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ABSTRACT

Purpose of the Study:

Twenty years ago, the Patterson City School Districts (PCSD) implemented a series of restructuring reforms that radically altered power relationships within the district. These reform policies, known as Trust Agreements, shifted decision making authority away from management, vesting new authority in the hands of sites and their teachers. These reforms altered the district and its culture of teachers in both far reaching and unforeseen ways. It is the intent of this historical study to tell this unique story of educational reform, detailing the historical contexts as well as presenting how these reforms are regarded in the PCSD today. This study specifically focuses on how the democratizing nature of these reforms altered power relationships within the PCSD, affecting cultural norms and leadership processes. This study also explores a tentative theory about leadership dynamics in school systems that employ participatory governance practices. This theory posits that teachers that have a high degree of autonomy and are equity-oriented, often undermine leadership interactions.

Procedures:

This study is a historical account and therefore follows the methodologies that necessarily inform this approach. Historical data has been gathered from two primary sources: 1) oral histories, and 2) historical documents. Since the period studied was not that long ago, many of the original authors of Trust Agreements documents were interviewed for this paper. Historical documents have also proven useful in gathering data of this period of reform. In order to obtain data regarding current views of Trust Agreement reform, PCSD site administrators were interviewed as well. These data were analyzed and categorized, culminating in a historical narrative suggested by these findings.
Findings:

The findings that emerged through an analysis of participant data often mirrored themes found in the review of the literature. Data from the Camelot period, a ten-year period considered to be the high-point of district Trust Agreement reforms, reveal increased teacher morale, a strong interest in professional growth, and a shared belief that expanding the role of teachers in the decision making process would improve educational outcomes. These data reveal that successful collaborations, the hallmark of the Camelot era, were enhanced by an abundance of resources made available through the CDE. Data gathered about Trust Agreement reforms during the last ten years establish that SDM processes are still well regarded at individual sites while district Trust Agreement committee processes are seen as being less effective. These findings also chronicle external change forces that altered the educational environment within the district. New state and federal mandates, changing personnel, together with declining resources, combined to undermine the PCSD’s ability to create and sustain alignment mechanisms that had characterized the Camelot period. Data gathered from participants that are currently employed by the PCSD reveal perceptions that achieving organizational and instructional alignment is still an unresolved issue of significant proportion.

Conclusion:

Trust Agreement reforms created sweeping changes within the PCSD. Shared decision making has become deeply embedded within the district in a variety of ways, often altering organizational and cultural dynamics in ways that need to be understood. Based on these data, it is clear that some Trust Agreement mechanisms do not function as well as they need to in today’s educational environment. In addition, the findings suggest that the PCSD still struggles with the crucial task of achieving organizational and instructional alignment—that these important processes are often undermined by strong autonomy norms, pedagogical disagreements, lack of trust, and insufficient support from district management. Data gathered supports the proposed thesis, that highly autonomous, equity oriented teaching staffs, act in ways that constrain leadership interactions. This study concludes with the recommendation that all district constituencies examine Trust Agreement policies to determine if they offer effective solutions that address today’s realities.
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Chapter I: Introduction to the study

Background

During the last quarter of a century, school systems in the United States have been involved in major reform efforts to improve their schools. Central to these reforms have been wide spread efforts to decentralize decision-making authority, moving it from traditional top-down, district directed management structures to individual school sites, where decision-making authority was to be “shared” by all staff members. The impetus for these reforms was the phenomenal success of the Japanese business model, where decision-making authority was broadened to include the workers. This devolution of authority to sites has come to be known as “Site-Based Management” (SBM) and the decision-making process within this system has come to be known as Participative Decision-Making (PDM) or Shared Decision-Making (SDM). At the present time, many school districts have adopted some version of decentralizing authority to school sites and have implemented some version of shared decision-making. The evidence of SBM/SDM effectiveness has been slow to accumulate, but now that a sufficient period of time has passed, many studies have been conducted regarding these reforms and much can be learned.

Public school teachers began unionizing in earnest during the 1960s and 1970s in an attempt to achieve better working conditions and the influence accorded other educated professionals outside the educational workplace. During this time period in public education, districts and school sites exemplified the industrial, “top-down” management model, where authority and decision-making were centralized through the district office. During the sixties and seventies, teachers made definite gains in their
professional roles through the labor/management negotiations process that would come to be known as collective bargaining. However, the centralized structure and power hierarchy that teachers, the union and management spent so much time sparring over, was about to be uprooted in the early eighties.

The seminal work, *A Nation at Risk*, published by the National Commission on Excellence in Education in 1983, proclaimed that a “rising tide of mediocrity” was threatening to overwhelm our public school system, leaving the United States increasingly unable to compete among emerging world powers. This widely read report initiated a tremendous outpouring of activity in response to these alarming charges. Prestigious institutions, such as the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy and the National Governors’ Association voiced their concerns regarding the health of our educational institutions. These reports also refocused attention on the highly popular book written by Thomas Peters and Robert Waterman, entitled *In Search of Excellence*, which elaborated on the best practices of highly successful corporations, thereby inviting comparisons with our school systems. These studies were instrumental in redefining the traditional labor/management working relationship to include greater collaboration and employee participation in decision-making; they were lauded as powerful innovations with great potential.

School reformers were quick to echo the chorus of those advocating that public education should govern and structure itself more like corporate business. Of particular interest at that time was the Japanese corporate model, a model where management gave its employees an active role in the decision-making process while also decentralizing its management structure. In business, these structural reforms proved to be immensely
successful for companies like Sony and Honda, where employee innovation, input and personal initiative were touted as being pivotal for success. The confluence of voices from government, business and educational circles soon gathered momentum, generating a sweeping wave of educational reform that was to alter the landscape of public education.

Both district and union leadership across America played an important role in this reform movement; they mobilized their respective constituencies at their sites in order to reorganize district governance systems, giving more control to sites and giving teachers, represented by their union, a much more active voice in the decision-making process. These reforms were put into effect in various forms during the mid-eighties across the United States and were expected to improve the quality of public education.

Statement of the problem

Approximately two decades ago, the Patterson (a pseudonym) City School District (PCSD) in collaboration with its union affiliate, the Patterson Federation of Teachers, (PFT) were among the first wave of districts across the nation experimenting with SBM and SDM reforms as a way to improve public education. The Patterson City Schools (PCS) and union rationale for choosing such a course of action was essentially simple; they believed that “those who will be affected by a decision should be involved in making it,” that SDM produced better quality decisions that would “result in more effective learning experiences for students” (Educational Policy Trust Agreement in Shared Decision-Making at Schools and Work sites—working draft, 4/18/1989, see appendix B).
Indeed, the PCSD embraced the philosophical tenets of decentralization practices with a unique commitment, crafting four Trust Agreement documents and numerous policies articulating how teachers would be given unprecedented decision-making authority in a wide array of professional matters. District leadership did not realize it at the time, but these reforms were to alter the institution and its membership in important ways. It is the intent of this historical study to tell this unique story of educational reform, detailing the historical contexts, people and key events while interpreting these variables within a larger, cultural context. In addition to seeking to understand and present these variables, this study specifically focuses on how these democratizing reforms altered power relationships within the PCSD, altering cultural norms and leadership processes over time. Finally, this study summarizes essential findings that speak to the outcomes these reforms were intended to produce. Thus, this historical report seeks to address and is guided by these four research questions:

- What were the PCSD Trust Agreement Project, the four Trust Agreement documents, and the historical contexts that informed their inception?
- How have SBM and SDM reforms, which have decentralized and democratized the PCSD’s workplace for nearly two decades, influenced cultural norms within the workplace?
- How have SBM and SDM reforms affected leadership practices within the PCSD?
- What can be learned when examining the history of the Trust Agreement Project that is of value when considering the educational challenges of the current era?
**The Emergence of a Grounded Theory**

The original intention for my thesis was to conduct a straightforward historical research project, essentially anchoring my project in the theoretical models presented in the school reform literature such as *A Nation at Risk* and organized around findings gathered from both oral histories and historical documents. However, as my inquiry deepened and expanded, elements of a grounded theory approach began to emerge that offered a plausible explanation regarding the interrelatedness of the data I was beginning to gather.

During the course of my extensive reading of the literature I came across an article that cited the work of Kuntz & Hoy (1976) who wrote an article entitled, “Leadership Style of Principals and the Professional Zone of Acceptance of Teachers.” This research posited that, “that strong leaders (high in initiating structure) tended to have teachers with a broad zone of acceptance” (Conway, 1984, p.26). This article also cited another study (Driscoll, 1978) that found “organizational trust” to be a better predictor of work satisfaction than participation in the decision-making process, leading them to conclude that “there is a direct association between organizational trust and the size of an individuals zone of acceptance” (Kuntz & Hoy, p 27). My own knowledge of leadership dynamics supported this position, but my current experience of leadership dynamics within a SDM environment was distinctly different. My own experience led me to believe that trust and acceptance of the authority of leadership were unresolved issues that manifested in unique ways within a SDM environment—often fostering, in my view, a weak zone of acceptance of leadership.
While reflecting on the implications of these findings and relating them to my own experiences of leadership dynamics within the PCSD, I began to wonder if the zone of acceptance principle, expressed as: strong initiatory leadership \( \rightarrow \) engenders a strong zone of acceptance implied a corollary, which I expressed as: a weak zone of acceptance \( \rightarrow \) engenders a weak, non-initiatory leadership style. This emerging “weak zone” hypothesis \( wz \rightarrow wl \) seemed to offer a plausible explanation that fit some of the unique challenges that SDM cultures imposed upon its leadership. At that point in my research, I had never read any studies that supported this hypothesis. However, I remained intrigued by this concept and knew that I needed to broaden my field of study to include leadership theory. I was beginning to understand that leadership roles were uniquely defined by the political culture within which they operated.

Eventually I came across the work of political scientist, Aaron Wildavsky, who provided corroboration of my “weak zone” theory in a chapter entitled “A Cultural Theory of Leadership” (Wildavsky, 1989). Wildavsky’s theory of leadership lays out a nine-model construct that matches leadership style with political cultures and the dominant values embraced by those cultures. In his description of one of his cultural models, which he called an “equity regime,” he describes a political culture that values participant equity above all else. He states that such a system generates high demands for leadership but low levels of support—thereby creating real problems for leadership functions. Wildavsky’s description of leadership challenges found within an “equity regime” corroborated the SDM literature and my own experience of leadership dynamics within the SDM culture of the PCSD.
I also continued my exploration of leadership models and found Ogawa and Bossert’s “Institutional” theory of leadership (Ogawa & Bossert, 2000) to be especially useful in my search to make meaning out of the complexities informing leadership processes within a SDM culture. Their theory of “Institutional” leadership de-emphasizes the traditional “positional” and “trait” concepts of leadership theory, positing that leadership potential also resides within a political culture organized around shared meanings and goals. According to “Institutional” leadership theory, effective leaders don’t stand apart from their constituencies, but lead from within the web of human relationships, deftly utilizing “shared values” to influence the meaning people give their experience within the culture.

Both Wildavsky and Ogawa and Bossert have been very instrumental in expanding my own inquiry. They have anchored my own findings regarding the challenges and complexities faced by educational institutions operating within a SDM culture. From their perspective, both cultural and leadership processes are highly interwoven; altering one side of the equation implies that the other side will change as well. Accordingly, if changes such as Trust Agreement reforms are introduced into a political culture that redistributes power among stakeholders, creating as Wildavsky terms, an “equity regime,” it is reasonable to assume that challenges to leadership will soon follow.

**Limitations of the Study**

The primary intent of this historical account is to present both an accurate and meaningful account of Trust Agreement reform as it developed and evolved within the PCSD. In keeping with a historical narrative approach, the findings presented here
represent the author’s interpretation and prioritization of the narrative. I should also point out that I work in and have worked within the district I have chosen to study. Consequently, I have an “insider” experience of the phenomena being examined as well as an unusual degree of access to the participants I have interviewed. This “insider” position in my view, has improved the quality of information I was able to obtain and enabled me to interpret this information through the lens of my own experience. While I have endeavored to be both accurate and fair in gathering and interpreting these data, this process, none-the-less, represents a “single” point of view.

I also acknowledge limitations within the participant sample. While I believe the sample of participants that were interviewed to gather data about the early history of Trust Agreement Project to be quite strong, representing all constituencies that participated in the Project, (with the exception of school board members), the participant sample from which “current time” data was obtained was much narrower. I had originally hoped to conduct a survey that involved all PCSD constituencies, but was unable to proceed with that course of action. This meant that I had to conduct interviews, a fruitful, but very time consuming process. In order to limit this project in a way that was workable for me as well as maintain the integrity of the research, I chose to focus on a middle management perspective of Trust Agreement reforms of the “current era.” This sample is composed of current and former PCSD site administrators. As such, this sample represents a strong sampling of PCSD middle management while excluding the perspective of teachers, district management, and its school board. Thus, the findings presented in section four of Chapter IV, “The Current Era,” specifically represent the
views of those interviewed and should not be generalized beyond this specific group or time frame.

Definition of Terms

Trust Agreement: A management/labor negotiations tool designed to create more flexible, non-adversarial ways of bringing management and labor together in order to craft education reform policies.

Site-based management: The organizational structure that defines the school site as the unit having the authority to make many important decisions regarding educational programs and practices. Site-based management involves the school’s stakeholders, i.e., the principal, teachers, other staff, students, parents and other community members in decision-making processes that shape school programs.

Shared decision-making: The decision-making process where authority to make most decisions is no longer held by top level management and is shared by various stakeholders including district office management, site principals, teachers, other staff members, students, parents and community members.

Decentralization: The delegation of authority away from a centralized management hierarchy to decision-making structures that incorporate multiple levels of staff participation.

Restructuring: Another name given to reform policies and practices that shifted decision-making authority from district office management to school sites and their various stakeholders.
Alignment: One of the definitions that Webster’s dictionary lists for this noun is “a state of agreement or cooperation among persons, groups, nations, etc., with a common cause or viewpoint” (*Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language*, 2001).

Charismatic leader: One whose personal qualities and leadership acts inspire trust, enthusiasm and devotion among followers. Such a leader activates interpersonal talents, and exhibits a genuine embodiment of the values and aspirations of those led.
Chapter II: Review of the Literature

*Rationales for SBM/SDM*

There have been many reasons offered for including teachers, support staff and parents in the decision-making process. Perhaps the key rationale for this decentralization of power is the popular concept that those closest to the actual work have the greatest understanding of and commitment to work related issues. “The assumptions underlying this devolution and redistribution of decision-making authority are that greater ownership, morale and commitment among stakeholders will result and that decisions made at the local level are likely to be more responsive to the specific, individual school contexts” (Stevenson, 2001, p.103). Thus it is assumed that a variety of stakeholders, including teachers, administrators, support staff and parents, will produce a collaborative team approach that yields deeper understandings and commitment to each site’s unique issues. In short, the literature posits that these grass roots collaborations are expected to produce better instructional methodologies, greater accountability and improve student learning (Stevenson, 2001; Leithwood & Menzies, 1997; Smylie, Lazarus, & Brownlee-Conyers, 1996; McNeil & McNeil, 1994; Weiss, 1993).

SBM/SDM reforms are seen as being especially potent in their ability to increase teacher professionalism and improve teacher morale. They give participants bargaining power in a wide array of issues and a sense of being invested or committed to carrying out decisions that are felt to be important. Heightening teacher professionalism is seen to lead to increased morale, greater accountability for and commitment to the decisions they make (Weiss, 1993).
Another important rationale for the implementation of SBM/SDM reform is its proclaimed ability to “democratize” the workplace and serve as a model of democracy-in-action. SBM/SDM practices give participants many opportunities to engage in empowering discourse and consensus building activities that are vital components of a democratic society (Anderson, 1999). SBM/SDM processes actively redistribute power by giving people a voice in the decision-making process, which facilitate “the breaking down of barriers of authority and of isolation” (Johnson, & Pajares, 1996, p. 623). These reform processes also encourage community participation and ownership of the change process that is seen as being a necessary ingredient of a healthy democracy.

The Difficulty of Evaluating SBM/SDM Reform

It is very difficult to formulate and present an accurate, generalizable set of conclusions for SBM/SDM reforms. As shown by the literature, varying degrees of success that schools experience with this reform process are attributed to a multitude of complex factors. SBM/SDM structures, by their inherent nature, are idiosyncratic; they are designed and enacted to fit the unique needs of each site and reflect each site’s individual culture. There are no set rules or guidelines to follow and those that do embark upon this reform process receive widely varying amounts of training in the shared decision-making process. All of these factors add up to the inescapable fact that there are many different models and degrees of SBM/SDM implementation, and are therefore hard to critique in a satisfactory manner, yielding to, as (Smylie et al., 1996, p. 182) posit, “equivocal conclusions.”

Much of the SBM/SDM research done to date are studies presenting data derived from the early stages of institutions grappling with the complexities created by these
reforms. This factor cannot be overlooked in terms of how it affects the data; these studies reflect the struggles and frustrations that are to be expected in any new startup situation and need to be evaluated from this perspective. Since sites implementing SBM/SDM reforms characteristically spend a lot of time helping their staffs become comfortable with these new decision-making processes, it is not surprising that many studies report findings that stating that SBM/SDM reforms have been far more successful at implementing structural rather than instructional changes. While there is strong evidence to support this contention, one has to temper one’s rush to judgment with a careful consideration of key factors that limit implementation. As (Bauer, 1998) contends, it is troublesome to evaluate the efficacy of specific processes when those reform efforts are often implemented in ways that significantly undermine their effectiveness.

Another complication in presenting an accurate picture of SBM/SDM reforms that critics cite is the contention that the research done in this area is simply not very sound. Smylie et al., (1996) point out that many studies are often no more than position papers or project descriptions, and that much of this research has been based on very little empirical evidence, use of control groups or formal theory. As a result, the nature of the evidence available for review makes it is hard to untangle all of these variables in a manner that presents an accurate picture. Nevertheless, the literature has produced a substantial amount of evidence of both the positive and negative outcomes attributed to SBM/SDM reforms.
What the Literature Says

The abundance of research on SBM/SDM reform efforts has produced a complex and often ambiguous trail of evidence. However, patterns have emerged as a result of these studies that suggest ways to focus our inquiry. The research findings coalesce around three categories of SBM/SDM efficacy: 1) improved participant professionalism; 2) improved educational outcomes; and 3) the benefits of democratizing the workplace (Weiss, 1993).

Increased Professionalism

SBM/SDM’s ability to introduce and maintain collaborative processes that are linked to increased professionalism in the workplace is well documented. There is a general agreement that these reforms have been successful in creating new opportunities for participation and new opportunities for people’s ‘voice’ to be heard. Many studies relate how these types of reforms were instrumental in increasing critical dialogue, innovation, a sense of community and accountability (Griffin, 1995; Wagstaff, 1995; Jenkins et al., 1994). Johnson & Pajares, (1996) point to SBM/SDM as being a viable tool of empowerment, where stakeholders participate in collaborative decision-making situations and are valued for their input. Studies contend that the participative nature of SBM/SDM processes alter school culture by creating a collaborative atmosphere, which, in turn, mitigates a sense of teacher isolation (Wagstaff, 1995; Johnson & Pajares, 1996; Weiss, & Cambone, 2000). These same studies also found that teachers reported a sense of ownership in the decisions they were making and a heightened sense of commitment to actualize their decisions. A key theme that weaves through the SBM/SDM literature is that stakeholders who are most intimately involved with daily educational issues are the
ones best equipped to offer innovative solutions. Beck & Murphy (1998) report that SBM/SDM structures were instrumental in creating a collaborative dialogue that led to new innovations.

These are indeed, positive outcomes that are observed in some sites practicing SBM/SDM reforms. While linking these outcomes directly to SBM/SDM reforms is a dubious endeavor due to a complex number of variables, it is defensible to state that these participative processes supply some of the conditions for increasing the productivity of schools (Leithwood & Menzies, 1997). Other researchers, notably Smylie, et al., (1996), and Beck & Murphy, (1998) also present evidence that SBM/SDM reforms, if implemented effectively, can foster mechanisms linked to improved educational outcomes.

*Improved Educational Outcomes*

There are two categories of educational outcomes that need to be evaluated in terms of how they are influenced by SBM/SDM processes. There are studies that report on the efficacy of these reforms to create supportive conditions for curriculum and instruction related initiatives and there are studies that report on SBM/SDMs ability to raise student performance.

There is some evidence that SBM/SDM processes alter working conditions in ways that have beneficial effects in the area of curriculum and instruction (Beck & Murphy, 1998; Wagstaff, 1995). Wagstaff’s (1995) study cites that SBM/SDM governance impacted both curriculum and instruction through structural innovations such as new scheduling of honors classes, block scheduling, mentor teaming, inter-grade level
planning and other team arrangements specifically designed to effect instructional issues. Jenkins et al., (1994) also reports success in the area of program modifications designed to improve instruction. Smylie et al., (1996) found a significant correlation between committee collaborations and the degree of accountability and learning opportunities for teachers. Studies such as these demonstrate that SBM/SDM has had a favorable impact on facilitating effective collaborations among stakeholders for the purpose of creating optimal conditions for student learning. This type of evidence does add credence to the original rationale that decisions “shared” by those involved with the actual work, those that have intimate knowledge of the issues at hand, construct the most effective solutions.

There are also quite a few studies that attempt to determine how SBM/SDM processes affect student performance. If it is demonstrated that these types of reforms are successful in creating collaborations and structural changes that support optimal learning conditions, then increased student performance should be in evidence after a reasonable period of time at sites where these “optimizing” structures and processes have been put in place. There is some data indicating that improved student performance is sometimes associated with SBM/SDM reforms. Smylie et al., (1996,) report gains on standardized test scores in schools operating with highly participative, instructionally oriented building councils while finding declines in scores in schools operating with building councils exhibiting the least amount of participation and instruction oriented behaviors. Beck & Murphy, (1998) found that learning outcomes of a site they studied did improve after the implementation of SBM/SDM governance structures, but were not willing to attribute these improvements to the change in governance structures. However, they concluded that newly implemented SBM/SDM practices contributed in ways such as involving
teachers and the greater community in the decision-making process, which they felt contributed to the overall learning environment of the school. Despite positive findings that SBM/SDM practices have proven successful in initiating structural and cultural changes, there is general agreement that implementing these changes have had a minimal effect on student performance (Stevenson, 2001; Beck & Murphy, 1998; Leithwood & Menzies, 1997; Smylie et al., 1996; Weiss, 1993).

*Democratizing the Workplace*

The literature is rich in its accounts of how SBM/SDM processes have democratized the workplace. In fact, a large number of studies focus on SBM/SDM’s ability to redistribute power to all stakeholders by mandating their involvement in the decision-making process. If one judges the SBM/SDM reform movement based on how well these practices have given stakeholders a voice in the decision-making process, then this movement must be deemed highly successful. Johnson & Pajares (1996, p. 602) draw on Foster’s leadership model, which posits that leadership is not positional but resides in “leadership acts” that embody the “communication of possibilities.” SBM/SDM practices give participants many opportunities to engage in “leadership acts” thereby empowering discourse and consensus building activities that are seen to be vital components of a democratic society (Anderson, 1999). SBM/SDM processes actively redistribute power by giving people a voice in the decision-making process, which facilitates “the breaking down of barriers of authority and of isolation” (Johnson & Pajares, 1996, p.623). An often-heard sentiment throughout the literature is that shared decision-making feels intuitively right in our democratic society; it appeals to our sense of fairness and encourages rational participation for self and collective interests.
The Shadow Side of SBM/SDM Reform

When one reads the literature on SBM/SDM reforms, one is struck by the amount of contradictory evidence that has accumulated; for every positive characteristic that is attributed to SBM/SDM, in many instances its opposite is also in evidence. This is due, in part, to the fact that when many voices are brought into the decision-making process, more “energy” is present; energy that can manifest in constructive or debilitating ways. For example, Smylie et al., (1996, p.193) contend that if participative decision-making processes are contentious, “…where it exposes divisiveness within a school’s community, or where it takes time and attention away from classroom instruction, student outcomes could be affected negatively.” SBM/SDM reforms are charged with responding to or giving a voice to stakeholders, so it stands to reason that this process will mirror the school/community culture and all its constituencies. SBM/SDM reforms magnify the political forces that are already embedded within school and community culture and sometimes spawn unintended consequences.

As Fullan, (1995, p. 1) argues so convincingly, school systems are under siege from many reform agendas, resulting in debilitating “constant overload, fragmentation, and mystery.” The public school system is deluged with information overload and multiple priorities, making it very difficult to navigate through this maze of competing agendas. Adding SBM/SDM governance processes into this mix injects yet another layer of complexity and potential fragmentation. A common, yet significant theme that emerges in the literature is that districts and schools using SBM/SDM structures and processes have had a hard time defining a coherent vision and an explicit set of goals aimed at improving student performance. These schools spend a large percentage of their time
focusing on structural changes and often ignore issues that effect teaching and learning (Weiss, 1993). Some educators contend that SBM/SDM processes should be called a structural reform as opposed to an educational reform because its primary focus has more impact on structural changes. Several examples are noted in the literature, which illustrate this structural focus.

A common finding cited in the literature of those involved in SBM/SDM, is that teachers spend too much time on “administrivia,” which leaves little time left for deep, pedagogical considerations that directly effect student performance (Stevenson, 2001; Weiss, 1993). It has also been argued that the time spent in endless structural considerations, as Weiss, (1993) contends, making decisions about how to make decisions, creates such a burdensome working environment that participants often feel overwhelmed and over committed beyond what is reasonable and sustainable (Leithwood & Menzies, 1997; Reitzug & Capper, 1996; Wagstaff, 1995; Weiss, 1993). Stevenson (2001) suggests that districts and schools new to SBM/SDM governance structures may have such a steep learning curve adapting to these new systems that significant periods of time and training may be needed before stakeholders are able to “trust” in the new system and become “empowered” players. He concludes that there is little “transfer” (p. 14) between developing competence in negotiating organizational changes and developing competence in dealing effectively with teaching and learning issues to improve student learning. The literature is full of corroborating evidence establishing that SBM/SDM has done little to improve student performance (Beck & Murphy, 1998; Leithwood & Menzies, 1997; Jenkins et. al., 1994; Weiss, 1993).
There are many explanations that researchers have cited that can account for SBM/SDM’s ineffective record regarding improving teaching and learning. One plausible explanation, according to Bauer (1998), is that sites are rarely able to fully implement reforms enacted through SBM/SDM processes due to a host of factors. Studies often include a section that articulates the “constraining factors” in evidence that limit the effectives of reform efforts. Lack of time, resources, inability to reach consensus, and teacher burnout are often included in these explanations.

Now that schools using SBM/SDM governance have existed long enough to yield a wide range of research data, it is clear that one factor stands out as being particularly significant in limiting SBM/SDM effectiveness; sites using SBM/SDM governance processes often do a poor job on focusing their efforts on goals that directly relate to improving curriculum, instructional practices and the implementation of explicit learning objectives (Stevenson, 2001; Bauer, 1998; Weiss, 1993). Bauer (1998) notes that researchers ignore the fact that the majority of SBM/SDM reforms are structural in intent; they focus on empowering stakeholders and are not explicitly designed to raise student performance. All too often, SBM/SDM committees are diverted by structural challenges and have little energy left to pursue issues related to teaching and learning. These findings do not support commonly held assumptions that SBM/SDM processes will eventually “trickle down” resulting in higher student achievement. As Weiss (1993) points out, SBM/SDM governance is not a linear process that, once started, systematically develops to its maturity; there are simply too many conditions that emerge, often undermining the original reform. In fact, Stevenson (2001) contends that districts and schools using participative governance processes are mishandling opportunities to
maximize the strengths of a participative process because of a lack of vision regarding effective teaching along with an absence of goals for student achievement. Weiss & Cambone (2000) found that SBM/SDM reform was sometimes at odds with trying to enact reforms that focus on educational practice, that resources expended on making SDM practices work sometimes had an adverse effect on enacting educational reforms. They contended that principals expended “their credits on trying to make SDM work when their real goals were bringing about changes in teaching and learning” (Weis & Cambone, p. 381).

A repeated theme in the literature is that SBM/SDM is not an end in itself and should not be the focus of reform efforts. In contrast to this often-reported scenario, McNeill & McNeil (1994) cite a promising example of SDM that prioritizes its work around student outcomes.

What is so different about this model for SDM is its exclusive focus on the assessment of student outcomes. The assessment of the district’s progress and performance with respect to student achievement is essential; it goes to the very heart of why the district is engaged in the business of education—helping students learn what they need to know. The assessment of exit outcomes by school-based SDM committees will also provide the district with the critical feedback it needs with regard to almost everything else it does. (p. 258)

Brost (2000) contends that the goal of SBM/SDM reform during the last decade has shifted its focus from teacher empowerment to improving student performance. It is not surprising, in this author’s view, that the current reform movement in vogue, involving standards and accountability measures, owes some of its impetus to SBM/SDM’s inability to improve student learning. Since the large majority of teaching professionals do not want to give up the conditions they have gained under SBM/SDM, there is wide
agreement that schools using these reform processes must do a better job defining both organizational and performance goals that directly effect student performance.

