

**WERA /OSPI State Assessment Conference
December 2006**

A Decision Making Model for District Administrators

**Michael Power
Mercer Island School District**

Contact:

Michael Power
Director of Instruction and Assessment
Mercer Island School District
(206) 236-3313
michael_power@misd.wednet.edu



Mercer Island School District

District Administrative Team Decision Making

INTRODUCTION

This document describes how district level decisions are made by the Mercer Island School District administrative team and clarifies which stakeholders are involved in the decision and the role of each stakeholder.

Decision making is under the umbrella of the District Instructional Improvement Plan, School Improvement Plans, Board and administrative policies, contractual agreements, state and federal laws and regulations, and program/curricular requirements.

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR DECISION MAKING

These guidelines provide a structure for district decision making. They are equal in importance and are not sequential. Decision makers shall assure that:

1. Decisions are made based on what is best for students.
2. The decision making process will be communicated in a clear and consistent manner to those affected by the decision.
3. The decision making process will ensure input from staff, students, parents, and community members as appropriate per Board Policy (EL-12: Instructional Program).
4. The decision will be communicated in a clear and timely manner to those affected by the decision.
5. The Board is kept informed as appropriate per Board Policy (EL-10: Communication and Support to the Board).

NORMS FOR DECISION MAKING

1. Viewpoints should be shared, differences discussed, and all involved should work together collaboratively toward common goals in an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust.
2. The stakeholders are responsible for sharing their insights and suggestions so that decision making will be more inclusive and thorough.
3. All members of the administrative team shall commit to the decision making process and honor decisions once made.

REPRESENTATIVE GROUPS / STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholders are those most affected by a decision and who have the greatest interest in the decisions made. The decision maker should provide opportunities for staff, parents, students (where appropriate), community members, etc., to be involved in the decision making process.

Although it is the intent of this process to include the views of those impacted by a decision, it is often not possible to involve every person affected by a district decision at the individual level. This process provides opportunities for individuals to participate through their representative group. The role of the representatives is to represent the best interests of their constituents. They are expected to approach issues with an open mind, seek to build consensus and understanding, and present the viewpoints of their constituents. Each representative will work toward achieving a result that is best for the entire district and not just the group they represent.

✓STUDENTS

Elementary students will be represented through their teachers and parents. Secondary students will also be represented by their Associated Student Body (ASB) representatives, the Site Council, and the District Advisory Council.

✓TEACHERS AND OTHER CERTIFICATED STAFF

Teachers and other certificated staff will be represented through their principals, their representatives on Site Council, Principal's Cabinet, or other school advisory groups. Certificated staff also have a voice in the Ad Hoc/TLC committee, through the curriculum lead teachers, and the District Advisory Council. Teachers and other represented certificated staff will also be represented by their professional association in matters of negotiations and contract compliance.

✓CLASSIFIED SCHOOL STAFF

Classified staff will be represented through their principals, Site Councils, and the District Advisory Council. Classified staff will also be represented by their professional association in matters of negotiations and contract compliance.

✓CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF

Central office staff will be represented individually and through their representatives on the Administrative Team, the Site Council, the District Advisory Council, and/or their professional associations in matters of negotiations and contract compliance. (Central office includes Instructional Services, Personnel, Transportation, Maintenance/Operations, Technology, Business Office, and Student Services.)

✓PARENTS

Parents will be represented through their school's Parent Teacher Association (PTA) and by their representatives on school Site Councils and the District Advisory Council.

✓COMMUNITY MEMBERS

Community members will be represented through the District Advisory Council and by the Board of Directors.

Decision-Making Matrix

The decision making matrix below identifies who is involved at each level of decision making and how they are involved. The actual process may vary depending on the decision to be made.

RESEARCH

The following two articles found in our research helped to clarify our thinking about what we wanted in our model.

File: CFD-R

Author: Roberta Ward

Date: 09/06/96

Section: C

Category: F

Sub-Category: D-R

Title: Site Based Shared Decision Making

Site Based Shared Decision Making
(District Shared Decision Making Committee)

INTRODUCTION

This document is meant to be used as a guide for members of the Pueblo School District No. 60 community in the implementation of Site Based Shared Decision Making (SBSDM).

