BACKGROUND PAPER 97-2

SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT

H. Pepper Sturm, Chief Principal Research Analyst
Miriam M. Barcellona, Research Analyst
Research Division
Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau

1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT

INTRODUCTION

Site-based or school-based management (SBM) aims to decentralize decision making by transferring authority and resources from state education agencies and school district offices to units such as governance councils, committees, or teams located at an individual school. Site-based management is an approach to educational reform that allows an individual school to make its own decisions related to finances and curriculum. A school council, which typically consists of the principal, teachers, parents, and other community members, determines the policy direction for the school.[1]

Under the traditional governance system, power is centralized in the office of the superintendent and/or the school board. It is there that the decisions on the schools' curriculums, discipline policies, budgets, and personnel issues are made. Those with the power are the farthest removed from the day-to-day operation of schools. In contrast, principals and teachers, who are better positioned to make knowledgeable decisions, are seldom empowered. They are placed in the awkward position of operating schools and classrooms with only minimal formal authority. One of the goals of SBM is to give flexibility to those closest to the classroom so that decisions can be made to provide the best education for the students.

BACKGROUND

Proponents of SBM have been influenced in part by a body of corporate research indicating that participatory decision making creates a more effective, responsive organization. Beginning in the late 1980s, many private companies moved away from hierarchical organizational structures to ones with less rigid lines of authority where workers participate more actively in decisions concerning productivity and company policies. Site-based management is the educational reform version of this philosophy.

Site-Based Management and Traditional Structures

According to a 1993 study done by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education concerning private sector decentralization, participatory management is most appropriate in organizations where the environment is changing rapidly; the work is complex and

---

[1]Carlos, Lisa and Mary Amsler, *Policy Briefs*, "Site-Based Management: An Experiment in Governance," Far West Laboratory for Education Research and Development, San Francisco, California, 1993: p. 1.

involves uncertainty and is performed in teams. The study argues that this is an apt description of many schools.[2]

The traditional "command and control" management model used by most school districts can sustain the status quo, but many argue that it is severely challenged to achieve excellence because of the crucial disjuncture in authority and accountability that it imposes. To resolve this disjuncture, it is argued that a realignment of authority and accountability is needed—site-based management. By shifting authority to schools, holding them responsible for performance standards, and utilizing a central office to provide assistance instead of issue orders, the operating integrity of schools can be restored.[3]

Advocates of SBM believe it will result in higher student performance; more efficient use of resources; increased skills and satisfaction for school administrators and teachers; and greater community and business involvement in and support for schools.

The underlying principle behind SBM proposes that smaller governing bodies representing a wide cross section of educators and community members can better determine policies that directly affect them. In theory, greater participation in decision making helps build consensus for certain reforms and helps ensure that the implementation reflects the expertise of those directly involved in teaching and learning.

Governance Structure

The school's basic governance structure is the central feature of any SBM plan. At some schools there is only one governing committee, while at others decision making occurs in several subdivided units or working groups, with final decisions made at the full committee level or through an executive committee.

The membership of a SBM governance body will vary from school to school, but typically the governance body represents a wide spectrum of interests. Generally, among the members of the governing body are administrative and teaching school staff, community members, and parents. Some high school governance bodies may include students. Membership qualifications and their proportional representation may be mandated from a higher level of government (i.e., the school district or the state).

---

[2]Priscilla Wohsletter and Susan Albers Mohrman, *Consortium for Policy Research in Education*, "School-Based Management: Promise and Process," *CPRE Finance Brief* (FB-05), Consortium for Policy Research in Education, December 1994: p. 1.

[3]Guthrie, James W., and Gerald C. Hayward, Michael W. Kirst, Julia E. Koppich, Mary Lee McCune, James R. Smith, *Management Analysis & Planning Associates*, "Nevada School District Organization and Control: Meeting the Challenges of Growth and Diversity," Berkeley, California, July 1996: p. 80.

Arguments For and Against Site-Based Management

Site-based management is difficult to implement due to resistance by many of those involved in public education.[4] Although there are many active proponents of site-based management, few of the key personnel directly involved in public education support it. For school boards and district superintendents, it means a loss of authority; to principals, it presents new responsibilities and open accountability. For teachers, it is yet another duty assignment that crowds an already crowded workday. The SBM approach does, however, find numerous advocates within parent groups and the business community.

