchy from type 3 values of
personal preference to type 2a values of consequence; one moved from type 2b values of consensus to type 2a values of consequence; four moved from type 1 values of principle to type 2a values of consequence and one stayed at values of principle. Seven individuals remained at 2a values of consequences. Those who did not participate in the two-day process showed no change in their response.

Second School- Response Number Two

After the two-day retreat, the responses from the second school indicated that the participants thought the two days had been productive and that they hoped they would make a difference. They varied from the first school in that the first school had expressed more optimism that school-based planning and management would have impact. The second school's comments expressed more of a hope than a belief that there would be a positive impact on the school and more specifically on students. Comments such as "We got a lot done, but in the coming future is when we will see how we did do and what we got accomplished" (type 2a, Tim B.) and "I wonder about the actual power we will really have to implement our dreams" (type 2a, Taylor K.).
Although staff members were still not totally convinced that there would be definite benefits from school-based planning and management and their comments remained less enthusiastic than those of the parent/community participants, their values choice significantly changed over time. This, it might be suggested, was the result of increased information, time commitment and involvement in the process.

Three of the nine participating staff members, changed from type 3 values of personal preference to type 2a values of consequence; two changed from the type 2b values of consensus to 2a values of consequence; four, two of whom were the principal and vice principal, remained the same having once again chosen type 2a values of consequence. The tone of the comments also shifted in that many were more hopeful and less negative about the value of the school-based planning and management process than they had been earlier. The consequences they stated were more positive in nature such as "Working together towards common goals should make things better for our kids" (type 2a, Taylor K.).
Four parent/community members shifted from type 3 values of personal preference to type 2a values of consequence; one adjusted from type 3 values of personal preference to the type 2b values of consensus and four remained the same. Of the four that remained the same, two continued to choose type 2a values of consequence while the other two espoused type 3 values of personal preference.

The parent/community responses continued to be more enthusiastic and committed to the process than those of the school staff, a disposition that could be the result of the early negative information the staff received from the school’s former administration. The parent/community received no negative information from the school regarding site-based planning and management prior to their involvement.

Of the eleven participants who modified their value choice, eight moved up Hodgkinson’s hierarchy from type 3 values of personal preference to type 2a values of consequence; two moved from type 2b values of consensus to type 2a values of consequence and one moved from type 3 values of personal preference to type 2b values of consensus. This pattern of movement from type 3 values to type 2 values was consistent
for participating parents/community members as well as for staff. Those who did not participate in the two-day process showed no change in their response.

Response Two- Change in Value Types

Some similarity of response is apparent from participating school staff, students and parent/community members in both schools. Unlike those who did not participate in the two-day planning session, those who took part had more changes in their value choice. These alterations occurred after their first response which was prior to any involvement, and were exhibited in their second response which took place after the two days of planning.

The staff members who were not involved in the two-day process in either school and who had originally voted against participating, five in the first school and thirteen in the second school, were asked to provide feedback on their perspective of the initiative. This group of people had had no involvement in the process to this point, either positive or negative, so it is not surprising that there was no change from their original response.
Response Number Three

The last information gathering took place during the school-based planning and management review. This was the first time the whole planning group had come back together since the two-day planning session. The review took place in the first school from 8 am until 12 noon and in the second school from 8:30 am to 4 p.m. This session was designed to review the action team plans and determine whether they supported the planning teams' original intent. It would be determined at this point if any additions or deletions needed to be made to the school action plans or whether they would be accepted as written.

During this time all information presented by the action teams was recorded in order to share it with those staff, students, parents and community members who were not participating as well as for a school record. Part of the school-based review process was consensus building and everyone in both schools did come to consensus after a few minor alterations and supported the action plans as presented.

Although the second school took more time and deliberated longer than the first school to reach consensus and gain
the full support for all of its action plans, they were accomplished to everyone's satisfaction. Personal reflections on how each individual felt about the process at this stage were the focus of the researcher's interest. This researcher chose to take each participant's comments at face value. Having done this, however, she also realized that some participants might have not fully expressed any discontentment with the process even though continually encouraged to be open and honest.

The length of the comments recorded in both schools during this third response period was considerably longer than during the first response. They were, however, comparable in length to the second response. There may have been several reasons for this dynamic. There would have been an increase in the second response over the first as the participants were now more familiar with site-based planning. The lack of increase between the second and third response, however, may have been partially due to the importance that was put on the presentations. The site-based planning and management review provided an opportunity for both an oral presentation and follow-up discussion. Therefore most of the group members made their thoughts known orally at this time.
The planning team members came across as excited at this point about what had been accomplished and appeared eager to respond to the presentations. Once the action plans had been ratified, many participants expressed a sense of relief and accomplishment. The group had also resolved many of its earlier conflicts of values over the period of time that members had been exposed to the school-based planning and management process and were now very familiar and comfortable with the process and each other.

First School- Response Three

The third and final responses indicated that all of the nineteen planning team participants and four of the five staff, who did not participate in the two-day planning session but were part of an action team, responded using type 2a values of consequence. Increased knowledge of the process may have brought about this change. The only participant who did not choose type 2a values of consequence was the only person who did not take any part in the school-based planning and management process. He instead chose type 3 values of personal preference in all three responses.
The other four staff members, who originally chose type 3 values of personal preference, although not part of the planning team, did take part in one of the five follow-up school action teams. All four in the third response chose type 2a values of consequence as the result of a highly positive personal experience with a school-based action team. In the final analysis, all backed their colleagues in the implementation of the newly established school goals and objectives.

The local trustee, who was also a parent at the school, in his final response, stated several reasons for his participation in the school-based planning and management process. The first was to learn more about the process as well as to support his child's school. He felt it was the duty of all trustees to be involved and informed as it was a Board-mandated process. This illustrates type 1 values of principle. Although he reiterated his type 1 values of principle, using responsibility as one reason for involvement, he now included many new comments on the short and long-term benefits of the process, which reflected type 2a values of consequence. These type 2a values of consequence became his primary focus in the final response.
The school principal listed many potential benefits as well as a few areas that would require increased effort to avoid future consequences. Although these values appear to fall under Hodgkinson's type 2a values of consequences, it can be argued once again that they are in fact type 1 values of principle and reflective of the role of the school administrator.

Second School- Response Three

All of the participants chose type 2a values of consequence in their third response. The school staff responses differed from the first school and from the community participants in the second school in that they reflected the hope that all of their hard work would pay off. Five of the nine staff made comments such as:

I hope that all of our efforts will pay off. We need to have some effective new ways of handling all of the educational changes that are hitting us. I hope this will help us gain the support of our community and be better understood (type 2a, Toby T.).

Descriptors such as "hope" and "we shall see" were less common in the first school and also with the second school's parent and community members than with the staff at the second school.
Those who chose not to take part in the two-day planning session in the second school had much less variance from their first to third response than those who participated. All of the staff members did, however, participate in a follow-up action team. Unlike the first school, this did not have the same influence on them. Six of the staff members who did not participate in the two-day planning session retained their original choice of type 3 values of personal preference; one stayed with a same choice of type 2a values of consequence; four moved up the hierarchy from type 3 values of personal preference to type 2a values of consequence along with two who moved from type 3 values of preference to type 2b values of consensus.

Five of the most active participants, the two administrators, two parent/community members and one staff member were consistent in their choice of type 2a values of consequences. Although all five remained consistent in their value choice, the number of consequences they listed changed. It increased over the three responses and the tone of their comments also became more positive. One not very involved staff member was also consistent in her choice of type 2a values of consequence.
Those in the second school who participated most actively in the school-based planning and management process were more likely to be positively and enthusiastically motivated by the process. The thirteen who did not take part in the two-day planning showed less change in their value choices. Although six of the thirteen did move up Hodgkinson's hierarchy, the group was less positive about the initiative than those who did not participate in the first school. They had received less initial support and information on school-based planning and management than those in the first school and subsequently showed less movement and change in their thinking.

Interviews

Interviews were carried out individually with all school staff as well as with community, parent and student participants. These interviews varied in length between thirty minutes and one hour. They assisted in clarifying value choices, particularly in instances when there was little detail and the interpretation of the responses was difficult to make. The appropriate section of Appendix G was provided to each study participant for a response.
No additional questions were asked at this time except for those questions that were required for clarification. These questions varied according to the responses provided.

**Question Three- Hodgkinson's Three Postulates**

This research project did not find any clear evidence to fully support the first and third of Hodgkinson's three postulates. From the data gathered, his second postulate can be questioned as well.

**Hodgkinson's First Postulate**

Although Hodgkinson's first postulate with respect to hierarchy maintains that type 1 values of principle are thought to be more desirable and superior in nature, the data from this study suggest that the better informed and committed individuals were the more likely they were to function according to type 2a values of consequence. Increased knowledge of the school-based planning and management process in both schools resulted in a shift to the centre of Hodgkinson's hierarchy, a move from transrational type 1 values and subrational type 3 values to rational type 2 values.
Hodgkinson's Second Postulate

Hodgkinson's (1991, p. 103) second postulate maintains that values tend to lower their grounding over time, losing their authenticity or force. This does not seem to be consistently supported in the short timeframe of this research.

First School - Choice of Value Type Over Time

All of the five people in the first school who originally chose type 1 values of principle did lower their level of grounding over time to Hodgkinson's type 2a values of consequence, while eight out of nine individuals who originally chose type 3 values of personal preference moved up the hierarchy to type 2a values of consequence. The one person who did not move in his value preference remained with his initial choice of type 3 values of personal preference.

FIGURE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Number One: Choice of Value Type Over Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second School- Choice of Value Type Over Time

Fourteen people moved up Hodgkinson’s hierarchy from type 3 values of personal preference to type 2a values of consequence; while two changed from type 2b values of consensus to type 2a values of consequence; and two people shifted from type 3 values of personal preference to type 2b values of consensus.