The literature reveals many other interesting findings in schools and districts where SBM/SDM reforms have been implemented. There is a lot of data that indicate that SBM/SDM processes can be unproductive due to the unpredictable dynamics that are sometimes active in group processes. Brown (2001, p. 8) states, “...that changing established relationships in schools erects barriers to educational reform.” This is a very interesting statement because it directly contradicts one of the original assumptions that is a key rationale for SBM/SDM reform; that teaching and learning are improved when those with the most intimate working knowledge of the issues are involved with the decision-making process.

However, the research indicates that bringing teachers into the decision-making process significantly alters participant power relationships, leading to unexpected cultural consequences that often have an undermining effect on educational reform. For example, Brown (2001) reports that teachers use their new negotiating capacities to strengthen their power base, and to challenge or co-opt the educational agenda. Weiss & Cambone (2000, p. 370) report that teachers were often reluctant to embrace innovations and tended to act as a “brake on reform.” Unforeseen consequences also take less obvious, seemingly passive forms as well. Wood (1989) found that SBM/SDM committees charged with specific tasks were very concerned with maintaining group harmony; this dynamic undermined staff accountability, reaching true consensus and completing tasks. This study also led her to conclude that high-status participants inhibited the voice of those with less status and therefore limited the scope of effective participation. Griffin (1995)
also notes that “politeness” was an unspoken norm that inhibited group-member discussion and limited their effectiveness. In contrast to this phenomenon, Johnson & Pajares (1996) found that SBM/SDM processes could sometimes unleash potentially divisive forces such as disagreement and personal attacks. Perhaps the specter of conflict contributes to staff silencing norms that work to eliminate conflict and disagreement. Of course this begs the question, what else is being eliminated from collegial dialogue because of this strong need for politeness and what are the unintended consequences?

While Smylie’s (1996) study reports that enthusiastic participative processes can lead to increased frequency of conversations focusing on teaching and learning, the literature does indicate that bringing teachers into the decision-making process has often not been productive in the area of teaching and learning. Miller (1995, p. 2) argues that “teachers are likely to resist decisions that require them to make drastic changes in the way that they teach,” and that “teachers …saw themselves as conservators of traditional educational values and time tested, proven methods, resisting the numbing effects of bureaucracy and the faddish innovations of ambitious administrators and zealous reformers.” Bauer (1998) challenges the assumption regarding the benefits of citizen participation in decision-making committees with findings that asserted that citizen participation, while increasing input, has not led to better quality decisions.

It is also interesting to note in the literature that teachers did not engage issues around curriculum and instruction with the seriousness that one might expect in a SBM/SDM environment specifically designed to bring more informed voices to the table. Studies point to cultural factors such as strong norms among teachers that had the effect of negating conversations related to teaching and learning. Brost (2000) found that strong
norms of teacher autonomy could put up roadblocks that limited the development of serious, professional conversations. Even though charged with decision-making tasks, teachers tended to avoid decisions that were perceived as having the potential to impact curriculum issues, or personal teaching style. Scribner et al. (1999) reported that team “like mindedness” and “self adulation” had a stultifying effect on critical reflection. Griffin (1995) reported a similar finding where staff members did not have a serious approach to pedagogical issues, due, in part, to the contention that these teachers had high opinions of their competence and were not interested in going beyond what they already had accomplished. This study also found that teachers did not question their own pedagogical expertise and were uncomfortable questioning the teaching practices of other teachers because of an unspoken norm that made reflecting on and questioning one another’s teaching practices taboo. Contrary to an original assumption, that increased teacher participation leads to better quality staff collaborations, many studies note cultural norms that encourage the persistence of isolationist teaching practices and resistance to deep pedagogical enquiry.

Change Agents and Leadership in an SBM/SDM Environment

There is quite a lot of speculation in the literature regarding what elements of SBM/SDM are the most significant as change agents, or causal conditions that support positive educational reform. Proponents of SBM/SDM governance structures have always argued for the potential inherent in a participative process paradigm. While this logic proved to have, and still has, an undeniable egalitarian appeal, research has shown that successes attributed to participative governance structures are often not causally linked to reform outcomes. In fact, Beck & Murphy (1998) discounted SBM/SDM reform
as the primary cause for successful educational outcomes at the site they studied. After a careful analysis, they concluded that these positive outcomes were driven by

…deep commitments on the parts of individuals and groups: (a) to promote powerful student learning; (b) to function as a caring and supportive community; (c) to invest time and resources in activities that build the capacity of adults to work more effectively with children; and (d) to assume responsibility for seeing that what needs to be done, in fact, gets done. In an interesting way, these factors are simultaneously causes, conditions, and outcomes of change. (p. 382)

Both Beck & Murphy (1998), and Leithwood & Menzies (1997) contend that SBM/SDM reforms are effective vehicles for engaging participation and providing suitable governance structures that can nourish or culture the ‘real’ catalysts of the reform process. In other words, deeply committed educators acting with sustained intentionality to improve student performance make the difference.

This brings us to the consideration of the importance of leadership, its place in the reform process and its influence on student achievement. The literature tells us that effective leadership within our schools is essential for success. With regard for improving student outcomes, the review of research compiled by Leithwood, K. et al., (2004, p. 5) reveal that “…leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to what students learn at school.” The meta-analysis of school reform research done by Marzano, R. et al., (2003, p.172) found that “leadership could be considered the single most important aspect of effective school reform.” The literature also supports the contention that the leadership of the principal, or the lack of it, has been a significant determinant of outcomes in SBM/SDM environments (Johnson & Pajares, 1996; Sidener, et al., 1995; Weiss, 1993). Weiss & Cambone, 2000) found that
successful reforms enacted in SBM/SDM driven sites were often attributable to the commitment and change-oriented leadership of the principal.

However, what is surprisingly unreported in the literature of SBM/SDM reform is an examination of how shared governance structures affect leadership processes and outcomes. Since the literature has established the relevance of leadership in educational reform, and given the fact that SBM/SDM reforms radically alter the dynamics of leadership structures and processes, it is prudent to question how these reforms affect the quality of leadership within our schools. For this analysis, I draw upon the “Institutional” theory of leadership of educational researchers, Rodney Ogawa and Steven Bossert and the “Cultural Theory” writings of social science researcher, Aaron Wildavsky. Even though the work of these researchers span two different fields, their work emphasizes the importance of organizational and cultural contexts that circumscribe leadership actions.

Ogawa and Bossert’s “Institutional” theory of leadership (Ogawa & Bossert, 2000) departs from traditional leadership theory, which emphasizes organizational roles, and individual traits that are actualized to influence behavior in organizations to influence goal attainment. “Institutional” theory focuses on the importance of organizational, cultural and survival realities that inform our public schools and have a tremendous influence on leadership. Ogawa and Bossert argue that our public schools “face a constant struggle for legitimacy” (Ogawa & Bossert, p. 47), which also affects the survival, or sustainability of school programs. They contend that survival, which is often linked with the ability to
please constituencies in order to insure funding, is the overarching goal that shapes school organizations. Therefore, gaining social legitimacy by being seen acting in ways that mirror societal values is a key function of leadership.

Ogawa and Bossert also assert that because of the difficulty in demonstrating success in society’s educational marketplace, public schools often “decouple” administrative structures from the outcomes they are intended to produce in order to pursue legitimacy. “Thus, they decouple to reduce the likelihood that inconsistencies between structure and activity will not be discovered. For example, after a new instructional program is adopted by a school district, it is common for administrators not to monitor its implementation” (Ogawa & Bossert, p.46). Because it is essential for schools to appear successful, they contend that certain structures, which have become institutionalized or imbued with a specific meaning within that organizational culture, “…can serve as a focus of symbolic activity,” fostering “…the development of shared meaning and values among organizations’ members…[that] in turn, can produce commitments to engage in coordinated, or organized action” (Ogawa & Bossert, p. 46). They cite SBM as an example of how districts create structures to gain legitimacy among various constituencies without having to show evidence that such an approach improves student performance. This example of decoupling demonstrates how districts often laud programs that are actually symbolic, i.e., they stand in for the outcome they are supposed to produce—the process attains the status and legitimacy of the desired product or outcome. Decoupling is achieved through fuzzy or nonexistent accountability mechanisms. When district leadership is inconsistent or not explicit
in monitoring performance, they can continue to point to all the programs that have been implemented without having to show hard data demonstrating their efficacy—or lack of it.

Ogawa & Bossert (2000, p. 39) state that, “…we treat leadership as a quality of organizations—a systemic characteristic” where “…leadership shapes the systems that produce patterns of interaction and the meanings that other participants attach to organizational events.” They contend that social interactions within the organization are the “…medium by which leadership is exerted,” (Ogawa & Bossert, p.51) that the “…interact, not the act, becomes the basic building block of organizational leadership.” (Ogawa & Bossert, p. 50). Ogawa & Bossert’s “Institutional” leadership theory suggests that effective leadership influences the meaning people ascribe to events within a cultural context, thereby affecting intended outcomes.

Although a social scientist, Wildavsky (1989) looks at leadership theory from a similar lens that also emphasizes the influence of culture on leadership. He is credited, along with Michael Thompson, a noted anthropologist, with being the developers of Cultural Theory, Douglas (2005). However, these two academics borrowed this framework from Mary Douglas, an anthropologist who had originally developed what she called the Grid/Group model. Douglas created this framework to explain how control dynamics, specifically cultural values and constraints exerted through group rules and expectations, establish a cultural typology that posits four basic cultures. This model (see Figure 1.) displays two vertices that represent specific dimensions of societal control.
The constraining/socializing mechanism exerted by groups on individuals is represented by the horizontal, “Group” axis while the vertical, “Grid” axis represents the degree rules or expectations are imposed and tolerated within groups. The intersection of these two dimensions, expressed a continuum of transmission (from low to high and few to many) along these axes, gives rise to the Grid/Group, four-quadrant model. This model, (See Figure 2.), posits four basic types of social organization, or political cultures, Gastil, J., Braman, D., Kahan, D.M., & Slovic, P., (2005). Wildavsky and Thompson took this model and developed it into what is currently known as Cultural Theory. According to Wildavsky, a basic premise of this theory is that individuals are unable (due to lack of time and capacity) to make informed choices on matters that affect their personal welfare and therefore instinctively rely on their cultural affiliation to “orient” their decision-making process. An individual’s identification with a set of cultural values and their basic disposition towards power and authority creates “[a] cultural bias [that] is a point of view, with its own framing assumptions and
readily available solutions for standardized problems” (Douglas, 1997, p. 128). Cultural identification and cultural conflict is therefore seen as a way “through which diverse citizens apprehend (author’s italics) their common interests” (Gaskil et al. 2005, p.31). Wildavsky also relates Cultural Theory to leadership processes, contending that “…leadership is a function of regime or political culture…” and that “…macropolitical regimes constrain the micropolitics of individual encounters” (Wildavsky, 1989, p. 98). He stresses the importance of organizational culture, stating “…the important decisions that individuals make are simultaneously choices of culture. People discover their preferences by continually constructing and deconstructing their culture through decision making” (Wildavsky, p. 98-99).

What is interesting and unique about Wildavsky’s work is that he proposes a construct that contains four models of political cultures, their unique cultural descriptors, and leadership styles that are the best fits for those models. The point of Wildavsky’s construct is to link, or show how political cultures and leadership functions are interconnected and to examine the implications of this symbiosis.

Each of the following models, as they are depicted in Figures 3, 4, and 5, demonstrate the interplay of cultural forces and leadership functions. Of particular interest for this study is cultural model # 2, which Wildavsky calls an “equity regime.” As described in these three charts, equity regimes, in Nine Models of Cultures (Figure 3.), have leadership that function within an organizational framework that exacts few prescriptions within a strong group. In Styles of Leadership By Political Regimes, (Figure 4.), communitarian or equity regimes,
because of their egalitarian ethos, give rise to an “all-or-nothing” (Wildavsky, p. 101) acceptance of leadership, thus making it “discontinuous” and ideally suited to the “charismatic” leader. In Political Balance in (Anti) Leadership Systems (Figure 5.), communitarian, or equity regimes, are described as (anti) leadership regimes because the political culture informing leadership places a high demand on leadership while offering weak levels of support that are necessary for effective leadership.

Figure 3.
Nine Models of Cultures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Fatalistic</th>
<th>3. Hierarchical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESPOTIC</td>
<td>POSITIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Market</td>
<td>2. Communitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuous</td>
<td>Discontinuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METEORIC</td>
<td>CHARISMATIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Styles of Leadership By Political Regimes
Equity regimes describe the politics and organizing mechanisms found in SBM/SDM school districts and particularly the district that is the subject of this study. Because Wildavsky contends that leadership is both a function and consequence of regimes, or political cultures, it is very interesting to examine how leadership functions are influenced in an equity driven system. Wildavsky states that equity regimes constrain leadership, that “...equities are in trouble because there is too much demand and too little support; they need leadership to stay together, but they manufacture, so to speak, anti-leadership antibodies” (Wildavsky, p. 105).

He also posits that equity regimes, (and therefore SBM/SDM regimes) by their very nature, reject hierarchical constructs such as leadership and other forms of authority because they imply inequality and are therefore regarded with...
suspicion. Wildavsky reflects on how cultural norms within an equity regime continually undermine leadership by stating that:

When all are equal, who is supposed to do what is unclear. …Endless factional struggles beset regimes that have no internal authority and thus no mode of settling disputes except by starting one’s own sect. Ordinary leadership is anathema because it represents a prima facie instance of inequality. …The voluntary and collective character of equities extends to the necessity of gaining agreement on each and every issue, rather than just the most important ones. Thus, there is no disposition to follow merely because an erstwhile leader tells you to do so. Egalitarian regimes often engage in tearing down leaders as soon as they rear their ugly heads.” (Wildavsky, p. 103)

The SBM/SDM literature cited thus far certainly describes educational reforms that are egalitarian and are therefore subject to all the constraints that occur in regimes that have a high demand for leadership but find countless ways to undermine those very processes and functions.

The point of including the leadership theories of Ogawa & Bossert and Wildavsky is to emphasize the importance of the interrelatedness of culture and leadership, stressing, as Ogawa & Bossert assert, that social interaction or human relationship is the medium through which leadership flows; and, as Wildavsky asserts, that political systems highly influence the type and effectiveness of leadership within those systems. One must examine the implications of these theories when looking at leadership processes and functions in school districts that have adopted SBM/SDM reforms. Clearly, it is worthwhile to ponder how leadership can operate effectively in an environment that sorely needs effective leadership but has embraced a political system that constrains leadership processes.

Leithwood (1994) also writes about the concepts of “transactional” leadership and “transformational” leadership that are useful to consider in this context. The transactional
model is equated with managerial leadership where leaders are called to work within the equilibrium of an existing system. The transformational model, in contrast, calls for leadership acts that are charged with the purpose of motivating followers beyond the status quo. The recent meta-analysis work of Marzano, R. et al (2005), which synthesizes the work of many important studies on leadership and educational reform, has also yielded some very interesting findings. This study posits that second-order change, or deep change that “…alters the system in fundamental ways, offering a dramatic shift in requiring new ways of thinking and acting,” (Marzano, R. et al. 2005 p. 66), necessitates leadership skills that are “transformative,” (referred to as level-two leadership), as opposed to transactional leadership. This study also argues that serious school reform often fails because leadership does not recognize what level of change their reforms necessitate and thus do not mobilize the appropriate level of leadership assets.

The implication of this research and what has been borne out by the SBM/SDM literature, is that problems arise in situations where “transformative” leadership is needed to envision/enact solutions within an educational culture and governance structure that is essentially unsupportive of leadership. According to Wildavsky, equity regimes are highly conflicted regarding leadership roles and are prone to rejecting authority. Interestingly, Weiss & Cambone (2000, p. 376-377) found that reform oriented principals at the SDM sites they studied “…experienced the most conflict of any schools in the study,” and “…generated opposition among significant portions of the faculty.” This study also pointed out a paradoxical dynamic that existed at sites lead by reform-oriented principals; while these principals were the most committed to SBM/SDM practices, their actions evoked noticeably more dissention compared with principals who took less active
of fruitful collaborations between these two groups (Koppich & Kerchner, 2000, 1990; Bascia, 1991; Kerchner, 1979). A new labor/management negotiations tool was needed, one that was to exist alongside the collective bargaining agreement, one that would articulate new ways that management, teachers and the union could work together on innovative educational reforms.

Other studies were published at this time in California that also supported this view. A 1986 research study entitled, *A View from the Classroom: California Teachers’ Opinion on Working Conditions and School Reform Proposals* published powerful data that supported the growing number of reform advocates that lauded the efficacy of structural reform and greater teacher involvement (Koppich et al. 1986). This report went on to say that California teachers were the “untapped resource,” a vital component that policy makers needed to involve in the decision-making process to generate meaningful reform. The recommendations made by this study, if enacted, would significantly restructure the ways schools operate in California. In addition, this study reported on the prevailing mood among California teachers at that time, characterizing them as “…a frustrated profession on the brink of change” (Koppich, et al., p. 15). Policy makers regarded this frustration as being symptomatic of an antiquated labor/management bargaining system, a system that minimized the contributions of teachers and kept them from the “professional” status they desired.

In 1985, the California Commission on the Teaching Profession published a report entitled, *Who Will Teach Our Children?* This report laid out several recommendations (See appendix D) including the development of a new management/labor negotiations tool that had come to be known as a “Trust Agreement.” This new negotiations tool
allowed both management and labor greater flexibility to bargain in a far more expansive manner. In response to the recommendations of *Who Will Teach Our Children?*, a special one-year pilot project known as, *The Trust Agreement Project: Broadening the Vision of School Labor-Management Relations*, was funded by the Stuart Foundation of San Francisco in 1987. Its mission was to test the viability of this new labor-management tool as a vehicle for supporting promising educational reforms. This project was a collaboration involving the California Federation of Teachers, the California School Boards Association and was under the guidance of the Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), (See Appendix D). The purposes of the Trust Agreement Project were twofold: “(1) to develop new forms of school organization and new patterns of relationships among teachers and administrators and (2) to expand the range of labor-management discussions in education from the technical, procedural work rules that are the traditional purview of collective bargaining to substantive areas of educational policy” (Koppich & Kerchner, 1988, p. 8).

During the first year of this project, six California districts were chosen to participate. Inclusion in this endeavor was largely due to demonstrated strength of union membership, district/union willingness to engage in innovative collaborations and the harmonious relationships that existed between labor and management in their respective districts. At the time of this project, Trust Agreements were considered written “compacts” between the district, its teachers and the union, who represented its teachers. These agreements were designed to bring teachers and management together for the specific purpose of working on areas of educational reform that were the shared priorities of both teachers and management (Koppich & Kerchner).
While there were no specific definitions of Trust Agreements, a Trust Agreement, as articulated in the year-one policy paper *The Trust Agreement Project: Broadening the Vision of School Labor-Management Relations*, was the written evidence that authority to act or control resources for specific educational reforms had been transferred from management to a joint committee composed of both teachers and administration. These agreements were founded on the implicit understanding that it was advantageous for all parties to conduct negotiations in a trusting, civil manner. Trust Agreements of this period were written with the following specific elements: 1) a statement of purpose that clearly spells out project goals; 2) identifies funding sources; 3) contains a clear articulation of participant roles, responsibilities and timelines; and 4) a dispute resolving mechanism (Koppich & Kerchner, p. 24).

The six participating districts were Lompoc, Patterson, San Francisco, Santa Cruz, Newport-Mesa and Poway. These districts were given the freedom to choose an area of educational reform that fit their needs. These reform areas that were chosen were typically outside the scope of collective bargaining and were the following: peer assistance and review, staff development, school-based management, staff evaluation, paraprofessional career programs and a literature based reading program.

*High Expectations for Union Driven Reform*

The Trust Agreement Project brought its own set of goals and assumptions that reflected a union perspective and its unique language. This project was essentially an experiment; a pilot project designed to implement structural reforms that decentralized authority while giving teachers and union representatives a more prominent role in the
ways schools operated and carried out their core mission of providing a quality education for all students. The driving premise that informed both the national school restructuring movement and the California Trust Agreement Project was that decentralization (SBM) and involving teachers in the decision-making process (SDM) would professionalize the workplace, resulting in numerous reforms and improved student performance. Specifically, these union-driven reforms were touted as being symbiotic, fostering outcomes such as: a new vision of possibilities, shared by management, teachers and the union; dynamic and innovative collaborations; new modes of principal leadership; greater teacher participation in school reform projects; development of empowered teacher leaders; and teachers taking mutual responsibility for the quality of their teaching craft (Koppich & Kerchner, 1993). Kerchner and other union reformers felt that these attributes and processes would flow from the dynamic synergy created by structural reform and dubbed this union approach, the new “professional unionism” (Kerchner, 1993, p. 9). He also posited that three conditions needed to be in place in order to nurture this new union-driven professionalism: 1) teaming; 2) culture building; and 3) organizing around quality (Kerchner, p.11).

The literature summarizing the work of this project, as well as the policy papers written by those that conducted this four-year project heralded the potential of these structural reforms to affect positive educational change in a myriad of ways. It is important to report these claims and the assumptions predicated on these claims; such assertions define the standards through which one can measure the effectiveness of these reforms in the PCSD. It is fitting to close this section with the reflections of Julia Koppich, who opines on the potential of this union-driven reform movement. Knowing
that these reforms were in their infancy, she posed what she termed “unanswered questions” by asking, “Can the new relationship between union and management, the new way of doing business, “hold” in times of crisis?” and, “Finally, if change is real, will it spread? Is this the birth of a new professional unionism, or simply an aberration brought about by this particular, perhaps transitory reform movement?” (Koppich, 1991, p. 21-22).
Chapter III: Methodology

*Design of the investigation*

This qualitative thesis is a historical account of the PCSD Trust Agreement Project, an educational reform movement within the PCSD that has been evolving for nearly two decades. The essential methodology that informs the design of the thesis is historical research, and as such, is guided by the following five tasks defined by Johnson & Christensen, (2000, p. 343):

- To uncover the unknown
- To answer questions
- To identify the relationship the past has to the future
- To record and evaluate the accomplishments of individuals, agencies, or institutions
- To aid in our understanding of the culture in which we live

The cycle of research and thesis construction also follows their process, (Johnson & Christensen, p. 345) beginning with: 1) identification of the research topic and research question formation; 2) embarking on an extensive review of the literature; 3) data collection; 4) data analysis and synthesis; and 5) preparation of the narrative.

*The Sample and Treatment*

The first cycle of interviews, conducted to gather information detailing the early history of the Trust Agreement Project, included eight retired PCSD educators, all of whom participated in some meaningful way in the original Trust Agreement Project. Each participant was asked a series of questions (see appendix A) in a comfortable
interview setting lasting between one-and-one-half and two hours in length. I would occasionally conduct a brief, follow-up interview for clarification.

The second cycle of interviews, conducted to gather data regarding administrator views regarding “current time” Trust Agreement and leadership issues, included nine participants, all of whom were current site administrators or had held that position within the PCSD within the recent past. These interviews were briefer in duration, usually lasting no more that three quarters of an hour.

In addition to gathering data from oral histories, key information was also obtained from district historical documents (see appendix D) that were useful in understanding the original rationalizations for these reforms. These historical documents helped to substantiate participant data but were not part of the coding process. And finally, the actual Trust Agreement documents (see appendices, B and C) provide an essential context for this project.

While pursuing this thesis as a historical narrative, intent on presenting the lessons of the past as my primary objective, I have also been pursuing the exploration of a tentative hypothesis in the field of leadership. This exploration has developed in the manner described by a grounded theory approach where theory is not confirmed but discovered through a thorough examination of the data. Having worked within a SDM environment for over twelve years, and having experienced its permutations in many different settings, I began my thesis project already immersed in SDM processes. As such, I was continually reflecting on my own experience of the interrelatedness of SDM and leadership dynamics, often posing questions regarding the efficacy of these approaches. I
also immersed myself in the literature and explored new avenues of inquiry for well over two years.

In keeping with a grounded theory approach, my data analysis has followed the constant comparative method developed by Glasser & Strauss, (1967). I have deeply immersed myself in these data, often engaging in reflective journaling, reading, questioning and collecting more data until these data reached saturation, yielding no more new insights. I coded and categorized data from these interviews, and summarized my findings in the conclusion of this thesis. In addition, I have presented essential lessons to be learned from this historical research, while presenting a tentative theory that offers a plausible explanation of leadership challenges within a SDM environment in an educational setting.
This is the story, or brief history of the PCSD Trust Agreement Project, a unique experiment in shared governance agreements involving the PCSD management, its teachers and the Patterson Federation of Teachers (PFT). It is told in chronological order and is presented in four sections. Section one, “The Pre-Trust Agreement Years,” presents important variables that preceded the period when Trust Agreements were crafted, while section two, “The Camelot Years,” presents the Trust Agreement Project (1987) and the productive years that were to follow. Section three, “The Decline Period,” traces the decline period of Trust Agreement processes beginning in 1995 and continuing through 2001. Section four, “The Current Era,” examines important variables that inform this restructuring movement from 2002 through 2006.

The PCSD, which is actually composed of both an elementary and secondary district, is located in Northern California in a mid-sized town and serves approximately 7,800 K-12 students. Currently, the PCSD has six elementary schools, two junior high schools, two high schools, two small alternative high schools, one community day school, one continuation high school and has two charter schools under its jurisdiction. The PCSD is relatively affluent, serving twenty-six percent of its total enrollment on free and reduced lunch and serves a growing English Learner population that is approximately seventeen percent of total enrollment.

The Pre-Trust Agreement Years

While this project began in earnest during the 1986/87 school year, it is necessary to begin this history by looking at factors that were instrumental in providing the “right,
fertile field” for these new collaborations to take hold and bear fruit. Thus we begin our story by looking at some of the factors that many participants felt were important during the pre-Trust Agreement era during the seventies and early eighties. When interviewing participants regarding their perceptions of the years preceding the Trust Agreement Project, they reported findings that I have clustered into four sections: 1) a history of congenial working relationships within district constituencies; 2) an influx of new, idealistic teachers into the district; 3) dynamic district office leadership; and 4) the importance of union affiliation with the American Federation of Teachers (AFT).

A History of Congenial Working Relationships

Participants report that the PCSD has a history of positive relationships between district management, the school board, its teachers and the union that dates back to the sixties. School sites were given a lot of independence back then with the expectation that they would solve their own problems in a professional manner. The school board assumed administrators were doing their job competently and did not micromanage decisions by administration. The superintendent during this era was credited as being a “straight shooter,” fostering collaborative relations between district management and the newly formed PFT. When the union president of the local informed the superintendent that seventeen teachers had just signed their first union charter and was not sure what his reaction would be, she reported that, “he was very gracious; he said that you are still the same people and we can work together no matter what.” This type of professional consideration and willingness to cooperate with the new union was characteristic of district management at that time.
An Influx of Idealistic Teachers

Patterson City Schools experienced an influx of a hundred or more new teachers fresh out of credential programs in the late sixties and early seventies. Many of these teachers brought a “sixties” idealism, great energy and a paradigm-challenging spirit with them into the educational work place. As one participant noted, it proved to be a “yeasty mix,” while another said that the district was populated by, “a confluence of the right people who were intellectually curious…that were interested in education, interested in theory, and interested in working together to encourage teachers to become professional learners.” Pockets of experimentation began to develop in notable ways in some of the sites within the district. Experiments in team teaching, clustering or schools-without-walls configurations, and a school within a school were some of the experimentations that began to emerge throughout the district during the early seventies. As it turned out, many of the pioneers of these experiments were the same people who would later become mentor teachers, union leaders and administrators who became key players in the Trust Agreement Project that was to happen a decade later.

One of the interesting findings that emerged during the course of this research was the belief that much of this creative outpouring happened because 1) these were passionate and creative teachers and 2) they were being given very little direction from administration and therefore felt free to construct what they felt served their students. As one participant related, “You know our hopes were high, we were a bunch of idealists…maybe things were going to be possible at that point…we were doing all kinds of exciting, progressive stuff—we were all real young and crazy.” But this type of experimentation was not the norm in the district during the seventies. Many people
interviewed characterized the PCSD as a pleasant but mediocre place to teach, bereft of inspiring leadership at this time. One pointed observation was that “all the principals were male…no one was the least bit inspired to look at research, to talk about how we can improve the education of kids; it was a very comfortable place for mediocre people.” Many of these new teachers took advantage of this leadership vacuum, and felt free to innovate exciting programs for years. They came to appreciate this independence, believing that they had something very valuable to contribute to their students and the district.

*Dynamic, District Office Leadership*

The PCSD was fortunate to have strong district leadership during this time. The Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources in the seventies, Dr. Franklin, (a pseudonym) who would later become the district superintendent, deserves special recognition for his contributions. There was wide agreement among participants that this individual was highly instrumental in fostering a caring working and bargaining climate within the PCSD. This individual had been a minister before getting into education, and therefore brought a humanistic approach to both management and bargaining issues. In fact Dr. Franklin was known for having “this romantic notion of a district family where we looked to take care of one another” in a variety of ways that extended to all district employees. As chief negotiator for the PCSD he,

established a climate where the negotiators were perceived as colleagues …he opened the door in terms of establishing a climate of negotiations and then recruited people onto district level negotiations as co-administrators who were able to work within that context. And, if they weren’t then they quickly learned that these are the rules of the game here; it isn’t about us versus them.
Congenial bargaining practices fostered a growing sense of trust and inclusiveness within the PCSD that enabled “kindred spirits” to realize the power of sharing ideas and working through creative approaches to problem solving. These types of collaborative dialogues, held with many different constituencies throughout the seventies and eighties, were instrumental in building the context for shared governance practices that were later codified as Trust Agreements.