The guidelines in this document are intended to clarify the appropriate balance of site and centralized decisions. Site based shared decision making is not an end in itself. This strategy moves decision making closer to the individual school site and classroom. All site-based decisions are subject to review by the Board of Education in its' sole discretion.

DESIRED RESULTS

- Increased student learning and achievement
- Increased quality of education and educational environment
- Increased quality of decisions through analysis and assessment
- Increased involvement and satisfaction of staff, parents, students, and community
- Increased responsiveness to staff, parents, students, and community
- Increased support for proper utilization of resources at sites

BELIEFS

- Individual school decisions can be most effectively addressed by those involved in local school community
- Valuing people and their diverse opinions/backgrounds/experiences will improve the quality of decision making
- Process succeeds when each accepts responsibility for his/her own input and decisions
- People committed to the school can control that which fosters success
- SBSDM is an evolutionary process that takes time and dedication to reach improvement

- People want to be involved and do their jobs well
- Every person wants to feel like a valued contributor
- More can be accomplished by working together to improve the system than having individual contributors working around the system
- SBSDM is a structured problem solving process using graphical techniques produces better solutions than an unstructured process
- Adversarial relationships between labor and management are counterproductive and outmoded

PURPOSE

Site Based Shared Decision Making (SBSDM) is an integral part of the Pueblo School District No. 60 strategic planning process and serves the following purposes:

- Improve student achievement for all District No - 60 students
- Improve the quality of education for all District No. 60 students
- Promote, enhance, and implement the district vision.
- Exercise site level decisions that will increase student achievement
- Exercise site level decisions that promote efficient use of resources.
- Exercise decision making that improves the daily procedures, system, quality, cost and outcomes at the site and District No. 60 as a whole
- Provide student achievement data, operational information and recommendations that enhance the decision making authority of the superintendent
- Share, communicate and implement the SBSDM process
- Consistently review site autonomy, with accountability, rights and legal parameters to ensure success of process
- Define SBSDM process, providing flexibility and empowerment
- Actively involve parents, students, staff, businesses, and other community members in the operation of schools
- Remove the causes of problems in the system to improve productivity

DEFINITION - SITE BASED SHARED DECISION MAKING (SBSDM)

- A process in which representative members of a school community collaborate in decision making based on identified goals and direction. Those individuals who are responsible for the

implementation of a decision at the building level are actively and legitimately involved in making the decisions.

- Decision making at sites, is under the umbrella of the District vision and mission, state goals, district strategic plan, district policies and procedures, contractual agreements and program/curricular requirements. There should always be an appropriate balance between decisions made at the site and of the District level.

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR DECISION MAKING

These guidelines provide the structure for site based shared decision making. They are equal in importance and are not sequential.

1. Provide rationale for decisions - Decisions will incorporate a review of relevant literature and research. Decisions will be data driven.
2. Create awareness and garner support from the Board of Education -The school administration is responsible for keeping the Board of Education informed. The Board of Education will support the process of SBSDM as long as it remains and functions within the objectives of the district strategic plan, policies and contracts.
3. Cooperate with and involve district office staff - It is the responsibility of school principals to involve the appropriate district office personnel in decisions that directly affect site council and staff. Viewpoints should be shared, differences discussed, and the school and the district office should work together for common goals in an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust.
4. Adhere to Board policy, negotiated agreements, and federal and state mandates or seek a waiver through approved process The schools will be responsible for adhering to these areas unless a waiver is sought through approved procedures. The District will assist the site in the development of a waiver request.
5. Be consistent with the District strategic plan, vision, mission and goals - The District's strategic plan, vision and goals, as well as the school's vision, mission and goals, will guide the development of the SBSDM process.
6. Involve school community and stakeholders – School/community/parent stakeholders should be involved or represented in SBSDM at the site level. Active efforts will be undertaken to recruit school/community/parent stakeholders at the site level. The SBSDM members are responsible for sharing their insights and suggestions so that the decision making will be more inclusive and thorough.
7. Implement the model for SBSDM at each school - Each school will be responsible for implementing SBSDM based on the parameters established/set forth by the Board of Education. The school, working with stakeholders, should create a plan for communicating this model to all stakeholders.
8. Assess the success of SBSDM in relationship to the identified goals - Assessment and accountability for decisions is the responsibility of the individual school and must include valid, measurable, and reliable data that is used to assess identified goals. An annual Continuous Improvement Plan and outcomes will be presented to the District Accountability Committee and

the Board of Education.