Six remained unchanged at type 3 values of personal preference and seven at type 2a values of consequence. This move from the subrational to the rational over time does not provide consistent support for Hodgkinson’s second postulate, at least during the short timeframe observed.

FIGURE 4

School Number Two: Choice of Value Type Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Value Type-Response 1</th>
<th>Value Type-Response 3</th>
<th>Hierarchy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Type 3- preference</td>
<td>Type 2a -consequence</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Type 2b- consensus</td>
<td>Type 2a -consequence</td>
<td>Shifted Within Type 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Type 3- preference</td>
<td>Type 2b- consensus</td>
<td>Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Type 3- preference</td>
<td>Type 3- preference</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Type 2a- consequence</td>
<td>Type 2a- consequence</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hodgkinson’s Third Postulate

Hodgkinson’s third postulate, which postulates that conflicts are resolved at the lowest level on the typology to avoid moral issues, was not evident in both schools. Although conflicts were not solved at type 1 values of principle, they were also not solved at type 3 values of personal preference. Both type 1 and type 3 values are difficult to bring to a resolution, as type 1 values are transrational and type 3 values subrational. During the two-day planning session several examples of type 1 and type 3 values arose and were resolved at type 2b values of consensus. The few conflicts that were observed arising from matters such as differing staff or staff and parent/community opinions throughout the process were solved at type 2b values of consensus. Here, as well as in the three individual responses over time, there seemed to be a centring affect.

First School- Dissention and Consensus

The most dissension in the first school came from the wording in the school’s mission statement. This variance in opinion did not occur between different representative groups such as teachers and parents but rather between
various individuals. Two parents asserted that the word "values" should be included in the mission statement. This was hotly opposed by two staff members and three parents who felt strongly that they did not have a common understanding of the word and that it should not be used. After a lengthy discussion the two parents agreed that they could live with the majority's decision and exclude the word "values".

**Second School—Dissention and Consensus**

The second school used consensus in order to come to a final agreement on the contentious area of threats, which are the obstacles which can block and make it more difficult for the school to achieve its vision. The threats in the discussion seemed to be the types of issues that were considered obstacles by some individuals but not by others. This discussion did split the participants down the line of parents/community members and staff. Although at one point the discussion was a little heated, a final decision was made by consensus that all participants agreed to support.
Conclusion

Almost all individuals, after having increased their knowledge of school-based planning and management through discussion, information sharing or participating on either the planning team or an action team, chose type 2a values of consequence. There was only one exception to this in the first school and that person maintained type 3 values of personal preference throughout all three responses. This was the only individual not to take part in either the planning team or in an action team.

There were six exceptions in the second school as only five non-participants out of thirteen chose type 2a values of consequence in their third response. Six remained with their initial type 3 values of personal preference, while two chose type 2a values of consensus. All thirteen individuals in the second school did not take part in the two-day planning session and did not have as great a knowledge or sense of ownership in the process as those who were more actively involved. They did, however, take part in an action team.
School One- Data Summary

School One began site-based planning and management enthusiastically, having several advantages that School Two did not. The first school had a principal who was committed to the process. The principal of School One was a trained facilitator in the Cambridge Model and provided her staff and Parent-Teacher Organization with a variety of information for 3 months prior to the site-based process. The information took the form of articles, guest speakers and discussion. This occurred, however, over a limited period of time as the pilot schools began the process in March of 1994 and had completed the process by June of 1994 under very tight timelines. During that period of time the principal tried to move individual school stakeholders from an individual sphere of influence and vision of self, to that of group, organization and community. This transition was not accomplished, however, until participants took part in the two-day planning session and their experience and understanding of the site-based process began to expand and grow. Non-participants took longer to evaluate the effectiveness of the process and buy into the collective vision since they had little upon which to base their judgement and so had no reason to formulate a new opinion or values type.
School One personnel had what they perceived to be a choice to participate or not participate. This would not have been true four years later but in the winter of 1994 School One had the choice to be a pilot school or not to be a pilot school.

Although the individuals in School One chose a variety of value types, the majority of school staff and parents in the Parent-Teacher Organization were positive about participating in the process. Lack of a real understanding about the process and the short preparation timelines may, however, have been why only eight out of twenty School One participants chose type 2a values of consequence in the first response. Once individuals had an opportunity to be part of the two-day session, many more participants, seventeen out of twenty, chose type 2a values of consequence resulting in an increase of nine. All but two participants chose type 2a values of consequence after being involved in the two-day planning process. Most of the planning team members, who did change their values type, did so as they gained more knowledge of school-based planning and management. One of the five negative votes did not change his type 3 values of personal preference
throughout the entire process, while the remaining four changed to type 2a values of consequence.

Although none of those casting negative votes participated in the two-day planning session, all but one participated in the design and implementation of the action plans. This lack of involvement by the one individual may have been the reason he did not move from his type 3 values of personal preference.

One of the other original negative votes moved to type 2a values of consequence and dramatically changed to support school-based planning and management when she benefited directly from some of the results of the site-based planning and management goals. The remaining four staff negative votes began with type 3 values of personal preference but two moved to type 2a values of consequences after informal discussions with participants and more formal presentations of information at staff meetings.

School Two- Data Summary

The second school's staff varied from the first in that they took part in the process not as a matter of choice but because it was mandated. They were the last school to
complete the process. It is not surprising then that despite a positive experience for those who participated, six of the thirteen non-participants or negative votes remained unchanged in their values choice.

School Two had only six out eighteen participants who chose type 2a values of consequence in the first response. Their comments, particularly those of school staff, were less positive about the consequences of participating in the process. After the two-day planning session, however, fifteen of the eighteen participants chose type 2a values of consequence. In the final response all participants chose type 2a values of consequence while only five out of thirteen non-participants chose type 2a values of consequence. Unlike the participants, though, non-participants made a number of comments regarding negative consequences as opposed to positive consequences.

Although thirteen from the second school did not participate in the two-day planning session, everyone in this school participated in follow-up action teams. Their initial attitude turned out to be more resistant to the initiative than that of persons from the first school and
as a result they had a greater distance to go in order to make significant value changes.

**Both Schools**
Lack of early information and positive administrative leadership influenced school stakeholders' interest in involvement and their initial value selection. The large number of type 2a values of consequence choices was the result of a positive and successful experience with the site-based planning and management planning sessions. The greater involvement and knowledge staff and parents/community had, the more likely they were to see positive outcomes, reflecting type 2a values of consequences.

**Hodgkinson’s Three Postulates**
In both schools initial lack of understanding about the process resulted most frequently in type 1 values of principle or type 3 values of personal preference. The more knowledgeable individuals were, the more likely and the more rapidly they were to choose type 2a values of consequence. This refutes Hodgkinson’s first postulate, as type 1 values did not appear to be superior to type 2 values and type 2 values to type 3 values. Of the five
individuals who did choose type 1 values of principle, four moved to type 2a values of consequence after increasing their knowledge and ownership in the process by participating in the two-day planning session. The fifth followed after his involvement in the action team presentations.

Hodgkinson’s second postulate, that values tend to lose their authenticity of force over time, was also not solidly supported in this study. Comments in the third response revealed stronger support and many more examples of the positive consequences of participation in site-based planning and management than in both response one and two, particularly than response one. Although there was no indication of a loss or weakening of the values over time, this may be due to lack of data. The responses in this study were done over a three-month period of time at each school. This of course is a very short period of time in which to fully evaluate Hodgkinson’s second postulate. Since consensus was the basis of much of the group decision making in the site-based process, Hodgkinson’s third postulate of avoidance was not confirmed. One example of this occurred in School One during the two-day planning session where participants spent some time discussing type
values of principle during the designing of their mission statement. Reaching no foreseeable agreement, they agreed to support the majority decision. This resulted in consensus. Consensus was used to make all group decisions in School One.

Type 1 values of principle and type 3 values of personal preference were not used at any time to settle conflicts. Type 1 and type 3 values resulted in some disagreements between participants but in all cases they were solved by type 2b values of consensus. Conflicts were not solved at the lowest level on Hodgkinson's typology (1991, p.97) but rather had a centring affect and were solved at the rational level. This was evident when the primary values were collated for greater clarity in Figure 5 and 6.
FIGURE 5
School Number One: Responses to School-Based Planning and Management Using Hodgkinson’s Analytical Model of the Value Concept (primary value recorded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Initial-Code</th>
<th>Response # 1</th>
<th>Response # 2</th>
<th>Response # 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p= parents and community members</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F= trustee</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k= student</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a= administrator</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s= school staff</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n= negative votes</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Penny S.  preference  consequence  consequence
2. Pat L.  consequence  consequence  consequence
3. Paul M.  preference  consequence  consequence
4. Pam C.  consequence  consequence  consequence
5. Petra S.  consequence  consequence  consequence
6. Patry L.  consequence  consequence  consequence
7. Pete R.  principle  principle  consequence
8. Paula K.  principle  consequence  consequence
9. Kathy N.  principle  consequence  consequence
10. Andrea J.  consensus  consequence  consequence
11. Sarah S.  consequence  consequence  consequence
12. Sam J.  preference  consequence  consequence
13. Suzanne S.  consequence  consequence  consequence
14. Susan J.  consensus  consensus  consequence
15. Sandra M.  consequence  consequence  consequence
16. Sidney A.  preference  consequence  consequence
17. Sally G.  preference  consequence  consequence
18. Sady R.  consequence  consequence  consequence
19. Sandy K.  preference  consequence  consequence
20. Nad J.  preference  preference  consequence
21. Nan S.  preference  preference  consequence
22. Nelson T.  preference  preference  consequence
23. Nell A.  preference  preference  consequence
24. Nat H.  preference  preference  preference
FIGURE 6
School Number Two: Responses to School-Based Planning and Management Using Hodgkinson’s Analytical Model of the Value Concept (primary value recorded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Initial-Code</th>
<th>Response # 1</th>
<th>Response # 2</th>
<th>Response # 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cam L.</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy K.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie S.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor M.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooba B.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine H.</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin A.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codie F.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey B.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consensus</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von P.</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam G.</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy N.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim B.</td>
<td>consensus</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabitha M.</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd G.</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor K.</td>
<td>consensus</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toby T.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler B.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mickey J.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manny S.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark N.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nona B.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly H.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manny K.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandy P.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millie H.</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac H.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew D.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie A.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha T.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary D.</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>consequence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusion and Suggestions for Further Research

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the link between individual values and action and more specifically the beliefs that lie behind the action. This was investigated using three key questions.