Table No. 1

Advantages of Site-Based Management	Disadvantages of Site-Based Management
According to advocates, site-based management:	According to opponents, site-based management:
1. Fosters within the community a greater sense of ownership and responsibility for the quality of education through the process of making decisions locally;	1. Is a complex process. It may be difficult to find participants with the interest, time, and expertise to make wise decisions—often, new layers of regulations are added or a variety of programs are created at the school site without any real focus;
2. Gives more authority and accountability for results to teachers, administrators, parents, and students;	2. Can often be frustrating and sometimes slower than current systems; and
3. Motivates improved performance due to the "flatter" management structure focused on measurable academic achievement; and	3. Implies additional responsibilities for teachers, taking time away from teaching duties; may require additional training (and, therefore, additional costs). Finding the time for teachers to participate usually requires restructuring the school organization and the teacher's job, including how the teacher spends his or her time.
4. Provides for a more efficient use of resources.	

Sources: Wohsletter (1994); Carlos (1993); and the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory website—s.v. "Critical Issue: Transferring Decisionmaking to Local Schools: Site-Based Management," http://www.ncrel.org (1996).

---

[4]Guthrie, p.85.

3

CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL
SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

A 1993 review of site-based management practices by the Far West Laboratory identified a number of characteristics of successful programs.[5]

Power sharing. According to the study, a key factor in determining the success of SBM is whether the redistribution of power is a genuine redistribution or whether it is a symbolic gesture. The amount of power redistributed can vary greatly. At one end of the autonomy spectrum are those models with school-site governance bodies having authority to make decisions by consensus with the principal, superintendent and/or school board. At the other end of the spectrum are SBM models in which the governance body serves a purely advisory role and all of the true decisions are left to, or are subject to the veto of, the principal, superintendent and/or school board.

Accountability and evaluation mechanisms. Contained within SBM is the notion that by sharing power with the teachers and principals, parents and communities can hold themselves and school site administrators accountable. To monitor the effectiveness of a SBM school, baseline data should be collected and used to measure progress towards improved performance. A state's achievement testing requirements and district-wide testing programs are typically used to monitor schools.

Role of parents and community members. Through the implementation of SBM, parents and other community members can participate in the decision making process. These community members provide valuable insight about how the schooling process can be improved to better educate the children in the community. Restrictive models limit parental input; expansive models delegate real authority and provide support from the school, the districts, and the state.

Professional development at the school site. Principals in SBM schools are required to share the decision making process and teachers' roles expand to include new managerial, leadership, and problem-solving responsibilities. A formal training process will help all participants in administering an effective SBM school. Parents and community members also must redefine their roles and responsibilities. A professional development component should allow for governance council meeting time, training days, and resources to pay substitutes during planning and decision making meetings.

School districts may need to provide appropriate training in management techniques for principals, teachers, and parents for managing schools. The district office is a logical source for providing ongoing assistance in these and other related matters during the

---

[5]Carlos, p. 2.

period of transition from a central authority management structure to that envisioned in SBM. During the transition period and beyond, the district office could provide consultative services for customized on-site training in SBM and other teacher development activities.

Another important issue to consider before moving to site-based management concerns the presence of *proper incentives* for participation. This component encourages teachers, parents, and community members to actively participate in the decision making process.

Improving student performance. According to the study by the Far West Laboratory, in designing a SBM program it is important to stay focused on the ultimate purpose of implementing such a program—increasing students' academic performance. Often, the focus shifts from the students to the details of setting up power sharing, accountability and evaluation systems, recruiting parents and community members to get involved, and then training these individuals. It is generally agreed that a vision or mission that is directly linked to student outcomes be formulated before the SBM process begins and should be referenced frequently along the way.[6]

KEY POLICY ISSUES

There are a number of key policy issues that legislators may wish to consider when adopting a SBM program. The following topics were contained within various reports about SBM. They are categorized into issues affecting program implementation; governance and autonomy matters; various related financial subjects; and accountability issues:

Implementation Issues

- The scope of SBM program should be defined (pilot, district-wide, or statewide program).

- Consideration should be given to length of phase-in period and time line for which components to implement first.