SPECIFIC GUIDELINES FOR DECISION MAKING

1. BUDGET

It is the intent that financial resources be allocated to the site as much as reasonably possible. It is the responsibility of the district office to create equitable overall allocations. The sites should use their identified school model for shared decision making in allocation of their budgets.

The school should have the discretion to allocate funds according to goals set at the school level based on parameters established by the superintendent and the Board of Education. Savings in one area may be used in another area at the discretion of the school site as long as it does not impact any student's opportunity for success. CERTAIN budget areas open to SBSDM include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Building level instructional budget
- Staff development funds based on district priorities
- Curriculum materials funds
- Fund raising projects Building level grants

All budget decisions should be made through the school identified model of SBSDM- The decisions should involve diverse representation from the stakeholder groups of parents, staff (classified, certificated, and administrative) and students (where appropriate).

1. CURRICULUM AND CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION A District curriculum and assessment framework is developed and revised centrally according to policies set by the Board of Education. It is the responsibility of each school to implement the District curriculum. Areas open to SBSDM include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Implementing the District curriculum and assessment framework
- Plans for personalizing curriculum and instruction for each student
- Selection of instructional materials other than basic learning materials
- Instructional evaluation (report cards, portfolios, etc.)
- Continuous Quality Improvement

1. BASIC LEARNING MATERIALS (Textbook Adoption to be done at the District Level While basic learning materials are adopted through a district-wide process according to policies set by the Board of Education, schools have some flexibility in the process at the site. Areas where sites may make decisions are the following:

- Sites determine their own purchase cycle-this may include following a District purchasing plan or it may involve creating a purchasing plan unique for the site needs (or with district approval), which is out of sequence with the District cycle.
- Sites may adopt learning materials which are not on the District's adopted list if they go through the waiver process for SBSDM.

4. PERSONNEL SELECTION

When a vacancy for a certificated or classified position exists at a school, the principal contacts the Human Resources Office (HRO) to review the applicant pool for the position. The HRO staff search the applicant pool to identify candidates who meet the school's specific needs and prepares those files for the principal to review.

Once the principal has reviewed the applicant files and determined which candidates to interview, HRO staff will call the candidates to set up mutually convenient interview times. The principal and representatives from the SBSDM team or their designees interview the candidates and make recommendations for employment of classified or instructional personnel. Also, the principal is expected to complete a reference check on the recommended candidate but, in some cases, Human Resources staff will conduct the check. Recommendations are sent to the superintendent to be presented to the Board of Education for final approval.

- Personnel selection procedures must be congruent with state statutes and contractual obligations with the different employee groups.

- School administrator positions are filled through a committee interview process. The interview committees are comprised of teachers, support staff and parents from the school with a vacancy, as well as School District No. 60 administrators. Formal training on interviewing may be offered for the committee members. In addition, committee members work as a team to develop interview questions for the candidates. The committee selects the top candidates and provides information on each candidate to the Superintendent. The Superintendent makes the final hiring recommendation to the Board.

5. PERSONNEL UTILIZATION

This should be a site decision once the building allocations have been finalized. Schools have had the authority to determine how best to use the human resources that are allocated to the site. This process is known as "conversion of resources" and allows personnel allocations to be shifted from one category to another (e.g. a .25 teacher allocation may be used to hire an instructional aide). It may be that the SBSDM will be used for these decisions as long as it does not increase classroom size to the detriment of the student. It is not the practice of the District to move staff out of existing jobs to allow conversions. The negotiated agreements must be honored, or waivers applied for, if the proposed utilization of personnel is not in alignment with these agreements.