Question One: What motivated school stakeholders to participate in their school’s school-based planning and management process?

Question Two: What values were manifested by the stakeholders?

Question Three: To what extent are Hodgkinson’s three postulates supported over a period of time by the findings in the research?
The application of Hodgkinson's Analytical Model of the Value Concept (1991, p.97) provided a useful framework to explore the three questions.

**Question One- Summary**

Educational reform takes on a variety of shapes and forms, many of which are unsuccessful. Greater understanding of what makes it work and why it so often fails is necessary to avoid wasting scarce financial resources as well as depleting the morale, trust and energy of school stakeholders.

There is a critical need for a more in-depth look at leadership and the role that the school administrator plays as well as the part taken by parents who are the prime stakeholders. Increased understanding of what motivates individuals to become involved in a reform such as site-based planning and management may assist in shedding some light in this area. Knowing the values underlying the actions of individuals may provide further insight into why people make the choices and commit the actions they do. Also, in a more practical sense, a more rounded understanding of individual values may assist in providing information that will result in the more successful
implementation of school reforms such as school-based planning and management.

Three main conclusions may be drawn from this study which may assist in determining what motivated school stakeholders to participate in their school's school-based planning and management process. They may also prove helpful for future implementation of strategic planning. These three areas impacted individual decision making by school staff and parents/community members, who in turn affected the successful participation in, and implementation of, the site-based planning and management process. The first area was the essential need for early and ongoing information and communication with all stakeholders; the second area, committed leadership; and the third area, grassroots commitment. Other areas such as time and resources will certainly help support such an initiative but all the resources and time in the world will not bring about success if there are not grassroots commitment, strong leadership and early, ongoing information and discussion.
Leadership

The two schools in this study were influenced by contrasting leadership styles. The first school had a principal who was very positive about site-based planning and management, providing early and ongoing information about the process. The principal of the second school varied greatly from the first, in that he had a much less positive attitude; he chose to share little information about site-based planning and management with the staff and parents. Indeed, the only information he shared was his negative opinion of the process; his announced strategy was that he would try to protect the staff as long as he could from having to participate in this new initiative.

One factor which may have helped the second school to have a more successful than expected two-day planning session, was the arrival of a new principal and vice principal the September before the planning session took place. The new principal, Pam G., was experienced with the site-based process, having completed it at the last school where she was principal. Pam G.'s enthusiasm and positive outlook regarding site-based planning and management was a new experience for the second school. The vice principal, Von P., although not as visibly enthusiastic or vocal in his
endorsement of site-based planning and management as Pam G., proved supportive of the process. He assisted the principal to make it a success by trying to motivate the staff in various ways such as through discussion.

Unlike in the first school, however, the principal Pam G. had difficulty finding participants for the two-day planning process, particularly staff. Tabitha N. commented in her first response that "... Pam was having difficulty getting enough people." Pam G. had to work very hard to get the number of people required to make up the planning team. She made personal invitations to both staff and parents through numerous phone calls, hand written notes and one-on-one discussions to try to encourage their participation. Although a large number of staff still remained unconvinced of the value of the site-based planning and management process, Pam G. after much encouragement and a little arm twisting, managed to get enough school staff to participate. The arm twisting involved connecting the process to staff leadership incentives and evaluations.

The planning process in the second school included seven staff, plus the principal and vice principal, a total of nine, which was an acceptable number. Andrea J., the
principal in the first school very quickly and easily had nine staff volunteer to take part, plus herself, a total of ten. The size of the staff in the first school was also somewhat smaller so a much greater percentage of staff, fifteen versus twenty-two including administrators, demonstrated a greater commitment to participate in the first school than in the second school.

The first school had far fewer staff who voted against taking part in the process than in the second school, which was reflective of a more positive overall attitude towards the initiative. The first school had nineteen vote to participate, while five elected not to participate. The second school had eighteen vote to participate, while thirteen chose not to participate.

Pam G., principal at the second school, also had the extra burden in that the school began site-based planning and management four years after the pilot schools. Over the period of four years many schools had completed the three to five year process and were now reviewing what they had accomplished.
The Board by this point was looking ahead and had begun to investigate solutions to deal with the pressure of oncoming amalgamation. This resulted in a search for a new strategic planning process that would be unique to the newly forming amalgamated Board. Although the Cambridge Model was used in one of the former Boards, it was not employed after the amalgamation. This change arose from the steering committee's view that the cohesiveness of the newly amalgamated Board demanded that the process not be aligned with either of the former Boards.

Amalgamation along with computerized report cards, newly designed curriculum and Ministry mandated testing were among the new educational initiatives that competed for teacher time and energy. The educational climate had also become more strained with funding cut backs, many collective agreements unresolved and a government many teachers felt was unsympathetic. As a result, the political climate for School Two was significantly different than that for School One.

Principal decision making also played a role. Each principal was instrumental in determining the time the process took place, the amount of information each school
received about the process over the four year time period, as well as the attitude and tone that was set. School One began the process on a positive note and chose to participate as a pilot school. School Two participated in the process only because it was mandated and then did not take part until absolutely the last minute.

Principals in schools using site-based planning and management have a great responsibility in that they set the tone, choose the planning team members, try to keep the momentum going for the action teams in both the planning and implementation phases as well as act as strong advocates for a process which does demand a lot of additional co-operation, time and energy from staff. In both schools the principal’s attitude appeared to have a great deal of impact upon the staff. Comments from parents in both schools were relatively positive, although more enthusiastic in School One. This was not true of staff. The staff in School One was much more positive and less negative in their responses than in School Two. This attitudinal difference was particularly evident in the first response.
Principals in successful schools are "often described as facilitators and managers of change, as strong supporters of their staffs, as people who brought innovation to their schools and moved reform forward" (Wohlstetter, 1995, p.24). This appears to be the case in both School One and School Two. All three principals were instrumental in molding staff attitudes, both positive and negative, particularly early on in the site-based planning and management process. Administrative leadership is one of the factors, which contributes to the success or failure of new initiatives. Many reforms will experience a great deal of difficulty meeting with success without the full support and leadership of the principal (Fullan, 1982; Rosenholtz, 1985; David, 1989).

Grassroots Participation

Many parents as well as educators support the notion that site-based decision making provides the opportunity for those closest to the issues and concerns to make decisions that influence them. It would "give parents and teachers the right to participate in important school decisions" (Clark, 1979, p1.). These individuals may then have a greater opportunity to give meaningful input into school policy and procedures. This increased amount of
participation and involvement has the potential to develop more ownership and commitment at the grassroots level and generate a closer home-school connection (Goodlad, 1984).

Enhanced feelings of involvement and control may positively influence the attitude that both the child and the parents have towards the school (Lareau & Benson, 1984). That attitude also not only affects parents but teachers as well. Teacher empowerment improves morale and efficiency; helps attract and hold skilled staff; and bolsters satisfaction, professionalism and self-esteem (David, 1989; White, 1989). Greater participation and input from all stakeholders encourages a greater sense of commitment ownership and trust.

**Parental Representation in the School**

Although site-based planning and management may in fact increase participation in the school, there is some concern (Walford in John Smyth ed. 1983), that all too frequently many stakeholders are not represented. Low socio-economic groups and those from minority cultures may unintentionally be left out. This appears to be the case in the two schools in this study.
The parent/community members who agreed to take part in the site-based planning and management process were primarily individuals who were already very involved in the school. Many of these people were volunteers in classrooms or in the library. The majority of these individuals also sat on the school's Parent-Teacher Organization as in the first school, or on the School Council as in the second school.

The first school had four out of nine site-based participants on the Parent-Teacher Organization. One of the nine not on the Parent-Teacher Organization was a full time high school student, another a trustee. The remaining three parent/community members not on the Parent-Teacher Organization were also familiar with the educational system in that two were married to teachers and the third did extensive volunteer work at the school. Two of the three parent/community members not on the Parent-Teacher Organization went on to co-chair their school's newly formed Principal's Advisory Group, which emerged from the site-based action plans. Interestingly enough this new Advisory Group, which had been formed prior to the creation of School Councils, greatly resembled the Ministry-mandated School Councils in make-up and purpose.
The second school had six of the nine parent/community members on the School Council. The rest were also involved in education in that one ran the community pre-school program located in the school, one was a very involved school volunteer and the third was a high school teacher. Therefore, all of the site-based participants were already involved in the school or school system in some significant way, beyond the fact that for the majority of them they were parents of children in the school.

A look at the cross-section of individuals who did participate reveals several clear limitations for those who did not. They include first, that not everyone may have found it possible to give up a Friday and Saturday to participate. Not all individuals would have had the resources or opportunity to be able to free themselves from either day-care responsibilities or their jobs for two full days.

The second limitation may have been the language in which the process was facilitated, which was English. Although the first school did not have a huge number of English as a Second Language families, there were more non-English speaking families in attendance at the second school. The
facilitation of the process in English would certainly have limited the participation of some individuals unless special accommodation had been made, such as having interpreters available.

The third limitation to consider is that some individuals are unfamiliar or uncomfortable with the school system. Their experience with schools in the past may have been unpleasant or non-existent and so this may have led them to the decision to consciously not choose to participate. Two questions then arise. The first question is: just how many families never receive an opportunity to provide input into school decision making? The second question is: how does this skew the site-based decisions we make, which are supposed to be made in the best interests of all children? These are just two of the numerous questions which should be well thought out before the site-based process even begins.