Governance Issues

- The degree of autonomy extended to SBM schools needs definition, including the extent of the schools' authority for curriculum and finance, and whether staffing is centralized or school-based.

---

[6]Carlos, p. 2.

- Defining the role of the school site governance body—advisory vs. full policy-making body.

- The role and responsibilities of the school district—districts for example, may retain authority for custodial and food services, utilities, building maintenance, athletic programs, transportation, staff training, or teacher recruitment.

- Method of selecting and evaluating the performance of the school principal. (Should the district superintendent or the school's advisory committee make the selection and do performance evaluations?)

Fiscal Issues

- The financing structure for SBM schools—how much funding should be passed along to the individual school site (some programs specify a fixed amount—90 percent, for example, based upon the funding formula).

- Whether to centralize or decentralize programs for children with special needs—are special program staff (psychologists, social workers, speech pathologists) and the diagnosis and placement process for special education students to remain centralized?

- Determination of levels of fiscal accountability and reporting, specification of uniform financial records and reports to the district.

- The degree of authority granted to individual schools to purchase supplies from competitive vendors or to continue to purchase supplies from a district's central warehouse.

- The degree of authority granted to individual schools to purchase services from competitive vendors.

- Whether to allow some central services to be charged back to schools (examples include payroll, financial, printing, and telephone services).

- Provisions for appropriate training in management techniques for principals, teachers, and parents for managing schools—are staff development funds and substitute teacher funds to be decentralized or school-based?

Accountability Issues

- Standardization of reports that itemize the school's revenues and expenses.

- Expansion of school accountability reports to include drop-out rates, parent satisfaction, teacher grievance levels, and level of applications for students living outside traditional attendance zone.

- Revision of the structure, format, and distribution of the school accountability report to include the school's performance relative to specific standards and specific outcomes.

- Continued participation by schools in any statewide proficiency test to make valid comparisons among schools.

- Use of a value-added performance measurement to determine what a student knew at the beginning of an assessment period and what a particular grade or school added by way of learning value.

- Methods of increasing the communication between the principal and parents and the principal and school personnel, including the assessment of this component within a principal's overall evaluation.

- Prescribing the consequences for schools that continue to fail in delivering results specified within a performance agreement—some states define a series of interventions that become progressively more intrusive in schools.

- Establishing a reward structure for schools that exceed achievement goals; examples include one-shot grants and authority to carry over savings from one fiscal year to the next.

SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

A number of states and school districts have implemented some form of SBM, usually as part of a larger reform effort. Other states, such as Nevada, have considered SBM as a separate, statewide program.

Site-Based Management Activities in Other States and School Districts

Several states have recently adopted SBM programs within state statute, including Arkansas and Hawaii. Kentucky has recently revised its SBM law. In Kentucky's case, school councils and SBM were key components of a comprehensive reform package enacted in 1994. Other states such as California and Utah have adopted pilot programs or limited reform programs which include a SBM component.

Most activities with SBM are taking place at the school district level. The chart in the appendix provides comparative information on different site-based management programs in key school districts across the United States. The information in the chart was provided by the Education Commission of the States.

Site-Based Management in Nevada

In 1993, the Nevada State Legislature passed Senate Bill 91 (Chapter 664, *Statutes of Nevada*), which authorized the board of trustees in each school district to establish rules concerning school-based decision making for public schools within the district. The bill was incorporated into law in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 386.4158, *et seq.* The statute lists specific subjects that the rules must address such as the creation of a school council involving parents and community members, methods for determining the progress of pupils and reporting that progress, and methods for allocating money and administering the budget of the school district. Furthermore, the law permits state and local waivers from regulations for schools that adopt a program of SBM.

According to the State Department of Education, by the end of 1996, the Carson City and Washoe County School Districts have taken action pursuant to statute to establish SBM in their schools. The structure and power sharing in these two districts appears to leave most of the power with the school board. However, the schools do have more decision making power than they had prior to the adoption of a SBM plan. Clark County elementary schools have adopted similar programs to those outlined in statute (i.e., establishing parental advisory groups), but have not formally developed a SBM program in accordance with NRS 386.4158. Unless the 1997 Legislature acts, Nevada's SBM provisions will sunset on July 1, 1997.

CONCLUSION

Unlike most reform strategies, site-based management is rarely considered an end unto itself but is usually part of a larger approach. Also unlike other strategies, support among most educators directly involved in public education has occasionally been lukewarm at best.