This paper would not be complete without the mention of Dr. Marni Christensen, (a pseudonym), who started out as the principal of the newly built Applewood Elementary School (a pseudonym) in 1975 and who later moved on to the district office to become the Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Curriculum and Instruction. Dr. Christensen’s influence on her students, teachers and the district was enormous; she had a substantial role in shaping the educational environment of the PCSD that still has cachet today.

Dr. Christensen was particularly instrumental in infusing the philosophy of Jean Piaget into the district and insuring that developmental, child-centered approaches would be translated into best practices. I have heard Dr. Christensen described as the consummate “teachers-teacher;” she excelled in challenging teachers to be life-long learners and stretch beyond their assumed limitations. This was also a time when utopian, child-centered pedagogy, as exemplified by such popular books like *Summerhill*, were resonating within the district and inspiring teachers to stretch themselves in new ways that “…let children’s talents and interests emerge…” in a developmentally appropriate manner. Students were very much at the center of the conversations held in the district at that time, particularly in the elementary setting.
We did a lot of kid watching, we would talk a lot about specific students and say, you know, what are their talents, what are their problems, how can we engage them in learning? And we really enjoyed that—it got very exciting about giving one another ideas on how to work with students, how to challenge students, how to nurture students. It was like we had our own little think tank talking about how do we make education really meaningful.

Dr. Christensen was very active in facilitating dynamic professional development opportunities for teachers and encouraging them to become experts in their areas of interest. As one participant reflected, there was a lot of statewide support for learning during the eighties through the State Subject Matter Projects for those that were interested in deepening their knowledge. But, as several participants alluded to, these opportunities were not taken advantage of by the majority of teachers in the PCSD, but they had a powerful impact on a group of teachers, many of whom would eventually assume leadership positions within the district during the time the Trust Agreement Project got underway in the late eighties.

Together Dr. Christensen and Dr. Franklin formed the core of a leadership team that included teachers, administrators and union leaders during the seventies and eighties. Participants were unanimous in their agreement that the leadership of these two individuals was absolutely essential to the success of the educational reforms within the PCSD that were to come out of that era. Both Dr. Christensen and Dr. Franklin were also connected to influential educators through their university connections, extensive networking with the State Department of Education and other bay area school districts. There was a continual flow of cutting edge pedagogy that nourished an expanding group of educators and administrators in the PCSD during these years. Both Dr. Franklin and Dr. Christensen had important relationships with Bob Garnston, Bill Baker and Bob Blackburn, who were described as “movers and shakers” at the CDE at that time.
According to one participant, the views espoused by these educations “[were]…based on that communitarian attitude…[that] we should nurture all children, [that] all children are valuable…let’s find the best way to help them learn. It was almost like coming out of the commune movement in the seventies.”

The Importance of an Affiliation with the Patterson Federation of Teachers

When looking back over the history of the seventies and eighties, one is struck by the important role that the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the Patterson Federation of Teachers (PFT) had in this district’s development. Both organizations were instrumental in providing invaluable support for district experimentations in collaborative bargaining practices that later paved the way for Trust Agreements. Many participants reported that the PCSD would have never embarked in its experimentation in shared governance processes and new bargaining practices if it did not have the PFT as its district bargaining unit.

In 1968, seventeen PCSD teachers signed the original PFT charter. Almost a decade later, with the passage of the Roddha Act in 1977, this union became the official bargaining unit for the PCSD and has functioned in that capacity since that time. However, prior to the formation of the PFT in 1968, PCSD teachers were also affiliated with the CTA. Even though PCSD teachers had an earlier association with the CTA, many PCS teachers grew increasingly disenchanted with CTA policies and practices that were perceived as unnecessarily confrontational, more suited to industry than to education. During this time the national and state AFT affiliates were focused on developing collaborative bargaining practices that minimized confrontational bargaining.
practices. Administrators and teachers within the PCSD were very appreciative of this new approach; it seemed to fit the pedagogical values and personal leadership styles of key leaders within the district.

The AFT national organization treated its affiliates in a very professional manner. AFT locals were also given more autonomy to solve their own problems while CTA locals were often constrained, waiting for permission to act. “Every little step we took got all clogged down because of all the hierarchy…AFT said, hey, you are a local, you know what your needs are—you do what you need to do and we will back you.” Another important function that the national AFT organization performed during this time was the active promotion of professional development conferences every year that PCSD teachers attended. AFT offered a wide variety of training on topics designed to increase teacher professionalism. This was the beginning of a very dynamic and productive negotiating process between the PCSD district and the PFT, which also mirrored national trends in emerging bargaining practices and a shift away from the “traditional blue-collar style adversarial bargaining environment.”

The Camelot Years

As reported in section one of Chapter IV, several important themes emerged that were instrumental in creating a context supporting the emergence of the Trust Agreement Project. The PCSD had a longstanding tradition of harmonious relationships between district management, its school board, teaching staff and its union, the PFT. Innovative educational practices were flourishing in some sites in the district as teachers took advantage of professional development opportunities sponsored by the California State Subject Matter Projects and other locally developed training opportunities. By the mid-
eighties, the PFT was emerging as an influential voice in the district through their skillful practice of collaborative bargaining, their commitment to increasing teachers’ input in the decision-making process and their interest in supporting developing teacher professionalism through professional development opportunities. In addition, the PCSD office was fortunate to have strong, visionary leadership that was highly successful in orchestrating an organizational environment that created trusting relationships, valued new ideas and was not adverse to risk-taking.

By the time the actual Trust Agreement Project started during the 1987/88 school year, the district already had the benefit of many years of successful district/union collaborations. An important example of this occurred during the 1986/87 school year after district management had received complaints from citizens and one PCSD board member regarding the demeaning manner with which some teachers, particularly at high school, were treating their students. These conversations prompted district management and the PFT to work together to create language, referred to as the Affective Domain Document, which was to stipulate the rationale and guidelines for appropriate teacher/student interactions within the district. These types of non-traditional district/union collaborations, which broke new ground in the field of management/labor negotiations, attracted the attention of key leaders of both the AFT and CFT at that time. As one participant noted, “…we had been doing a collaboration on the Affective Domain and CFT and AFT were both very interested in what we were doing and were part of the conversations at different conferences and so forth.” During AFT conventions in Washington D.C., Al Shanker, the president of the AFT, was touting the importance of restructuring reforms that gave teachers a greater say in their professional life. In
California, Miles Myers, the president of CFT and a professor at UC Berkeley, also championed the need for teachers to have a greater say in a wide range of educational decisions that lay outside the normal scope of traditional bargaining domains. Myers met with the PCSD/PFT committee during their work on the Affective Domain language, gave them lots of encouragement and was “very impressed” with the collaborative work that this committee was doing. As a result, committee work on Affective Domain language, which was later inserted into the district Collective Bargaining Agreement, attracted the notice of key AFT/CFT officials and set the stage for the Trust Agreement Project, which was to begin the following school year.

The actual genesis of the PCSD involvement in the Trust Agreement Project began during the fall of 1987, when the PFT president went to a conference where he had heard Dr. Charles Kerchner talk about the restructuring implications of the seminal report, “Who Will Teach Our Children,” and an exciting experiment in restructuring reform that was called “The Trust Agreement Project.” This research project was designed to test the viability of Trust Agreements, a new approach to management/labor negotiations whose restructuring goals were: 1) to develop new forms of school organization and new patterns of relationships among teachers and school administrators; and 2) to expand the range of labor-management discussions in education from the technical, procedural work rules that are traditional purview of collective bargaining to substantive areas of educational policy (Koppich, & Kerchner, 1988, p.5).

The PFT president was intrigued by Dr. Kerchner’s proposal and after conferring with other union officials brought the idea of participating in this research project to Dr. Franklin, the PCSD superintendent. Dr. Franklin was favorably impressed and remarked
that the project seemed “…so congenial because it was the fabric of what we were
already trying to be about at that time—so it sounded like it was just meant for us.” Dr.
Franklin then set the Trust Agreement Project in motion by having a “commitment-to-
try” letter signed by himself, the school board president, and the PFT president. He then
convened a special Trust Agreement Committee composed of school board members,
district management, teachers and PFT leadership who were charged with the task
crafting a Trust Agreement that would address some area of educational reform. This
project was to be collaboration between PCSD participants, the CFT and the California
School Boards Association. It was to be administrated by Policy Analysis for California
Education (PACE), with Dr. Kerchner acting as one of the projects co-leads and
specifically assigned to act in an advisory capacity with the Patterson team. In addition to
this attractive offer, each one of the six participating districts, which included Lompoc,
Newport-Mesa, Patterson, Poway, San Francisco and Santa Cruz, received a $4,000.00
stipend to defray the costs associated with the project.

The eight year period that spans the beginning of the Trust Agreement Project,
beginning in 1987 and ending with the development of a PCS, K-12 Trust Agreement in
Core Curriculum, is fondly referred to by old-timers as Camelot, or the “golden age” of
Trust Agreement.

We used to call it Camelot, you know, when Marni was downtown and all that good
stuff was happening with Trust Agreements. You know our hopes were high; we were
a bunch of idealists really—and it looked like maybe things were going to be possible
at that point.
Another participant noted, “I recognize it as a time in the institution when we probably were at our best as an institution, exemplifying the values that are probably closest to the spirit of education.” And finally, Dr. Franklin remarked when interviewed that,

someday we will look back and we will call these the good old days, and we should recognize right now that we’re living in the good old days. We should enjoy them and get as much done as we can because this is a lucky and magical and gifted period of time—when the right group of people are together [under] the right constellation with the intent to do some good things for boys and girls and the staff.

The Camelot period was a remarkable set of years for the PCSD and all its constituencies. This period marked the implementation of restructuring reforms that dramatically changed the educational landscape of the PCSD. As Dr. Franklin contends, it was a magical time, blessed by the right people, influenced by the right variables (constellation) with the intention to do some good work. Dr. Franklin’s characterization of this period is useful because it encapsulates common themes that were shared by the participants that I interviewed and provides a simple construct to organize the findings that emerged: The 1) right people; doing 2) the right work; during 3) the right time or educational era. The emerging sense of a new paradigm also began to form at that time, a firm belief that all things positive flowed from flattening the hierarchy and involving teachers in the decision-making process.

The Right People—the Cadre

In section one, it is reported that the PCSD had undergone an influx of newly trained teachers during the late sixties and early seventies. As reported by participants of this study, many of these educators were influenced by the idealism of the sixties, were risk-takers and believed that they could make positive changes in the PCSD through non-traditional means.
I would say that many of the key players at that time come from a philosophical position of being very idealistic and believing that we could, you know if not change the world then we could at least change the organization in the school district to become something new and different. I think to some degree it was the product of the more positive aspect of the sixties; the idealism, the inspiration that President Kennedy gave voice to. And a lot of folks that were at Patterson at the time kind of took that to heart and believed it and acted on it.

The significance of this group of talented educators that landed in the district at this point should not be underestimated. By the mid-eighties, which marks the beginnings of experimentations of non-adversarial bargaining practices in the PCSD, a precursor to the Trust Agreement Project, many in this emerging leadership group had taught together, had been in the union movement together and some were beginning to move into administration. Many of these educators had developed deep friendships, a level of trust, an enjoyment of collaboration and had similar views regarding educational reform.

In addition to these strong personal connections, tempered by over a decade of working together, these emerging leaders were immersed in the district “family” ethos fostered by the efforts of Dr. Franklin while he was the Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources and Superintendent. By the time the Trust Agreement Project started up in 1987, “…there was a cadre of us that were on the same page and were very committed and were very passionate” about pushing the envelope of educational reform. “Because we were fairly comfortable with each other and had longevity,” this cadre felt safe with one another, and, as this participant noted, were emotionally prepared to relinquish power roles. Another participant expressed a similar view, remarking, “…we were able to shed those roles that we had as union leaders or negotiators or school administrators and come into the room and be intellectual equals—and treat one another with trust and respect.” This trusting environment, the respect accorded individuals as
equal players regardless of their positions in the district hierarchy, fostered an outpouring of creativity and shared commitment and was an essential ingredient that nourished successful collaborations for years to come.

**Leadership within the Cadre**

A vital component of this leadership team, one every participant cited as being pivotal in creating the necessary conditions for successful implementation of the various Trust Agreements, was the dynamic and supportive leadership of key district management. Specifically, as reported in an earlier section, Dr. Franklin and Dr. Collins played important leadership roles that nurtured this reform process. Dr. Franklin, the PCSD Superintendent, was a strong supporter of collaborative bargaining practices and believed that the educational process was enriched through giving teachers a greater voice in the workplace. He explained that,

> having the directives come from on high might have the trains running on time but didn’t necessarily make for the best trains we could have. And so I always, just personally, from that philosophical bent, I always thought when the day comes...if I am ever a district person, if I ever have the chance to have more decision-making in the hands of the people who are the real experts and practitioners I am going to do that...If we are going to consider teaching to be a profession, then it just flies in the face of everything that is a definer of a profession to have somebody far away dictate how that profession shall work.

Dr. Franklin believed in the principle of shared governance and encouraged the formation of new Trust Agreements that gave teachers an expanded role in the decision-making process. During the early years of Trust Agreement work, there were definitely administrators that did not feel comfortable with “sharing” some of their administrative authority with teachers. While sympathetic to the real dilemma these administrators faced, this superintendent facilitated their acceptance of the new paradigm—or their
departure. His decisive leadership helped create an acceptance and willingness on the part of management to engage in leadership functions in a new way. Another important finding reported was that this superintendent worked at maintaining positive relationships with union leadership, believing that more could be accomplished when negotiators practiced non-adversarial bargaining practices. Many credit Dr. Franklin for embedding a negotiating mindset that was rooted in a strong humanistic ethic that flourished during the Camelot era.

Dr. Christensen also added her unique contributions to district management and the leadership cadre during these productive years. As Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Curriculum and Instruction, her gifts were grounded in her deep understanding of the art of teaching, her ability to connect with teachers and to communicate her unique vision. She was described as a “teachers-teacher,” whose door was always open, and who excelled at connecting with teachers across all grade levels. “People trusted her. She was so smart and just so intuitive and could really…make you…look at things from a whole different angle you had not thought of before—give you the confidence to try something maybe you had not wanted to do.” Dr. Christensen excelled at bringing out the best in teachers and challenging them to become experts in their field. She was very instrumental in implementing a staff development system administrated through the district that encouraged PCSD teachers to value professional development and to take on instructional leadership functions on a scale that has never been duplicated.

The district leadership of both Dr. Franklin and Dr. Christensen was an important ingredient in the success of Trust Agreement work during the Camelot years. They both
had the ability to inspire belief in the core principle of valuing teacher expertise and creating new structures that would allow teachers an expanded voice in the decision-making process.

The Right Work

The Trust Agreement Committee, composed of teachers, administrators, board members and union leaders, were committed to their task of creating new Trust Agreements using a highly collaborative process. The egalitarian nature of this committee process was a clear departure from the traditional governance structures of previous district meetings. The robust nature of the dialogue, coupled with the long hours they worked together seemed to confirm one of the foundational tenets of participatory governance, that “it just works—when they [teachers]…are involved and they are making decisions and they are real stakeholders, it just energizes people…There is a kind of synergy which occurs where …people work at a different level as a generalization.” As one participant expressed, “…it was a heady time, a very important and exciting period of my life where I was able to kind of join my philosophy and my core values to what I was doing on a regular basis both in the classroom then later in the district office.” Participants reported this type of belief in the new work that they were doing and felt a shared sense of excitement that they were doing something unique.

As one participant remarked, the institutional mantles fell away quickly and “…what mattered wasn’t whether there was a union initiative or bargaining initiative, but, was it a good idea? And so the tyranny of the good idea became sort of the preeminent value in that dialogue.” As a result, the quality of the dialogue was taken up a notch or two in
these discussions. The focus of these meetings and the collaborative process committee members engaged in took on an intensity that nourished the creative output of the group.

The Trust Agreement Committee began to gather momentum during the late eighties. Committee members felt a real sense of partnership and common purpose. By the time the first year of the Project drew to a close, they had already written their first Trust Agreement in Staff Development (see appendix B) and created new teacher evaluation protocols. These successes convinced committee membership that flattening the hierarchy and bringing teachers into the decision-making process had enormous potential to affect positive change.

Committee participants, whom I should add, were highly motivated by pursuing what they believed to be the “right work,” sometimes referred to themselves as a “think tank.” The “tyranny of the good idea” drove committee conversations; creativity, and not one’s position in the hierarchy, was the coin-of-the-realm.

We used to talk about Trust Agreement Committee as a think tank…What we were in the business of doing was creating knowledge. In my mind that is the highest expression of a learning community, when you are actually creating knowledge. And I am not saying we were inventing the wheel or doing something that had never been done before, but the thing that worked was that we weren’t taking a canned approach from some other district and implementing it in Patterson. We certainly brought in ideas from all over the place, books and workshops and visits to other districts, but we felt like we were giving it our own spin and really doing something fairly unique.

Good examples of the “fairly unique” programs the Trust Agreement Committee crafted during the first two years of the Trust Agreement Project were an invigorated staff development process, which was articulated in the Trust Agreement in Staff Development, the Trust Agreement in SDM, new hiring protocols and a teacher evaluation process. These programs and protocols serve to illustrate the committee’s
ability to negotiate significant reforms that were outside the scope of traditional collective bargaining practices.

Staff development blossomed under the guidance of the newly formed Staff Development Committee, a product of the new Trust Agreement in Staff Development. What was so powerful about this new collaboration was the fact that teachers were invited into positions of responsibility and felt like they were making a difference. This marked the beginning of many years of successful professional development collaborations that were valued by all district constituencies. (See Appendix E to view a typical catalog of workshops). Teacher-presenters felt valued for their expertise and the attending teachers felt that their needs were being met as well. “I think that they felt empowered in a way that they had never felt empowered before. And getting this new information on teaching strategies, on subject matter knowledge was almost like wine. I mean they really got excited, it really energized the teachers to work together.”

The new hiring protocols, developed by the Trust Agreement Committee in 1988 were also examples of Patterson’s “fairly unique” approach to finding new solutions to a wide range of thorny issues. The hiring protocols gave teachers an equal say in hiring principals, fellow teachers and teacher transfers, which was a major departure from previous management-controlled practices. In addition, the new teacher evaluation protocols, which included a newly created Professional Development Plan, gave teachers more ownership of the evaluation process and their own growth as professionals. The examples cited above illustrate far-reaching innovations that were developed through the Trust Agreement Committee “think tank” process and put into operation throughout the
district in the late eighties. These innovations positioned teachers in a new and powerful way; now they were equal players, now they felt like professionals and wielded clout.

**The Right Time—An Abundance of Resources**

The Trust Agreement Project was successful, in part, because its implementation occurred at the right time, a time that was flush with both material and intellectual resources that proved to be pivotal in nourishing these reforms. While the important role of union leadership could be treated under the “right people” section, I have chosen to include it here, as an intellectual resource.

During the eighties the PCSD was the recipient of a variety of resources that helped initiate and sustain restructuring reforms that would later take hold within the district. The California State Subject Matter Projects were in operation at this time and were quite successful in enriching and enlivening the quality of educational practice of teachers that had the good fortune of attending these institutes. Many teachers from the PCSD took advantage of various institute offerings, which, as one participant noted, helped foster a “healthy, stimulating environment” within the district. This participant described how Patterson teachers were very excited about the learning they were involved in and were frequently going off to conferences and workshops to learn more. Another participant remarked on the quality of the State Frameworks, how the state was creating opportunities for learning that were teacher-centered and looked at “teachers as a carrier of the practice.” This was both an exciting and stimulating time to be teaching in California and in the PCSD.
By the mid-eighties, the district was part of a growing network of organizations that infused the district with expertise. As previously noted, the district and its local, the PFT, were attracting the attention of Federation leadership, notably Al Shanker and Miles Myers. This association served to intensify the district/PFT dialogue regarding non-adversarial bargaining practices, leading to the CFT sponsored pilot-project in restructuring practices, the precursor which positioned our district to join the Stuart Foundation funded Trust Agreement Project the following year. When the district became part of the Trust Agreement Project in 1987 it received a $4,000.00 grant for its participation followed by a $5,000.00 grant the next year. The district also received the mentoring assistance from Dr. Charles Kerchner, the Project’s co-director, and Julia Koppich, his assistant. Both of them were assigned to meet with the Patterson group on a regular basis. Dr. Kerchner, a noted expert in union/labor relations, made himself available in an advisory capacity and was great at “stirring the pot”—getting the committee to examine issues from multiple perspectives.

Another source of outside expertise came through the network of professional relationships that Dr. Marni Christensen had developed during her career. Dr. Christensen knew influential people at the State Department of Education and high-powered educators through her UC Berkeley connections that she often called in to assist the district in various capacities. Two of her friends, Bill Baker and Bob Blackburn, referred to as “movers and shakers in California education” were brought in to help the district get through a time of declining enrollment during the late eighties. These two consultants, together with district, union and teacher leadership, helped the district through this difficult time and avoided significant layoffs.
During this time period money was prioritized for training events of various sorts. Leadership recognized that everyone needed to be trained in new Trust Agreement procedures and their implementation. There were trainings at each site, special training for management, union training for site representatives and individual responses to specific needs of administrators and teachers. Experts were also brought in to train district personnel through workshops entitled, “Facilitative Leadership” and “Improving the Union/Management Relationship: Introduction to Effective Problem Solving.” These were examples of the types of events that were held for both teachers and administrators where participants learned new strategies and gained a deeper understanding about Trust Agreements.

Perhaps the most significant resource that nourished the PCSD during this era were the ten staff development days available to teachers. Having this abundance of time enabled district and PFT leadership to offer trainings and educational programs that were instrumental in Trust Agreement implementations. The staff development program that was put into effect as a result of the newly ratified Trust Agreement in Staff Development was immensely successful and was very empowering for teachers. “I mean we had up to ten days for staff development—it was absolutely incredible. And we really had good workshops; we had mentors who were presenters.” One participant felt that this program was particularly significant, that “…it was such a sea-change from [the] previous administration in the Patterson district. We really turned the whole district around as far as teachers becoming more involved in professional development and taking a serious look at collaboration.”
These staff development days were also a very important resource for the PCSD because they provided the processing time needed for each new implementation. Having these days enabled all stakeholders to plan, train and implement reforms as effectively as possible. While participants acknowledge that the road to Trust Agreement reform had its challenges and disappointments, this abundance of time allowed stakeholders to practice and refine new skills that gave them greater confidence as professionals. The Staff Development Program together with the Trust Agreement in Shared Decision-Making created a synergy that was instrumental in creating a district identity focused around valuing teacher involvement in the decision-making process.

The Role of the Patterson Federation of Teachers

Contributions previously described in earlier sections of this paper by the PFT and its parent organizations were instrumental in creating conditions for successful district/union collaborations. By the time of district involvement in the second year in the Trust Agreement Project, the PCSD was receiving national and state recognition for their cutting-edge practices with restructuring reforms and was considered a “flagship” district within the AFT. Members of the PCSD Trust Agreement Committee were speaking at both national and state conferences about the district’s experience with the Trust Agreement process and the importance of shared decision-making practices. The district was also benefiting from numerous training opportunities made available to its teachers through both the AFT and CFT. Al Shanker, president of the AFT during this time and one of the most influential educational leaders of that era, even delivered the keynote address at one of the Patterson staff development days in 1989. Indeed, accolades
received by the district made everyone bask in the spotlight of national and state Federation recognition.

However, during the 1988/89 school year, as the newly created Trust Agreement in Shared Decision-making was getting implemented, a vocal block of teachers grew increasingly dissatisfied with PFT leadership. CTA, which had membership within the district but had never been the district’s bargaining unit, seized upon this period of disenchantment to mount a campaign to decertify the PFT. Since this was a time of declining enrollment within the district, and had been for a number of years, the district and the PFT had agreed not to grant raises over a period of years in order to minimize layoffs. This strategy did spare the district significant layoffs during this period but the CTA was able to convince a sizeable group of teachers that the PFT was not doing an adequate job in negotiating fair wages for its constituency. One participant reported “…at that time there were actually people wandering around with a T-shirt on with a big screw on them that said ‘Thrust Agreement.’” The perception shared by many teachers was that the PFT was “in bed” with district management and was more interested in concocting “airy-fairy” Trust Agreements than bargaining for a raise for its teachers. “They were saying what good was shared decision-making if our paycheck isn’t right.”

When the decertification vote was totaled at the end of the 1989 school year, the PFT narrowly escaped defeat; it had won by only five votes. In effect, this meant that almost half the voting membership felt that the PFT had misplaced priorities and needed to return to a more traditional union mindset. Nearly being decertified sent shock waves through the PFT and its parent organizations, the AFT and CFT. Soon after this vote, the current PFT president resigned and a new president took charge with an entirely different
set of priorities, one focused on rebuilding the membership and restoring faith in Federation policies that championed teacher professionalism in addition to bread and butter issues. After their narrow escape, PFT leadership reflected on what had gone wrong and concluded that membership did not really understand that: 1) there was no money to increase salaries due to declining enrollment; 2) the PFT had, in fact, done a very credible job in preventing large layoffs during that period; and 3) the new Trust Agreement in Shared Decision-Making had enormous potential to benefit teachers in a wide variety of ways. PFT leadership also concluded that both the district and union had not done a good job in explaining how district/union Trust Agreement collaborations were in teachers’ best interests. One participant stated:

If the union membership didn’t have the confidence that the PFT was truly representing their interest they were not going to buy into shared decision-making and Trust Agreements. So they really had to see that PFT was going to protect those bread and butter issues for them. That was fundamental—that was seminal in allowing shared decision-making to take root.

After the decertification vote the PFT leadership made a very intentional and sustained effort to visit school sites, demystify the Trust Agreement process while relieving teacher anxiety created by the perception “…that Trust Agreement always had the aura of being sort of a star chamber where mysterious decisions were made.” During the next few years that followed, both the district and the PFT began a training process to launch the shared decision-making process throughout the district and its sites. This was a period of experimentation regarding how to adopt participatory governance practices since there were very few examples of similar districts using shared decision-making models. After three years of hard work and numerous trainings, the district and the PFT produced the “Patterson City Schools Decision-Making Resource Guide” to assist sites in
the implementation process. (See appendix C). Over time the PFT was successful in its mission to rebuild its membership and do an effective job in selling the benefits of shared decision-making to teachers. The stewardship of the PFT was very important in embedding these participatory governance practices within the district. As one participant noted “…we had a teachers union that was less interested in the politics of leadership than the products which could issue from leadership. If we hadn’t had that kind of leadership form the Federation this wouldn’t have been possible.”

_Camelot and an Emerging Equity Ethos_

The restructuring reforms that were implemented and practiced during the Camelot years introduced a new, egalitarian ethos into district culture. Equity driven values created new priorities that “infused our decisions” creating a coherence, a sense of purpose and shared vision that unified many PCSD stakeholders throughout the Camelot years. A new paradigm began to emerge in the district, which was the enthusiastic belief that flattening the hierarchy, i.e., giving teachers a more equitable voice in the dialogue, in the decision-making process, (SDM) along with giving sites more authority to manage themselves, (SBM), would create the conditions from which positive outcomes would flow. There was a tremendous amount of excitement generated around the Trust Agreements and these new “teacher-centered” protocols that gave them a much larger voice in matters they considered important. Koppich & Kerchner co-authored a policy paper that presented a summary of findings after the first year of the Trust Agreement Project that noted this excitement. They stated that PCSD educators felt “pride” and “great satisfaction” in what they had accomplished during their first year of Trust Agreement work (Koppich, & Kerchner, 1988, p. 17). The summary of the district’s
participation in the first year of the Project concluded in a prophetic manner, signaling the beginnings of a change process that was to have profound and far-reaching consequences for the district:

The Trust Agreement process has begun to alter significantly the way decisions are made in Patterson. Involving teachers as decision-makers in staff development appears to be only the tip of the iceberg. Now that teachers have had a taste of professional decision-making authority, they are openly hungry for more. We believe pressure for change will continue to mount in Patterson as teachers and administrators continue to redefine their roles and as teachers to assume more decision-making responsibility.

And so the PCSD proceeded down the road of restructuring reforms led by the think tank of Trust Agreement Committee members, key members of both district and PFT membership and a small group of activist teachers. There was no manual of best-educational-reform practices, no formulas for success. As one participant related, we were “…making it up as we went along rather than following a recipe, which was one of the exciting and frustrating things about [the process].” Participants in this collaborative process knew they were pioneers and developed a sense of pride and ownership with each new agreement or new protocol that was developed because they felt they were “…doing something fairly unique.” This sense of uniqueness and desire to put a “Patterson spin” on mandates imposed from outside the district, such as developing a new core curriculum, began during the Camelot years and has been a defining characteristic of the PCSD from that time.