6. STAFF AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Funds to support staff development and curriculum development implementation are allocated to each school site. Decisions for use of these resources should be made by the principal with the assistance of the SBSDM Committee.

The District vision, goals and areas of study, as well as, the school vision, school improvement goals and areas of study should provide the focus for the use of these resources.

7. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PLANNING (CIP)

It is essential that all stakeholder groups are represented in this planning process. There are three main areas that should be considered: needs identification, goal setting, and monitoring and

reporting progress.

8. USE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

The District has a responsibility to ensure that facilities are used in ways that maximize efficiency. There are implications for the assignment of attendance boundaries and the placement of programs in school. This responsibility belongs to the Board of Education.

Decisions on facility matters require collaboration with the school and district administration. In some cases, needs may exist to place programs at alternative sites and there may be conflicting positions of school personnel and other program clientele. If an unresolvable conflict arises, the superintendent shall make the final decision.

9. DISTRICT AND SCHOOL CALENDARS

The Board of Education establishes a calendar of school days for the District. Within this calendar common inservice days are identified in collaboration with school sites. This allows the District to maximize transportation and food service savings for these days on a district-wide basis.

The purpose of these inservice days is to provide schools with opportunities for parent/teacher conferences, and curriculum and staff development. Some of these days are designated for District curriculum and staff development topics. Sites have discretion on the use of any remaining inservice days to meet the needs of their school community. These should be developed and scheduled in a collaborative manner.

Site-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making Matrix

When making decisions, sites shall solicit input from members of each group affected by a particular decision, including students, teachers, site staff, parents, community, and business representatives. This input will be taken into consideration as decisions are made. Many decisions require the collaboration of site, principal, central office and/or Board of Education. Under state law, the Board of Education has the authority in its discretion to establish and modify decisions, rules, regulations and policy; however the Board of Education recognizes the great value of input and contributions of site committees. The == in the matrix denotes primary place for shared decision making; the * denotes final approval. The shaded areas indicate the opportunity for input from specific individuals.

	Site Council	Principal	Superintendent/ Central Office	Board of Education
Accountability - District	==			*
Accountability - Site	==	*		
Assessment -Districtwide			==	*
Assessment - Site	==		*	
Budget - District (priorities)	==			*
Budget - Site R&R	==	*		
Building level grants	==		*	
Curriculum materials	==		*	

funds				
Fund raising projects	==	*		
Instructional funds	==		*	
Professional development funds	==		*	
Calendar			==	*
Length of school day			==	*
Length of school year			==	*
Capital expenditure (\$750-\$10,000)	==		*	
Capital expenditures over \$10,000	==			*
Co curricular programs			*	
Continuous improvement plan (School improvement plan) including professional development plans	==		*	
Course offerings	==		*	
Curriculum:				
Basic learning materials	==		*	
District curriculum	==		*	
Grading scale	==		*	
Instructional strategies	==		*	
Master schedule	==		*	
Methodology	==		*	
Purchase cycle	==		*	
Report cards evaluation	==		*	
Scope & sequence	==		*	
Site curriculum	==		*	
Site learning materials	==		*	
Textbook adoption	==		*	
Custodian services - custodian		==	*	
District philosophy	==			*
Emergency closings			*	
Enrollment (capping, etc.)	==		*	
Goals - district	==			*
Graduation requirements	==			*
Grants	==		*	

Homework requirement	==		*	
Mission - district	==			*
Mission - site	==		*	
Personnel:				
Appt. site administrators	==			*
Appt. district administrators			==	*
Evaluation - Admin		==	*	
Evaluation - certified		==	*	
Evaluation - classified		==	*	
Teacher - interviewing	==	*		
Personnel utilization	==	*		
Recommendation for hiring	==		*	
Screening	==		*	
Selection	==		*	
Termination - admin.			*	
Certified			*	
Classified		==	*	
Termination - Supt.				*
Policies				*
Professional development:				
District inservice days	==		*	
Site inservice days	==	*		
Purchasing - bid			*	
Purchasing - selection	==		*	
School colors and logo	==			*
School name	==			*
Site facilities:				
Boundaries			==	*
Building design	==			*
Construction			*	
Energy management			*	
Maintenance			*	
Use of site facility	==		*	
Staffing allocation	==		*	