Walford (1993, p.241) says that "It is not coincidental that these differences among parents in their relationship to schooling are likely to be class and ethnic biased". He warns that choice and self-management may result in benefits for some but that they will still not benefit
most. Unless social inequalities change, the mere fact that individuals participate in school-based planning and management will not overcome the influence of economic and social distinctions.

For participatory school-based management to become democratic and egalitarian individual empowerment must give way to social empowerment. Unless group interests and inequities of power among social groups become part of the school reform discourse, we cannot expect school-based management to empower in the social sense of the word, and we cannot expect fundamental change to occur (Anderson and Dixon in John Smyth Ed., p.59).

The responsibility for equity of representation falls primarily on the principal’s shoulders as well as upon the School Board. Administrators must undertake the difficult task of ensuring that all school stakeholders are well represented. This did not happen as fully as it could have in either School One or School Two.

Although increased parental involvement appears to be very beneficial for the school, students and for those parents who participate, many individuals are still missing out. More effort must be made to include minority groups who may
be less visible to the school but who may in fact be the group with greatest need of participation. 

**Decentralization**

Decentralization of power was one of the most difficult stumbling blocks in the site-based planning and management process. Although staff and parent/community were willing to work on the process, the authority and power to make the decisions that they envisioned, was not clearly set out and fuzzy at best. Two individuals in the first school entered the process eager for what they believed was the move back to localized decision making. One of them wrote in her second response:

> The process allowed for much greater interaction and input from parents and provided an avenue for parents to provide direct feedback to teachers and be a part of decision making. Site-based management will also open up the door for more local decision making, making them more appropriate for individual school needs (Penny S.).

These two individuals had hoped that the school could begin using local resources, both people and material, such as local electrical talents and resources. It was later explained to both individuals, by the Superintendent of Operations, that it was an impossibility. It was explained
that many restrictions such as those associated with the unions and their collective agreements, limited non-union workers from being contracted or even donating their labour.

Other unexpected complications such as Ministry-imposed directives, which may not have been an area selected as a school focus, often ended up being a priority because of Ministry mandates. These Ministry requirements added additional commitments onto each school’s already very full agenda, many of which did not co-ordinate with the action plans the school had already developed.

Limited attention to sites other than schools also created lack of continuity in the system as a whole. School sites articulated a strong commitment to their vision in site-based planning sessions but did not verbalize as strong a connection to the Board vision. Consistent beliefs, attitudes, behaviours, skills and structures could have had a greater transforming influence in strengthening the development of the site-Board connection.

Although the site-based planning and management process was mandated and in this sense top-down, it was supported for
the most part by the system stakeholders. The eleven chosen facilitators were strong and effectual leaders and positively influenced principals and vice principals through ongoing discussion and inservice. The senior administration and director very visibly stood behind site-based planning and management and did their best to "walk the talk" and support the process. Clearer guidelines, however, indicating parameters of authority would have avoided much frustration and confusion at the implementation stage.

Another area of uncertainty at times was the necessity for the participants involved in site-based planning and management to be of "good will" (Administrator's Handbook, 1994, p.35). This is difficult to ensure as individual and personal agendas are often difficult to both monitor and control. Some participants may have hidden agendas or perhaps an axe to grind and all will have personal biases.

Although both School One and School Two naturally enough had a variety of personalities on the planning team, some of which had strong opinions, those members were able to come to consensus in all areas. There is no guarantee that this rapprochement, however, would always be the case.
Strong facilitators and prior inservice for all participants may be one way to increase each site's chance of success. Individual biases can often be overcome if planning and action teams work hard to understand each other's point of view. Prior training in the area of listening skills, consensus building and group co-operation may be helpful.

The two schools in this study would have been wise to have invested some time in team-building activities and other collaborative skill development for those participants who were available and interested. "In schools where SBM worked, professional development was a very high priority," says Wohlstetter (1995, p.23). These schools valued and participated in the development of skills that may have increased their opportunities for success.

Site-based planning and management can increase feelings of commitment and ownership generating a more meaningful and richer resource base through greater grassroots involvement. Much thought and effort, however, must go into the planning at all levels by all stakeholders for site-based planning and management to more completely
demonstrate its full potential. Knarr and Dent (1992, p.45) say:

So far, we have found that site-based management can withstand formidable challenges- as long as School Board members, parents, administrators, teachers, and union leaders give one another their firm trust and total commitment.

**Values- Self**

The individual or self, as seen earlier as the centre ring in Figure 2- Individual Motivational Schemata, p.59, will approach the world with an existing set of beliefs already in place. Values are central to each individual's behaviour and outlook, as behaviour is motivated and thus value laden (Hodgkinson, 1991). These underlying individual beliefs are a product of a great many influences such as age, experience, gender, needs, preferred motivational bases and leadership styles. The self is the core on which an individual's world of influence is felt. It is connected to, and influenced by, several layers of society including the group, the organization and the community.

**Values- Group**

The layer immediately surrounding the self is the group. This layer at the school site is represented by the staff,
which includes the principal. The group affects the individual or self by generating new thoughts, influences and pressures on the individual through group interaction. This may in turn transform or change individual value types and so sway an individual's choices of action.

Many of the individuals who took part in the two-day planning session made a change in their value choice after increasing their knowledge through participation and discussion in the group. Not one of the non-participants in either school made a change in value type after the two-day planning session. These individuals did not increase their knowledge base or interact with the group so it is not surprising that there was no change in their value choice.

The participants, on the other hand, did demonstrate some changes in value type. School One had four individuals move from type 1 values of principle to 2a values of consequence, four move from type 3 values of personal preference to type 2a values of consequence, and one type 2b values of consensus shift to 2a values of consequence. School Two had seven type 3 values of personal preference change to 2a values of consequence, one type 3 values of personal preference move to type 2b values of consensus and
two type 2b values of consensus shift to type 2a values of consequence. Although not all individuals changed their values type in the second response, nineteen did and gave, as did those whose values' choice remained unchanged, more detailed reasons for their value type choice.

The numerous shifts in value types, in both School One and School Two, did not demonstrate support for Hodgkinson's (1991) first postulate. There was no indication of the superiority of type 1 values to type 2 values and that of type 2 values to type 3 values. Type 1 and type 3 values were selected when there was lack of information from which to make a decision. Type 2a values were chosen in almost all cases when there was increased knowledge about the process and individuals could see the clear advantages of participating in the process. Also, contrary to Hodgkinson's (1991) second postulate, value choices did not degenerate over time but rather moved to the centre of his hierarchy, type 2a values of consequence. As individuals gained more insight into the process and knowledge of the process, the positive consequences of participating in the process became more evident. Greater input of time and effort resulted in increased ownership of the process and helped contribute to the centring effect.
Values- Organization

Decision making at the group level may be very specific to the site but it is still greatly influenced by the next ring in the schemata, which is the organization. The organization may include the Board, federations and the Ministry of Education and Training, all of which have a tremendous impact on the group and in turn on the individual or self.

Organizations set a number of parameters that will often direct, and in some cases limit, group and individual decision making. Site-based planning and management is a process designed to cut back on some of the restrictions and control placed on smaller units by the organization. The process, however, does not always occur as intended and so may limit the effectiveness of the group decision making process. Just as the principal, in the group, may be reluctant to share both authority and power, Boards and federations may also not grant the authority that may be necessary to make the decisions the group wishes to make (Malen & Ogawa, 1985). Some of these factors, both positive and negative, were examined as part of the two-day planning process, during the internal analysis.
Values - Community

The community which is the outer ring in the schemata, also brings pressure and influence to bear on all of the inner rings as factors such as economic or geographical implications filter the impact on the way decisions are made within every ring of the circle. Many community concerns and issues emerged during the planning process when an external analysis was conducted. Social, political, economic, technological, demographic, educational trends and competition were examined by both schools and discussed by the group in order to begin to recognize their influence.

Information

One critical factor in this study was the amount and complexity of information individuals received and the timeframe in which they received it. How much information was received, whether it was a little or a lot, and the implications of the information and how well it was understood and applied, were important for consideration. As well, whether the information was provided early or late in the process and what other forces were in evidence when
the decisions were being made, need to be examined in order to understand individual value choices.

**Question Two- Summary**

**Final Values Choice**

Although individuals began the process stating a variety of value choices, as they gained information and involved themselves to a greater extent in the process, their choices became more similar.

School One participants and non-participants in the final response, all moved to 2a type values of consequence with the exception of one individual who chose type 3 values of personal preference. This individual was a non-participant. The second school had six non-participants remain at type 3 values of personal preference and two non-participants move to type 2b values of consensus. All participants in both schools moved to type 2a values of consequence.

This study demonstrates that the more information individuals receive and the more active their involvement in the process, the more likely they were to make value decisions based upon consensus and consequences. Over time,
participants and some non-participants indicated through their comments, more recognition for the positive consequences of participating in the site-based planning and management process. The result in this study was that all participants chose type 2a values of consequence.

When reviewing value choices, it is important to note that fewer individuals stayed with their type 3 values choice in the first school than in the second school. There was only one person out of the initial nine who remained at type 3 values of personal preference at the first school. There were six individuals out of twenty-two who remained the same at type 3 values of personal preference at the second school. It is important, however, to recognize how many participants moved from their initial type 3 values of personal preference in the second school. There were sixteen out of twenty-two who shifted from their type 3 values of personal preference, even though six did not. Although six did not make any change in their values choice, sixteen, which is a significant number did shift their values choice.

The second school also made more positive comments with increased knowledge and participation in the process. Even
so, the second school began with a less positive attitude and weaker knowledge base than the first school. This resulted in the second school having fewer changes in values, especially for those who chose not to participate in the process.