Another important PCSD assumption that grew out of the district’s growing commitment to the principles of shared decision-making during this time was an acceptance of what I have termed the “faith principle.” I chose this phrase because the word, “faith”, was mentioned several times by participants when asked about how the
concept of accountability fit into the district’s shared decision-making policies and practices. I specifically asked participants this question because of language contained in the “Patterson City Schools Decision-Making Resource Guide,” which asserts, “that teacher involvement in decision-making will result in increased student achievement.” I wanted to understand if the district ever tested the validity of this claim. The responses I got were both interesting and instructive. One participant summarized the inherent logic of this claim, that SDM practices would result in higher student achievement, reporting that:

At the time we wrote that, for me that was a statement of faith, I mean more than faith. It was a statement that I felt was evident on its face, you know, it just...makes such good sense that you almost have to stand the world on its ear for it not to be true.

There was also a fundamental acceptance of the belief that getting teachers more involved in a wide range of educational issues that had been previously withheld from them produced intrinsic motivation to perform at a more productive level. In other words, teachers who believed in what they were doing were highly committed, even passionate about their work. One participant expressed it this way, reporting, “I just have to have confidence that they [teachers] believe enough in what we were talking about to actually go back and...implement.” In this case this participant was referring to situations where teachers received good professional development and were motivated to go back into the classroom to implement what was learned. When asked about accountability another participant stated that, “…accountability was based on individual integrity…and there was a consensus in the district—that we held each other in high regard and we had high expectations for each other…It was more on a personal relationship basis.” This faith presumption, that teachers would go back into the classroom and do what was best for
students because they were intrinsically motivated, i.e., they believed in what they were
doing, they had professional expertise, informed the developing set of values around
shared decision-making and teacher equity during this era, making it difficult to embrace
accountability systems that were to be imposed in later years.

The Decline Period

In spite of the successful collaborations and skills that educators developed during the
Camelot period, participants reported that these new Trust Agreement documents, which
codified decentralizing decision-making authority, did not adequately prepare the PCSD
for changes imposed upon the district in the years that were to follow in the late nineties.
As one participant remarked:

We were institutionally naïve to the unintended consequences of this [Trust
Agreements] because we were filled with visions of how good it could be and what
could be done with it that it didn’t occur to us, except when things started to go awry,
that there would be a period of reckoning or readjustment…But, like any
organizational change—it has these unintended consequences that you have to be
prepared for—we weren’t.

Unforeseen change forces interrupted the PCSD during the late nineties, bringing the
Camelot era to a close. These change forces and their unintended consequences are the
subject of the remainder of this section. They include the challenges brought on by
changing personnel, challenges imposed by state standards and accountability mandates,
the deterioration of district management and PFT relationships and the hardships brought
about by diminishing resources available to the PCSD during this time.
Staff Turnover

Perhaps the most significant factor that contributed to the decline of Trust Agreement processes during the late nineties was staff turnover. As noted previously, many district leaders who were hired in the sixties and seventies, many of whom had taken on key roles in Trust Agreement processes, started to retire, died, or left the district. In the space of five years, almost the entire PCSD cabinet management was replaced. Staff departure was also taking place at the sites and within the PFT leadership as well. Site principals and highly experienced teachers who had been strong advocates of Trust Agreement and shared decision-making practices back at their sites and in various important committees, began to retire as well.

While staff turnover is an important dynamic that effects all educational institutions to some degree, participants interviewed were in agreement that the PCSD lost key personnel who were the driving force behind the Trust Agreement movement. These were people who had been in the district from the inception of the Trust Agreement Project, had participated in some significant way, had received training in shared decision-making and were very committed to the concept of shared governance processes. As one participant noted, these people were the “structure,” or the mechanism through which all was accomplished. They had the knowledge, skill and commitment to function at a high level within a collaborative structure. When referring to this shared decision-making model, one participant stated that, “I do know that it is a fragile process, it’s a process that flowers and develops in the right setting…and it’s fragile in that it is very personality driven.” When the key personalities left, much of the intellectual resources necessary to keep the movement robust never really recovered. Thus one of the
unintended consequences of decentralization and shared decision-making was the fact that leadership had never created any type of structure for keeping the movement going with the same momentum once key leadership left. Indeed, the PCSD experiment in restructuring reforms that began in the mid-eighties proved to be “fragile,” requiring an ongoing investment in process time, training and a belief in the value of shared decision-making practices.

One participant talked about the inevitable cycle of retirement, remarking that as “…those people started graying out, just aging in general, their influence with their peers changes—as there are fewer and fewer of them and new teachers [who are] coming on board who know nothing about Trust Agreement—their issues are different issues.” This participant felt that Trust Agreement reforms were the product of a specific educational era and therefore had a “limited shelf life.” In his opinion, many educators hired after the Camelot era had different priorities than Trust Agreement reforms. “The new priorities were not to create Trust Agreements; the new priorities were how to deal with standardized testing and the concept of measurement.”

The majority of educators hired from the mid-nineties, whether they were new administrators or teachers, had no knowledge of the history of the Trust Agreement process and minimal understanding of the importance of shared decision-making within the PCSD. New employees did not receive any training in these processes nor was there any attempt to educate new staff on the merits of Trust Agreements. With each passing year, educators who understood and championed the use of Trust Agreements as a viable set of tools to construct better educational programs were replaced by those who had little understanding or allegiance to these practices.
One of the principle findings that emerged in this research regarding the impact of new personnel had to do with dissatisfaction with the new superintendent who was hired in 1996. Participants generally agreed that the new superintendent had a difficult time adapting to shared decision-making processes and grew increasingly wary of using these time-honored practices to accomplish the mission he had set out to fulfill. Within a relatively short span of time, the superintendent was acquiring a reputation for a “top-down” management style that inspired both fear and mistrust among segments of teachers and administrators. According to participants, the management style of the new superintendent was radically different than his predecessor and this new style ruffled a lot of feathers.

Standards and Accountability Mandates

The new superintendent was brought on board during the same time districts throughout California were given directives to implement the new standards and accountability mandates. This new educational agenda was immensely unpopular within the PCSD; the fact that it was the new superintendent’s job to deliver this message while steering the district through uncharted waters, the goal being district compliance with state mandates, served to increase the ire of his detractors.

While many districts in California simply grumbled about the difficulties created by the new mandates, many PCSD educators were outraged by the prospect of having any outside agency impose a set of directives that many in the district felt were not in the best interests of both students and teachers. The district had just spent the better part of a year collaborating on a new set of curriculum documents that reflected the unique vision of
PCSD educators, (See Trust Agreement in Core Curriculum, appendix B) and now the CDE was informing them that the district must have a set of core curriculum documents that conformed with state standards. The resentment level was high—educators felt that they were being forced down a path that was antithetical to their values. One participant explained:

One of the reasons there was so much resentment was because this district had done a heck of a lot of work internally over the last decade to refine and upgrade its curriculum. We were moving forward on staff development on high quality instruction too. And so there was a certain amount of frustration when, after all that work, the state came in and said, get rid of all the blood, sweat and tears that had gone into that…So it really devalued all of this work that the teachers and the administrators had done together.

In addition to feeling devalued, many in the district were not used to being told what to do. Educators in the PCSD had been practicing in a highly collaborative culture, a culture that took pride in home grown solutions and local expertise. The district was in a real quandary over how to address state instructions to rewrite its core curriculum to meet compliance requirements. After a lot of discussion, it was decided that principals, department chairs and teacher leaders would be chosen to lead grade-level or department discussions on a monthly basis in order to involve all voices in deciding how to rewrite district core curriculum. Educators worked diligently throughout the school year only to be informed by district management that it had unilaterally decided to formally adopt state standards, that this set of documents would replace the recently written PCSD Core Curriculum.

As one participant described, this “…was a watershed moment in the history of shared decision-making and Trust Agreement.” This particular process, culminating in the district’s decision to abandon its core curriculum documents, was perceived by
teachers and the PFT to be the district’s first major assault on Trust Agreement and shared decision-making processes. By this time, the new superintendent was already viewed by many teachers and union leaders as being openly hostile to Trust Agreement and shared decision-making practices. This district decision, which was not “shared” with teachers or the union, served to further confirm a gathering sentiment among many teachers that district management was out to weaken the union and quell participatory power that teachers had gained through Trust Agreement and shared decision-making practices.

Principals also lost some credibility as a result of this curriculum alignment process. One participant, who was critical of this process, pointed out that some principals facilitated curriculum alignment meetings with teachers in ways that devalued the expertise of mentor teachers and the spirit of true open-ended collaboration where teacher input was valued.

You know, we had been doing things in a really nice, cooperative, collegial kind of way and all of a sudden, wait a minute—this isn’t the old paradigm you know. Bring in the principals, they know best, even the ones who didn’t and then stick a token teacher with them—make it look good. And they lay this on people whether they wanted to do this or not. It just did not ring true and I think it felt like a big waste of time for people. There was resentment against the district: The district wouldn’t stand up against the state and say, “we have a core curriculum…we want to stay with that.” It just didn’t feel authentic.

This was a pivotal moment for district management as well as site leadership. For the first time in over a decade, teachers and the union were beginning to question district management, wondering if the days of appreciating teacher expertise were over. For the first time in a long time within the PCSD, the issue of lack of trust, of trusting administrators to stand up for the best interests of teachers and students started gathering
momentum among union leadership and the rank-and-file. The union began to assert themselves in new ways in order to counter what they perceived as harmful, top-down management practices that violated longstanding Trust Agreement policy. One participant summed up a popular view regarding new state mandates:

There is this fundamental assumption that we have created standards and it’s a mandate goddamit—and you will go into your classrooms and do it. We are going to test you on it, we’re going to give you merit pay based on whether you have done it—or not done it—and find ways to hammer your ass. [It’s] totally alien.

State standards and accountability mandates were viewed as being diametrically opposed to core values that guided many teachers in the PCSD. Both teachers and administrators had been working in a highly collaborative fashion for a long time, one where trust between all constituencies was almost taken for granted. Many of these educators had come of age within a district infused with values and practices championed during the Camelot era. A great many of these people had come to value a non-hierarchical management system that valued teacher expertise, and believed that educators performed at the highest level when they were intrinsically motivated—not given bonuses for high test scores. Measuring student performance and then holding teachers and their schools accountable in this manner were regarded as draconian and viewed as a direct assault on their hard earned professionalism.

The PFT response

Teachers felt threatened by the reasons described above. The PFT responded to these perceived threats by speaking out against the new standards and accountability paradigm every chance it got. “Now that all the mandates that have come down, all the threats that are implied in those mandates have separated us because the union feels right now that
their main job is to protect teachers from being exploited in the name of mandates.”

Indeed, these new mandates, the educational direction that they imposed and the district leadership’s response to implementing these mandates, drove an implacable wedge between district and PFT leadership. Both leadership groups were overwhelmed with what each constituency believed to be its appropriate mission. There was no time to think about developing new Trust Agreements or get excited about new learning strategies when sites were focusing on teaching new standards-based materials and preparing their students for the upcoming STAR tests.

**Declining Resources**

The decline of the district’s intense involvement with Trust Agreement processes was undoubtedly hastened by the cumulative effect of diminishing resources. Various assets, such as staff development days and State Subject Matter Project Institutes, which had once nourished Trust Agreement endeavors and the intellectual climate of the district, dwindled as the state began shifting its focus to funding standards and accountability mandates.

As cited previously in this section, key members in the Trust Agreement movement were starting to retire during this time, leaving a leadership void, but everyone was too busy grappling with the new mandates to consider the long-term implications of these personnel changes. When teachers, administrators and union leaders left the district, much of this wisdom or leadership capital regarding how to be effective in a highly collaborative decision-making environment vanished with them. New administrators were given very little information regarding Trust Agreements and shared decision-making policies and processes. Unlike the Camelot era, district leadership, which by
2002 was entirely new, did not prepare its fledgling principals with the heads-up, “…here are the things that are important to you, … these are the things that we expect to be shared and processed.”

In 2000, when the standards and accountability movement was gathering significant momentum in California, the PCSD crafted a fourth Trust Agreement, which is referred to as the Trust Agreement in K-12 Curriculum. This document (see appendix B) was written to align the district more closely with the new State Curriculum Standards. By 2001, when the No Child Left Behind laws were put into place, participants report specific ways that they felt Trust Agreement processes were being undermined. The current superintendent eliminated the teacher-on-special-assignment ombudsman position, which, for a decade, had been a position created to facilitate open lines of communication between district management and the union. In the past, the ombudsman had an office next door to the superintendent and thus had access to the district management team at all times. The union regarded this district action as yet another indication of its unwillingness to honor the policies and processes of Trust Agreements.

Participants also reported that Trust Agreement Committee meetings began to suffer because of staff turnover. New principals, with very little understanding of the history and importance of these policies and processes, would often be assigned to the Committee, adding very little to the discussions. Sometimes administrators would not come to these meetings, leaving its participants unable to make decisions that they felt represented full Committee endorsement. Over time, the combined effect of uninformed new participants together with poor attendance undermined the effectiveness of Committee collaborations and strained the relationship between district and union
leadership. During the Camelot era, the Trust Agreement Committee was the nexus of power and dynamism—now it was slipping toward irrelevancy. As one participant noted, “…there seemed to be a diminishing will among administrators to be the voice…” of Trust Agreement practices and “…carry back what was going on…” to their sites in an effective manner.

Participants also noted that Trust Agreement committee work exacted a heavy toll on both teachers and administrators.

There were endless meetings and little hand-drawn notes and nothing came of it, nothing. So nobody wants to go to a meeting where nothing happens, where you spend all these hours talking—you have taken time out of your classrooms and nothing comes of it. So people got burned out on that, they got burned out on all the mandates to have to reexamine curriculum, textbooks and assessments. I hear it still. There is too much asked of them.

This participant also felt that the district, being so focused on implementing standards and testing measures, had erred in not utilizing teacher expertise, which had been a practice that had great import during the Camelot era.

I don’t see teachers being used well at all in this district. Some of the best ones I know were not called on to do anything in the last eight years that I was here…Some of them got so disgusted at what was not happening at the meetings that they stopped going…And I think that was my frustration with the district—the creative, generative piece was just dead.

This period of decline was a difficult transition for district teachers precisely because they were being asked to do more with less and were being directed to follow proscriptive programs that a large number regarded with skepticism. One participant commented on what he described as the “starvation of public education” and its effects on teacher morale.
I think people are exhausted… We are seeing fewer resources rather than more and we are seeing higher expectations rather than lower. So it is not surprising to me that you see cynicism, more skepticism, teachers looking askance at being on a committee… We are losing something pretty important in the bargain as a result of that.

This participant was very insightful about this period of decline and when interviewed remarked that new directions from the state forced the district into a management position that was antithetical to time honored Trust Agreement policies and practices. It was not surprising, in his opinion, that this paradigm shift away from a locally developed “shared” governance approach resulted quite predictably in staff “being very confused and disquieted as a result.” This characterization is probably an understatement—participants felt that district leadership lost a lot of credibility with many of its teachers during this period.

Other important examples of the “starvation of public education” cited by participants as particularly important contributors to the decline of the Trust Agreement movement, were the reduction of paid professional development days and the decline in State Subject Matter Institutes available to educators. During the Camelot period, up to ten professional development days were available to district teachers throughout the year. These days were put to good use and allowed the district sufficient process time to conduct all phases of new program implementations, which of course, included Trust Agreement implementations.

We were utilizing those days for professional growth and real training… having the time to sit down and think about what we were doing and how we could do it better. So the reduction of those staff development days to what they call buy-back days, from ten to three was huge… it didn’t give us the kind of quality time we needed.
The precipitous decline of staff development days within this district was particularly important; no one anticipated how having significantly fewer days available for collaborative decision-making processes would affect both the quality and integrity of collaborative practices. Teachers and administrators no longer had enough time for in-depth processing, which is exactly the type of work demanded in a shared decision-making environment. As the stresses mounted, the result of new mandates and far fewer days to make sense of it all, morale declined and the quality of the decisions suffered.

While district educators were grappling with the pressures created by these new limitations, the CDE had also shifted its focus to supporting the new standards and accountability mandates. Unfortunately, this meant that there were fewer dollars available for the State Subject Matter Institutes; many of these training opportunities simply vanished. One participant lamented:

I don’t see the same stuff going on at the state level that we had during the golden years…I went to the language arts institute in 1986 that was six weeks at UCLA where you lived language arts twelve hours a day. That was a transformational experience...There were always five or six people going to one of the curriculum leadership institutes every summer and this went on for years and years. As far as I am aware, that has probably pretty much gone away.

This was a significant loss for the district. Its educators had been voluntarily immersing themselves in “transformational” learning endeavors through summer institute training for years. In addition to these Subject Matter training opportunities, a very robust staff development program (referred to in section two) had been implemented under the direction of the newly formed Staff Development Committee, a product of the Trust Agreement in Staff Development. These institutes and locally developed trainings helped
district educators deepen their subject matter knowledge, develop skill sets and nurture a passion for learning, all of which brought immeasurable value to the district.

The Current Era

The final chapter of this historical report on Trust Agreement reforms within the PCSD concerns participant findings of what is termed the Current Era, a time period that, for purposes of this study, begins in 2001, with the advent of the No Child Left Behind Act and continues through 2006. Nine participants were interviewed to gather relevant data that encapsulate common themes regarding how Trust Agreement processes, particularly SDM, are working in today’s educational environment. These nine participants are either current site principals or have worked recently as site principals for the PCSD. The findings that are presented here are clustered into seven topics: 1) SDM processes are working well at individual sites; 2) the need for more training in SDM and a new Trust Agreement in communications; 3) frustration with Trust Agreement committees at the district office; 4) democratizing reforms and their effect on district culture; 5) the union as “provocateur;” 6) perceptions of district management’s leadership effectiveness; and 7) anti-leadership challenges linked to SDM practices within the district.

SDM Processes Are Working Well at Individual Sites

In spite of the controversy that often surrounds the topic of SDM in the PSCD, one of the strongest findings that emerged from these data concerned participants’ respect for the concept of SDM and their genuine efforts to honor SDM practices at their sites. A significant majority of participants stated that SDM was absolutely pivotal in arriving at
well-informed decisions, which in turn, engendered greater teacher support for those decisions. The following quotation sums up principals’ positive regard for SDM at their sites:

Well, I think the SDM process is key to how all decisions are made at [my] school. All the teachers really value their input from their colleagues and feel that it is important that they each have a strong voice in most decisions. So I would say that the SDM process is alive and well. It elongates our path to making decisions dramatically but every time we slog our way through it and get results I feel that it affirms that process because everyone is on board with that decision.

Principals also reported a positive regard for the concept of shared leadership, expressing that “…the process [SDM] as a whole has augmented the job because it is requiring us to do what we should be doing as leaders, and that is getting feedback from everyone before decisions are made.” As a whole, principals viewed their leadership role as that of a facilitator of the decision-making process rather than the dominant voice in the process. Most principals reported that very few decisions were made on site without staff input. While there was widespread agreement on the time consuming nature of the SDM process at sites, participants expressed the opinion that collaborative decision-making approaches produced greater “buy-in” than traditional, “top-down” approaches. However, most participants reported that failure to get significant staff input in the decision-making process could seriously undermine decisions that were made.

In addition to these positive findings, participants expressed a few caveats that merit additional consideration. Out of all the participants that were interviewed on the topic of how SDM practices were working at their site, only one out of nine described site SDM processes in negative terms. This participant described their site as “an example of SDM taken to an extreme.” This participant’s experience of SDM practices at her site reflected a
lot of staff discord that was not reported at other sites. This participant also reported that dysfunctional patterns that existed among staff members could be magnified through SDM processes. One participant, who described a very successful and harmonious SDM process, felt that collaborative processes were more likely to yield positive results at smaller sites, where teachers could get to know one another and “…have access to one another.” His point was that smaller staff size allowed for trust building and sharing of information that larger sites could not duplicate as efficiently.

In addition, some participants opined that SDM practices worked well at their site as long as the issues being discussed were not controversial and did not challenge deeply held educational beliefs of vocal staff members. As one participant explained, “I anticipate that it [SDM] will continue to work well…until we continue down the path of program improvement and come to the point where…we are all told what to do and it is different from what we want to do.” These types of concerns, the ragged side of collaborative decision-making practices and their unintended outcomes, will be considered in later sections.

The Need for More Training and a New Trust Agreement in Communications

Even though participants expressed widespread support for SDM at their sites, they often pointed out that the educational environment in public schools had changed dramatically since these reforms were put into effect. Many participants voiced frustration with trying to guide a highly collaborative process in an environment dictated by new state and federal mandates. One participant noted:
The rules have changed, …the accountability has changed, the dollars have changed, how you spend funds has changed, our student-to-teacher ratio has changed, our administrator-to-students has changed, our social expectation and what we provide has grown. So we don’t have the luxury of what it was like in the eighties to sit around and do the Socratic method about every decision a school should make.

In view of the changing educational landscape alluded to above, there was widespread agreement that SDM practices needed to be reinvigorated and refocused through more training in all aspects of SDM, particularly meeting facilitation training. During participant interviews, I would always ask if the actual language of the Trust Agreement documents needed revisions to accommodate current NCLB realities. Participants did not find the Trust Agreement language outdated, but felt that current problems with SDM practices could be attributed to the assertion that district and union leadership “…haven’t kept the [SDM] process going and alive with people trained to do it [with] a clear sense of purpose…to keep it working.” This participant aptly pointed out that the SDM process was “…only as good as the training and knowledge and commitment of the people who [were] behind it.”

In response to the perceived need for training in SDM practices by the district and its local union, these two bodies put together a team of trainers that visited each school site, presenting on a wide array of topics aimed at clarifying SDM issues and procedures within the district. Participants agreed that the training was informative, particularly to newer staff members who had never received any training in SDM nor had been informed about the district’s rich history regarding collaborative bargaining practices. However, the scope of this series of presentations on SDM was regarded as “barely a beginning,” insufficient to create the knowledge and skill-sets necessary to maintain a well-honed SDM environment.
Another strong finding among participants was their belief that many problems undermining SDM processes within the district could be traced to poor communication between decision-makers, or the pattern of decision-makers not receiving accurate and timely information. All agreed that some type of new Trust Agreement language was needed to spell out communication protocols and procedures to aid all parties to take responsibility for their part in an effective information system.

*Frustration with Trust Agreement Committee Practices at the District Office*

Although participants expressed a positive assessment of SDM practices as a means of decision-making at their sites, they voiced a palpable amount of angst when they talked about their experiences with the Staff Development and K12 Curriculum Trust Agreement Committees (see appendix B) held at the district office. Both of these committees are made up of teacher representatives from each site, site administrators, district, and union leadership. These committees are designed to provide a collaborative, information sharing venue for making decisions related to staff development and curriculum and instruction. Participants raised many concerns about the efficacy of these committees: Was the district getting value out of the Trust Agreement committee process as it currently existed? Were these committees accomplishing the tasks they were designed to accomplish?

Many participants felt that the Staff Development and K12 Curriculum committees had serious problems that undermined their ability to be effective. To begin with, various communication problems were often cited as having added unnecessary complications to the decision-making process. “I think it is always communication. We seem not to be able to communicate as well as we intend to. …From the hub [District Office] back, we haven’t
trained staff well…who are representing us. It is like they go and do the job and then it falls by the wayside.” Participants also reported frequent breakdowns in the reciprocal flow of information between district committees and the school sites.

We talk about the accordion [communication] system of back and forth, but I don’t think people go to those meetings with good site knowledge and I don’t think they return from those meetings carrying what happened at the meeting in a very intelligible way so that people really understand what is happening.

Another problem undermining effective communication mentioned by participants is the amount of time needed for all constituencies to process their piece of a decision under consideration. One person noted that “…my experience this year is that frequently I get things to my staff in a fashion that doesn’t allow them enough time to gather the information they might need ‘to adequately inform their decision.’” This participant felt that slow moving communications from the district office was due to logistical problems created by understaffing at the district office.

Participants also expressed concerns that certain committee members, known for their passionately held educational views, were given to editorializing—not delivering the information to and from committee meetings free of their own biases. These same committee members, as noted by participants, also displayed a tendency to dominate the committee discussions, sometimes causing discussions to go off topic while consuming valuable time.

Unlike the earlier years of SDM, where these committees were often composed of highly trained teachers, participants contend that today’s Trust Agreement committees are often made up with inexperienced teachers. “You get people who just show up because they have to sign up on the extra duty list and they have no knowledge or commitment to
make it work…or even the knowledge to explain what they have heard…” at the meetings they attend. Consequently, participants questioned the quality of the dialogue and decision-making that took place during these meetings. They also felt that many of the district’s most knowledgeable teachers had ceased coming to these meetings. The most often cited reasons for diminished participation were teachers’ lack of time and their negative perceptions of committee work. Many of the most experienced teachers didn’t want to spend time away from their classroom to participate in what they perceived as endless committee discussions that seemed to have a questionable impact on teaching and learning.

Democratizing Reforms and Their Effect on District Culture

If one has the good fortune to work for the PCSD, one is struck by the uniqueness of its culture, a culture of educators influenced by two decades of educational practice guided by Trust Agreements policies that placed teachers on an equal footing with administrators with regard to making important policy decisions. This section examines findings that reveal how participants view the linkage between teacher empowerment and cultural norms that have formed within the district culture during these two decades of power-sharing practices.

Autonomy findings. One of the most interesting findings that emerged in this research concerned the importance of teacher and site autonomy within this district. Teachers within this district place a huge premium on autonomy, or their freedom to act as they see fit, whether it is within their own classroom or as a school site. Historically, district educators have bristled when given directions from outsiders and have prided themselves as being trendsetters, not followers. Participants report various reasons for this strong independent
When questioning participants, and asking if SDM practices fostered this sense of empowerment, I elicited this insightful response:

I think the empowerment came from sites having operated—probably ever since…the late seventies and early eighties—they were really autonomous—they were like little islands. They had decision-making authority over every single thing that happened at the school site. And so I think…that is …the source of this entitlement and power. Nobody had the right to tell anybody what to do with their own site—certainly not the district.

This person went on to say that teachers had a tremendous amount of classroom autonomy as well, treating their own classrooms like kingdoms, free from outside direction.

The time period referred to above is during the early nineties, but the premium placed on teacher autonomy actually began during the Camelot period. As reported in section one of this chapter, there was a sizeable influx of new teachers within this district during the late sixties and seventies. This talented cohort came of age in the seventies and eighties. They were heavily influenced by district, state and union programs that viewed teachers as central players in the reform process, and invested in developing their professionalism. This educational reform period, referred to as the Camelot era in this paper, put teachers at the center of educational reform within the PCSD. Teachers were given the freedom to experiment, craft their own professional development programs and wrote their own curriculum, believing that they had enough local expertise to handle any challenge. One participant, who referred to district teachers from that era as “rebels,” explained that,

I think that we are critical thinkers…and we are not going to just take things, swallow things because it is out there. We really want to look at it, think about it, chew it over, talk about it with each other, see how it lines up with what our beliefs are, or if it changes our beliefs before we jump on it and take it.
Even though teachers and site administrators valued their autonomy before SDM processes became embedded within the district, once teachers got used to sharing power in the late eighties and early nineties, teacher equity and teacher autonomy became preeminent values of teachers. The Trust Agreement in SDM, completed in 1988, helped institutionalize a teacher empowerment process that had been years in the making.

There were, however, unintended outcomes that participants attributed to teacher empowerment of the Camelot era, attitudes, points of view that participants feel have become embedded, or “normalized” within the culture of teachers. The result of being “way ahead of other districts,” one participant opined, was an intellectual smugness that began to insulate the district, noting that,

Sometimes we just thought that nobody else out there had anything they could offer us. You know, we got so confident in our ability to train ourselves and we got so insular that we decided at some point, we don’t need anybody else...we’ll do it our way.

This participant posited that many teachers coming out of this earlier era of education, those who participated during the Camelot era, were “rebels” who definitely took contrarian positions because they felt they could do a better job than the so-called experts. This participant also noted that during the Camelot era district staff were well connected at the CDE, and often managed to convince state officials to grant the district waivers so that it could fulfill educational requirements in its own, unique way.

The findings suggest that Trust Agreement policies have embedded a strong belief in teacher autonomy within the culture of teachers. While a significant amount of power was transferred to teachers through the original 1988 Trust Agreement in Shared Decision-Making, teachers were granted even more influence under Article XX, (see Appendix B)
language that was added to the District Collective Bargaining Contract in 2000. This Article essentially gave teachers the right to grieve any decision that affected their working conditions if they could prove a decision was not negotiated according to district SDM protocols. Since decisions affecting working conditions could apply to almost anything within a teacher’s workday, their capacity to exercise power was greatly expanded under this Article. According to participants, many teachers use this decision-making authority to regularly challenge reforms that are viewed as narrowing the range of teacher choices—their ability to chose actions they prefer. One participant, who believed that SDM practices had the capacity to accentuate whatever was driving decisions at the site level, offered the following insightful comment, stating that SDM,

gives sites a lot of autonomy—and that can be a good thing; but it also allows a site to fall further and further behind if they are not moving in a direction they need to move, if they are not working together, if there is poor leadership, whatever it is. Whatever is dysfunctional in a site can become more dysfunctional when there is that much site autonomy.

Obstructionism findings. Participants agreed that SDM practices are sometimes used as a tool to slow down or halt promising educational reforms. They reported that SDM had been used more productively in the past, but had somehow morphed into a powerful tool used by teachers to say “no” with alarming regularity. This is not surprising, considering that union leadership, when going around to all sites to do training on SDM, presented an effective analogy; SDM was compared a red stop button commonly found on any factory production line that workers (teachers) could push to halt production—should a compelling reason present itself. Challenging whether or not the SDM process was adhered to properly, or charging that teachers were left out of the loop had the effect of pushing the red stop
button. Thus, a common lament voiced by participants was that “…whenever the teachers didn’t like something, whether it was coming down from the state or district administration, they would yell SDM, where is the SDM?” Another participant added, “…if there are one or two teachers that do not want something to happen and they happen to be vocal or leaders, they can stop something that might be in the school’s best interest,” through SDM.