Specialty schools (charter, magnet)	==			*
Students:				
Behavior standards	==			*
Detention	==	*		
Discipline	==			*
Dress code	==			*
Expulsion		==		*
Substitutes:		==	*	
Technology: hardware/software	==		*	
Time on task - % contact time	==			*
Training	==		*	
Transfer process (staff)		==	*	
Transportation (start/end times)		==	*	
Waivers (Board policy)	==			*
Waivers (admin. directive)	==		*	

Central office: Transportation, Auxiliary Services, Budget, Human Resources, Division of Instructional Services, Management Information Systems

SITE BASED SHARED DECISION MAKING COUNCILS

Every school is expected to establish a model and structure for shared decision making. There is no preferred organizational model. Each site group should determine what model of shared decision making will work best for their school.

Representation should reflect appropriate, equitable, representation for the school and community it serves. The number of certificated staff and classified staff representatives should be less than, or equal to, the number of parent and business/community (non-parent) representatives.

• Recommended minimum:

Elementary - 1 certified staff
 1 classified staff
 2 parents (not staff members)
 1 business/community
 1 principal Total 6

Middle - 1 certified staff
 1 classified staff
 2 parents (not staff members)
 1 business/community

1 student
1 principal Total 7

High - 2 certified staff

1 classified staff
2 parents (not staff members)
2 business/community
1 students
1 principal Total 9

The following are required components for shared decision making councils and should be articulated in developing a plan and model for shared decision making:

1. Shared decision making teams are expected to include representation that reflects the local school community. There should be an appropriate balance of school staff, parents, non-parent community members and students in the middle and high schools. Procedures for selection of representatives will be a part of the model as defined by the Board of Education. Active efforts should be made to recruit school/community/parents.
2. Roles and expectations of various groups should be clearly delineated. General guidelines for roles are included in this document.
3. In schools that choose to have accountability teams separate from the SBSDM Team, the relationship between teams/groups will be outlined in the overall structure. Communication links must be established between groups, so that all functions of decision making are covered so there are neither gaps nor overlap.

If the school accountability committee and SBSDM committee are one and the same, the accountability committee's responsibilities and requirements would supersede those of the SBSDM committee.

4. Meeting time consideration should be given regarding the needs of various groups.
5. Procedures will be established to select the chairperson(s)/facilitator(s) of each group. It is suggested that the principal and other district employees not be the chair of the group.
6. The process for decision making at each site (sequence, steps, etc.) should be described in the model.
7. The level of involvement and how decisions are made (vote, consensus, sufficient concern, etc.) should be described in the model.
8. Evaluation and review of the process and model for shared decision making at each site will take place on an annual basis.
9. There should be documentation of the discussion of major items and decisions made in the meetings, in addition to the representation/attendance regarding formal action taken.

ROLES

Each school will establish a SBSDM team. Individual schools have the flexibility, within District guidelines, to define roles, composition and leadership of these teams.

School teams are expected to be clear about who is going to do what, who will make what decisions and who will communicate with others about decisions made. Teams are continually encouraged to examine who should be involved in decisions, how they should be involved, and how will we know whether the decisions are good ones. The question is who needs to be involved in a decision to optimize its chances of being a good one, rather than concerning ourselves with who has the right, in a political sense of the term, to be involved in the decision.

STAKEHOLDER ROLE

Stakeholders are those groups of people who are most affected by the decision, and have the greatest interest in the decisions made. The students and the parents are primarily affected by all educational decisions made in School District No. 60 and should be considered our primary customers. The SBSDM process should provide legitimate opportunities for parents, students (where appropriate), community members, staff, etc., to be involved in the decision making process. All members of SBSDM groups should agree to present all viewpoints that emerge from their constituents. Each member should try to make the decision that is best for the entire school and not just the group they represent.

Parents, staff, community members and students (when appropriate) should be given the opportunity to be represented or involved in decision making areas outlined in these guidelines.