**Question Three- Summary**

**Hodgkinson’s Three Postulates**

Hodgkinson’s model has a hierarchy built into it with type 1 values being superior to type 2 values and type 2 values to type 3 values. It is a “hierarchy of rank” says Hodgkinson (1991, 103). These values will lower their level of grounding over time and weaken in force. Conflicts in values, according to Hodgkinson, will most likely resolve themselves at the lowest level of the hierarchy as individuals try to avoid dealing with moral issues. Type 1 issues of principle are more likely to be avoided as they are very difficult to resolve since they are not based on rational principles but on faith or belief.

Hodgkinson (1991), does not mention timeframe or the amount or complexity of the information received as factors which impact value choice. It would be interesting to do a follow-up study several years after the completion of the
first process, to examine Hodgkinson's second postulate. Perhaps given a greater period of time, there may be a tendency for values to lose their level of grounding or force. This was not evident with School One or School Two in the three-month timeframe of this study but might perhaps reveal itself over a longer period of time.

Although not fully supported by this research, Hodgkinson's (1991, p.107) three postulates are central to the study and much can be learned from the reasons that they are in fact not completely upheld.

**Postulate One**

Contrary to Hodgkinson's (1991) belief, type 1 values do not appear to be superior to type 2 values and they to type 3 values in this study. Both schools chose type 1 values of principle or type 3 values of personal preference in the initial stages when they possessed less information with respect to the site-based process. The more knowledge individuals had regarding the process, the more likely and the more rapidly, they were to choose type 2a values of consequence.
Second Postulate

Hodgkinson's second postulate was also not fully supported, as there was no evidence of a loss or weakening of values over time. The short time span in this three-month study may have influenced these results.

Third Postulate

Hodgkinson's third postulate, that conflicts will be resolved at the lowest level of the typology to avoid moral issues, was also not confirmed by this research. Although conflicts were not at any time solved at the highest level on the typology, they were also not solved at the lowest. They were resolved by type 2a values of consensus. This was undoubtedly the result of the structure of the site-based process which had a consensus component built right into each step of the process.

Summary

Although not explored in this research it is also probable that the educational setting may have been partly responsible for the lack of support for Hodgkinson's postulates. An educational setting is characterized by professional accountability and consequences for actions while the culture for example of a church might be more
likely to be driven by faith and beliefs. The effect that the group, organization and community have on the individual or self may greatly impact the values choice of an individual.

Educational organizations influence decision making by placing it in an administrative context. Hodgkinson's postulates may be more in tune with human nature than with the administrative context of education. Personal preferences, as a result, may be less likely articulated as they may be seen as less worthy or acceptable in the more rational, accountability-driven world of education. Here the rational values of type 2a values of consequences and type 2b values of consensus are more highly regarded.

Summary

Many influences affected the two schools before, and during the action plans. The most obvious difference between the two schools was that School One became a pilot school and School Two became the last school to complete the process. The process began with the parents and staff in the first school volunteering enthusiastically to be a pilot school. This did not happen in the second school. However, with more participation and greater understanding of site-based
planning and management, both sets of participants in School One and School Two became more supportive of the process.

Each participant in this study had his/her own set of personal values and beliefs, which influenced his/her decisions. These beliefs changed over time for many of the participants as they were influenced by a variety of factors on the schemata—FIGURE 2. The nature of the beliefs was important to the entire process as success did and still does depend on where the values of those individuals lie. It is therefore personal values, which drive decision making, and so determine the success or lack of success of school reform.

Much has been learned in this research by closely observing individual values and examining the link between personal values and choices. This new awareness will be of great assistance in continuing the difficult but necessary move to more collaborative and participatory school-based decision making. It will also assist in providing further understanding of what motivates and drives the individuals who have become part of the move towards school-based planning and management.
Recommendations for Further Research

Although not the intent of this researcher, replication of this study would be not only fascinating to undertake but be valuable as a comparative study. An investigation of the same two schools and a similar site-based model, but not necessarily the Cambridge Model, may uncover a similar pattern of values choices. It would be interesting to see the results and discover how similar they might be. New leaders in both schools, experience with the process, and a continuously changing political climate would no doubt have some impact on the data results.

The Board steering committee and senior administrators as well as principals may have an opportunity after the completion of site-based planning and management Board-wide, to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the process and make adjustments in their approach. Early and ongoing communication; inclusion of a cross section of all stakeholders; inservice for all staff and all parent participants prior to partaking in the process; and clearer parameters, including greater decentralization of authority and power are just a few areas that may influence both participant and non-participant attitudes and increase the success of the process. These efforts may affect
stakeholders prior to even beginning the process and so
influence their first values choice as they recognize the
benefits of participating in the process.

Another possible area of research might be to examine the
values choices of select groups such as principals. This
research could also be expanded in order to determine if
there were any specific variances such as geographical,
type of school, or gender differences.
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APPENDIX A

Definitions

Site-Based Planning and Management

Site-based planning is a process involving all stakeholders, designed to bring about significant change in a school in order to improve student learning outcomes, to foster teacher growth, to plan for the future, and to serve as a basis for decision making on a day-to-day basis.

Site-Based Planning

Site-based planning is the process by which sites develop a mission, objectives, tactics and action plans that are uniquely relevant to the students, staff, parents, and communities. Site-based planning precedes site-based management.

Site-Based Management

Site-based management is the participatory process by which decisions are made at the site. These decisions
result in the effective management of resources to meet the unique needs of each site.

**Strategic Planning**

The discipline and process by which an organization such as a Board of Education re-creates itself to achieve an extraordinary purpose.

**Beliefs**

Beliefs are the formal expression of an organization’s values, fundamental convictions, character, and moral and ethical priorities.

**Mission**

The mission identifies why an organization exists. It is a broad statement of purpose, function, and client and niche.

**Internal Analysis**

The internal analysis is the examination of the organization’s strengths and weaknesses. The strengths are the characteristics which help achieve the mission. The weaknesses are the characteristics which limit our ability to achieve the mission.
External Analysis

The external analysis is the examination of those forces over which the site has little or no control. External factors may be social, political, economic, technological, demographic, educational trends and competition.

Competition

Competition refers to any organization/group/individual which attempts to address the same needs as the specific site.

Critical Issues

Critical issues are issues and circumstances which must be dealt with if the organization is to survive or re-create itself in the context of the mission. They include threats and opportunities. An opportunity is a blessing of time and circumstance which is uniquely theirs. A threat is a circumstance which will move the organization away from the mission unless action is taken immediately.

Objectives

Objectives create risks and improve accountability. They are measurable, demonstrable, and observable in terms of
time, money, quality, and quantity. At least two of the measures must be present to validate an objective.

Tactic
A tactic is a means of deploying resources to achieve the organization's objectives. Tactics drive action plans.

Action Plans
Each action team is charged with the responsibility of creating a body of action plans for each tactic (or strategy). They may not change the tactic but must honour it as stated. They must decide on the most effective way in which to implement the tactic. The steps followed include tactic analysis, information gathering, creative problem solving, action plan writing, and cost-benefit analysis. Action teams are not responsible for implementing the plans.
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Site-Based Planning Process

1. Set the Stage for Planning

2. Gather Relevant Information

3. Select the Planning Team

4. Conduct the First Planning Session
   a) Understanding Board Beliefs
   b) Mission
   c) Internal Analysis
   d) External Analysis
   e) Competition
   f) Critical Issues
   g) Objectives
   h) Tactics

5. Communicate the Draft Plan

6. Action Plan Teams
   a) Action Plans
7. Conduct the Second Planning Session

8. Approval of Plan

9. Implementation

8. Review Progress

9. Update Annually
## APPENDIX C

### Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Site-based Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Beliefs</td>
<td>1. Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mission</td>
<td>2. Internal Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parameters</td>
<td>3. External Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Internal Analysis</td>
<td>4. Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. External Analysis</td>
<td>5. Tactics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Action Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Action Team Plans

Day 1 (2 1/2-3 hours)

1. Arrive at a mutual understanding of the tactic. (What does it mean?)

2. Focus on what the end result of implementing this tactic will be. (What will it do?)

3. Make a list of questions (obstacles) that must be addressed before brainstorming can begin. (resources, timelines etc.)

Day 2 (1 1/2-2 hours)

1. Present answers to questions raised during Day 1.

2. Brainstorm action team ideas in pairs or small groups.

3. Combine, groups, prioritize ideas in the large group.

Day 3 (1 1/4-2 hours)

1. Phrase action plans.
2. Propose timelines.

3. Delegate writing of final action plans if not completed during the session.

**Day 4 (2 ½-3 hours)**

1. Present and review plans started on Day 3.

2. Rephrase and rewrite if necessary.

3. Do cost/benefit analysis.
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Action Team Meeting Report

Date

Strategy Leader

Whole Team Meeting Subteam Meeting

People Attending:


Agenda Items Covered:


Decisions Made:


Next Meeting (date, time, and place):


Tasks for Next Meeting:


APPENDIX F

Data Collection

Questions For Response One

Prior to being pilot schools a question was completed by all school staff at each school, along with interested parents, community members and former students.

The question was:

Are you willing to participate in the two-day planning session?

a) Please indicate the reasons for your choice.

Questions For Response Two

After the two-day site-based planning retreat a set of questions was completed by all participants and all school staff at both schools.

a) How do you feel about the site-based planning process?
b) Do you feel anything has been accomplished? Explain.
c) Reflect on your past and present involvement in the school-based planning process. If your thinking has changed at all, why has this happened?
Questions For Response Three

The last information gathering took place during the school-based planning and management review. This was the first time that the whole planning committee had come back together since the two-day planning session.

Data were gathered from the action team presentations and group discussion as well as from the questions above which were answered on individual response sheets.

a) How do you feel about the site-based planning process?
b) Do you feel anything has been accomplished? Explain.
c) Reflect on your past and present involvement in the school-based planning process. If your thinking has changed at all, why has this happened?