Participants also expressed a high degree of concern that they could not move to adopt research-based practices because they could simply not get their site staff to agreement around issues that were controversial at their site. When talking about the long-standing issue in this district regarding the degree to which each elementary site embraced the district adopted reading program, one participant noted that there was “…no SDM process that we are going to be involved [with] in my tenure that is going to get us to the point where we fully embrace…” following the program recommendations. After four years, this site, and other elementary sites within the district, implement their reading program in a manner that is sometimes not consistent with program recommendations and can vary widely within grade levels because of teacher preference.

The degree with which participants linked SDM practices to obstructionist tactics varied site by site. Some participants reported very few problems of this nature while others reported having great difficulties achieving consensus on decisions on a regular basis. As a result, there were degrees of frustration expressed by participants regarding the amount of time and energy it typically takes to navigate the decision-making process.

An interesting finding that emerged during the course of these interviews was participants’ perception that veteran teachers, those that had taught in the district during the
Camelot era, were often the teachers that saw themselves as guardians of the “old ways,” or protectors of the practices and values that informed the Camelot era. These were the vocal teachers, according to participants, that often raised objections to the new mandates and programs that were designed for these mandates. When asking participants if veteran teachers altered staff interactions, one participant noted:

> It alters the dynamics for sure. Sometimes I don’t know how much it influences decisions as impedes decisions. It takes more time to get to a decision because there is always that impediment—there will always be something that someone feels wasn’t shared adequately.

Another participant expressed a similar view, stating that SDM was practiced successfully at his site because no one was on staff from that “old era,” having “deep-rooted connections to the SDM glory days.” This allowed him, as he related to me, to practice SDM in a modern context and employ the process with great success.

**SDM and conflicting values within the PSCD culture.** This section examines how both district and union leadership have come to endorse very different educational values over the years as both camps have struggled to deal with the new realities created by both state and federal mandates. One participant offered a very succinct explanation of factors informing both camps by stating:

> I think the pressures that come to administrators are so different than the pressures that teachers are feeling because we are being told that you have to get these test scores up and that we are going to have to look at the data, etc., etc., etc. The teachers are seeing it from a totally different perspective so therefore it seems to put us into competing lots.

The PCSD, like all districts throughout California, is under enormous pressure to meet both state and federal growth targets mandated by the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act. In order to deal with these realities, the district has been examining relevant data for years and has
been investing significant resources in identifying and implementing various types of support designed to move the district forward. Examples of this work include: hiring highly qualified teachers; implementing data collection systems; insuring that every student has state approved standards-based textbooks; sending teachers to numerous trainings; writing District plans that address staff development, English Learners; Technology; Gifted and Talented Education; and developing a document that identifies key or power standards. In short, the district has been extremely busy grappling with the complexities of providing all students with high-quality, standards-based educational programs.

By investing in the activities cited above, the district has acknowledged that they value and endorse a standards-based curriculum and have accepted state, STAR and district created tests as being valid ways of measuring and reporting student performance. However, many district teachers and its union leadership have taken an entirely different view of how to respond to this new set of mandates. This camp is opposed to these mandates, seeing them as harmful to both teachers and students for a variety of reasons. In their estimation, these mandates de-professionalize the role of teachers, limiting the scope of their actions in ways that make them less effective for their students. The imposition of direction from outsiders together with the mandate to accept what is viewed as a seriously flawed educational platform (the standards) and accountability system (the state testing system, STAR) has become the source of philosophic disagreement between district management, many of its teachers, and the union leadership, that has yet to be resolved.

While union leadership and veteran teachers were upset with having state and federal mandates narrow the scope of their decision-making authority, their mistrust of this new
paradigm was also rooted in their strong conviction that the CDE had erred in adopting standards that they viewed as educationally inappropriate. As one participant noted:

> When you look at these standards, they are not measuring what they were asking us to do with the Frameworks, or what we believe is right, what is good teaching. And that is where people got so frustrated, threw up their hands and said, “...why would we want to put all of this time into this when it doesn’t mean anything to us.”

The quotation above referred to how many veteran teachers, teachers that had been very active in leadership positions throughout the district, felt ten years ago when the district first began the process of adopting the state standards. Interestingly, the view held by the district’s union and a vocal group of veteran teachers had not changed much, even ten years later. When asked about today’s standards-driven educational environment one participant stated that, “…the standards suck.” This person also articulated the popular union view that STAR tests are “…culturally biased and inappropriate,” that the “…tests suck…and that is what needs fixing, not our district.” These statements represent the views of the district’s union and an influential set of teachers within the PCSD. An interesting observation that has been noted in previous sections by participants is the contention that many of the teachers who were the most vocal in their disapproval of today’s standards and accountability movement were usually veteran teachers, those who had taught in this district during the Camelot years and believed in the educational values that had informed that era.

When one considers the unique history of the PCSD during the Camelot years, it is not surprising that new state and federal mandates would be viewed as a paradigm shift, or, in this case, an uninvited intrusion of “top-down” directives to be resisted at all costs by some within the district. It is also not surprising that district management has responded to these
mandates by shifting its focus over the years to raising test scores. In view of these two very different approaches for creating quality educational programs for students, it is probably to be expected that these two factions have pursued separate agendas while continuing to criticize one another.

At present, there is a high level of distrust expressed by union leadership and some veteran teachers regarding district management’s embracing of the standards-driven educational system and how it is perceived as wanting to undermine SDM practices to affect speedier change. Union leadership and many teachers see themselves as champions of a “…battle to protect the philosophic concept of SDM.” One participant expressed similar concerns, reporting, “…the union feels right now that their main job is to protect teachers from being exploited in the name of these mandates.” Another participant noted that, “…the state and federal government are both doing everything in their power to keep almost everybody in the educational community off balance.” In any case, a high degree of cynicism and mistrust informs the ideology of this faction; they simply feel that state and federal mandates are ruining public education and see that the district as selling out to this set of priorities.

*The Union as Provocateur*

Participants interviewed for their views on the effectiveness of current Trust Agreements and SDM practices are united in their opinions regarding union leadership and its influence on the educational reform process within the district. Participants believed that their local union is “…out of sync…” with the new realities facing public education and offered some interesting explanations.
Participants pointed out that the current divide between management and the union actually formed over nine years ago while the district was under the leadership of the previous superintendent, a leader who was perceived by many as being hostile to SDM practices within the district. Participants also pointed out that the key members of the current union negotiating team are now retired, but were very active during the Camelot days and subsequently bring an outdated mindset into the negotiations. One participant expressed that the makeup of this negotiating team was highly unusual, and noted that their “…longing for the days of yore…” mindset would present problems for a district management staff that had no direct experience of the old days. So it is understandable that some of the philosophical differences that have characterized both management and union camps were and are exacerbated by years of prior mistrust, fueled by the addition of new management personnel who do not understand the history of Trust Agreement practices within the district.

Lamentable as this may be, participants voiced strong disapproval of union tactics that they felt were directed at slowing down the implementation of new educational reforms. “There have been comments that the union leadership has made to me—[that] they purposefully slow down these decisions in hoping those things will go away…because they think NCLB, if we wait it out long enough, is going to go away.” This participant articulates the frustration of this group, describing how, in his view, the union has abdicated its role as a key collaborator in the educational reform process:

My thoughts are that you are part of the problem if you are not part of the solution—it’s not going away. And even if it is going to go away in ten years, what are we going to do between the next ten or fifteen years? Are we just going to sit here and wait and become more and more program improvement? And hope to God
that the legislation gets changed…before the government comes in and takes over all of our jobs? Not only that—we are doing a disservice to the kids.

Participants also cited their strong opposition to Article XX in the district’s collective bargaining contract. They believe that this contract language gives teachers and union leaders unfettered authority to stop or at least slow down unpopular changes by claiming that SDM protocols have not been properly followed. The following quotation expresses some of that frustration often voiced by participants regarding the union:

And the thing that can’t happen, the union cannot stand by and watch as a teacher doesn’t listen during a staff meeting, doesn’t pay attention to the things going to be done, doesn’t participate. And then when it comes down to the place where they need to make a change, they say, no, there wasn’t SDM. Of course it was, you just weren’t listening, you just weren’t playing.

Participants expressed dismay with union leadership tactics that they believe often present the district management as a foe of SDM. One participant contended that union leadership puts a spin “…on everything in regards to Trust Agreement that makes teachers feel that the district is circumventing SDM. But in reality it is doing it, is endeavoring to do it. It is very frustrating to me.” Thus participants expressed considerable consternation over what they viewed as the union’s role in adding to the fires of divisiveness. It is their view that a new era in education demands a new set of solutions from everyone—that it is the union’s responsibility to embrace the spirit of collaboration and offer constructive solutions.

Perceptions of District Management’s Leadership Effectiveness

One of the striking findings that emerged from participant interviews is their perception regarding the effectiveness of district management as it endeavors to carry out its primary mission for creating high quality educational programs for all district students. The
majority of participants expressed frustration with a range of district management practices that fell out into two, broad categories: 1) the perception that district management sometimes exercises ambiguous or indecisive leadership when acting within the context of SDM, and is therefore slow to respond to the challenges of a mandate driven educational environment; and 2) the perception that district management has not supported teachers and administrators with a set of systems that is charged with creating K-12 program coherence, sustainability and accountability. Simply stated, participants voiced frustration with the leadership of their leaders, holding them responsible for not adequately defining and supporting leadership roles and responsibilities within a SDM system and current decentralized organizational structure.

Participants often viewed district management as unwilling or unable to exercise leadership in areas that were considered important to teachers and principals. Two reasons were given for this perceived reticence to exercise decisive leadership: 1) aversion to risk-taking; and 2) lack of skill at exercising leadership within the context of district SDM mandates. Risk avoidance was a theme that was associated with district management. One participant opined that district management was not in a strong position to act decisively because the school board was often more comfortable with avoiding confrontation, and preserving the appearance that all was well. This person felt that the board and district management had not decided which battles they wanted to fight, and that this lack of prioritization had contributed to an aversion “…on anybody’s part to take the risk…[that there was] nothing in place that allows anybody to have backbone.” This person went on to explain that district leadership backed away from owning responsibility for taking a decisive stand on program changes and district-wide agreements, fearing this type of
leadership style would give the wrong impression that the district was mandating, or
directing change, not facilitating it. Another participant, when asked if SDM mandates
undermined district reform efforts, stated unequivocally that leadership, not SDM, was the
problem because educators in leadership positions within the district were often not bold
enough to take the heat that would inevitably follow taking controversial positions.

However, there was also agreement among participants that SDM mandates are a factor
in constraining the effectiveness of district management. “It just seems really difficult for
any kind of clear statement or direction to come from our district. I guess it is because of
SDM and because of our contract and negotiations.” Another participant expressed a
similar view, noting that district management gets “…silenced…or they silence
themselves…” and are therefore “…not as clear as they need to be.”

While acknowledging these constraining factors, participants were in agreement that a
more decisive leadership approach was needed for success. The commonly expressed view
was that “…you have to have a strong district direction…” in order to implement and
sustain effective change. A significant frustration shared by the majority of participants was
that district management did not set clear priorities, adequately support those priorities and
hold principals accountable to enact those priorities. When talking about the importance of
a strong central office, the phrase “…holding my feet to the fire…” was voiced numerous
times without prompting. The recognition that district management needed to exercise a
firmer leadership style is reflected in the following quotation:

It is not only that they should be holding my feet to the fire, but they should be
holding everybody’s feet to the fire here. They should be saying, look, this is what
has to happen—and as a district, this will happen in every school.
Participants also felt that district management needed to be more visible in their role as advocates for the educational reforms. Instead of primarily acting as facilitators of various committees where decisions were made, participants expressed their desire for district management to be more decisive in steering committee decisions toward desired outcomes. During the Camelot era, when SDM practices were at their pinnacle, the former superintendent and assistant superintendent mentioned in section one, were regarded as very skillful in leading various decision-making committees as opposed to having their leadership role subsumed by those committees. As reported by one participant who was very involved in Trust Agreement work during the Camelot period, both these district leaders were “…absolute master[s] of facilitating the collaborative process. But neither…were above subtly managing the facilitation to lean in the direction that they thought they out to go.” The point of including this example of leadership during the Camelot era is that participants recognized that bold leadership and SDM practices can co-exist while yielding productive results. Participants want teachers to be involved in the decision-making process and sites to continue being autonomous, but they also want their district leaders to realize the importance of decisive leadership and act accordingly.

Participants also noted that decisive and visible positions taken by district management empowered them as principals to be more effective at implementations back at their sites.

The following quotation offers an example of the dilemma most participants expressed regarding effective leadership within a SDM environment:

There are certain decisions that I think even the Administration has to say—well, the upper Administration has a certain command decision authority, and it makes it easier. They make a command decision that empowers us to make a command decision. But if they are telling us, well, how do you want to do it, you solve it; middle management is stuck in a quandary of having upper management not
making a decision and the sites trying to make decisions for them. And yet they’re held accountable to make a decision but they are not truly empowered to make the decision. Then it is almost like middle management becomes the scapegoat on both sides of the equation.

Participants were not advocating the return of a “top-down” driven decision-making system, but did express that there were key areas that needed more top-down direction from district management. Agreements around the implementation of common assessment practices and use of instructional materials were mentioned by participants as examples of areas of concern where agreements have been tenuous at best. When citing an example of ambiguous leadership around language arts program agreements, one participant noted:

Now…all the children have a standards-based textbook. OK, we don’t have any direction about—will it be used, or how much will it be used, or how much time every student in the District will have literacy time for example….We have no direction on that.

Participants were in agreement that the SDM process made it much more difficult to achieve needed district-wide agreements and that this was a systemic problem that needed to be addressed.

Another important finding that emerged from these data is that participants feel overloaded with the complexities of their job and do not feel that they are being supported by district management in a variety of ways. Many of those interviewed expressed dismay when describing attending meetings at the district office. They reported that meetings are often packed full of “nuts and bolts” items that relate to compliance issues as opposed to issues that have more relevance for their sites. Participants report that they feel overloaded with minutia that they often felt could have communicated by email. While these types of administrative pressures are not unique to this district, participants expressed that they did not feel appreciated for the work that they did do when attending these meetings. One
participant noted that, “…you just don’t really hear from anybody ever, ever about anything really that is going well—ever. You just don’t.”

One participant expressed frustration that district management wasn’t more active in developing administrator leadership and mentoring skills. “I don’t feel like I get [grown] at the district office as a leader….Why am I not being told what I need to learn? Why isn’t somebody watching me, saying, ‘OK, you are a little weak here, I want you to learn this.’ I don’t feel like I am being guided.” These data suggest that participants sometimes feel overwhelmed by compliance duties, under appreciated and in need of greater support to handle the unique challenges they are faced with on a daily basis.

An important finding that surfaced many times during the course of these interviews concerned the role district management played as instructional leaders and developers of relevant professional development. Participants were particularly critical of district management in this area, and felt that management was so consumed with dealing with compliance issues that not nearly enough time and resources were being devoted to deepening knowledge around curriculum and instruction. Participants did point out however, that site needs could be very different and that professional development in a variety of programs and instructional strategies were called for—that this presented difficult issues to address.

This being said, participants expressed concern that the district has not done enough to create a professional learning community approach where educators are given the opportunity to examine research about best practices. As one participant noted, “...unless people understand [the] why, they don’t sustain anything.” Too often, teachers in this
district have been told to teach new programs without having training, and therefore adequate understanding of what they were being asked to do. It is not surprising that, over time, programs and practices that started with good intentions are sometimes abandoned or modified because teachers are unable to get the results they had hoped for. Thus participants expressed a real desire to be involved with more relevant learning opportunities. They felt that educators needed adequate training in order to teach effectively and they felt that it was the district’s role to take a strong role in creating vibrant learning communities within the district.

The second set of findings in this section deals with participants’ perceptions that district operations and authority are too decentralized, and subsequently have impeded its ability to exercise leadership as effectively as participants would like. Specifically, participants feel that district management has been ineffective, slow to establish district-wide agreements and accountability systems that they view as being crucial components of successful reform efforts. They also cite a lack of resources, most notably a lack of time and sufficient funds, as significant factors that limit district reform efforts.

The prevailing view among participants is that the district has become too decentralized, that it suffers from having a structure that is “loosely coupled,” a phrase that has been used numerous times when educators have described the decision-making process of this district. The image of a train engine being decoupled from its cars comes to mind when considering this phrase because it describes a mechanism that focuses power and direction (engine) being separated (at least intermittently) from that which it is charged with pulling to a destination. Participants often voiced their concerns regarding ways they believed that the district was not pulling its weight—and these concerns often focused on
perceptions that the district leadership, including its board, did not have well thought out systems and accountability structures in place to support successful program implementation.

One participant, when talking about the importance of insuring that teachers understood the learning theory that anchored the programs they were being directed to teach, noted that there was no “…ring of systems…” managed by the district that ensured that this important knowledge reached all who needed this information. Another participant characterized the district organization as “…a system that serves from seventy-five to eighty-five percent of its clients very well…” and then remarked that “…we have different schools going in vastly different directions and it is going to take a systems-wide change for that to be overcome.” When discussing how the educational landscape had changed so dramatically during the last decade, yet another participant expressed a commonly held view regarding the district’s role in the reform process, that “…a systems look…is going to have to happen and somehow it is going to have to evolve, change to meet today.”

Participants registered their beliefs that district management had a greater role to play in creating and implementing various types of support and accountability measures that are seen as originating from the district office because it confers credibility to these support structures in ways that can not be empowered at sites. Participants voiced their concerns that weak support from the district office undermined reform efforts, sometimes resulting in “surface” level implementation leading to negligible results. An example of this, often cited by participants, was the discovery that many of the district’s elementary sites had ceased following a six-year agreement outlining the use of language arts assessments. One
participant felt that the district office took too passive a role in the articulation of these agreements, thus undermining the conditions necessary for success.

The whole elementary reading assessment came because elementary principals pushed for it—because we weren’t doing anything from the district level. …So we had an action plan and we put together this whole thing. Perhaps there was very little involvement from district level people in that action plan that we put together—very little involvement. Perhaps it is important for somebody from…the district level to be involved in that kind of decision-making so that …[we] understand what is being done and why it is being done, and have some expectation of how it is going to be useful to the district. …And so it becomes impossible for the district to hold your feet to the fire over that because they didn’t have anybody—it wasn’t on their plate.

When asking participants to clarify where they thought that district management needed to exercise more authority in order to create a more cohesive set of support systems, they noted that the district: 1) had not been able to create a widely held agreement among teachers regarding how to define student progress (there still is a sizable group of district teachers who argue against a standards-based approach); 2) had not achieved agreements regarding what information (data) would be used to measure student progress; and 3) had not achieved agreements on effective ways to monitor and hold all staff accountable.

Those I interviewed had very strong views regarding the importance of measuring student outcomes, using data to inform decision-making on all levels, and making sure accountability systems were in place. Participants expressed frustration over the continued debate over how to define student success. One participant noted that, “I mean, I am not sure what assessments are acceptable now to judge whether or not kids are learning. So you’ve got a [mooshy] target.” This person explained that as a district, we still had not defined and agreed upon what were considered legitimate measures of student success.
In addition to this perceived dilemma, participants voiced strong concerns regarding the district’s data collection and accountability practices. One participant was very blunt in her assessment of district data monitoring practices and noted: “We are in danger of becoming a program improvement district…because we haven’t done that monitoring as carefully as we needed to.” This person expressed that while the district was making progress in creating a set of agreements for data collection, the tendency of the district was to put new programs in place without having effective ways of measuring how well those programs were working. Although this approach is hardly unique to the PCSD, participants acknowledged how a tradition of minimal district supervision has undermined district ability to create effective monitoring systems. As noted by one participant,

…there hasn’t been a history of the district closely monitoring sites on a lot of things….And the expectation is that I am doing my job…that when a direction has been given or decided upon—that we are each following through in our role with that.

This example raises an interesting point—that district management has struggled with assuming a more authoritarian posture because that is not the role they have played for the past two decades. This example also illustrates the point that district management has the tendency to maintain a hands-off posture while assuming that teachers and principals are, in fact, honoring agreements that have been made in the past. Although those interviewed are very much in sympathy with the complexities faced by district management, they contend that management must take a stronger role in the development of district-wide systems and support structures necessary for effective accountability.

In addition to expressing their leadership concerns, participants also acknowledged variables that constrained management’s ability in the current environment. When asked to
weigh in on the district’s role in creating accountability systems, one participant expressed an opinion voiced by other participants. He stated: “I don’t know that the district has an accountability problem. What we have in general in education is [to create] mandates and not provide resources for making things happen.” He also stated that, “…what we have to be careful about in this district is the number of new initiatives and the number of things we ask people to do.” His point was that the continuous stream of initiatives put into action in an attempt to meet mandated targets were straining the limited resources of all constituencies involved, including the district office.

While there was some voicing of concern that the district office was understaffed and therefore unable to create needed support structures, or the “ring of systems” mentioned earlier, the most prevalent finding was that there was simply not enough time available to effectively expedite all that needed to be handled. If, as one participant noted, “people are the structure,” then it follows that time limitations also seriously undermine the effective implementations of a well-honed set of systems required by these mandates.

Dwindling resources, specifically the lack of time available to deal with an increasing workload, is a factor that has an increased significance in a district that is highly decentralized. Since teachers are part of the decision-making process, they need to be part of the continual round of decision-making committees that help develop programs and structures that meet state and federal requirements. The demand to create various new systems and procedures are imposing pressures that are testing all constituencies. One participant expressed her concerns that the time consuming nature of the district’s SDM process was having a demoralizing effect upon many of its teachers. She stated that the nature of our decision-making committee process was “…adding another burden to
teachers who don’t have any time to themselves to do what they need to do…[so] they’re on overload; …they are really caught in a system that is playing havoc with them as well.”

As a result, participants question the viability of a governing process that imposes considerable demands upon its constituencies in a resource-poor environment.

*Anti-Leadership Challenges Linked to SDM Practices within the PCSD*

The last set of findings that complete section four, The Current Era, deals with participant views on the unique challenges imposed on leadership within the SDM culture of the PCSD. When one examines these challenges and how participants regard them as being linked with district SBM and SDM practices, one is struck by how strongly these findings mirror Wildavsky’s description of the challenges besetting an equity regime and its leadership. In brief, participants describe numerous ways their leadership efforts are often undermined by challenges that Wildavsky contends are the hallmark of an equity regime. This final section presents these leadership challenges, building the case that the PCSD, as an equity regime, has developed cultural norms and governance practices that often undermine effective leadership practices.

Participant data reveals an almost universal sentiment that SBM and SDM practices pose challenges for leadership at all levels within the district. One participant noted that it was more difficult to have authority within the district’s power sharing structure and used an analogy of being an effective classroom manager to describe what he considered a fundamental assumption that anchored the practice of effective leadership. He stated:

> How do you, as a teacher, manage your classroom? You only do that when you are confident that you are the manager of that classroom, that you are the one in charge.
Once you have that fundamental assumption, the rest...starts falling into place and you build a system that works for you.

Having interviewed the majority of district principals, the data indicates that this fundamental assumption of being in charge, of having enough influence to lead effectively, is in doubt. This finding mirrors one of Wildavsky’s basic contentions regarding equity regimes—that these regimes are defined as a system that has a high demand for leadership functions while having minimal support structures in place that help to support these functions.

Participants reported decision-making situations that, in their view, often merited more decisive, authoritative leadership behaviors in order to affect a desired change. When attempting to exhibit such leadership behaviors, participants related story after story where their actions evoked antipathy towards them. The phrases, “…ugly battle field,” “…wouldn’t be fun,” “…creates dissention,” and “…would have a mutiny on my hands,” were all descriptions characterizing what often happened back at staff meetings when participants attempted to voice a strong position on a course of action they thought their staff should take. Participants report that teachers are very likely to be offended if their leadership behaviors are perceived as coming from a position of authority. Again, this dynamic of challenging leadership actions, indeed, of challenging the very concept of leadership, is central to Wildavsky’s description of an equity regime. He contends that equity regimes hold “…equality of condition [as] the only legitimate political norm.”

Wildavsky, (1998, p.101) Thus, egalitarianism, in essence, is opposed to the concept and execution of leadership, because leadership implies inequity. In addition, Wildavsky posits that equities are uncomfortable with the act of following all but one leadership style; that of the “charismatic,” or, one who visibly embodies the values of the culture and displays well
developed interpersonal skills. Wildavsky contends that leadership within an equity regime is “discontinuous” because of the many ways constituencies opt out when leadership fails to connect with its culture and embody its values. He posits that these equity driven cultures like to “tear down” leadership in a variety of direct and invisible ways. The cumulative effect of this “tearing down” or constant challenging, as reported by participants, is that they are sometimes hesitant to “rock the boat” and make any type of unilateral decision without continually looking over their shoulder. Thus participants often reported that they felt compelled to use SDM for almost all decisions, that decisive leadership actions should be used with caution.

Another variable reported by participants is their perception that educators taking on leadership roles needed to be highly skilled in many attributes of leadership in order to be successful within this district culture. When referring to the complexities of operating within a SDM culture, one participant commented that “…by its very nature, this process is one which, if a person is lazy or uncommitted, it can be subverted. That has always been so, and my guess is that it is more so now than ever.” Another participant summed up the dilemma faced by those in leadership positions when trying to steer a group toward a particular outcome: “The group isn’t going anywhere the group doesn’t want to go, you know, which means that you’ve got, how do you create wholeness out of this diversity? …That is a highly skilled sort of thing and it is available in facilitation training.” As noted in an earlier section, there really has not been a lot of training in facilitation and other leadership skills that would help aspiring leaders within the PCSD acquire the necessary skills needed for success. Given the challenges that face all of those who aspire to lead in
this SDM culture, it is not surprising that participants do not feel supported, and confident that they can exercise their authority in more expansive ways.

Another interesting finding that supports Wildavsky’s equity regime construct is data that suggests that some teachers within this district have a hard time accepting the concept of expertise, and are prone to rejecting the notion that an “expert” opinion confers the weight of legitimate authority. One participant noted, “…that there isn’t an assumption that the principals have expertise. I really do think there is not a value, that the principals carry anymore expertise than anybody else.” Another participant commented on why she felt that PCSD teachers were given to questioning research-based practices, stating that: 1) district teachers valued the freedom conferred by SBM/SDM practices to teach as they saw fit, developing their own expertise; and 2) challenged outside solutions, believing “…that there is an art to understanding children and [that] it can’t necessarily be quantified in a research-based way.”

These examples illustrate participant perceptions regarding many of the challenges faced by leadership in this SDM district. They also serve to illustrate how the PCSD does conform to Wildavsky’s equity regime construct. The significance of these findings will be considered in the conclusion of this paper.
Chapter V: Conclusions and Implications

Summary of Findings

The history and evolution of restructuring reforms undertaken by the PCSD during the last twenty years present educators with the opportunity to reflect on one district’s unusual journey of restructuring reform. In concluding this thesis, I briefly summarize the essential findings of “The Pre-Trust Agreement Years,” “Camelot,” “The Decline Years,” and “The Current Era.” I then end with a concluding remarks section where lessons from the past are woven together with needs of the current era.

The Pre-Trust Agreement Era

Many of the conditions that contributed to Trust Agreement policies actually began forming within the district during the early seventies. The district was a friendly place of employment—people went out of their way to get along. It is clear that dynamic district office leadership played a large role in fostering this positive atmosphere. They nurtured a set of norms that honored positive collaborations and valued teacher input. The district was also experiencing an influx of new teachers at that time. These teachers exhibited many of the qualities attributed to “sixties” generation, which meant that they infused much of their work with a lot of idealism, experimentation, and the desire to do “…their own thing.” Another important condition that started to take root during this period of time was the formation of the PFT and the productive relationships this body started developing within the district.
The Camelot Years

An examination of these data from the Camelot period reveal a substantial number of cultural and organizational attributes that experts (Collins, J., 2001; Elmore, R. 2005; Marzano, R., 2003; Reeves, D., 2003; Wheatley, M., 2000) tout as being the hallmarks of successful educational organizations. The leadership team that functioned during this period displayed many attributes of what Marzano, (2005, p.99) termed a “purposeful community,” also referred to in the literature as a “professional learning community.” The Camelot “community,” described in section two, was composed of the “right people,” doing the “right work,” at the “right time.” This dynamic team was committed to a shared vision of educational philosophy, methodologies, and SDM practices they believed served to accomplish shared goals. While leadership was distributed throughout the Trust Agreement team, allowing each participant to bring something unique to the group, strong district leadership was also an essential factor that contributed to this group’s success. This leadership was particularly successful in “…modeling common values,” (Elmore, 2005, p. 141) that honored the principles of SDM and created a very strong focus around improving instruction. PFT leadership was also an integral part of this dynamism; they shared the same core beliefs and were equal partners in the district’s collaborative work. All of these elements combined during the Camelot years to produce a whole that was greater that the sum of its parts, creating an organizational coherence that has yet to be duplicated within the PCSD. Elmore (2005) offers a succinct description of the type of organizational and cultural coherence achieved during Camelot:

Schools work as accountable organizations to the degree that they nurture and demand from their participants—teachers, students, parents, administrators—high levels of agreement, convergence, or alignment around the conditions of powerful practice in the classrooms. Powerful organizational environments require trust,
embodied in the norms of respect, personal regard, competence, and integrity. People within and outside public organizations form trusting relationships with those organizations to the degree that they feel that their own interests are encapsulated in the interests of the institution. (p.296)

Clearly, the Camelot era embodied a time when individuals created a new synergy, aided in large part by the shedding their institutional roles and a commitment to the creative work they were doing.