In addition, most evaluations of SBM conclude that a key factor in determining the success of the program involves the success or failure of managing the change process itself—moving an entrenched system from a centralized structure to a decentralized model. Those advocating site-based management and those with concerns about the system agree that clearly defined accountability monitors need to be in place to evaluate the transition. Such a system of monitors allows those in charge of the transition to evaluate the effectiveness of the governance team. Based upon these evaluations, approaches can be altered and the implementation timetable may be modified to allow for problems and

barriers encountered during the transferral of authority and responsibility. A SBM program also raises numerous policy issues involved with implementation, fiscal concerns, governance elements and accountability issues. Legislators considering site-based management laws are faced with balancing all of these considerations with needs specific to their states.

Based upon the descriptions of the various models operating throughout the country, SBM program structures assume many different forms specific to the needs of a particular school district or state. This observation corresponds with the philosophical approach contained within SBM itself—that governance will be tailored to the individual needs of a school community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carlos, Lisa and Mary Amsler, *Policy Briefs,* "Site-Based Management: An Experiment in Governance," Far West Laboratory for Education Research and Development, San Francisco, California, 1993.

Guthrie, James W., and Gerald C. Hayward, Michael W. Kirst, Julia E. Koppich, Mary Lee McCune, James R. Smith, *Management Analysis & Planning Associates,* "Nevada School District Organization and Control: Meeting the Challenges of Growth and Diversity," Berkeley, California, July 1996.

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory website—s.v. "Critical Issue: Transferring Decisionmaking to Local Schools: Site-Based Management," http://www.ncrel.org

Wohsletter, Priscilla, and Susan Albers Mohrman, *Consortium for Policy Research in Education,* "School-Based Management: Promise and Process," *CPRE Finance Brief* (FB-05), Consortium for Policy Research in Education, December 1994.

Zinser, Jana. *Investing In People,* "Reinventing Education," National Conference of State Legislatures, February 1994.

APPENDIX

"Site-Based Management Programs"

SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

(Compiled by: Education Commission of the States, 1996)

Note: No information was provided for empty cells.

	Milwaukee	Los Angeles	New York	Denver	Seattle	Chicago	Philadelphia	Edmonton	Dade County	Boston
Contact Name and Title	Bert Molina, Finance Director	Didi Nubla, Director, Cluster Fiscal Services	Alan Dichter, (HS) Principal	Velma Rose, Chief Financial Officer	Geri Lim, Budget Director	Chris Hoagland, Deputy Budget Director	Jack Myers, Director, Financial Planning and Analysis	Peter Little, Budget	Edward Brown, Budget Analyst	Robert Payne, Senior Budget Coordinator
Telephone Number		(213) 625-6787 or (818) 704-3916	(212) 349-5350	(303) 764-3226	(206) 298-7247	(312) 535-8759	(215) 299-7288	(403) 429-8063	(305) 995-1000	(617) 635-6985
Total Budget- All Funds	FY 1996 $774 Million	$4.4 billion	$8 billion	FY1996 gross $502,490,622	$320 million + $38 million from community	$2.6 billion	$1.4 billion		$2 billion	$482.3 million
Number of Students	103,000	646,000	1 million	64,358	47,000	413,000	211,000	76,600	310,000	62,728
How is Staffing Configured? (Centralized or School Based) Centrally, Set Staffing Formulas? (FTE=full time equivalent)	School based	Learn schools - school based. All other schools are centrally budgeted.	High schools are school based. Allocated on units tied to enrollment, et cetera.	School based. Allocated by enrollment formulas. (Can trade in teaching staff for dollars.)	Centralized control of staffing/budgets FTE allocation to schools. Schools determine type of teacher.	Board sets base level staffing on enrollment. Discretionary funds/grants direct to school. Lump sum budget. Pilot to begin.	School based. Enrollment per school allocation. Supplemental funds based on formulas.	School based. Determined at school level; no requirements for teacher/ student ratio except cannot be greater than 30.	School based. Staff assigned on FTE allocated formulas from the board-approved school allocation plan.	School based. Allocated formula based on enrollment. Schools budget dollars as they want.
Number of Years Using School-Based Budgeting	Approx. 4 years	Learn schools 3 years.	19-20 years	1990 mandated site-based management. 1995 began restructuring for site-based budgeting.		Illinois mandated to begin 1991.	4 years	1976 SBM pilot for seven schools. 1980-1981 extended to all.	10 to 12 years	1989 pilot schools
Total Number of Schools	Approx. 165 schools	900 schools and centers	178 high schools	111 schools	100 schools	553 schools	257 schools	197 schools	Approximately 330 day schools	118 schools