Interviews

Follow-up interviews were held with site-based participants and all school staff members. The interviews were approximately thirty minutes to one hour each in length. These were designed to help clarify the comments written on each of the three individual response sheets. These interviews were extremely helpful in clarifying many of the less detailed comments. No additional questions were asked
at this time, other than those used for clarification. These questions varied according to the responses individuals gave and the need for clarification.
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School Number One

Parents/Community Members

1. Penny S.

Response One
We are already a community school but I think we would all be glad to be involved even more if it was offered to us.

TYPE 3

Response Two
It was a wonderful chance to get to know each other, share ideas and plan the educational future of our children together. The process allowed for much greater interaction and input from parents and provided an avenue for parents to provide direct feedback to teachers and be a part of decision-making. Site based will also open up the door for more local decision making, making them more appropriate for individual school needs.

TYPE 2a

Response Three
We’ve come a long way in our planning together. Communication has increased. I now understand better the whole picture and the job of the teachers more clearly. This was a good opportunity to work together to benefit our children. The action plans are good and we now have a plan of where we are going so are more likely to get there. It has been great to be part of the planning so much has been accomplished. This process has produced very worthwhile results.

TYPE 2a

2. Pat L.

Response One
I think our school would be an ideal pilot and that more participation and involvement from parents will be beneficial for teachers and kids. It would make the home school connection for children and save teachers a lot of work in the long run.

TYPE 2a
Response Two
We all benefit when we work together and the kids will ultimately benefit the most. I can already begin to see the benefits that will come out of the tactics that we have developed. Once the tactics are developed into a detailed plan then we will be able to see growth in the key areas we established as our focus. So much can be accomplished once an organized process is developed and we all work together on it. We have worked really hard to come to this point but it has been really worth it. The tactics we have developed should really be good once implemented.

Response Three
Having so many people involved has been a plus along with all the discussion. We have come to consensus and can now work together even better than ever. I have always tried to be active in the school and I will continue more than ever as I can see the importance of the work in our planning and management sessions. Focusing on exploring alternatives to the resources we have and accessing our current resources and what it is we really need will be invaluable in supporting our children’s education. Good experience with numerous benefits, which is ultimately what I had hoped for and why I participated in the first place.

3. Paul M.

Response One
Our school would be perfect for a pilot — its ideal. I would enjoy being a participant.

Response Two
Site-based planning moves parents towards a more balanced partnership with teachers. It allows for more localized decision-making and input and decentralization of boards. We should see some clear long term benefits. I would like to be on an action team. I would like to be on the resources and marketing action teams. These two areas will with all our support and good planning will do a lot to support our school. Expanding our resources is a good place to start working—use more local resources, skills and materials eg some of our parents are electricians etc and
could donate their services, and then money used for other things.

**TYPE 2a**

**Response Three**
This planning process has been very good at moving us towards our goals. I am committed to it as I can see the benefits. I do however worry about those who are not here and their commitment to the mission, vision and tactics. I think the session is really designed as far as keeping people on track - not heading off on tangents and personal hobby horses and so we made great strides forward. Amazing. We have a great school with lots of care and commitment but this will move us even further ahead and faster. The more people working together the better.

**TYPE 2a**

4. Pam C.

**Response One**
I would like to be involved. Sounds like this type of planning could result in some positive results.

**TYPE 2a**

**Response Two**
Very worth while with lots completed. Putting many heads together came up with many good ideas in the end. These ideas will now be expanded into a form from which great benefits will be derived.

**TYPE 2a**

**Response Three**
Good communication, better knowledge of school and what goes on. The end results of this planning will be better for the students. Results from the two days and action plans will allow for many fantastic things to happen. I have always been proud of our school and I think we just keep getting better with the help of all our efforts.

**TYPE 2a**
5. Petra S.

Response One
Big gains have been made in business using similar collaborative strategies and I think the same could happen with us.
TYPE 2a

Response Two
A lot of work but we made it through the two days with lots to show for it. I am glad we did it because a lot can come from this if we all work just as hard in the next stage.
TYPE 2a

Response Three
Well it has been a lot of work but worth it. We would not have as much figured out and if we had not gone this route. Really worth it. Lots accomplished. We have a clear plan and are on our way to making it a reality.
TYPE 2a

6. Patsy L.

Response One
I support the development of school goals as it should improve the quality of my children’s education.
TYPE 2a

Response Two
I think everyone would agree this planning process was helpful and productive. I hope the rest of the parents and teachers not here support us and the plan as they have not been a part of developing it. I would like to continue in site-based and be on an action team to work on one or two tactics.
TYPE 2a

Response Three
Interesting. We have excellent action plans. Put into action we should see lots of good things happen. I’m realizing more and more what I learned from the exercise, its value and am understanding more and more the process and expectations. Certainly worthwhile.
TYPE 2a
7. Pete R. (trustee)

Response One
Yes I am interested in being part of the two day planning days. This is one of my schools and it is part of my role to support the families and schools in my area.

Response Two
It is my duty as a trustee and responsibility as a parent to be involved and informed. I want to continue to learn more about the process and support my child’s school. I feel every trustee should be apart of this process as part of their role.

Response Three
I can see many specific short term and long term benefits to this kind of planning. We will see a well supported plan that will be a daily focus as well as provide long term direction. Every school should have to do it and each trustee should be part of it to see the many advantages of this type of process. Many good ideas came out of the process and everyone worked together for the good of all of our students.

8. Paula K.

Response One
As a parent I have a strong sense of commitment to my children’s education. It is important that all parents be actively involved in their child’s education. My children’s welfare is my prime concern and responsibility.

Response Two
I would recommend to others to take part in this- even if only for the chance to work with the teachers of their children, other parents etc. All members of the group appeared equal- were good listeners-contributed equally- ideas and opinions were repeated and validated in the decision making process. No one with any specific axes to grind. It was valuable to hear different view points of parents as well as school staff.
Those not in attendance will be at a definite disadvantage when planning ahead and committing to our plan. I would like to next be on an action team.

**Type 2a**

**Response Three**
A very worthwhile experience. Forces you to take a global view of the school which perhaps we don't do in light of all the demands on our time. Forces you to look ahead - 5 years etc. and plan not just for today. I feel good about the action plans. The results are what we had hoped for. Working towards consensus was interesting and valuable. It was interesting and informative to work with parents and teachers on a collaborative process and get all of our opinions and ideas.

**TYPE 2a**


**Response One**
I and lots of other kids got a good start here and it is only right that I pay something back to the school. I'm in.

**TYPE 1**

**Response Two**
Great ideas came out of all the talking we did. It was lengthy but we ended up with great tactics. The information that we put together will help with the action plans which should be very good with all the ideas we have sorted out.

**TYPE 2a**

**Response Three**
A worthwhile activity and a good opportunity to plan together. I am proud of this school and if we achieve all we have planned we will be the best in Canada. Great results come out of hard work and a good facilitator and plan.

**TYPE 2a**
School Staff

1. Andrea J. (principal)

Response One
I would like to proceed with staff support. If the staff or at least the majority of the staff agree, we will proceed and offer to be a pilot school. I am excited about the prospect of site-based planning and management but feel we need the support of staff and parents/community if we are going to be successful.

Response Two
It was very valuable to have various stakeholders working together to develop future directions for our school. The more ownership and involvement the greater chance we have at succeeding in and making our school the best it can be in supporting our students.

Response Three
We have worked very hard to develop action plans. The fact that we all worked together and came to consensus is important and the closeness that developed and the increased understanding and support was essential to our success. I think, however, the most important advantage of the process is that it provides us with long term plans and provides us with future direction.

2. Sarah S.

Response One
I'm interested because I think we need to think through where we are going and get a good plan to be really effective.

Response Two
Good ideas, discussion. It was interesting to work with teachers and parents on a collaborative process like this. I found the session to be a worthwhile experience- only time will tell what actually results from this.
This process has been helpful.
Response Three
I found the exercise worthwhile but taxing at times, especially during the two-day planning when we were working on the mission statement, the wording. I was glad to be part of the exercise overall as I learned a lot from it as we developed an excellent plan which we will all gain from. The parent support will also be an important benefit. Worth the time and energy we gave to it.

TYPE 2a

3. Sam J.

Response One
We have to do it at some point so we might as well get on with it and see what it is like.

TYPE 3

Response Two
I felt that there was some very good information sharing taking place during the last two days. I was pleased and surprised by the variety of opinions, concerns and suggestions that everyone had.

TYPE 2a

Response Three
The process works. We have our plans which are well supported by those involved and we are ready to implement them. A lot of work but worth it, at some points you wonder, giving up a Saturday but it has given us a direction and clarified our goals.

TYPE 2a

4. Suzanne S.

Response One
I have read a little in the area of strategic planning and there appears to be many benefits to it. I would take part in it as if it improves things it is worth a try.

TYPE 2a

Response Two
After two intense days I can see the benefits of developing goals for the school. I wonder how people not involved will
feel—should we have had all staff? Will we see the benefits more than our colleagues who don’t take part?

Response Three
It felt good to see all we had accomplished, time for celebration. Well developed and important plans for the school’s future. We are a fairly cooperative group. I wonder if all schools would manage to accomplish as much as we did?

5. Susan J.

Response One
I will go with the majority. If we vote to go ahead, I will gladly participate in the two-day session.

Response Two
To be totally honest, I don’t know at this point how I feel. I am relieved to have come to consensus on the mission statement, objectives and tactics. We were able to pull together and compromise and agree to complete the process.

Response Three
We have completed what we set out to and the plans are ones that will support and help us all. Should make it easier for all of us and better for kids.

6. Sandra M.

Response One
I think we should be part of it. It may help us connect more closely with our parents and students and do a better job with added support and commitment.

Response Two
I am concerned with how to get the rest of the staff, parents etc. to take on ownership—I feel ownership but will they? I see the benefits and know how important these goals
we set are- but will they? I look forward to working on an action team. We have achieved a lot in the two days. I hope everyone will be able to embrace our vision.