The role of the SBSDM member is to represent the best interests of all students and various members of the school community. They are expected to approach issues with an open mind, seeking to build consensus and understanding. The overall goal of SBSDM is total school improvement emphasizing student achievement.

TEACHER ROLE

Teachers play a key role as professionals with the responsibility for meeting the educational needs of our students.

PRINCIPAL ROLE

As the leader in the school, the principal is accountable for providing leadership so all parties are given the opportunity to contribute within these guidelines. The principal is responsible for leading the development of collaboration and decentralization procedures in his/her school which includes the following:

- Establishing provisions for equitable stakeholder representation
- Providing information and research to assist the group
- Setting parameters
- Being a member of committees

- Determining the structure for decision making
- Ensuring full communication about decisions

The principal is accountable for the effective operation of the school, staying within District policy and guidelines, implementation of District curriculum, and, ultimately, for the decisions made at the school. The principal will actively participate in the shared decision making process and is ultimately responsible for the school. If, in his or her judgment, the principal feels a decision is inappropriate, the principal may override a decision.

The job of the principal in SBSDM systems is leadership and active participation as a member of the group. The principal helps to frame the issues and keep the attention of the planning group on priorities. The principal is still responsible for making the difficult decisions involving personnel and program quality. The main difference is the richness of thinking from a variety of viewpoints which is now available prior to final decision making. The SBSDM members are responsible for sharing their insights and suggestions so that the decision making will be more inclusive and thorough.

ROLE OF DISTRICT OFFICE AND CENTRALIZED SERVICES

The role of District administration and central services is to provide support to school sites in the accomplishment- of their goals.

The interaction between the District administration and the school sites is one of cooperation in which there is two-way communication, mutual review of issues, and the active resolution of conflicts.

ROLE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

- Develop administrative rules and guidelines ensuring conformity to all laws and process.
- Develop administrative rules and guidelines for procedures for intervention when necessary.
- Monitor and modify the decision making matrix.
- Ensure consensus is the primary method of making decisions by providing ongoing training
- Monitor committee membership which represents a cross section of the site (parents, community, teachers, administrators, support staff and students, as appropriate) and may vary according to grade level and size of population.
- Develop process for problem resolution.
- Ensure a process is developed to improve communication and record keeping
- Ensure an annual written evaluation is reported to each school community by the Site Accountability Committee
- Provide a set of guidelines defining the policy and process in detail to be available at each site.

TRAINING

SBSDM is a process and all school/community stakeholders need to be involved in training in order to be effective team members. District funds should be used to refine and improve these efforts. Elements of training for SBSDM teams should include the following:

- Team building, including recruitment • Strategic Plan Orientation and retaining of members to the Council • Budgeting
- Facilitation skills • Personnel selection
- Conducting effective meetings • Program evaluation
- Consensus, building • Laws and other mandates
- Conflict resolution/management relevant to these decisions
- Problem solving

Training and support for SBSDM committees will be provided, as needed, as requested by the site. The District is responsible to establish and maintain a team of trainers and facilitators to promote and assist the SBSDM process. This team will also assist SBSDM councils in conflict resolution should the need occur.

WAIVERS

Sites requesting waivers of existing Board Policy and Agreement language will submit their request to the appropriate individual for consideration. Waivers will be submitted for review and recommendation, in writing and, in a timely manner by the following:

Agreements Association Presidents

Curriculum and instructional Director of Elementary Education/Preschool model (Elementary) Director of Elementary Education/Title I

Curriculum and instructional Director of Secondary Education model (Secondary)

Curriculum and instructional Executive Director Instructional model Program Development

Development of budget and Assistant to the Superintendent expenditure of funds for Budget and Planning

Interviewing and staff selection Executive Director of Human Resources

All waivers will comply with state law, state rules and regulations and board policy and will be granted for one year.

Evaluation of the waiver process will take place annually.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Program Review and Evaluation

Ongoing assessment of both the SBSDM model and the goals set by each school site will be a high priority. This will include an annual written evaluation and report to each school community. This is currently a requirement of state accountability regulations and local school improvement teams.