	Milwaukee	Los Angeles	New York	Denver	Seattle	Chicago	Philadelphia	Edmonton	Dade County	Boston
Number of Schools Decentralized	All	34; 89 in FY 1997; 192 in FY 1998	All high schools	All involved	All to some degree	Over 90%	All	All	All (except 20 Alternative/ Extension Education)	All
How is Salary Budgeted? (Average or Actual) If Actual, Effect on School Equity?	Average, adjusted to actual	Learn schools, actual per school's request. All other average.	Average, not adjusted to actual.	Average	Average, adjusted to actual.	Actual	Average	Average unit costs for all categories.	Average. Schools use a new hire rate to purchase additional staff.	Average, adjusted to actual after budget period.
Differential Funding by Level?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, quota formulas vary allocations.	Yes	Identical, based on minutes of instruction.	Yes	Yes
Who is Involved in School-Level Budget Decisions? Governance (council, principal, staff, parents?)	Shared between principal, staff, and parents.	Varies. Learn schools have governance council of principal, staff, parents, and classified.	Principal, and if SBM, a council including parents and staff.	Collaborative Decision Making Committee (CDM) of principal, teachers, parents, students, and community.	No policy. budget decisions primarily determined by principal and staff. Site councils of principal, staff, parents, and community in five pilot schools.	Principal has primary author-ity. Local School Council (LSC) of parents, staff, student, principal, and community set improvement plan.	School council of principal, staff, and parents.	Principal makes final decision. Staff, students, parents, and nonparent community all provided opportunity for involvement by each school.	If board approved plan, principal and staff deter-mine programs. Nonboard approved plan, schools have committee (principal, department heads, treasurer, curriculum representative).	School-site councils of building administrator, parents, teachers, representatives of collaborating institutions and student (if high school).
Prudent Reserve Required?	Yes	Yes	No	3% emergency reserve; 1% contingency operating reserve.	Required, none available.	No	No		Yes, district reserve.	Yes, in 1997. No prior years.
Carryover Policy (Percent Allowable, Type of Expenditures)	Yes, but inactive due to state revenue caps.	Carryover of general funds.	None	No carry over.	Schools can carry over nonsalary dollars.	No local funds. Discretionary/ direct funds can be carried over.	Carry over of book/supply allotment.	Surpluses carried forward.	Schools can carry over nonsalary dollars.	No. All turned in for surplus.
Are Deficits Carried Over?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes, nonsalary deficits.	No, use discretionary.	Yes,book/ supply allotment.	Yes	Yes	No