A high level of trust, which Bryk and Schneider (2002) termed, “relational trust,” also infused the leadership teams of that period. Trust Agreement committee members had known one-another for years and had developed close friendships. Ideas motivated this group; they were infused with an idealism that both focused and drove their work. In their negotiations, they endeavored to find ways where everyone’s input would be treated with respect. An analysis of Camelot data reveal social dynamics that mirrored four attributes that Bryk and Schneider (2002) posit as encapsulating “relational trust;” respect, personal regard, competence in core responsibilities, and personal integrity. Indeed, “relational trust” defined Camelot in many ways and helped foster “…a set of organizational conditions, some structural and others social-psychological, that [made] it more conducive for individuals to initiate and sustain the kinds of activities necessary to affect” change mechanisms (Bryk & Schneider, p. 116).

The Camelot era also owes a lot of its success to fortuitous timing; participants were able to process and implement these new structures during a resource-rich era. The CDE funded many more staff development days during that period, which were often used by committee members and sites to hammer out the complexities of Trust Agreement processes and procedures. These days were also used to do staff development
seminars, led by teacher-presenters from within the district. Many district educators also participated in state funded Subject-Matter Projects during those years. Having reviewed the information that describes the resources that were available to district educators of that period, it is clear that these resources were pivotal in nourishing Camelot’s success.

The Decline Era

The flourishing of Trust Agreement collaborations, which defined the Camelot era, came to an end during the mid-to-late nineties. External forces, those being changing personnel, the imposition of standards and accountability mandates together with declining resources, posed formidable challenges for the PCSD. These change forces weren’t unique to this district; in fact many districts across the United States were experiencing these same realities. However, data presented in the Decline section suggest that district constituencies were not prepared to deal with these new challenges.

The data suggests that the most significant factors that began to destabilize and polarize district constituencies were changing personnel and the imposing of new standards and accountability mandates. As reported previously, PFT leadership grew increasingly disenchanted with the new superintendent, whom they believed to be out to eliminate SDM practices and move the district toward a more traditional, top-down management structure. Power struggles of a personal nature began to characterize meetings involving district management and the PFT. The union was also adamantly opposed to standards and accountability mandates, believing that these mandates de-professionalized teachers, narrowing their decision-making powers, while increasing the voice of non-educators.
Losing important monetary and intellectual resources also impacted the district. As the CDE shifted its priorities to focus on the standards and accountability mandates, it took away the majority of staff development days and also cut funding for the Subject Matter Projects. In addition, many key personnel within the district and union began retiring, creating a loss of expertise that was never replaced. Reduction of these resources weakened the vitality and integrity of Trust Agreement processes.

District compliance with new mandates and accountability requirements, the PFT’s strenuous opposition to them and the management style of the new superintendent, signaled the decline of Camelot-style collaborations. Disagreement regarding how to serve the educational needs of students and an erosion of trust, undermined district and union efforts to find common ground. A new superintendent was hired in 2002. This person inherited a set of Trust Agreement policies and practices that had lost much of their vigor, new staff that had little understanding of the importance of these collaborative practices, and a local union that looked on with suspicion.

*The Current Era*

Data gathered from participant interviews of the Current Era reveal many important themes illustrating both the complex and controversial ways Trust Agreement processes inform district culture. The findings also indicate that these reforms alter leadership processes as well.

SDM is well integrated and enjoys strong support among teachers at all district sites. Participants report that SDM, a time-intensive process, could be improved if staff members had more training in SDM processes, particularly meeting facilitation skills.
They also voiced strong support for the creation of a new Trust Agreement in communication, believing that new language was needed to clarify how information was to be communicated between decision-making constituencies. In addition, participants expressed their concerns with Trust Agreement committee work at the district office, but many believed the frustrations associated with these committees could be mitigated with new communications procedures and training.

Quite a lot of time was devoted to questioning participants about cultural norms and their possible linkage with Trust Agreement reforms. The high value district teachers place on personal autonomy is found to be linked with both SDM and SBM policies and practices. There is also agreement that SDM practices are used as a tool to obstruct, or slow down reforms that are controversial. Participant data also reveal that teachers are invested in using SDM to challenge proposed educational practices because they are not convinced that these practices reflect their core values about best instructional practices. The union is seen as playing a substantial role in encouraging teachers to exercise their decision-making power to voice disapproval of standards-based reforms. The factors described above contribute to an educational environment that is sometimes perceived as fragmented and lacking direction.

The final summation of Current Era findings reveal participant views concerning the efficacy of district management leadership and findings suggesting that Trust Agreement reforms have created cultural dynamics that undermine effective leadership processes. Findings reveal a perception that district management is sometimes uncomfortable exercising decisive leadership or is unclear how to exercise a more decisive leadership style because of constraints created by SDM policies. District management is also viewed
as being slow to facilitate agreements around instructional matters and set up accountability systems that are effective in monitoring implementation efforts. Finally, data is presented that illustrate how leadership processes within the district are subjected to the constraints characteristic of Wildavsky’s “equity regime” political model.

Implications and Concluding Remarks

The history of the PCSD’s experiment with restructuring reforms, most notably SDM, is unique in the public education arena. Although many districts engaged in some form of restructuring during the eighties, most of them grew disenchanted with their reforms efforts, abandoned them or at least made major revisions along the way. PCSD, in contrast, has continued to follow its original Trust Agreement policies, adhering to SDM policies that have given its teachers far reaching powers within the district. Now that the story has been told, the data collected and analyzed, what lessons can this bold experiment in restructuring reforms offer?

I begin this examination on a cautionary note by acknowledging that PCSD leadership enjoyed advantages during the Camelot period that are greatly diminished in the current educational environment. These limiting factors do circumscribe the choices and actions of current district leadership, creating an environment that demands its own unique set of solutions. Thus, it is neither fair nor reasonable to keep looking to the past for all the answers, as some in the district suggest. That being said, the Camelot experiment does offer some important lessons.

If Camelot teaches us anything, it is the value of achieving what Elmore (2005, p. 135) describes as “alignment,” his term for moving an organization “…from an atomized
state to a more coherent organizational state.” Camelot reforms worked, in large part, not because of new power redistribution policies, but because a relatively small leadership team participated within a confluence of ideal conditions that helped align individual actors within the district, creating an intentionality focused by common values and goals. The original Trust Agreement Project reformers were highly motivated by a shared belief that they were doing the “right work,” work that would translate into improved instructional programs and student performance. Camelot also had the benefit of visionary leadership both at the district office and within the PFT. These upper level leaders shared core educational beliefs and worked diligently to align both resources and organizational systems toward achieving specific goals. I think that it is also important to point out that these reformers enjoyed high levels of trust, activating, as Bryk and Schneider (2002) contend, important resources for school reform.

An examination of participant data from the Current Era reveals that the conditions that supported success during the Camelot era are in short supply today. The variables described above, those that nourish conditions that facilitate alignment processes, began fading during the mid-nineties, replaced by the new realities dictated by standards and accountability mandates. The pressures brought about through trying to adapt to these new realities became painfully obvious to district leadership many years ago. Yet Current Era findings expose dissatisfaction with the slow pace of district reform efforts. It is therefore important to examine these data in order to uncover the most likely conditions that impede reform efforts. Indeed, why hasn’t more progress been made toward achieving “alignment,” basic agreements, or the “ring of systems” mentioned in the previous chapter?
Based upon the findings in this project, I have come to conclude that the PCSD’s experiment with restructuring reforms, notably SDM and Article XX, have contributed to a system of governance and set of cultural norms that often weaken mechanisms that are essential for success within an educational organization. In fact, the research leads me to conclude that this district, together with its egalitarian culture, function as an “equity regime,” and experience all the constraints that Wildavsky attributes to this model. As revealed in these data, a disheartening and unforeseen consequence of evolving Trust Agreement policies and practices within the PCSD has been what Elmore (2003) refers to as an “atomized” culture, where individual concerns rather than shared concerns of the “collective” undermine alignment processes. I find it ironic that Trust Agreement reforms, which were implemented to improve the quality of educational programs and practice, now appear to undermine important alignment mechanisms such as crafting a shared vision, creating district-wide agreements that guide practice and treating diverse points of view with respect. In addition, the findings also support the conclusion that district management, from the post-Camelot period up to the present, has not been as effective as it needs to be in providing leadership charged with moving an entire educational organization into a new era of accountability and standards-driven reform. The findings suggest that Trust Agreement policies, including Article XX, overemphasize teacher input while providing almost no articulation regarding management’s role in creating and maintaining an effective educational organization. Indeed, most of these agreements were written during an era that believed that power should moved away from the central office and site administrators, so it is no surprise that these documents contain very little language that clarifies roles and responsibilities
of management. Accordingly, Trust Agreement language stresses empowerment of
teachers, i.e., all the ways individual teachers should be brought into various levels of
decision-making but fails to provide sufficient clarity regarding management’s role as an
effective agent of change. Kerchner and Koppich, two Trust Agreement Project
consultants that worked closely with the original PCSD Trust Agreement team, shared
these concerns. It is not widely known within the PCSD, but these experts reversed their
position on the viability of Trust Agreements as policy tools, stating that Trust
Agreement reforms rarely achieved systemic coherence and “…still tend[ed] to focus on
preserving equity and teachers rights” (Kerchner, et al. 1997, p. 111). In their view, Trust
Agreement reforms they studied across the state had a very glaring error; they
emphasized teacher equity without emphasizing how expanded roles for teachers would
be linked to measurable, student outcomes. They also felt that the success of these
reforms were too dependent on the personalities involved—namely that of the
superintendent and the union president. When examining these data and the opinions of
experts, I conclude that many of the policies and practices crafted by the Trust
Agreement Committee have played a significant role in undermining alignment processes
that help build and sustain effective educational organizations. While these policies
provided guidance that was uniquely suited to the realities of an earlier educational era,
participants question their “fit” in today’s world. Given the constraints faced by the
PCSD, it is prudent to question whether these reform policies make wise use of the
district’s limited resources and can provide a framework for building consensus and
getting stakeholders to agreement.
Getting stakeholder agreement is a major area of concern—it is simply very difficult to do within the PCSD. Participant findings indicate that PFT leadership has been at odds with district management for the better part of the last decade. This contrarian dynamic supports Kerchner and Koppich’s view that the success of Trust Agreement reforms are often undermined by a poor relationship between the union president and the district superintendent. While criticisms have been made of district management’s attempts to align stakeholders in this era of accountability-driven mandates, it is also true that the PFT leadership has made this process much more difficult because of the very different value-driven mindset that they bring to the negotiating table. A protracted history of “cool” relationships, which is exacerbated by a lack of trust between PFT and district leadership, also complicates this situation. The data of the past decade suggests that creating consensus within this loosely coupled district can be exceedingly difficult, straining district resources that are in short supply. Indeed, participant data and the findings of Kerchner and Koppich provide compelling evidence that the PCSD is struggling under the weight of Trust Agreement policies that reflect the values and process-oriented practices crafted for a bygone educational era.

I am especially concerned with what these data reveal about leadership processes within the district—that strong leadership behaviors often elicit negative responses, which, over time, can have the cumulative effect of constraining or silencing leadership. If, as Marzano et al. (2003) contend, that level-two leadership is needed for level-two change away from the status quo, if the literature is correct in positing that “...second-order changes require a form of leadership that is sensitive to organization building: developing shared vision, creating productive work cultures, distributing leadership to
others,” (Leithwood, K., 1994, p. 501), then one must consider the implications of these assertions as they relate to the “equity regime” findings presented in Chapter 1V. In short, are Trust Agreement policies tying the hands of leadership, “atomizing” the culture of teachers within the PCSD and creating a “weak zone of acceptance” that undermines “transformative” leadership actions? And if so, how do these dynamics ultimately affect student learning?

There is strong evidence that student outcomes and school improvement are affected by alignment mechanisms orchestrated by leadership. Research done regarding the restructuring practices undertaken by the Chicago public schools beginning in the late eighties, which were similar to those undertaken by the PCSD during the same time frame, conclusively linked higher student performance to “relational trust” mechanisms (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Additional research, (Newmann, F.; Smith, BetsAnn; Allensworth, E; Bryk, A., 2001) indicated that strong principal leadership was linked to instructional coherence and school improvement. Less successful schools were linked to higher levels of teacher autonomy and discretion in choosing curriculum materials and teaching and assessment strategies. The evidence is compelling; schools that operate with high levels of agreement around teaching and instruction and hold educators to those agreements are the most successful (Elmore, R., 2005).

Creating effective alignment mechanisms, such as shared educational goals for students, common assessments and an agreement to participate in some type of monitoring/evaluation cycle, is an extremely important set of responsibilities that have a direct effect on how students learn. The implications of these findings should be evident—that current Trust Agreement policies, as they play out in today’s complex
educational environment, can create obstacles that impede reform efforts and undermine student performance. Alignment, when reduced to its core or foundational principle, can be expressed by one word: Agreement. “Organizations…” according to Elmore (1999-2000, p. 7), “…improve because they agree on what is worth achieving.” Since participant findings clearly reveal equity norms that place a high value on individualism and autonomy, which often trump or at least slow down alignment or agreement processes, it is hard to be optimistic about reforms that are attempted within the PCSD under current conditions.

It is difficult to be an educator in today’s polarized and fragmented educational environment. Reeves (2003, p. 59), cites the “…law of initiative fatigue…[where] each additional initiative, program, task, or swell idea results in fewer minutes of time, fewer dollars, and generally less leadership attention and emotional energy of teachers to make successive initiatives work.” These forces can be even more overwhelming in an SDM environment where so much additional time is needed to process all phases of decision-making. But Reeves’ statement illustrates why effective leadership is so important in today’s fragmented environment—teachers are too busy to make sense out of this jumble of information and competing priorities. It is the job of leadership to craft a coherent plan that unifies, or aligns stakeholders, and to be strong advocates and implementers of that plan. Notable leadership experts, (Collins, 2001; Wheatley, 2003; and Elmore, 2005) assert the importance of leadership acting in ways that build allegiance to core values, the mission of the organization, and a passionate pursuit of one’s work within the context of that shared mission. Echoing these sentiments, participants consistently state in Chapter 1V that they would be more successful in motivating their teachers and building stronger
programs if district management visibly displayed their commitment by defining core beliefs and articulating a clear mission that supports those core beliefs. This type of leadership was evident during the Camelot period; leaders had strong values and were seen as being advocates of those values and the educational practices that flowed from those values. The Camelot period does illustrate that SDM, when combined with specific leadership practices and styles (Wildavsky’s “charismatic” leadership style) can yield powerful results.

Currently, PCSD management is grappling with ways to create more effective leadership practices in order to move reform initiatives forward. They believe that leadership efforts cannot be perceived as being “top-down” and are therefore looking at ways of distributing leadership functions among teachers. At the time of this writing, participants report that some teachers are resisting their efforts to build teacher leadership. Why is this and what is this resistance telling us? I do think that Reeves’ “initiative fatigue” is operative here; many teachers are simply too busy to add leadership duties into their schedule. However, participant data indicates that another important dynamic is also causing teachers to respond in this manner. Participant data points to trust and confidence issues regarding management’s history of offering weak support for new programs and practices. Evans, (2003, p. 304) voices the reluctance felt by many PCSD teachers by stating that “[t]hese teachers are naturally suspicious,…inclined to hold back, waiting for proof that for once the administration means what it says and will really persevere.” Teachers feel that management has not created a set of systems that is organized for success and has not exhibited leadership that inspires stakeholders to commit to district priorities. Participants have also informed me that their teachers are
wary of taking on leadership roles because they do not want to deal with the dissention
that often happens back at their sites when controversial issues are brought up. Some
teachers feel that management’s proposal to create teacher leadership sets them up to take
the “heat” that management would rather “distribute.”

Evans (2003, p. 287) talks about the importance of trust in effective leadership
practices; that “TRANSFORMATION BEGINS (author’s emphasis) with trust.”
Participant data suggests that teachers would be more inclined to take on greater
responsibility if they believed that stakeholders were committed to the same core values
and trusted that management would follow through with providing leadership that held
stakeholders accountable for honoring agreements. Collins, (2005, p. 13) states that
“[t]rue leadership only exists if people follow when they have the freedom not to.” Since
some PCSD teachers are resisting management’s suggestions to take on leadership
functions, perhaps it follows that management has not made a convincing case for
change. The Camelot findings also suggest that there is a definite relationship between
dynamic teacher leadership and rigorous, self-selected professional development.
Unfortunately, it may also by true that much of today’s educational environment is
offensive to many district teachers, and they simply can not see themselves as advocates
for programs that don’t ignite their passions.

There is an abundance of research that validates the important leadership role
played by district offices, so it is puzzling that PCSD management still displays
reluctance to be seen as “taking the lead” on reform initiatives and holding stakeholders
accountable. I suspect that Elmore’s “buffer” dynamic is operative here, at least to some
degree, where “…administrators protect or ‘buffer,’ the technical core from outside
scrutiny or interference,” and perform “…ritualistic tasks of organizing, budgeting, managing…all in the name of creating and maintaining public confidence in the institutions of public education” (Elmore, R., 1999-2000, p. 2). As “Institutional” theorists tell us, weak accountability systems allow administrators to point to numerous programs and trainings that have been implemented without having to show hard evidence that these activities have improved student performance. Participants note that the district’s Power Standards process, Springboard training, and Edusoft assessment tools, which represent significant investments by the district, have yielded questionable results in improving student performance. These three programs are very good examples of how “…schools are almost always aboil with some kind of ‘change’ [but] they are rarely involved in any deliberate process of improvement where progress is measured against a clear and well-understood instructional goal” (Elmore 1999-2000, p. 3).

I have included a brief discussion about the “buffer” mechanism in order to echo Schmoker (2006, p.3) who, citing Jim Collins, author of Good to Great, states, “…that the first difficult step toward improvement is to ‘confront the brutal facts’ about themselves” (2001a, p. 65). The PCSD is a “good” district, but many argue, including myself, that it could be “great” if stakeholders were willing to address the “brutal facts” regarding policies, practices, and cultural norms that consistently undermine excellence.

To begin with, I would suggest a thorough examination of the perspectives that Cultural Theory brings to unpacking the challenges described in the findings of this study. The PCSD, as an evolving equity regime, is going through a decade-long identity crisis that has been largely unexamined as it struggles with accommodating new values and organizational structures imposed by NCLB mandates. District constituencies,
including the PFT and many of its teachers, as predicted by Cultural Theory, will continue to oppose these new reforms, vociferously stating that they are a symbol of all that is wrong with hierarchical, or top-down power structures. As long as these power struggles and failed dialogues continue without resolution, alignment resources are not leveraged for maximum effect. In the end, students are poorly served when leadership groups do not trust one another’s conception of the common good. Somehow, in the midst of these competing points of view, bold leadership is needed to create a vision of possibilities that is simply more compelling that the disparate agendas currently being voiced. This will not be an easy task, but it is, I submit, the task of leadership.

Another important lesson that can be derived from the PCSD experiment in restructuring reform concerns the necessity for systematic monitoring and evaluation of district organizational policies and practices. Having done the research and examined this district’s history of Trust Agreement reform, it is clear that no serious evaluation of Trust Agreement policies has ever been undertaken. These policies initiated far-reaching changes within the organizational structure and culture of this district. Considering the radical nature of these reforms, past leadership would have been well advised to include a “sunset” provision in the language of each Trust Agreement. Such a provision would be greatly instrumental in encouraging stakeholders to engage in ongoing monitoring and evaluation processes—thereby providing leadership with a powerful tool to achieve its overarching goal of continuous improvement. This type of robust and honest reflection would be of great value today.

In conclusion, district stakeholders, PFT leadership, the PCSD management, and its school board, need to be willing to engage in a frank assessment about a number of
important issues. Clearly, the findings presented in this paper indicate areas of concern that should be addressed. Foremost among these concerns is a consideration of the efficacy of Trust Agreement policies and their “fit” in today’s accountability-driven environment. Do Trust Agreements undermine or augment the district’s ability to meet the challenges of an ever-changing educational environment? Are they well-written, clearly spelling out roles and responsibilities—and do they establish effective accountability mechanisms? How do Trust Agreement documents explicitly establish coherence around instructional practice? Should the PCSD invest resources in trying to retool Trust Agreement policies when experts, notably Kerchner and Koppich, have repudiated their viability? And, upon a rigorous evaluation of these questions, if Trust Agreement mechanisms are found to be wanting, what solutions are needed to remedy this quandary?

Discussions of leadership are also crucial and should include a realistic appraisal of leadership processes and how they are informed by a long history of “equity regime” dynamics. What specific leadership skills are needed within a SDM environment that honor teacher input while leveraging timely and effective change? Is the district able to generate an effective shared leadership process with the current level of resources allocated for these decision-making venues? What is the relationship between quality professional development and effective distributed leadership? Finally, an in-depth examination of data derived from PCSD teachers, the PFT, and school board members would enhance greater clarity on these important matters.
Appendix A
A Historical Report of the Trust Agreement Project in the City School Districts

A Menu of Interview Questions

Section I, Pre Trust Agreement Context

Were you around when PCS teachers joined the union in 68?
What do you know that led us to affiliate with AFT as opposed to CTA?
Did joining this union, in your opinion, have any impact on our educational environment and if so how?
Prior to TA, in the early 80s, what was the educational environment like in the PCS—did we have a centralized power structure or were sites operating with a large degree of autonomy?
Prior to the TA project, did the PSC have a history of being a top-down managed district or did it have an established tradition (culture) of working collaboratively with stakeholders?
What was the leadership structure like during this time (mid 70s to mid 80s)—did they assume / practice the more traditional, top-down leadership role?
Who were the dynamic players during this time and how did they affect our district and educational culture?
Do you think that these influences set the stage for the TA project?
During this period that led up to TA, in the late 70s to mid 80s, how did teachers and the union relate to site and DO administration—was there a history of collaboration, of valuing getting along?
How did the district admin, teachers and the union work together in this period that led up to TA?
During this time period, did our district management and union leadership have a clear sense of identity, philosophy and a sense of purpose?
During this period, did our sense of district mission / identity change or emerge in a new way that you feel influenced our decision to embrace the TA project?
Who were the key players that influenced our district during this period?
What was the national and state educational context during this period and was our district influenced by these external forces—and in what ways?
How would you characterize the PCS as a leaning organization at the time just prior to our getting involved in the TA project?
I understand that prior to the TA project, the CTA came in and tried to decertify our AFT union affiliation and that the vote was very close. Do you think that this was significant in any way in terms of how this struggle affected us / the union?
Are there any other significant influences, in your opinion that helped usher in the TA era that I have omitted or not considered fully enough?

Section II, The TA project period

So how did the PCS get involved with the TA project?
Who were the key players; teachers, union officials and district admin?
What was the rationale for joining this project—what did we hope to accomplish?
How did the TA project participants sell this to the rest of the district staff, and body of teachers?
Was this affiliation done with a lot of PCS support or buy in from various constituencies or was this done quietly in committee?
Were there any dissenters?
What was the district leadership position on the concept of TA, creating another negotiating vehicle that had the potential to alter the status quo?
Describe what happened in the initial, first year of the TA project committee where you developed the first TA on staff development.
What were the dynamics of this committee work?
Did you read a lot of research, or communicate with the other district teams involved with the project—how was your committee informed by influences outside the district?
What type of help did you get from your TA project advisor, Charles Kerchner? Would you say their was a lot of passion involved in this new collaborative endeavor and if so why?
How did teachers, the union and the district administration respond to this process and the actual TA on staff development?
One person I interviewed described this process as being very seminal for this district for a number of reasons. Do you agree with this—why or why not?
Did anyone ever propose a way to evaluate whether or not these new TA were effective vehicles for accomplishing there stated purpose?
What happened for year two of the TA project?
Was the district still being funded to participate in this project?
Did you still have 10 days of staff development time and did you use this time to work on the TA?
Why did you decide to create a TA on SDM—what was the rationale behind this decision?
Did any research or any external forces influence your decision to work on SDM?
Were the same committee participants still involved?
What were the group dynamics, i.e., passion, leadership ect. involved with this TA?
What were the principle goals or outcomes that this TA in SDM was supposed to accomplish?
Did anyone ever suggest that the TA language needed to include some sort of evaluative process to ascertain if the TA document, as written and practiced, was effective in carrying out its mission—did anyone ever suggest a sun-setting clause—if not, why not.
In retrospect, how can you account for this group or the district not building in some sort of evaluation process and creating language that supported monitoring and making necessary refinements?
Did our district ever have a way of assessing the effectiveness of its educational programs in relative to national norms?
Once the committee finished this TA/SDM, what did it do, how did it implement it?
What type of training did you give teachers and administrators in this new process?
How did you come to define "consensus"—who participated in this decision.
As this process progressed, what was the buzz about this new way of collaborating?
Was there some sort of cultural shift or re-culturing that took place during these years as a result of this collaborative management process? Describe.
How did this effect the principals and district administrators—did they adopt a different posture or attitude in conducting their responsibilities?
How do you think that this TA/SDM process changed the identity, philosophy and vision of the district?
Do you think that positive changes were made as a result of TA/SDM during this period and if so, what were they?
Were there any negative or unintended consequences that were seen as outcomes of the TA/SDM process during that time?
How did the TA/SDM processes affect teacher professionalism in that period—what evidence was there that substantiate that claim?
Did these reforms lead to better teaching, better student outcomes and increased teacher participation in the leadership process—what evidence supports this?
Did participants in this district see our TA and new SDM process as being unique among districts?
Do you recall there being a lot of pride, or a sense of specialness whereby we set ourselves apart from other districts?
The district crafted one more TA on Core Curriculum in 1995. Were you involved with that process?
Was crafting this TA any different from the previous two? If so, how?
Were the conditions under which this was done different than in the past?
How did stakeholders feel about being involved this time?
For some participants, this was third TA—did they start to feel burdened by this participative process?
Was there a different feeling about having to work on a TA as a result of a State directive?
Would you say that the bloom was off the rose relative to TA/SDM at this point—why or why not?
Did the TA/SDM process re-culture the district—if so how—in what ways did we go about our business differently as a result of our involvement?
From the perspective of your own experience as an ____________ involved with the inception of this TA project, is there anything else that you would like to say about that may have been minimized or omitted in this interview?

Section III, Post Renaissance period
All participants cannot answer this section because some of them had left the district by this time.
Was there, in your opinion, a flowering or heyday of productive collaborations between teachers, the union and the District leadership—if so, when?
In your opinion, what has happened to the PCS in the post TA/SDM heyday?
Is there a turning point that you would cite, where key stakeholders within the district began to feel that they needed to advocate for agendas that made collaborations difficult?
At some point in the mid 90’s, conditions start to change the educational environment both at the State level and at the District level that contributed to a breakdown in collaborative processes between the union, teachers and the district. What were these conditions?
What was going on with the union’s relationship to the district during this period where state mandates were beginning to occur?
What about union personnel, has it changed over this period and how has it affected its relationship to its work/mission?
Did the union’s relationship or involvement with AFT change during this period and if so, do you think that that had any affect on how it went about carrying out its mission?

Section IV, Questions posed to administrators regarding the current period, post standards

How long have you been an administrator?
How long have you been an administrator for the PCS?
Has your site had the recent training in SDM and if so how long ago?
Has anything changed as a result of this training?
Why do you think we have had this training?
What is your basic opinion of SDM practices in our district—what works, what doesn’t?
Do you think that all the time you and your staff invest in working the SDM process is time well spent or do you think that this process takes away from time that could be allotted in more effective ways?
Based upon being a principal in the PCS, do you think that our SDM practices have empowered teachers and if so, has this culture of teacher empowerment made it:

More or less difficult to perform your job
More or less difficult to implement and sustain programs
More or less difficult to hold teachers accountable to school-wide agreements

Do you think that teachers use SDM practices as a way of slowing down change or protecting their own autonomy/creative freedom?
Do you think that our SDM culture encourages certain teachers to dominate the discussion in ways that would not be supported in more traditionally run school systems?
What is your opinion of the K12 Curriculum and Staff Development committees and their use of the SDM process? Are they effective and do you feel that quality
decisions come out of those committees? What would you change about this process?
Are there ways that you would recommend modifying the current TA/SDM practices? Why?
How do District administrators feel about TA/SDM processes and how they currently affect their ability to do their work?
How do you feel our DO management team and their leadership effectiveness is currently viewed by your staff, by your self?
Since TA process and the mandate to share in the decision-making process is about sharing leadership responsibilities, in your opinion, how has this affected the issue of effective leadership in our district?
Evaluate the leadership that both the district and union leadership have provided in responding to these new mandates.
How does the Union figure into all of this?
How would you critique union leadership?
Having observed TA/SDM processes at work in our district over the last 15 years, how would you critique its effect on improving student learning, creating teacher professionalism and empowering leadership processes with all stakeholders?
Do you think our decision-making process, as it is presently configured, has helped us become an effective educational organization that clearly knows who it is and how to accomplish its mission?
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EDUCATIONAL POLICY TRUST AGREEMENTS
A HISTORY

The concept of Educational Policy Trust Agreements was originally developed by educational researchers Charles Kerchner of Claremont Graduate School and Douglas Mitchell of U.C. Riverside, as a response to the report of the California Commission on the Teaching Profession. The report called for acknowledging a legitimate role for teachers in shaping and implementing policies affecting the daily performance of teachers and students. Through a process of joint discussion and planning, teacher unions and district administrations would formally address specific educational issues, resulting in a binding agreement, put into an “educational trust”.