Response Three
Parental input was so valuable-feel they are really behind our efforts. I think we all have a much better understanding of each other and what we are trying to do. Now we will move a head knowing we have a lot of support behind us.

7. Sidney A.

Response One
Yes let’s go first, I feel like trying something new.

Response Two
I wonder if the action committee members will come up with the action plans that fit the objectives and strategies (having missed the discussions that took place here). Those who did not take part in the two days may be at a disadvantage. I feel we worked hard on our decision making and a lot of excellent discussion and sharing took place. I have two action teams I am interested in if that’s possible.

Response Three
The sessions worked in that the action plans fit the framework we had established. It helped that some people were on both the planning team and an action team. I am pleased to have had the opportunity to take part in this as it was good to pull us all together in a common focus.

8. Sally G.

Response One
I believe it is our responsibility as educators to respond to the wants and needs of the students and families we provide for. If school-based planning will bring us closer
to this objective then the only professional thing to do whether we want to or not is to become involved.

**Response Two**
I was hesitant to spend the time, a Friday night and Saturday but it has built support and brought us closer together. I do see the benefits of working together towards common objectives. It has been worth the time and energy when you see such productive results.

**Response Three**
The final results have proved our hard work paid off. Looking at our analysis of strengths and weaknesses and what we see as priorities has clarified for me and I think for us as a group what direction we should focus our energies in. The process has been a productive experience.

9. Sady R.

**Response One**
Yes we should go first and get the full support available; there might be extra funding or more Occasional Teacher Days available. We may miss out on some funding or extra assistance if we wait.

**Response Two**
I think much has been gained from spending the time to think ahead. We are supportive because we have been a part of site-based and see the benefit. Will the people not involved feel the same way-maybe not? I would like to be on an action team and continue on.

**Response Three**
Good to see from beginning to end. Amazing the support we have gained and the number of people involved-great! The planning we did was carefully thought out and we spent the necessary time thinking it through so that the action plans would focus on our needs and priorities. It was valuable well spent time and we have much to show for it and the good we have done will be there for some time.
10. Sandy K.

Response One
I will take part because as teachers we are responsible for the success of our school. Site-based planning provides us with the opportunity of working together towards a common goal in which we all have a sizeable investment.

Type 1

Response Two
The brainstorming and consensus groups were valuable to sort out our thoughts and get different perspectives. We learned a lot from each other and built on each others ideas. Narrowing it down to five tactics brought us closer to our vision.

Type 2a

Response Three
Pleased to have an opportunity to hear all the action plans presented and discuss them. It was necessary to work on this as we were trying to do a little of everything. If we had not worked on this we would not be as clearly focused on what we want to see happen as there are so many things that take our attention and energy. Feel the increased support from parents and know the areas we chose are important ones to work on.

Type 2a

Non-Participants (negative votes)

1. Ned J.

Response One
I don't think I would be a good candidate to sit on this committee. I don't feel good about a lot of outside intervention. I've seen this kind of thing in operation and I didn't like what I saw.

Type 3

Response Two
I still don't feel particularly interested in the process. I didn't take part in the two-day meeting. Not something I feel enthused about.

Type 3
Response Three
Feedback from two days appears positive-hmm. Parents are behind us on the action teams and very positively involved. Worked out better than I would have expected although we will see if the time commitment equals the gains- does look that way.
TYPE 2a

2. Nan S.

Response One
I personally don't think the school should be a pilot of site-based planning I do not want to be part but I would be willing to help with an action team.
TYPE 3

Response Two
I am happy with the things I am doing already. I still feel I made the right decision not to take part in the planning. I'll reassess after I am involved in an action team.
TYPE 3

Response Three
Came up with a workable plan for marketing/public relations. Looking into a sign for ongoing communication and logging volunteer hours will both result in some benefits. Many other ideas I am also supportive of as they will improve teacher-parent communication.
TYPE 2a

3. Nelson T.

Response One
No, not interested.
TYPE 3

Response Two
Still not interested.
TYPE 3
Response Three
Action team was too time consuming but we developed a good plan which was supported by the planning team, they also thought it was good. Doable with clear benefits not just more make work things to do.
TYPE 2a

4. Nell A.

Response One
I don't think we should be a pilot and I am not interested in being part of the two days or action team.
TYPE 3

Response Two
I might help with an action team as I am a bit curious after all the talk after the two days away.
TYPE 3

Response Three
Sounds like I missed a lot with the planning although I think the action plans are most important as they are when something happens. The implementation of these plans will help us increase resources and realize many other opportunities.
TYPE 2a

5. Nat H.

Response One
If I have a choice than no is my preference. I especially wouldn't like two days of sitting. I would prefer to be at school.
TYPE 3

Response Two
No is still my preference to the whole site-based exercise. I had a good two days here and at home.
TYPE 3

Response Three
Same answer as last time. No change. Still not interested.
TYPE 3
School Number Two

Parents/Community Members

1. Cam L.

Response One
This is a good opportunity to set long term goals. I support it. Increased involvement makes for a better school.

Response Two
The process really works! Even with this many people. Enjoyed the great sense of humour, food, commitment and consensus to achieve what I think are appropriate and achievable goals. Hopefully the action teams will be as enthusiastic and productive as this group was.

Response Three
We did it. We have clear goals and workable plans to carry out our tactics. Although time consuming at first it will save us time in the future as we carry out our plans. Good cooperation and participation from everyone to make our vision a soon to be reality. Glad I was there to be part of the process. Sorry I was a bit late the second day.

2. Cathy K.

Response One
As an active member of the original planning committee to get the school built and ready seven years ago, I want to be there for this too. I like goal setting.

Response Two
I liked being part of the two days although I was really tired by the end. It was fun. Food good- muffins in the morning and candies throughout the day as well as all that fo-o-o-od for meals, facilitator patient and we all enjoyed ourselves.
Response Three
It has been a pleasure to work so closely with parents and co-workers for the betterment of the school. I participated in the process and was extremely impressed by the outstanding results.

TYPE 2a

3. Connie S.

Response One
Wanted to be in on the planning stage of the plan for the school. Wanted to interact with adults for a change. Get me out of the house!

TYPE 3

Response Two
Enjoyed opportunity for input and opportunity to hear other adult views. What happens finally remains to be seen. I am still glad I participated. It was good to be with adults and work together. I enjoyed the two days.

TYPE 3

Response Three
Time and effort has resulted in ownership of our mission statement. Opportunity to share ideas/opinions with other adults and come up with good collective results. We accomplished what we had hoped to and more.

TYPE 2a

4. Connor M.

Response One
I want to be further involved in my son's school direction in these political times. Further development of my experience working with people is an interest of mine...as a parent... Yes! I support the process.

TYPE 3

Response Two
I found these last two days a very energizing way to focus on the importance of my children's school learning experience. When doing teamwork the result is more than the sum of the parts! The results made the time commitment worth it. We came up with many good ideas which will now be
put into a plan of action. Will consider being on an action team.

**TYPE 2a**

**Response Three**
Amazing to hear all that has been accomplished. So many good ideas and plans to move ahead. Hope they will accomplish all we hope they will. The mission ties in with the end results and the plans are ready. I can see the light at the end of the tunnel. Everyone should be commended on the progress we made.

**TYPE 2a**

**5. Cooba B.**

**Response One**
I want to be involved in what goes on in my child's school. I want to understand how school's function. Focus on something I think is valuable.

**TYPE 3**

**Response Two**
I appreciated the experience of participating in site-based management, which allowed me to interact with school teachers and administration and participate in development of strategies for school. I care about my child's education so the outcome of these two days was important now that I see how it fits together. I see the benefit of my involvement.

**TYPE 2a**

**Response Three**
Lots of work. Good ideas came out of the site-based planning. The plans did reflect our tactics so the whole process was linked together. The plans must reflect the process for the results we envisioned to become a reality. This was done and I hope will continue to be followed through. The next steps are also important and the discussion and ideas we felt were important can not be overlooked or forgotten as much thought went into producing and expanding them into direction we felt was critical.

**TYPE 2a**
6. Catherine H.

Response One
I was thinking about it and Connie gave my name to Pam. Parent/Community input is important to what happens, hoping to make a difference. More parent involvement will help improve things in the school.
TYPE 2a

Response Two
Very exciting to be able to take all the ideas from eighteen people and be able to express them in one mission statement. Lots has been accomplished in the two days. Hope we continue with the momentum—so far great.
TYPE 2a

Response Three
On the whole I am glad I took part as I feel we did make good headway. Would I do it again probably not because of time commitment but I do think it was worth doing and someone else should have an opportunity to be part of the process.
TYPE 2a

7. Calvin A.

Response One
A desire to be part of a plan for a great school. I like being part of things and I absolutely support the process or I wouldn’t be here. I want to be part of the solution, not the problem.
TYPE 3

Response Two
Hard, hard group activity. Good to hear so many passionate thoughts and ideas. Feel motivated to “carry on” with what we have come up with. All good stuff, making progress.
TYPE 2a

Response Three
What we have done here will ultimately benefit my children.
TYPE 2a
8. Codie F.

Response One
An inner desire to get involved. Get away from kids, free food. Sense of community accomplishment. I support the process the idea- to do something new.
TYPE 3

Response Two
Found confusing at first- what objective was. Wide variety, brainstorming etc. Yet through our labour pains we prevailed, very rewarding, educational, insightful. Great food, company, facilitator and we have done so much to make our school into a better place.
TYPE 2a

Response Three
Long process but liked the plans, fit with vision and mission. Got done everything we needed to with minimum disagreements. Pulled together many different ideas and opinions to come to the best way to accomplish our goals. I would take part in it again but think the process could be shortened.
TYPE 2a

9. Casey B.

Response One
This is one of those things. Like an enema. You know you have to do it, it’s a real pain, but it feels so good when it’s over. So let’s do it- I for one want to.
TYPE 3

Response Two
We all managed to agree for the most part although sometimes it was a struggle. The consensus although painful at times to reach moved us forward. Important that we all pulled together to reach common tactics. I am continuing to support as long as we reach consensus at each level.
TYPE 2b

Response Three
My concern is for education at the elementary level, especially technological education, for all children, not just my own. Yes because it has been proven for nearly fifty years in business and industry as a method for
success in any organization. You can't argue with results and we have been successful ourselves with our plans for the future.