	Milwaukee	Los Angeles	New York	Denver	Seattle	Chicago	Philadelphia	Edmonton	Dade County	Boston
Percentage of Funds Controlled by School	55%, to be 73% with benefits	Learn-89% of general funds and general programs.	80 to 90%?	65% of general fund, excluding transfers and reserves.	Schools control 10-15%; 75% total budget to schools.	15% total control; 47% lesser control.	88% allocated to schools.	89% of funds budgeted by schools.	Varies between 30% to 80%.	
Can School Site Amend Budget and/or Reallocate Funds during School Year?	Yes, bottom line authority.	Yes, learn schools.	Budget obtained in two parts, fall and spring. Reallocations for a few weeks each term.	Yes, transfers of $5,000 or more require board approval.	Nonsalary accounts only.	Yes, categorical reallocations need board approval.	Yes	Yes	Yes, nonsalary accounts. Salaries reallocated within FTE limits.	Yes, with Assistant Superintendent approval.
Can Schools Purchase Supplies/ Equipment Directly? Prior Approval Required? Dollar Limits?	Can purchase supplies and equipment up to $2,000 per item. No prior approval.	Learn schools - yes, under $100,000. Over $250 various procedures/ restrictions.	Yes, items under $250. Over $250 various procedures/ restrictions.	Yes, petty cash accounts, term and supply contracts, or purchase from the district's warehouse.	Yes, schools have a $1,000 per transaction limit.	Yes, up to $10,000 per vendor. Over $10,000 requires board report and competitive bids.	Yes, up to $500 from Petty cash. Various other limits. Prior approval required for consultants.	Yes, up to $1,000. If over, required to go through central purchasing department.	Yes, directly through the purchasing system or a petty cash system for items under $100.	Yes, from qualified vendors and petty cash. All other purchases require central purchasing.
Are Exceptional Education Programs Centralized or School Based?	School based	Centralized	Moderate disabilities - decentralized. All other centralized.	Assigned to schools, but managed centrally.	Centralized		School budgeted, control shifting to schools.	Both, students may attend local school or a district center for special needs.	ESC staff, centralized. Planning/ programming centralized by region.	Both. Centrally budgeted services provided to nonpublic school students as required by law.
Is the Diagnosing/ Placing of Ex Ed Student Process Centralized or School Based?	Centralized. Moving toward school based.	Centralized	Both involved in initial placement.	Centralized	Centralized with school representatives.		Combination of school based and cluster.	School based, consulting assistance available at cost.	Centralized	Process is in the schools, driven by central director.
Are Social Workers, Psychologists, and Speech Pathologists Centralized or School Based? Who Evaluates?	School based. Evaluated by central office.	Centralized. Learn schools - school based for psycholo- gists and social workers (general program only).	Decentralized	Centralized. Evaluation is central.	Centralized. Evaluated by school principal and program manager.	Centralized	Speech pathologists - centralized. Psych/social worker - cluster.	Schools purchase all services. Speech is not an education responsibility.	Centralized by region.	Both

	Milwaukee	Los Angeles	New York	Denver	Seattle	Chicago	Philadelphia	Edmonton	Dade County	Boston
Are Staff Development Funds Centralized or School Based?	School based. District-wide activities centralized.	School based - all schools.	Primarily centralized. Some in school budgets.	School based	Both	School based at $65 per classroom teacher.	¾ school based and ¼ central. Some at all levels.	School based. Inservice dollars allocated to all in 1996-1997 & schools pay to attend.	Centralized. Some in regional budget.	School based
Are Substitute Teacher Dollars Centralized or School Based?	School based	Centralized. Learn schools - school based. However, budgeted amount added back to the central budget.	No school sub budget. School uses teacher budget.	Centralized for uncontrollable leaves. Decentralized for controllable leaves.	Centralized	Subs for board funded-centralized. Categorical funded - school based.	Cluster controlled	School based. Over 3 days long-term illness.	Central sets number of days and dollars per day for subs. Budgeted and controlled by school.	School based
Who Evaluates the Principal?	District level middle management	Cluster leaders	Superintendents		Superintendent, revising.	Local school councils		Superintendent	Regional Director	Assistant Superintendent
Are Utilities Decentralized? (Heating, Water, Electricity, Telephone)	Centralized	Centralized. Learn schools - decentralized excluding telephone.	Centralized	Reported by school, but managed centrally.	Centralized	Managed centrally, budgeted at school.	Yes. Energy incentive program schools receive part of savings.	Decentralized	Centralized	Centralized
Employee Benefits?	Centralized. Moving toward SBM.	Decentralized - learn only.	Centralized	Centralized, reported by school.	Centralized	Central control, budgeted at school.	School based	Part of unit cost charged to school.	Central control. Allocate average amount.	School based
Minor Maintenance Operations?	Centralized	Decentralized - nine pilot learn schools only.	Centralized	Centralized	Centralized	School based	Centralized	1/3 have budget & responsibility. 2/3, 1996-1997 and all, 1997-1998.	Centralized	Centralized
Building Operations?	Decentralized, salary only.	Decentralized - nine pilot learn only.	Centralized	Decentralized	Centralized	School based	School based, minimal control.	1/3 have budget & responsibility. 2/3, 1996-1997 & all, 1997-1998.	Decentralized, based on FTE.	School based