Each site will submit a Record of Accounts reflecting site activities, training activities, expenditures of site funds and a log of major activities implemented through the SBSDM process. This record will be submitted once a semester, to the appropriate director or executive director, to

review for compliance to federal and state law, state regulations, board policy and master agreements. I This Record of Accounts must also reflect site congruence with district goals, the strategic plan, accountability rules, and the school improvement plan.

MONITORING

Monitoring of the SBSDM process shall be at the direction of the Superintendent. A Monitoring Committee shall be formed by the Superintendent and will include, but not be limited to, District Accountability Chair, Strategic Planning Committee Chair, a parent, a business/community member, a student, a teacher, an administrator and classified staff members.

Advisory to this committee will be our Director of Purchasing and the Assistant Superintendent for Auxiliary Services or his/her designee. This Committee shall serve until specific Administrative Rule is in place.

The role of this committee should be to interpret and assure compliance of these policies, rules, and guidelines.

Approved July 28, 1992
Revised October 13, 1998
Revised May 10, 2005

Pueblo School District No. 60, Pueblo, Colorado

Each school is required to complete annual campus improvement plans that are linked to an overall district improvement plan designed to enhance student performance. Campus improvement plans reflect the performance objectives, related strategies, staffing, staff development and budget necessary to enhance student achievement at a particular campus. The board and district-level committee review all campus improvement plans. In exchange for decentralized decision-making, principals are ultimately held accountable for improving student achievement.

Minneapolis Public Schools (MPS) implemented site-based management based on a variation of the Minnesota model that uses a team of representatives from all areas of the school community to serve as a “site council,” “education council” or “shared leadership team.” The teams typically include principals, parents, teachers, students, specialist teachers, clerical, other building staff, business partners and community members from the school neighborhoods. The councils meet monthly to make decisions and discuss long-range program goals for their respective school. These councils examine everything that might be standing in the way of student achievement—be it grade levels, student groupings, materials or school policies and practices—and recommend keeping what is working and changing what is not working.

MPS’ site councils establish and maintain a site-based decision-making matrix for each school that clarifies the levels of responsibility for specific types of decisions in the shared decision-making process. The matrix specifically outlines the levels of input required for specific district-level decisions and whether the decision is shared, requires on-site input, requires site explanation or can be made at the site with no explanation or input from the superintendent or cabinet members. The matrix also describes the types of decisions that can be made at the building level and by whom. **Exhibit 1-19** presents the decision descriptors MPS uses for joint or delegated decisions at the site level and for site decisions.

Exhibit 1-19
Minneapolis Public Schools Site Decision-Making Matrix
District-Level and Site Decision-Making Descriptors

Decision Level	Type of Decision/Descriptors
<i>District-Level</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared – The superintendent, district administrators or districtwide committees set the parameters for a decision and building sites make specific decisions relative to implementation. • Site/Input – A decision made at the building site level with input requested from the superintendent, district administrators or districtwide committees <i>prior</i> to the decision being made and with an explanation to the superintendent, district administrators or districtwide committees <i>after</i> the decision has been made. • Site/Explanation – A decision made at the building site with an explanation to the superintendent, district administrators or districtwide committees <i>after</i> the decision has been made. • Site – A decision made at the building site, which requires no explanation to or input from the superintendent or cabinet members.

Source: Minneapolis Public Schools’ Sample Site Decision-Making Matrix, August 1997.

Exhibit 1-19 (continued)
Minneapolis Public Schools Site Decision-Making Matrix
District-Level and Site Decision-Making Descriptors