TYPE 2a

Staff

1. Von P. (vice principal)

Response One
It is not a choice to participate or not to participate as this has been mandated.

TYPE 2a

Response Two
Have participated in something similar before and see it as worthwhile. Know it is vitally important to have clear goals and to set specific strategies to reach it. Obviously then support this process because it is a good way to use various talents in school community to come to successful outcome. Have worked hard for the last two days and established workable tactics.

TYPE 2a

Response Three
It was a great experience to work with parents and staff members. Motivation remained good and focused. Plans are ready to be implemented and staff and parents have worked hard to get us to this point. It is good to get to this point in the process.

TYPE 2a

2. Pam G. (principal)

Response One
Although this has been board directed and not popular with everyone, I hope there will be positive outcomes.

TYPE 2a

Response Two
I loved doing it before. I believe in shared decision making. I am required as the principal. I like involving parents in the school. Yes I support the process. Parents involved in the plan, decisions can be made from the plan
ie money, daily routines, activities. Forces you to think.

**TYPE 2a**

**Response Three**
We have been very successful. Some areas we have begun working on already and this just reinforces that we are moving in the right direction. Need to motivate staff not involved as those who took part very supportive and pleased with what we have completed.

**TYPE 2a**

3. Tammy M.

**Response One**
I am committed to giving effort pro-actively in establishing vision and focus. The process should reflect the common good. Its potential weakness is minimizing to the lowest common denominator. I like to know what is going on so I am willing to take part.

**TYPE 3**

**Response Two**
It is valuable to be part of proactive thinking and planning. This experience should pay off in the building of a very purpose-driven school. The process of consensus/brainstorming/sharing is hard. Some people will never understand that spirit and basic concepts far outweigh a narrow list of specifics. But in the long run, they should be better achieved.

**TYPE 2a**

**Response Three**
Having a plan will move us more quickly in the direction most hope to see us move in. We will follow our plan supposedly for the next three to five years. All should be supportive but things change. Right now we are in a good position to meet our goals.

**TYPE 2a**

4. Tim B.

**Response One**
I’ll go with it, it’s there I’ll do it.

**TYPE 3**
Response Two
I was surprised how much we got done. It was long days and sometimes unnecessary haggling over wording - glad we finished that mission statement. Think it was a good two days of work. I am looking forward to hearing the action plans. Need to make sure they support what we intended.

Productive two days. We got a lot done, but in the coming future is when we will see how we did do and what we accomplished.

TYPE 2a

Response Three
Through the labour pains we prevailed. Very rewarding, educational, productive, insightful experience.

Type 2a

5. Tabitha N.

Response One
To take an active part in developing a plan that will affect the environment the students, teachers and families are a part of. Yes I support it - so that we have ideas from a variety of sources.

TYPE 2a

Response Two
It was very successful working with this group of people. We saw a variety of perspectives. We normally do not get to be on such a personal and intimate basis, and sometimes that's just as well.

TYPE 2a

Response Three
I am glad I participated in the process and was extremely impressed by the outstanding results.

TYPE 2a

6. Todd G.

Response One
It has come from the top and the consequences of not doing it are greater than the consequences of doing it. I hope the changes made will be long lasting and worth the effort.

TYPE 2a
Response Two
I am pleased with the work we have done and I hope others are too. It would be nice to think that the work we have put in these last two days will have a significant impact?? Good thought has gone into tactics although the way they are interpreted in the action plans will make a difference to their success. Hope the plans are kept to a manageable number.
TYPE 2a

Response Three
See it as worthwhile. Know it is vitally important to have goals and to set specific strategies to reach it. Yes obviously support this process because it was a good way to set common goals that everyone is willing to support. Good way to make use of various talents in the school community.
TYPE 2a

7. Taylor K.

Response One
I will go with the majority. Don’t feel strongly either way.
TYPE 2b

Response Two
My motivation was increased through the process. I found working with parents was a positive experience. I’m looking forward to see how effective we have been in the end result. Working together towards common goals should make things better for our kids. I wonder about the actual power we will really have to implement our dreams.
TYPE 2a

Response Three
Feel motivated to carry on with implementation of plans. Impressed by support.
TYPE 2a
8. Toby T.

Response One
Curiosity. Yes with reservations. I am not totally convinced of its proposed effectiveness, however I am willing to give it a chance.

TYPE 3

Response Two
I have some passionate beliefs in education. I do not believe in consensus. I did not know it was the basis for getting things done in this process. It is slow and primitive decision making that is politically motivated (to generalize responsibility). I do however feel that when more people are part of the decision making process like this, they are more likely to believe in the school as a democratic place to educate kids.
The cynic.

TYPE 2a

Response Three
There was good interchange of ideas and the give and take among participants. I still do not care for consensus decision-making, but see how it can work. I hope that all of our efforts will pay off. We need to have some effective new ways of handling all of the educational changes that are hitting us. I hope this will help us gain the support of our community and be better understood.
No longer cynical (colour me skeptical).

TYPE 2a

9. Tyler B.

Response One
I don’t know about this. I still have my doubts about the whole thing, that much will change. I felt I might as well sign up because I figure it is better to be part of it and for us to decide together as a group on what’s to come than have a few people deciding.

Type 2b

Response Two
Much what I expected. Fun group, had fun- however keep in mind that most decisions are made for us and as long as we agree we think we have a say. We did work through a lot of
ideas through discussion and set a path for future decision making. Parents seem behind us.

**Type 2a**

**Response Three**
I felt more positive about the process as time went on and I could actually see what progress we had made. Sometimes these things can backfire as you get many opinions and then wish you hadn’t. Here we seem to be on a positive track and making positive progress.

**Type 2a**

**Non-Participants (negative votes)**

1. **Mickey J.**
   No thanks. I do not wish to take part. I am happy with the way things are.

   **Response One**
   **Type 3**

2. **Manny S.**

   **Response One**
   No. I’ll leave it to others who are more enthused.

   **Type 3**
Response Three
Haven't really been involved that much in what is going on. Not something that I have felt strongly about being a part of.
TYPE 3

3. Mark N.

Response One
No thanks don't care to be involved.
TYPE 3

Response Two
Still don't care to be involved and only just finding out more about it.
TYPE 3

Response Three
The information shared and our plans had a lot more substance and valuable than I expected. The impact will directly support many areas that should hopefully make our jobs easier.
TYPE 2a

4. Mona B.

Response One
Honestly don't care about the process or taking part.
TYPE 3

Response Two
Haven't heard too much about it. Seemed like a lot of time and energy went into it. I have remained uninterested.
TYPE 3

Response Three
When shared at our staff meeting and designing plans I had a better picture of the whole process. Could see how it might support day to day practice and increase teacher-parent relationships better than I thought.
TYPE 2a
5. Molly H.

Response One
Seems like same old, same old to me with a new title.
TYPE 3

Response Two
Haven't really paid much attention. Knew about two days but didn't take part.
TYPE 3

Response Three
Missed staff meeting where plans were reviewed. Was explained to me. Sounded involved. Not sorry I didn't take part in two days of planning.
TYPE 3

6. Manny K.

Response One
No. Not sure why just personal preference.
TYPE 3

Response Two
Out of the loop a bit. My own doing. Other things I chose to focus on.
TYPE 3

Response Three
Yes with reservations. I am not totally convinced of its proposed effectiveness, however I am willing to give it a chance. The plans shared at the staff meeting show potential to make some positive changes.
TYPE 2a

7. Mandy P.

Response One
No. A hundred other things I would rather do with my time.
TYPE 3

Response Two
Still a hundred things I would rather do. Wish them success.
TYPE 3
Response Three
Still not of interest to me although others seem excited by it.
TYPE 3

8. Millie H.

Response One
It will cause definite work overload and eat away even more at the already low staff morale.
Type 2a

Response Two
I think the time commitment and aggravation may outweigh the benefits although those I talked to who took part felt they had made a lot of growth in their planning and organization.
TYPE 2a

Response Three
At this point I am willing to be part of the implementation. I was not particularly positive about site based but I must admit that I am starting to see some benefits. The parents have shown support and it looks as if they will be improvement in people and material resources.
TYPE 2a

9. Mac H.

Response One
I am not interested at this point but might be willing to help on an action team.
TYPE 3

Response Two
Bad timing. Too much I’d rather do right now.
TYPE 3

Response Three
I can now see some of the benefits of the planning together. I can see increased support, seems positive more co-operation and support when we decide together.
TYPE 2b
10. Matthew D.

Response One
No not into it.
TYPE 3

Response Two
Please leave me out of next stage too. I would rather help out in other ways.
TYPE 3

Response Three
Can’t say I have changed my mind much.
TYPE 3

11. Maggie A.

Response One
No. Already booked up. Saturdays not good for me.
TYPE 3

Response Two
Not interested in becoming too involved. I’m busy enough.
TYPE 3

Response Three
We’ll wait for the outcomes but I still don’t believe it it could be worth all the effort that went into it.
TYPE 3

12. Martha T.

Response One
No. Why would I?? Friday night? Saturday?
TYPE 3

Response Two
No again no. Haven’t seen anything yet. No pain, no gain but I say no pain.
TYPE 3
Response Three
Let those enthused individuals continue with their good efforts.
TYPE 3

13. Marg D.

Response One
No thanks, not interested.
TYPE 3

Response Two
Not interested.
TYPE 3

Response Three
Interested in assisting with school grounds project. Money and expertise in place. Good planning and ideas emerged.
TYPE 2a