In 1987, the Federation of Teachers and the School District Administration received a grant from PACE (Policy Analysis of California Education) to plan and implement an Educational Policy Trust Agreement in K-12 Staff Development. With the mentoring of Dr. Kerchner the union and district administration created the first trust agreement in This trust agreement led to the “shortened Wednesdays”, the purpose of which is to inform teachers and administrators about the latest research on curriculum and effective instruction.

In 1989, the Federation and District Administration developed an Educational Policy Trust Agreement on Shared Decision-Making and a Decision-Making Resource Guide, providing a process by which teachers and administrators work collaboratively on educational issues that arise at district and school levels. Under this trust agreement the following policies have been developed:

- A hiring protocol which calls for a selection committee for administrative positions. Composed of teachers, parents, classified employees and administrators, the committee develops criteria, paperscreens, interviews and creates simulations for the hiring process.
- An elementary hiring committee, made up of teachers and administrators from several sites, interviews and recommends a pool of teacher candidates for potential openings.
- A new teacher evaluation system, based on the best research available on effective teaching. This system, which requires a yearly Professional Development Plan, has allowed tenured teachers, through a waiver received from the California State Department of Education, to be evaluated every three years.
- A District Budget Committee, composed of representatives from the Federation, classified and administration, uses research and interviews to make cost-saving recommendations to the Board of Education.

In addition, Article XX, Shared Decision-Making has been added to the collective bargaining contract.

In 1995, an Educational Policy Trust Agreement in Core Curriculum was developed to describe a process whereby district-wide core curriculums have been designed and implemented, using the State Curriculum Frameworks as guides.
In 2000, an Educational Policy Trust Agreement in K-12 Curriculum was developed in response to the new State Curriculum Standards. A K-12 Curriculum Committee, composed of teachers, site and district administrators has been given the following tasks:

- The review of curriculum issues
- The selection of appropriately aligned materials
- The planning of staff development on curriculum
- The reporting of student progress to parents

This trust agreement serves as a guide for staffs to ensure that student assessments authentically reflect student understanding of the curriculum. It also describes a process whereby staffs are regularly informed of the work of the committee and are given the opportunity to give input and feedback on curriculum and instruction issues.

These trust agreements are designed to be frequently reviewed and revised in response to changing conditions in the world of public education.
EDUCATIONAL POLICY TRUST AGREEMENT
IN
K-12 STAFF DEVELOPMENT
(1987)

PURPOSE

The purpose of this Educational Policy Trust Agreement is to support the implementation of the School Districts' distinctive statement concerning the importance of the affective domain. That statement expresses the Districts' desire to create the organizational culture and style that support the growth of character in students and staff through building self-confidence, self-reliance and mutual respect. In order to bring these abstract qualities to a concrete reality, all of us need to consider the content of what is taught and the processes of instruction, example and application of authority through which learning and behavior are guided. To these ends we must create a special relationship among administrators, teachers and students.

PHILOSOPHY

We agree that the most significant staff development experiences result from collaborative planning by teachers and administrators. We also agree that staff development programs will be planned and implemented on a K-12 basis. Finally, we agree to more fully recognize the outstanding talent and expertise of District personnel by consciously designing staff development programs based upon their special skills.

MEMBERSHIP

Teachers representing each school
At-large representatives appointed by the Federation of Teachers
Site administrators and Assistant Superintendent assigned to instruction
A majority of the committee shall consist of classroom teachers

RESPONSIBILITIES

The committee has been given the following responsibilities:
1. To recommend, coordinate and evaluate District-wide staff development programs, including:
   To plan and implement District staff development days
   To help implement the affective education goals of the District
   To assist teachers to become effective workshop presenters
   To increase the number of teachers who serve in leadership roles
   To find ways to increase communication between elementary and secondary teachers
To consider ways in which Summer School can be used as a demonstration school for staff development
To develop structures that recognize teaching specialities, such as those represented in the curriculum strand
To explore effective models of professional development, such as adult learning and peer coaching
2. To identify, recommend and coordinate the use of human fiscal resources, including the Mentor Teacher Program, Classroom Teacher Instructional Improvement Program, Summer School, TEC Center and other outside agencies
3. To explore and recommend ways to compensate and support certificated staff for their preparation time for staff development leadership roles

COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES
In addition to the commitment implied in the shared decision making model of staff development, the District and Federation agree to the following:
Release time for participation of staff on K-12 Staff Development Committee
Compensation for presenters for planning staff development training experiences
Clerical and production assistance will be provided for staff development
Assignment and allocation of administrative staff time to coordinate District staff development
Assignment and allocation of administrative and teaching staff to provide consultation to staff presenters
Workshops provided by staff and administrators for training of presenters for staff development activities
Assignment and allocation of administrative staff to pursue grants and other external funding sources to be used for staff development

CONFLICT RESOLUTION
If a disagreement between the Federation and District Administration regarding this Trust Agreement cannot be resolved, a third party, agreed upon by both parties or selected in accordance with the rules of the American Arbitration Association, shall be called in to resolve the dispute.
SCHOOL DISTRICTS
FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

EDUCATIONAL POLICY TRUST AGREEMENT
IN
SHARED DECISION-MAKING AT SCHOOLS & WORKSITES
(1992)

PURPOSE

The Federation and the District Administration agree to follow shared decision-making processes in the School Districts. The Federation and the District Administration believe that shared decision-making will result in more effective learning experiences for all students. The Federation and the District Administration also believe that continued implementation of the shared decision-making processes will strengthen the special relationships among students, staff, administrators, parents and the Board of Education.

PHILOSOPHY

The commitment of the School Districts to a philosophy of shared decision-making is based on the belief that those who will be affected by a decision should be involved in making it. It is also based on the belief that those with the knowledge, experience and commitment in particular areas should be a part of the problem-solving process: it will be in this way the best thinking occurs and the best decisions are made. Our philosophy concerning shared decision-making is further based on the desire to honor diversity within the staff and community and to demonstrate respect for all who are a part of the Petaluma School Districts.

CHARACTERISTICS OF SHARED DECISION-MAKING

1. Individuals affected by a decision participate in that decision, either directly or through chosen representatives.

2. Once a decision has been made, all individuals are responsible for helping implement it.

3. Included in the process is consideration of the consequences of the decision: its effects on students, parents, staff, other worksites, the District and community.
4. The following behaviors are vital to the shared decision-making process:
   valuing all persons involved;
   listening to other points of view;
   ensuring all participants opportunities for input;
   encouraging innovative thinking;
   guaranteeing support for risk-taking;
   being willing to alter preconceived positions;
   following through on commitments.

COMMITMENT TO SHARED DECISION-MAKING

The District Administration and the Federation recognize that there are already examples of shared decision-making at every site. The Federation and District Administration agree to provide continued support for the implementation of shared decision-making by committing resources to those teams who design and carry out changes which effectively improve education for children and/or redefine the professional relationships and responsibilities among team members. These resources include:
   • providing staff development for strategies in the shared decision-making process;
   • providing consultation, including support in proposal development, possible waivers;
   • assisting or providing assistance in developing and implementing documentation and evaluation activities included in proposal;
   • helping to provide a communication link between participants and other interested colleagues;
   • helping to acquire additional resources;
   • assisting in dispute resolution

Note: The District Administration and the Federation agree that funding for the planning phase of Trust Agreement projects will be included as an item in the annual budget process.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION

If a disagreement between the Federation and the District Administration regarding this Trust Agreement cannot be resolved, a third party, agreed upon by both sides or selected in accordance with the rules of the American Arbitration Association, shall be called in to resolve the dispute.
SCHOOL DISTRICTS
FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

EDUCATIONAL POLICY TRUST AGREEMENT
IN
CORE CURRICULUM
(1995)

Purpose
The purpose of this Educational Policy Trust Agreement is to guide the development and implementation of a K-12 core curriculum, using a shared decision-making process, which will include the following components:

- The participation of members of the Federation, site and district administration, students and other stakeholders of the school district and community
- Identification of groups, timelines, resources, communication, approval processes, implementation steps and professional development support

The process shall be ongoing and result in substantial agreement about and ownership of the K-12 core curriculum.

Philosophy
The guiding principles of the trust agreement are our districts' belief in shared decision-making and respect for the judgment and expertise of educators. We further believe that the best core curriculum will be developed through a collaborative process involving all stakeholders. The curriculum will reflect our district culture with a balance between diversity and unity. The process will result in a curriculum which will be a dynamic, changing document. The ultimate goal of this curriculum is success for all students.

Defining Characteristics of the Core Curriculum
The core curriculum will serve as a usable guideline for implementing a rich, thinking and meaningful curriculum based on state frameworks, reform documents, the districts' Mission Statement, and the best research on effective learning theory. This process will also ensure assessment which authentically reflects student learning.

Assumptions
1. The core curriculum will provide a framework, both implicit and explicit, for an assessment system that will demonstrate what students know and are able to do.
2. The core curriculum and assessment will be K-12 and closely aligned to California State Frameworks.
3. Teachers will serve in a key role in facilitating the research and writing. In addition, careful efforts will be made to involve many teachers and inform all teachers on the process of the work.
4. The process is to be a district staff development experience.
5. The Core Curriculum subcommittee will work during the summer of 1995 to research various effective curriculum development processes. The team will report back to the Trust Agreement Committee in the Fall, at which time a curriculum development process will be selected.

Responsibilities
Two administrators and two teachers shall conduct research on processes by which our core curriculum is developed.

The development of core curriculum is a district priority and requires that certificated staff members are committed and involved in the process.

The Certificated Trust Agreement Committee shall maintain an oversight role to ensure that this trust agreement is fully implemented.

Resources
The District Administration and Federation agree to the following resources to ensure success:

- Two site administrators who will serve on the Core Curriculum Subcommittee selected by District Administration
- Two teachers who will serve on the Core Curriculum Subcommittee and are selected by PFT Trust Agreement teachers
- K-12 Staff Development Committee
- Clerical and production assistance
- Release time for participation of staff members on an ongoing basis, including shortened Wednesdays and staff development days
- Workshops or consultants provided by SCOE or other relevant agencies
- Teachers who have been trained in subject matter projects
- The Division of Instruction

Conflict Resolution
If a disagreement between the Federation and District Administration regarding this trust agreement cannot be resolved, a third party, agreed upon by both parties or selected in accordance with the rule of the American Arbitration Association, shall be called in to resolve the dispute.
SCHOOL DISTRICTS
FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

EDUCATIONAL POLICY TRUST AGREEMENT
IN
K-12 CURRICULUM
(2000)

Purpose

The purpose of this Educational Policy Trust Agreement is to guide the planning, development and implementation of a K-12 Curriculum Committee using a shared decision-making process, which will include the following components:

The participation of teachers, site and district administrators.

The establishment of a K-12 Curriculum Committee, in consultation with site staffs, which has as its focus: curriculum; assessments; selection of appropriately aligned materials; staff development (as it pertains to curriculum) and reporting student progress to parents.

The process shall be ongoing and result in substantial agreement about and ownership of the K-12 curriculum (see assumptions on the next page).

Philosophy

The guiding principles of this trust agreement are our districts’ belief in shared decision-making and respect for the judgment and expertise of educators. We further believe that the best curriculum decisions are made through a collaborative process involving all educators. The Curriculum Committee's recommendations will reflect our district culture, with a balance between diversity and unity. The ultimate goal of this curriculum is success for all students.

Defining Characteristics of the K-12 Curriculum

The K-12 curriculum will serve as a resource and guide for implementing rich, thinking, meaningful instruction, based on state frameworks and standards, the districts' Mission Statement, district core curriculum and best instructional practices. The K-12 curriculum development process will also ensure assessments authentically reflect student learning, for the purpose of reporting to parents and for modifying programs.
Assumptions

1. The Board of Education will refer curriculum concerns to the K-12 Curriculum Committee.
2. The K-12 Curriculum Committee will develop a process for a district-wide assessment system that will demonstrate what students know, understand and are able to do.
3. The K-12 Curriculum Committee’s emerging agreements on best instructional practices and assessment systems, when developed, will be closely aligned with California State Frameworks, district curriculum standards and district core curriculum.
4. Teachers will serve in a key role in facilitating assumptions #1 and #2. In addition, careful efforts will be made to involve and inform all teachers on the process of the work. Included in the process of developing agreements on curriculum, instruction, standards, assessments and materials will be a public forum held for community input.
5. Representatives of the K-12 Curriculum Committee will report to the Trust Agreement Committee at least four times a year.
6. Representatives of the K-12 Curriculum Committee will report to Principals’ Council at least four times a year.
7. Representatives of K-12 Curriculum Committee will report to the Board of Education as needed.
8. Representatives of the K-12 Curriculum Committee will report to and seek information from site councils and/or PTA’s.

Committee Composition

The committee shall be comprised of representatives from the following areas: Primary, intermediate, junior high, high school and alternative education. A member of the Board of Education shall be invited to participate.

Responsibilities

The support of a K-12 Curriculum Committee is a district priority and requires that certificated staff members and members of the Principals’ Council be committed to and involved in the work of the committee. The committee will also organize district-wide staff development, report out to site staffs and gather input from site staffs on staff development needs.

The Certificated Trust Agreement Committee shall maintain an oversight role to ensure that this Trust Agreement is fully implemented.

Resources

The District Administration and Federation agree to provide the necessary resources to ensure success of the K-12 Curriculum Committee. The following will provide support for the K-12 Curriculum Committee.

- The Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction and a teacher will cochair the meetings
- Peer Assistance and Review Coach(es) and district mentors
- Clerical and production assistance
- Release time for participation of staff members on an on-going basis
- Workshops or consultants provided by SCOE or other resource agencies
- Teachers who have been trained in subject matter projects
- The Teaching/Learning Center (TLC) forums on professional practice

Conflict Resolution

If a disagreement between the Federation and District Administration regarding this Trust Agreement cannot be resolved, a third party, agreed upon by both parties or selected in accordance with the rule of the American Arbitration Association, shall be called in to resolve the dispute.
Certificated Collective Bargaining Contract:

Article XX

Shared Decision-Making

"The Federation and District Administration agree that teachers, as experienced professionals, should be involved in making those decisions which affect their professional lives. It is further agreed that the procedures and concepts outlined in the Decision-Making Resource Guide, as revised spring, 1997, will be followed at both district and site levels.

The Federation and District Administration agree to jointly plan and present a workshop for new teachers and administrators using the Decision-Making Resource Guide."
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DECISION-MAKING RESOURCE GUIDE

INTRODUCTION

The City Schools District and the Federation of Teachers agree that by working together we can exert a powerful and positive influence on the continued improvement of learning outcomes for all of our students.

We recognize that the most important interactions affecting student performance are those between teachers and students. As accountability for success is assumed by school sites, we believe that teacher involvement in decision making will result in increased student achievement.

Shared decision-making is an integral part of the process of improving student learning. The Federation and the District encourage each school staff to engage collaboratively in designing the teaching/learning model that best meets the needs of students in that school’s community.

PURPOSE

This resource guide describes several models of decision-making, including shared decision-making. By using a variety of strategies, and by building a common vocabulary, teachers and administrators will find collaborative ways to solve problems at the school site. To develop an understanding of the decision-making process, there must be sufficient time allocated to planning, implementation and evaluation. The collaborative process will continue to evolve as participants gain experience.

The Trust Agreement Committee is committed to the incorporation of the Decision-Making Resource Guide into Administration Regulations. Therefore, the committee will need continuing feedback from sites and individuals on how the document is being utilized. Anyone may contact the Federation President, District Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent for Administration and Human Services or the Trust Agreement Coordinator with questions, suggestions, or concerns.
DECISIONS ARE MADE
IN A
WIDE VARIETY OF ARENAS

- School site councils
- Principals' Advisory Groups
- Student Study Teams
- Middle School Academic Teams
- Faculty Associations/Senates
- Academic Departments
- Department Chair Committees
- School Site Staff Meetings
- Subcommittee of School Site Staffs
- Trust Agreement Committees
- District Budget Committee
- Federation Executive Council
- Professional Development Committees
- K-12 Staff Development Committee
- District Hiring Committees
- Site Hiring Committees. . . . . . . and others
THREE DECISION-MAKING MODELS

PURPOSE: To provide points of departure for further discussion. These models are not meant to imply that they are all-inclusive. Each school is encouraged to develop its own models and examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consensus</th>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Command</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff, including Administrator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Administrator with Staff Advice</strong></td>
<td><strong>Administrator alone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process:</strong> The Administrator is equal member of the group, not superordinate. Group uses consensus to reach decisions</td>
<td><strong>Process:</strong> Staff generates alternative solutions to a problem, reviews proposed decision, and makes recommendations to administrator who reports back to staff with decision and rationale</td>
<td><strong>Process:</strong> Administrator makes decision on information s/he deems appropriate. Provides explanation for decision when appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of discretionary monies</td>
<td>Teacher assignments</td>
<td>Adherence to California State Education Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>Master schedule</td>
<td>Board of Education Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development and/or integration</td>
<td>Student placement</td>
<td>Administrative Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School philosophy</td>
<td>Space allocation</td>
<td>Student discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring</td>
<td>Classroom assignment</td>
<td>Site emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Chair selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRE-DECISION MAKING CHECKLIST

1. How is the issue identified?
   a. Who will be affected by decision?
   b. Who should be included in the decision-making process?

2. Who determines the level of involvement?
   a. Administrator alone (upon request s/he will explain reasons for the decision)
   b. Whole group affected by decision (including administrator)
   c. Representative body of group affected by the decision (including the administrator)

3. Who will make the decision?
   a. Administrator
   b. Whole group
   c. Representative group

4. How will the decision be made?
   a. Consensus (decision made by group agreement)? Everyone agrees to support, not sabotage, the decision
   b. Consultation (decision made by recommendations to administrator)
   c. Command (decision made by administrator alone)

5. Group making the decision?
   a. Large group (with small group process if desirable)
   b. Representative group selected by large group
   c. Composition of group depending on issue

6. Knowledge of issues to be resolved by the process?

7. Experience and skills as decision makers/problem solvers?

8. Time constraints?

9. Physical set up: seating arrangements?

10. Legal policy, other constraints?

11. How should the decision be communicated?
SOME POSSIBLE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS

1. Identify the issue to be resolved

2. Develop norms for decision-making process, e.g.,
   a. Take personal responsibility for participating in the information-gathering and decision-making process
   b. Support the learning process for others by avoiding side conversations
   c. Stay in the moment by attending to and listening to other people’s opinions

3. Gather information – develop common understanding of the content underlying the issues:
   d. Clarify the issues (using brainstorming, jigsawing, among other processes)
   e. Gather factual information
   f. State the beliefs, biases, assumptions involved in the issues

4. Generate alternative solutions
   a. In whole groups or small groups
   b. Brainstorming
   c. Further research, if necessary

5. Advocate

6. Identify pros and cons of alternate solutions

7. Decide on a solution to the problem

8. Consider the unintended consequences of the decision as probable outcomes

9. Create a follow-up process for evaluation and improvement as needed

10. Develop a feedback/evaluation form in order to improve the decision-making process
## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Support of a cause or idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming</td>
<td>A group process whereby ideas are generated without argument or refutation; intuitive, creative and rational approaches to solutions are encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial</td>
<td>Getting along well with colleagues in a cooperative working atmosphere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command</td>
<td>Administrator makes decision without input and discussion by the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>A process of coming to agreement characterized by rational discussion of the issues until everyone involved in the discussion agrees with the decision, or at least agrees not to obstruct the decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Administrator makes decision with input and discussion by the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Standards on which a decision is based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Norms</td>
<td>Agreed-upon rules for discussion and advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jigsaw</td>
<td>A process used to speed up the understanding of a document. The process involves having small groups become expert in a part of the document, and sharing their knowledge with the larger group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>The standards, procedures and ethics characterized by those who are educated in a specific body of knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Decision-Making</td>
<td>A process in which team members collaborate, where appropriate, in identifying problems, defining goals, formulating policy, shaping direction, and monitoring program implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Decision-Making</td>
<td>The administrator makes a decision with little or no input from the staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unilateral</td>
<td>An action done or undertaken by one side or party only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
What Is A Trust Agreement?

EDUCATIONAL POLICY TRUST AGREEMENT

FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

PRESIDENT

SCHOOL DISTRICTS

SUPERINTENDENT
Who will teach our children?

A Strategy For Improving California's Schools

The Report Of The
California Commission On The Teaching Profession
Dorman L. Commons, Chair
November, 1985
RECOMMENDATION
TO: LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS, SUPERINTENDENTS, AND TEACHERS

Involve Teachers In School Decision-Making

School boards and administrators should work with teachers to develop new school-level procedures that directly involve teachers in a range of responsibilities, including:

- Selection of new teachers.
- Evaluation of teachers’ performance.
- Helping establish goals for the school.
- Development and coordination of curriculum across grade levels and within departments.
- Establishment of student routines and discipline policy.
- Design and conduct of inservice education at the school site.
- Assignment of students and scheduling of classes.
- Schoolwide problem solving and program development.
- Organization of the school for effective instruction.

RECOMMENDATION
TO: TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR ORGANIZATIONS, THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, AND LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Develop Demonstration “Education Policy Trust Agreements” To Formalize The Cooperation Of Teachers And Administrators In Educational Improvement

Almost all of the recommendations of the Commission call for changes in the current organization and management of schools and will affect the work and careers of both teachers and administrators. In many districts, however, these two groups are more likely to think of each other as adversaries than as partners.

An “Educational Policy Trust Agreement” was proposed by Charles Kerchner and Douglas Mitchell as a way for management and teachers to deal formally, but with mutual trust and with flexibility, with matters that lie outside the collective bargaining contract.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction should convene a Task Force on Labor and Management in the Schools, with equal representation of teacher organizations and school district administrators. The task force should initiate the collection and dissemination of information on cooperative ventures in labor-management relations in other occupations and in education in other states. This task force could initiate and evaluate a limited number of experiments by school districts to develop a new form of agreement between teachers and administrators. These trust agreements may help create an environment for enhancing the profession of teaching and improving the quality of instruction for students. The task force could also make recommendations for changes in current collective bargaining law which may be necessary to allow the development of the trust agreement.
What is a Trust Agreement?

An Educational Policy Trust Agreement is an experimental means for extending the relationship of unionized teachers and school districts to professional concerns: the quality of education, the professional responsibilities of teachers and school organizations, and the ways in which both school districts and teacher union shapes the worklives of teachers.

As its name implies, an Educational Policy Trust Agreement is a negotiated agreement between teachers and school employers about educational policy -- the intent and normal operating rules and standards of a school or school district. Any mutually agreeable topic may be addressed. Policy Trust Agreements are an indication of teachers' legitimate concern with, and shared responsibility for, policy. Policy Trust Agreements do not in any way replace traditional collective bargaining agreements, nor do they abrogate any contractual rights or obligations.

The idea of Educational Policy Trust Agreements is contained in the report of the California Commission on the Teaching Profession, *Who Will Teach Our Children?*, and the concept was developed in a paper written for the Commission by professors Charles Kerchner (The Claremont Graduate School) and Douglas Mitchell (University of California, Riverside) based on their research into the impacts of teacher unionism. The Policy Trust Agreement idea is both quite new, representing a new generation in labor relations, and quite traditional. The newness lies in the explicit recognition of a legitimate role for organized teachers in shaping and

---

1 An edited version of the report to the Commission appears as, "Teaching Reform and Union Reform," *Elementary Education Journal*, March 1986, Vol. 84, No. 4.
executing school policy, and, in particular, the union's role in reforms. At the same time, Policy Trust Agreements are extensions of the tradition of participation and consultation that are practiced in many school districts and are allowed by current labor law (Calif. Gvt. Code, Sec. 3543.2). There are examples, in California and elsewhere, of labor and management agreeing to act jointly on important school policy questions. The Policy Trust Agreement idea recognizes the value, even the necessity, of such professionalizing activities.

The techniques for negotiation, writing and implementing policy trust agreements are being developed in a number of school districts.

Charles T. Kerchner
8/27/86
"TRUST AGREEMENTS" CAN SPEED SCHOOL REFORMS

"Trust Agreements" developed by school boards, administrators, and teachers' unions outside of the traditional collective bargaining arena can serve as catalysts for educational reforms. This is one of the key findings of a report released today by Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), an independent education research center.


The one-year California pilot program was funded by the Stuart Foundations of San Francisco. Teachers, administrators, and school board members focused on such topics as school site management, collegial decision-making, evaluation of teachers by their peers, and teacher-developed curriculum.

The findings of the project were presented today (September 17) at a conference of 250 teachers, administrators, school board members, and state education officials at the Clarion Hotel at the San Francisco International Airport. Highlights of the conference included addresses by Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers speaking on "Unionism and Professionalism," and National Education Association president Mary Hartwood Furell, speaking on "Reforming the Reform Movement: The Imperative for Collaboration."

Among the Trust Agreement Project's major findings are:

- Trust agreements may not be prerequisites to reform, but they serve as catalysts to speed change.
- Trust agreements produce role changes among teachers and school administrators.
- Developing a network among participating trust agreement districts is an essential element of the program.
- Trust agreement discussions are substantively different from contract negotiations.
- Strong union and district leadership are necessary components of trust agreement success.
- The definition of a trust agreement is dependent on school district context.

PACE has applied to the Stuart Foundations for a grant to extend the trust agreements into a second year. The proposal would expand the project by adding six additional districts. The California Federation of Teachers would add Berkeley, Morgan Hill, and the Oxnard Union High School District. The California Teachers Association would also join the project with three districts: Cambrian Elementary, San Juan Unified, and San Diego.

The pilot project has the endorsement of Peter Mehas, education advisor to Governor George Deukmejian, and Bill Honig, state superintendent of public instruction.
Executive Summary

The purposes of the Trust Agreement Project are: 1) to develop new forms of school organization and new patterns of relationships among teachers and school administrators, and 2) to expand the range of labor-management discussions in education from the technical, procedural work rules that are the traditional purview of collective bargaining to substantive areas of educational policy.

The 1987-88 Trust Agreement Project was a collaborative effort of the California Federation of Teachers and the California School Boards Association, under the auspices of Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE). Six California school districts—Lompoc, Newport-Mesa, Poway, San Francisco, and Santa Cruz—participated in this unique experiment. Each district selected an area of educational policy in which it would attempt to craft a trust agreement. Lompoc, Poway, and Santa Cruz designated the area of peer assistance and review. Newport-Mesa chose staff development as its area of emphasis, and Petaluma selected the general area of staff evaluation. San Francisco chose to develop two trust agreements. One is a career development program for paraprofessionals (teachers' aides) to enable qualified individuals to earn teaching credentials. The other is an elementary school level interdisciplinary literature-based reading program involving a single elementary school.

First-year experience with trust agreements has led to seven tentative conclusions about the process:

1. Trust agreement discussions are substantively different from contract negotiations.

2. Strong union and district leadership are necessary components of trust agreement success.

3. Determining the policy area for trust agreement work is not nearly as thorny as developing a successful process by which to reach agreement.

4. The definition of a trust agreement is dependent on school district context.

5. Developing a network among participating districts is an essential element of the program.

6. Trust agreements may not be prerequisites to reform, but they serve as catalysts to speed change.

7. Trust agreements produce role changes.

Significantly, trust agreements developed in first-year project districts have begun conspicuously to alter the ways in which organizational decisions are made. Adversarial relationships have begun to give way to collaboration. Teachers are being included as partners in decisions about the structure and method of operation of school districts. These initial results provide hope that trust agreements can help school districts to "leap-frog" from the nineteenth century industrial model on which they are patterned to a new model of organization and decision-making more appropriate to schools of the twenty-first century.
Patterson City Schools
First Year Progress Report Excerpt

Schools and the . . . . Federation of Teachers concluded a preliminary
trust agreement in the area of staff development in spring 1987 and are at work on a second
agreement dealing with staff evaluation.

The . . . . Schools are comprised of two jointly managed districts: an
elementary district of just under 3,800 students drawn from the city of . . . . , and a
high school district of 4,600 students whose boundaries include a much larger rural and
suburban area in Sonoma County.

The elementary schools are beginning to experience slightly increasing enrollments,
but high school enrollments continue to decline sharply. The district is, therefore, feeling
financially squeezed. . . . . has avoided teacher layoffs, but just barely, and
reassignments and duty changes have been common in recent years. The enrollment picture
will change in the next decade as urbanization pushes northward from San Francisco. In
the process, the rural-small town ethos of . . . . is likely to feel pressure.