	Milwaukee	Los Angeles	New York	Denver	Seattle	Chicago	Philadelphia	Edmonton	Dade County	Boston
Student Transportation?	Centralized	Centralized	Centralized	Centralized, report by school.	Centralized	Centralized	Centralized	Centralized, except field trips.	Centralized	Centralized
School Safety Staff?	Centralized	Centralized	Centralized	Centralized, report by school.	Centralized	Centralized, categorized at school.	School based	N/A, no specific individuals hired.	Centralized by region.	Centralized
Meal programs?	Centralized	Centralized	Centralized	Centralized, report by school.	Centralized	Central control, budgeted at school.	Centralized	High schools operate cafeterias.	Centralized by region.	Centralized
Athletics (Extracurricular Activities)?	Centralized	Centralized, learn schools decentralized in FY 1997.	Centralized	Centralized, school sport activities decentralized.	Centralized	School based	School based	School responsibility	Centrally set fixed amount and FTE. In school budget.	Centralized
Do You Have Buy-Back Procedures in Place? Type? (School Accounting Services, Printing)	Yes, school accounting services.	Learn schools charge back for payroll, financial technology, and purchasing.	No	Reproduction center, commodity warehouse, transportation excursions, and meeting catering.	Yes, publishing and some maintenance only.	No, except for printing.	No	Yes, central services available for anything schools willing to purchase.	Charge back for copier, school maintenance, minor construction, and telephone service.	Central printing charged back to schools.
Do You Have an Activity-Based Cost System in Place? (Cost, Prevailing Rate)	No	No	No	Job costing system not in place yet for maintenance services, et cetera.	No	No	No	Yes, monthly report detailing all expenditures. Provided centrally.	No	
What is the Intended (Official) Purpose for Decentralization?	Improved management and point-of-service control.	Learn schools - flexibility in budgeting and improved student achievement.	Increased community and local control.	For schools to more effectively manage direct service resources.	For five pilot schools, accountability.	To focus on school level.	Point-of-service control/ decision making.	Increased involvement and accountability.	To provide/ reassure school equity.	

	Milwaukee	Los Angeles	New York	Denver	Seattle	Chicago	Philadelphia	Edmonton	Dade County	Boston
Should Decentralization be Tied to Student Achievement? How?	Yes.	Yes, evaluations being conducted.	Not linked. Outcomes expected or intervention.	Site-based decision making should be tied to student achievement.	Yes		Yes, also goals and incentives. Accountability and new testing.	Schools responsible for achievement and attitude of students, staff, parents, et cetera.	Not doing this	
What Type of Increased Support Has Been Provided to Schools/ Principals for Decentralization? Additional Staff, Technical Support, New Systems, Budget Training for Principals/ Staff/Parents (Type and Provider of Training)?	Increased technical support and added new systems. Limited training budget.	Dedicated budget unit. Implementation of an integrated financial system (budget/ accounting/ purchasing). Formalized budget training.	Limited school support, budget training, and shared decision making resources.	Support teams, videos on budget process, budget manual, surveys. Training and communication stressed. In next 12 months schools will have access to a new financial and human resource/ payroll system.	1991 - improved technology. Upon school request, budget/ accounting training available.	Training and mediation assistance for parents/LSC members at schools. On-line computer systems for budget monitoring. Budget training and technical assistance for staff/LSC members.	Increased communication with schools including guidelines, state mandate impact, court decisions, labor contracts, et cetera. Budget training to include seminars and cable television programming.	Staff interested in leadership positions provided inservice training. Schools inservice own staff and parent councils, et cetera. Inservice primarily provided by experienced principals.	Provided budget/ monitoring system on-line for schools. Central office provided comprehensive accounting/ budgeting training.	Technical support; budget office assigned and available to assist schools.
Is Decentralization Mandated by Board?	Yes	Yes	School based decision making, not budget.	1990, Governor mandated site-based management.	No, but allowed.	Illinois mandated, board supported.	Endorsed by board.	Yes	Yes	Superintendent driven, school committee approved.
What is the Targeted Level of Decentralization? Target Deadline?	100% target level in 3 years	100% target level by the year 2000	At target, only fine tuning.		N/A	No targets or deadlines for full decentralization.	Decentraliza-tion part of ongoing 5-year plan. No deadlines. No targets. In transition to do more.	Expenditure caps on governance/ administration at 4% of budget. Instructional support service at 1.2% for 1997.	Target took approximately 2 to 3 years. Targeted decentralization achieved.	