Decision Level	Type of Decision/Descriptors
<i>Site-Level</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal – A decision made by the principal and/or designee, which requires no explanation to or input from stakeholders. (Note: “stakeholders” are defined as those impacted or affected by a decision.) • Principal/Explanation – A decision made by the principal and/or designee with an explanation to all stakeholders <i>after</i> the decision has been made. • Principal/Input – A decision made by the principal and/or designee with input requested from stakeholders <i>prior</i> to the decision being made and an explanation to the stakeholders <i>after</i> the decision has been made. • Site Council/Explanation – A decision made by the site council with an explanation to all stakeholders <i>after</i> the decision has been made. • Site Council/Input – A decision made by the site council with input requested from the stakeholders <i>prior</i> to the decision being made and an explanation to the stakeholders <i>after</i> the decision has been made. • Shared at Site – The principal/designee or site council sets the parameters for a decision and all affected stakeholders make specific implementation decisions. • Stakeholder/Input – A decision made by stakeholder(s) with input requested from the principal/designee and/or site council <i>prior</i> to the decision being made and an explanation to the principal/designee and/or site council <i>after</i> the decision has been made. • Stakeholder/Explanation – A decision made by the stakeholder(s) with an explanation to the principal/designee and/or site council <i>after</i> the decision has been made. • Stakeholder – A decision made by the stakeholder(s), which requires no explanation or input from the principal/designee and/or site council.

Source: Minneapolis Public Schools’ Sample Site Decision-Making Matrix, August 1997.

MPS’ site matrix allows all participants in the site-based management process to understand the roles and responsibilities at each level of the decision-making process for specific types of district and school-based decisions. **Exhibit 1-20** presents an excerpt from MPS’ sample site Matrix.

**Exhibit 1-20
Minneapolis Public Schools
Sample Site Decision-Making Matrix**

DECISIONS	Share	Site/ Input	Site/ Explanation	Site	Principal	Principal/ Explanation	Principal/ Input	Site Council/ Explanation	Site Council/ Input	Shared at Site	Stakeholder/ Input	Stakeholder/ Explanation	Stakeholder
Goals and Policies													
Site Administrative Procedures (e.g., lesson plans, etc.)		●					●						
Site Policies & Procedures (e.g., evaluation of site improvement plan)			●					●					
Site Reporting to the District or Site Community		●				●							
Site Strategic Plan		●						●					
Program Delivery													
Supplemental Instructional Materials		●									●		
Teaching/Instruction			●									●	
Grading/Assessment			●									●	
Instructional Day Schedule	●								●				
Instructional Day Activities	●											●	
Extracurricular or Cocurricular Activities	●										●		
Building Advisory Groups (Mandated)	●						●						
Building Advisory Groups (Voluntary)			●					●					
Budget													
Base Allocation for Site Operating Expenditures	●						●						
Compensatory Allocations to Sites	●						●						
Supplemental Funding to Sites			●									●	
Site Capital Equipment	●								●				

Source: Minneapolis Public Schools' Sample Decision-Making Matrix, August 1997.

**Exhibit 1-20 (continued)
Minneapolis Public Schools
Sample Site Decision-Making Matrix**

DECISIONS	Share	Site/ Input	Site/ Explanation	Site	Principal	Principal/ Explanation	Principal/ Input	Site Council/ Explanation	Site Council/ Input	Shared at Site	Stakeholder/ Input	Stakeholder/ Explanation	Stakeholder
Personnel													
Allocation of Compensatory Staff	●						●						
Supplemental Staff		●							●				
Assignment at Site	●						●						
Site Leadership Positions (Nonadministrative/ Supervisory)	●						●						
Selection of Personnel	●						●						
Direction of Personnel				●		●							
Staff Supervision/Evaluation	●						●						
Site Staff Development that affects Multiple Buildings	●							●					
Site Staff Development that affects a Single Building			●						●				
Districtwide Staff Development Activities	●												●

Source: Minneapolis Public Schools' Sample Decision-Making Matrix, August 1997.

Exhibit 1-20 shows that MPS uses a modified school-based decision-making structure with a number of shared decisions related to program delivery, budget and personnel. Although MPS gives site councils broad latitude with respect to removing impediments to student achievement at the building level, the district engages in a collaborative decision-making process with budget and personnel allocations. This allows the central office to establish broad parameters with considerable input from principals and site councils, yet allows both the flexibility to make decisions about allocating and assigning staff at the site, developing targeted staff development activities and managing their budgets as they see fit once allocations are established in the shared decision-making process.

Recommendation 1-14:

Implement a modified school-based decision-making structure as a pilot and evaluate the results.