This district has enjoyed a long history of stable, productive labor relations.
participated in a preliminary CFT-funded trust agreement experiment in 1986-87. That process
produced an agreement on staff development. . . . . First trust agreement is, on its face,
simple. However, this agreement has had widespread effects on the ways in which teachers
think about their work and has provided a foundation for this year's trust agreement efforts.

Previously, staff development offerings in . . . . were determined by a central
office administrator with little or no teacher involvement. Teachers were dissatisfied with
the program, as evidenced by poor attendance at district-sponsored staff development
functions. . . . . Staff development trust agreement transfers authority over four days
of school time from the unilateral province of administrators to joint decision-making by
teachers and administrators. As an outgrowth of the agreement, teachers for the first time
have developed and expressed their own ideas of professional development, have
discovered and implemented ways of promoting and recognizing their own expertise as
teachers, and have taken initial steps to change teaching from an isolated activity to one in
which they share a collective responsibility for the quality of teaching in the district.

Teachers and administrators who implemented the new staff development program
made a number of important decisions which reflect substantive changes in the district's
professional development program. The staff development team substituted teacher experts
for outside speakers as providers of staff development courses, worked across schools and
grade levels rather than limiting opportunities to single grades, schools, or subjects; and
allowed teachers to choose from a variety of offerings rather than assigning them to a single
district-selected offering. Both teachers and school management agree these changes
would not have occurred without the trust agreement on staff development.
Having instituted the staff development program, the trust agreement negotiations on what the district and union call "the total evaluation system," meaning both student and employee evaluation. This task has proven to be a substantial thicket, and negotiators spent the better part of the 1987-88 school year discussing the kind of evaluation system they want, what its philosophy should be, and who should have responsibility for conducting evaluations.

To break the logjam, the trust agreement team decided to begin by designing and implementing a new system to evaluate the superintendent and central office administrators. By late spring 1987, the team had developed a new evaluation form which was sent to each teacher and administrator in the district. Results of this evaluation are being used by the superintendent to set his goals and objectives for the 1988-89 school year. By the end of 1987-88, the trust agreement team had also begun to develop a procedure to enable teachers to evaluate site principals for the first time. Concern about teacher evaluation of principals and the uses to which this new evaluation material might be put has engendered substantial anxiety among site principals.

Teachers, by their choice, are also beginning to grapple with a thorny issue, peer review. While teachers have yet to come to grips with the issue of peer evaluation, they now seem ready to embrace the idea, whereas a year ago it was so fearsome a topic that it could hardly be discussed.

Interviews with teachers and administrators reveal pride in being one of the first trust agreement districts and great satisfaction with the operation of the new staff development program. The old industrial line between workers and managers is being blurred. Staff development in some schools is now directed by a teacher and an assistant principal. This relationship brings together the two people thought by their colleagues to be the most knowledgeable about the subject, even though they are three hierarchical levels apart on a conventional organizational chart.

Staff development in staff development was previously a ritual, something administrators did with little zeal and to which teachers responded with even less. Now teachers are responsible for understanding the needs of their colleagues, equipping colleagues to present, and generally guiding the professional development program. As the assistant superintendent explained, "Quite literally, my job at the last staff development day was to stand back stage and pull the curtain."

At the same time, frustration exists that the evaluation process is taking so long to develop. As all the parties in the negotiation are coming to realize, evaluation is inherently a more explosive subject than staff development. Real stakes are involved, and there are significant differences of opinion about the legitimacy of teachers acting as evaluators. The trust agreement process has awakened a new sense of ownership of the educational process among teachers, and this new sense of ownership is implicitly challenging old assumptions about the proper relationship between teachers and school principals.
Nor are the differences in opinion limited to role differences between teachers and school management. What will prove interesting is determining whether the process of conducting trust agreement negotiations can lead to substantive agreements in situations in which the parties enter the bargaining arena with measurable differences about the scope and purpose of the topic under discussion.

Trust agreement team members realize the potential for divisiveness and as the 1987-88 school year closed, they adopted a slower and more deliberate attitude toward the evaluation process. They recognize the difficulties inherent in these negotiations and have set aside an intensive weekend for trust agreement negotiations shortly after the start of school in fall 1988. The 1988-89 school year will be given over to pushing forward with the evaluation process.

The trust agreement process has begun to alter significantly the way decisions are made in . Involving teachers as decision-makers in staff development appears to be only the tip of the iceberg. Now that teachers have had a taste of professional decision-making authority, they are openly hungry for more. We believe pressure for change will continue to mount in , as teachers and administrators continue to redefine their roles and as teachers begin to assume more decision-making responsibility.
Educational Policy Trust Agreement in Shared Decision-Making at Schools & Worksites

PURPOSE

The Federation and the District agree to follow shared decision-making processes in the School Districts. The Federation and the District believe that shared decision-making will result in more effective learning experiences for all students. The Federation and the District also believe that continued implementation of the shared decision-making processes will strengthen the special relationships among students, teachers, administrators, and parents.

PHILOSOPHY

The commitment of the School Districts to a philosophy of shared decision-making is based on the belief that those who will be affected by a decision should be involved in making it. It is also based on the belief that those with the knowledge, experience, and commitment in particular areas should be a part of the problem-solving process; it will be in this way that the best thinking occurs and the best decisions are made. The Districts' and the Federation's philosophy concerning shared decision-making is further based on the desire to honor diversity within the staff and community and to demonstrate respect for all who are a part of the School Districts.

CHARACTERISTICS OF SHARED DECISION-MAKING

1. Individuals affected by a decision participate in that decision, either directly or through chosen representatives.

2. Once a decision has been made, all individuals are responsible to help implement it.

3. Included in the process is consideration of the consequences of the decision: its effects on students, parents, staff, other workites, the District, and the community.

4. The following behaviors are vital to the shared decision-making process:
   * valuing all persons involved;
   * listening to other points of view;
   * ensuring all participants opportunities for input;
   * encouraging innovative thinking;
   * guaranteeing support for risk-taking;
   * being willing to alter preconceived positions;
   * following through on commitments.

COMMITMENT TO SHARED DECISION-MAKING

The District and the Federation recognize that there are already examples of shared decision-making at every site. The Federation and the District agree to provide continued support for the implementation of shared decision-making by committing resources to those teams who design and carry out changes which effectively improve education for children and/or redefine the professional relationships and responsibilities among team members. These resources include:

1. Providing staff development for strategies in the shared-decision-making process.

2. Providing consultation, including support in proposal development, possible waivers, legal and other procedural implications.

3. Assisting or providing assistance in developing and implementing documentation and evaluation activities included in proposal.

4. Helping to provide a communication link between participants and other interested colleagues; helping to acquire additional resources.

5. Assisting dispute resolution.

Note: The District and the Federation agreed that funding for the planning phase of Trust Agreement projects will be included as an item in the annual budget process.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION

If a disagreement between the Federation and the District regarding this Trust Agreement cannot be resolved, a third party, agreed upon by both parties or selected in accordance with the rules of the American Arbitration Association, shall be called in to resolve the dispute.
DRAFT #3

CLASSIFIED TRUST AGREEMENT – STAFF DEVELOPMENT

PURPOSE

The purpose of this trust agreement is to support the implementation of the School District's Mission Statement. This agreement will be a step in the creation of an organizational and educational environment for classified employees that enhances the growth of self-confidence, self-reliance, and mutual respect through guaranteed opportunities for professional growth. In order to achieve these ends, this environment will assure a continued special relationship among students, classified personnel, classroom teachers, administrators, and the community.

PHILOSOPHY

Staff development programs will provide professional growth opportunities for districtwide classified personnel. The committee recognizes that staff development can further develop the employee's potential, thereby enhancing his/her role in the educational environment. We recognize and will use the experience and expertise of district classified staff in creating and implementing staff development workshops. We also recognize that the Classified Staff Development Trust Agreement is essential to the success of these endeavors.

MEMBERSHIP

The Classified Trust Agreement Committee is comprised of a representative from each job classification (clerical, confidential, instructional assistants, custodial, cafeteria, transportation, maintenance and grounds).

In addition to the District Superintendent, there is both a classified and certificated representative from the management team.

PROCEDURES

A Classified Staff Development Trust Agreement Committee will be formed and will also represent each job classification. This committee will:

1. survey needs/interests of all classified personnel;
2. collaborate with Certified K-12 Staff Development Committee;
3. plan and implement workshops by:
   a. seeking presenters from within the District,
   b. recruiting outside consultants, and
   c. handling logistics of workshops;
4. maintain communications with classified personnel;
5. circulate evaluation forms and process feedback.

The committed resources will include:

1. release time for the Classified Staff Development Committee for meetings;
2. release time or extra pay for workshop planners/presentors;
3. clerical support;
4. custodial support;
5. supplies, materials, and duplication;
6. stipend for outside presenters;
7. shared expenses with the Certificated K-12 Staff Development Committee joint presentors.

We acknowledge the continuing fiscal impact and resolve to meet and confer each spring regarding the level of expenditure for the coming fiscal year.
PFT ELECTIONS MAY 23
Members Go To Polls, Vote On Officers, TA, Constitution

SHARED DECISION-MAKING PROCESS ON BALLOT
TO INVOLVE FACULTY IN MOST DECISIONS

Shared decision making is a process in which professional members of the school collaborate, where appropriate, in identifying problems, defining goals, formulating policy, shaping direction, and monitoring program implementation.

Why do it?

The goal of shared decision making is to create a climate in the Public Schools where teachers—participation results in a shared responsibility for improved decision making, increased satisfaction in one's professional position, and greater commitment to the total school community.

By working effectively as a team, teachers and administrators will produce an effective learning environment for students and enhance their academic achievement. In such an environment, all parties—teachers, administrators, pupils—enjoy a positive feeling of accomplishment and personal satisfaction. Through this synergistic effort, a higher degree of productivity is achieved than would otherwise be possible.

The opportunity for teachers to share with their administrators in reviewing, developing, implementing, and evaluating policies and plans within schools has benefits strongly supported by research.

SCHIPPER, COLLINS
IN RACE FOR PRES

On May 23, you will have the opportunity to elect a new slate of officers for the 1989-90 school year. In addition, you will be asked to ratify the newly-revised PFT Constitution, and the document on Shared Decision-Making. Each part of the ballot is of major importance to all certificated employees, so all members are encouraged to vote at their building site.

The nominees are as follows:
President: Shirley Collins
V.P. Second: Adena Clemmer
V.P. Eleen: Mark Leidy
Secretary: Kathy Kelly
Treasurer: John Ferrick

The Election Committee has distributed the newly established PFT election procedure to all members, but please note there is one change about absentee ballots, they must be turned in no later than the end of the day on election day, May 23.

Absentee ballots may be obtained from your building rep if you are ill or are planning to be away on school business, up to the day of the election. You may also phone in your vote to the designated school-site representative, who will cast your votes for you.

VOTE ON TUESDAY
PURPOSE AND RATIONALE OF SCHOOL BASED SHARED DECISION MAKING

School based decision making defines the individual school as the critical unit for educational change. Shared decision making assumes that stakeholder participation improves the precision of school actions.

John Goodlad, former Dean of the Graduate School of Education at the University of California, said the reform of American education can only occur one school at a time. Many studies, including the local Citizens League report, "Cooperatively Managed Schools" (1987) recommend a decentralization of authority to each school.

The rationale for school based shared decision making provides a potent base for adopting the practice. Key items of the rationale include:

1. Participants feel empowered and energized in schools where they help make important professional decisions. Empowerment elicits people's resourcefulness and ingenuity. Shared decision making evokes a strong sense of pride to produce the best education program possible. When participants are part of decisions, they develop a commitment to seeing their ideas work.

2. People vested in decisions will try harder to make their ideas work. They are more willing to be accountable for the results and to rework the decision if it doesn't produce the expected outcomes.

3. Decisions made at the point of action are better tailored to an individual school's situation than decisions made to apply uniformly to many schools. Locally designed decisions can be school sensitive and modified quickly to meet changing conditions.

4. As students, parents and other community members participate in school decisions, partnerships of caring and resource sharing develop. Home school partnerships can greatly increase school success for students.

5. Participants in decision making come to appreciate the complexities of educating diverse populations of youth. They more inclined to help and less inclined to blame.

The St. Paul Federation of Teachers conducted a survey of teacher views toward school based management in September, 1988. The results indicate support for the concept if the school staff is involved in designing a model of school based shared decision making, and then a high percentage of the staff, including a supportive principal, wish to participate in a pilot project.
DEFINITION AND BACKGROUND OF SCHOOL BASED SHARED DECISION MAKING

School based shared decision making is a form of school district organization that makes the individual school the unit where a significant number of decisions about the educational program takes place. The process of decision making involves the school's stakeholders (principal, teachers, other school staff, parents, students, and sometimes other community members) in shaping the program.

A variety of terms are used in the literature and by school districts for school based shared decision making. These include:

- school based management
- school site management
- school centered decision making

These terms all denote the concept that those closest to the implementation of a decision are involved in making the decision and that doing so contributes to stronger, better and more easily implemented decisions.

The concept of school based shared decision making arose during the past two decades partially as a result of changing management science. Businesses are moving toward decentralization, delegation of authority and flattening the management hierarchy. Increasingly, employees at all levels participate in decisions about their work. Their ideas help accomplish work more efficiently and improve its quality. Japan attracted widespread attention with "quality circles" in which, even workers at the lowest level were involved in decisions about how to make the product better and more efficiently.

Formidable international competition has driven American businesses to find more efficient and effective ways to make products and deliver services. This has led to more collaborative relations between management and employee groups. Businesses now routinely talk of "participative management" and "client driven decisions."

Educators recognize the tremendous complexity of schooling a vast diversity of students to greater levels of achievement. Highly centralized educational decisions have not been sufficiently fine tuned to the conditions and resources of individual schools. Schools must elicit every ounce of intelligence from all possible sources to meet today's educational challenges.

The topic of school based shared decision making highlights many conferences and educational meetings today. Impressive results from involving employees in decisions fuels the interest in this topic.
SACRAMENTO—State Senator Marian Bergeson (R-Newport Beach) was joined today by State Superintendent of Public Instruction Bill Honig, Miles Myers of the California Federation of Teachers, Davis Campbell of the California School Boards Association, Carol Knipe of the Association of California School Administrators, and Betty DeFea of the California Parent-Teachers Association in announcing their strong support for Senate Bill 824. Superintendent Honig is sponsoring the bill, which will be heard in the Senate Education Committee April 19, 1989.

SB 824 would encourage school boards, administrators and teachers to jointly develop and implement pilot programs which restructure instructional and administrative practices and provide for additional career opportunities for teachers for the central purpose of improving student learning.

School-based management is one aspect of restructuring and refers to building the capacity of school site staff to address students' educational needs. Creating an environment within schools in which teachers and principals can thrive as professionals, allows students to receive the benefit of their knowledge, creativity and problem solving abilities. Increased decision making authority for classroom teachers and principals is then coupled with increased accountability for results as the focus shifts from the school district simply checking for compliance with rules and policies to providing flexibility and support to sites as they work to improve student learning, employee satisfaction, and other agreed upon outcome measures.

Advanced career opportunities are another component of restructuring efforts and may include opportunities for teachers to be rewarded and recognized for their experience, the assumption of additional
responsibilities, or for meeting contracted performance goals.

Participation in the pilot projects is voluntary and would require approval by the local school board as well as by the exclusive representative of the district's certificated employees.

Honig noted that one of the preconditions of successful restructuring efforts is having an agreed upon definition of quality education. He added, "Developing better curriculum guidelines and textbooks has only been the first step. Now we must encourage school districts and schools to enhance their capacity to work together to teach this curriculum to their diverse student populations. Restructuring may be essential for some districts in taking this next step. We must admit that learning to work together is difficult and will take time."

Senator Bergeson agreed with Superintendent Honig, stating, "We have set very high standards for ourselves in California. Changing the way we do business to meet those standards is a complex process that can be as tedious and frustrating as it can be rewarding, but I think we can all agree that the rewards are clearly worth it."

####
The policy of the Board of Education is to support school restructuring as a process to achieve a fundamental change in school organization and instruction that will prepare all students for the future. The purposes of school restructuring are to improve the quality of instruction and student achievement. School restructuring will require greater site autonomy and control over budgets, shared decision making among staff members, parents and students, and appropriate accountability standards for student outcomes.

BELIEF STATEMENTS

The Board of Education establishes the following set of belief statements that are the rationale for promoting school restructuring:

Beliefs About Change

- We believe that school restructuring is not a passing fad but is a long-term strategic planning effort to improve the quality of student instruction by changing the organization of schools.

- We believe that the environment for change must allow for flexibility and risk taking.

Beliefs About Students

- We believe all students can learn and that public education should enable all students to fulfill their unique potential.

- We believe all students deserve to be at school, that each child should feel welcomed by the school staff, and that each student should achieve success at school.

- We believe that students learn in different ways, and that current instructional methods must change to meet each student's learning needs.

- We believe that with the rapid increase in knowledge, students must learn to effectively process information and become lifelong learners.

- We believe that parental involvement is an essential element of effective student learning.

Beliefs About Schools

- We believe that the school is the locus of change.

- We believe that schools should have greater autonomy and foster shared decision making among administrators, teachers, classified staff, and parents.

- We believe that greater school autonomy and shared decision making must be accompanied by the acceptance of responsibility and accountability for student learning.
Beliefs About Schools (Continued)

- We believe that changes in school organization, instructional practices, and staff roles will occur in phases and that they will need time to evolve. It will take several years before major change is evident.

- We believe that schools can restructure within their resource allocations.

Belief About District Organization

- We believe that the district organization exists to set district goals and objectives, provide support and help for schools, establish district standards, and assist schools in assessing results.

Beliefs About Changing Roles

- We believe that desired change in school must have significant involvement from teachers and place primary emphasis on teaching and the instructional process.

- We believe that principals should lead all employees in schools to create an environment for change by encouraging collaboration, shared decision making, and team work involving parents, students and the community.

- We believe that granting schools greater autonomy and encouraging shared decision making, collaboration, and team work will change the roles not only of school staffs, parents, and students but also of board members, employee organization leaders, cabinet members, and district certificated and classified support staff. Relationships must become more enabling, supportive, and empowering.

Belief About San Diego City Schools

- We believe San Diego City Schools is in a unique position to be a model for school restructuring nationally given the composition of students, quality of staff, and district reputation for innovation.

REQUIREMENTS

The Board of Education encourages schools to explore new and more effective ways to educate students and to request changes or waivers of present requirements that unnecessarily restrict schools. Until such changes are made or waivers granted, schools will need to adhere to the following requirements:

- Work to achieve district goals

- Adhere to board policy

- Conduct activities that are legal and ethical
SCHOOLS
STAFF DEVELOPMENT DAY

NOVEMBER 5, 1990

WORKSHOPS WILL BE HELD AT HIGH SCHOOL
CITY SCHOOLS

STAFF DEVELOPMENT DAY
NOVEMBER 5, 1990

"Commitment to our children, the curriculum, and our community"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:30</td>
<td>COFFEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-10:00</td>
<td>WORKSHOPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:30</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-12:00</td>
<td>WORKSHOPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-3:15</td>
<td>WORKSHOPS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping with Difficult People</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in the Classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use Identification</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka!!! I've Found a New Career</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything You Wanted to Know About Defensive &amp; Winter Driving</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid for Classified Employees</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Reading Out Loud!</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling Through the Math Strands</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangs, What's Happening In County</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Connection to Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Hazards of Computers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to Learn, Learning to Help</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing the Human Interaction Document: Part I</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Student Study Teams</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Your Public Library's New On-Line Computer Catalog</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-a-like for English/Language Arts</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-a-like Meeting for 6th Grade Teachers and 7th Grade Social Study Teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to Love Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let's Get Lost in Painting: Fine Arts in the Elementary Classroom</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature + Writing + Drama = Magical</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking at the Primary Language Record</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One for the Money: Grant Writing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral History</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouagadougou to Timbuktu</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.R.S.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Helper Orientation</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry Predicament</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on Project Interchange Trip to Israel</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected List of the Newest Titles in Children's Literature for Primary</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiEnz'nMath</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Reduction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taming the Pro-Gro Monster</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching History Through Technology</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Together We Can: Special &amp; General Education Teams</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformations in Physical Science</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the I - Global Resource Center?</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WordPerfect Made Easy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Toward Sex Equity in Education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You're a Great Typist</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your District Paid Benefits</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Roots in County</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Empowering Systems (Y.E.S.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RECYCLING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DIVERSITY IN THE CLASSROOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ORAL HISTORY IN THE CLASSROOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TAMING THE PRO-GRO MONSTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>YOUTH EMPOWERING SYSTEMS, Y.E.S., THE TEAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>COPING WITH DIFFICULT PEOPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>STRESS REDUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>HELPING TO LEARN, LEARNING TO HELP; BUILDING SUCCESSFUL PEER RELATIONSHIPS IN THE WORKPLACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>THE HEALTH HAZARDS OF COMPUTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>P.E.R.S. YOUR RETIREMENT SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>EURKA!!! I'VE FOUND A NEW CAREER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>TOGETHER WE CAN: EDUCATION COLLABORATIVE STRATEGIES FOR SPECIAL &amp; GENERAL EDUCATION TEAMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONS IN PHYSICAL SCIENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>GAMBLING THROUGH THE MATH STRANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>BEYOND BOOKTALKS--A MINI-GUIDE TO YOUR SCHOOL LIBRARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>LEARNING TO LOVE LITERATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>THE GRAPHIC CONNECTION TO LITERATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>YOU'RE A GREAT TYPE!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ONE FOR THE MONEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>CPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>FIRST-AID AND UNIVERSAL PRECAUTIONS FOR CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>TRIBES - A PROCESS FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT &amp; COOPERATIVE LEARNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>&quot;GRADE BUSTERS&quot; - COMPUTER GRADE PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>WORD- PERFECT MADE EASY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>100 WAYS TO TEACH AND MODEL &quot;EARTHDAY- EVERYDAY!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>OUAGADOUGOU TO TIMBUKTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>WHAT IS THE GLOBAL RESOURCE CENTER? WHAT CAN IT DO FOR ME?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANTS - WHAT CAN WE DO FOR EACH OTHER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>GANGS, WHAT'S HAPPENING IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO STUDENT STUDY TEAMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>TEAM BUILDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>WORKING TOWARD SEX EQUITY IN EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>AUDITORY PROCESSING - CHILDREN WITH LISTENING PROBLEMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>THE CLASSROOM STEEPELCHASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>AUGUSTINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>FOR READING OUT LOUD!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>LOOKING AT THE PRIMARY LANGUAGE RECORD: A BRITISH ASSESSMENT MODEL A LA DAMICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>THE POETRY PREDICAMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LITERATURE + WRITING + DRAMA = MAGICAL!

This workshop will help teachers discover and use various ideas, concepts, and activities to integrate the State Frameworks for Language Arts and Theater Arts throughout the curriculum. During the workshop focus will be centered upon concentration and relaxation exercises, improvisations, theater games, character development, stage and script techniques and the direct reflection that language/writing and literature share. Suggestions and practical methods for staging classroom plays to producing a major school production will be presented. (Please wear clothing that's comfortable and allows participants to move freely.) (Limit 5-20)

Lynda Davidson  
G2  
2-12

1:00 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.

INTRODUCTION TO YOUR PUBLIC LIBRARY'S NEW ON-LINE COMPUTER CATALOG

Come to the Library to see what's new! Using the Public Access Catalog (PAC), you can find out if the Sonoma County Library owns a certain book or recording by typing in TITLE, AUTHOR or SUBJECT. It will tell you if it is on the shelf at the branch. If not, you can place a hold on the item yourself. Added features, such as CONTENTS or SERIES search will be introduced, also. Learn this new system now, so you may share the excitement with your students. This workshop will be held at Regional Library. (Limit 5-16)

Kiyoe Okazaki  
Library
Head Librarian  
Regional Library

EVERYTHING YOU WANTED TO KNOW ABOUT DEFENSIVE & WINTER DRIVING

First half of class will be a film on defensive driving tips - 2nd half instructors will demonstrate winter driving tips. (Stopping distance on wet roads) (Limit 23)

Tim Colvin  
Ralph Knight  
A23  
All

REPORT ON PROJECT INTERCHANGE TRIP TO ISRAEL

This presentation will be a report on the Project Interchange trip to Israel in June, 1990. It will feature slides as well as impressions gained during this experience. (Limit 30)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Presenters</th>
<th>Rm. #</th>
<th>Gr/Lev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>DRUG USE IDENTIFICATION: WHAT TO LOOK FOR</td>
<td>Workshop will provide an overview of drug use in illegal drugs and paraphernalia will be displayed and explained. Warning signs of drug use and how you can tell if someone is under the influence will be covered. (Limit 10-50)</td>
<td>Detective Gene Wallace</td>
<td>E18</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>LET'S GET LOST IN A PAINTING: FINE ARTS IN THE ELEMENTARY CLASSROOM</td>
<td>Teachers will learn to look at and analyze art to find the principles of design and the meaning of the painting itself. Once we understand the tools of composition and meaning, we will paint an original work of art. (Limit 5-10)</td>
<td>Betty Harrison</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PEER HELPER ORIENTATION</td>
<td>Do you have a student(s) who could benefit from some extra attention in or out of the classroom? A peer helper might be the answer for you! Come join us for this fun, informative workshop where you'll learn about some basic peer helping skills, meet some of our veteran &quot;helpers,&quot; and discover how you can participate in the Peer Helping program. Ideally, we would like every school in the district represented. One of our main goals is to clarify the purpose and procedures of the Peer Helping program throughout the district. (Limit 30)</td>
<td>Stan Hardeman Peggy Wiley</td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTING THE HUMAN INTERACTION DOCUMENT PART I INDIVIDUAL GROWTH</td>
<td>Change is a part of all our lives. Come learn to help your students adapt to change and learn to implement the H.I. Document at the same time. We will be taking a close look at &quot;Stages,&quot; a program developed by the Irvine School District. &quot;Stages&quot; helps you to develop strategies to teach adolescents the awareness and skills to manage the process of change. This program is geared to address all children. (Limit 8-20)</td>
<td>Elaine Petersen</td>
<td>A21</td>
<td>K-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>TEACHING HISTORY THROUGH TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>A hands-on experience using computers and VCRs to teach History/Social Sciences. These ideas come from the North Coast Technology Project. (Limit 30)</td>
<td>Jeanne Jusaitis Carolyn Geiger</td>
<td>A16</td>
<td>K-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Presenters</td>
<td>Rm. #</td>
<td>Grade Levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>YOUR ROOTS IN COUNTY</td>
<td>We will trace the migration of people into California and, more specifically, into County. The focus will be on the period from the 1820's to the early 1900's. Included will be activities for the classroom to trace students' own families' moves into County. (Limit 30)</td>
<td>Vicki Whiting</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>JOB-A-LIKE MEETING FOR 6TH GRADE TEACHERS AND 7TH GRADE SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS</td>
<td>We will look at the new History/Social Science Framework together and share ideas and materials appropriate to grade levels. We will also talk about how to articulate the curriculum from 6th grade to junior high. (Limit 5-20)</td>
<td>Jean Hoffman, Georgia Squires</td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS JOB ALIKE</td>
<td>This is an opportunity for teachers to get together and discuss the English/Language Arts Framework and articulation from grade to grade. (Limit 30)</td>
<td>Stephen P. Collins</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>A SELECTED LIST OF THE NEWEST TITLES IN CHILDREN'S LITERATURE FOR PRIMARY GRADES</td>
<td>With thousands of children's books published each year, it is difficult to keep up with, let alone evaluate, this large quantity. At this session, participants will be presented with a sampling of what's new and of interest in picture books, beginning readers and first chapter books. Included in the discussion will be bibliographies of the new titles and the books will be on display for a hands on look. (Limit 10-40)</td>
<td>Mairi del Calvo, Regional Library</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>K-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>YOUR DISTRICT PAID BENEFITS: WHAT THEY MEAN TO YOU NOW AND AT RETIREMENT</td>
<td>Health and welfare benefits are an important part of the total employee compensation package. What are your benefits? How do you use them? What can you keep if you leave the District? What can you keep if you retire? What is Section 125? Bring your questions! (Limit 30)</td>
<td>Pat Martinez, Benefits Coordinator</td>
<td>A18</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
K-12 STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Marcia Joynt
Laura Richards
Mark Leidy
Linda Marschall
Mary Collins
Gay Robbins
Alice Sund
Anne Jones

Janice Eurgubian
Ellie Spence
Mary Beth Fager
Georgia Squires
Bill Austin
Carolyn Geiger
Steve Collins
Peggy Wiley

Margaret Potts
Margie Fiori
Nancy Smith
Jean Hoffman
Rick Homrighouse
Adrena Clemmer
Carol Isaak
Terry Menzel

CLASSIFIED STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Dolores Langerman
Rich Avilla
Cathy Marello
Donna Pozzi
Susan Graham
Karen Fuller

Kim Patterson
Carol Anderson
Chuck Cadman
Marge Hodapp
Rena Parsons

Linda Illia
Carol Isaak
Steve Collins
Roseanna Cresci
Linda Munsch

DIVISION OF INSTRUCTION SECRETARIES

Sandi Durham
Nancy Phillips

Kim Patterson
Marie Park

Linda Illia

CASA GRANDE HIGH SCHOOL STAFF

CO-CHAIRS

Georgia Squires
Carol Isaak
Mary Collins
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