

*Restructuring
the Public School System
for
Our Children's Future*

A Draft Report for Public Discussion

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	The Need To Restructure	3
III.	Proposals For A New Organization To Support School/Community-Based Management	7
IV.	New Organizational And Accountability Relationships	18
V.	Next Steps	23

Appendices

1.	Schools in Educational Service Areas	25
2.	School Support Centers	29
3.	Associate Superintendents	32
4.	School-Community Relations Office	34
5.	Division for Renewal and Assessment of Learning	35
6.	Division for Human Resources	38
7.	Division for Administrative Services	40
8.	Division for Information and Telecommunication Services	41

I. INTRODUCTION

This report presents proposals developed by the Department of Education's Project *Ke Au Hou* (A New Era) to reorganize the management structure of the department. This is part of an overall effort of the State to decentralize educational decision-making. The decentralization movement is known as school/community-based management (SCBM).

SCBM is a community-based, grassroots approach to creating an effective learning environment in our public schools. It was approved by the State Legislature in 1989 at the request of the Board of Education. The concept...

- * promotes greater decision-making independence at the school level;
- * relies on the collaboration of the school's principal, teachers, support staff, parents, students, and citizens of the community in making those decisions;
- * asserts that better educational results can be achieved when people responsible for implementing decisions are directly involved; and
- * recognizes the importance of a community of people to restructure schooling in ways that will lead to effective teaching and improved student performance.

Schools must change in order to effectively prepare students for a fast-changing society and an increasingly global community. As asserted by David T. Conley, "Change, in this environment, is not optional nor even necessarily debatable. It is, and will continue to be, a simple fact of life. The world will change. Schools will change. Some schools will move to exert more control over this process than others, but in the end all will change." (*Restructuring Schools: Educators Adapt to a Changing World*, February, 1991)

Although SCBM focuses on changes that need to be initiated by each school, it is in fact a call to change the entire school system. Schools and their communities will not be able to pursue more creative and effective approaches to student learning if all of the decision-making authority and controls of a centralized system remain in place. Those who govern and manage the school system need to be committed to decentralization and must themselves change.

There is a climate for change in Hawaii. Excitement is in the air as people talk about what might be possible. There is also anxiety as the risks of moving into uncharted waters are considered. In the final analysis, it will take a collective effort to move our public education system into a new era of quality and excellence. Collaboration, therefore, is the key to ensuring our children's future.

II. THE NEED TO RESTRUCTURE

Restructuring may be defined as changes in fundamental assumptions, practices, and relationships, both within the organization and between the organization and outside world to improve student learning. (Adapted from David T. Conley, *Restructuring Schools: Educators Adapt to a Changing World*)

There are compelling reasons why restructuring is necessary in education. This section presents a short discussion of those reasons.

Academic Achievement in a Changing World. Nan Stone, managing editor of Harvard Business Review, observed that the academic performance level of students has not declined dramatically since the 1960s. Rather, the demands of the external competitive environment have increased dramatically, producing a widening gap between the preparation level of students and the higher demands of society. (*Does Business Have Any Business in Education?*, Harvard Business Review, March-April, 1991)

Since 1969, the National Assessment of Educational Progress has regularly tested the educational achievements of fourth, eighth, and twelfth graders in U.S. public and private schools. In its findings published in *Accelerating Academic Achievement: A Summary of Findings From 20 Years of NAEP*, the proficiency levels of students in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and civics have remained stable over two decades. The academic proficiency of today's students is generally similar to those of their parents twenty years ago.

This trend is a serious concern. The world has changed in profound ways and the educational attainment levels of the 1960s will not be adequate to enable students to meet the higher demands of society. Economic, social, political, and technological forces have transformed jobs, the family, civic responsibility, and the very structure of knowledge at such an accelerating pace that schools must find new and better ways to help students.

In contrast, the educational attainments of other nations have not remained static. Test results show U.S. students lagging far behind their counterparts in other advanced countries in such disciplines as science and math. This is very alarming and heightens the need to change our educational practices.

It might have been acceptable in the past to educate only 10 to 20 percent of students to high levels of competence. Tomorrow's world of work demands that all students achieve higher levels of competence. Workers will be required to comprehend information in new forms in the information age. As technology accelerates knowledge-building and provides ready access, information will be used increasingly as a problem-

solving tool in the workplace. Workers will need to apply new skills to use information effectively.

What can be done to close the gap between the competency levels of our students and the competencies that are required in our changing society? There is no simple answer.

One clue is what researchers and educational experts have concluded. They say the fundamental structure of our centralized educational systems is based on many industrial-age ideas that no longer work. Consider the following:

Separation of Decision Making and Implementation. In the industrial world, there was a need to separate decision makers from doers. Mass production techniques required workers to carry out narrow tasks according to prescribed rules and procedures set by higher management. This system worked in mass production. In the educational setting, many decisions are made at levels far removed from the school. The federal government, state legislatures, governors, boards of education, superintendents, and central office officials make significant decisions in public education and these decisions are often handed down as prescriptions to be carried out by school personnel.

Separation of Owners and Professionals. In the late industrial period, the proprietorship model of business was replaced in many industries by the corporate model where stockholders (owners) entrusted almost all decisions to professional managers. The involvement of owners was limited. In education, decisions were entrusted more and more to professional educators. The public, as "owners" of the public schools, became less and less involved in the decisions that affected what and how students learn.

Isolation of Workers. Industrial organizations grouped workers by narrow tasks. The whole production process was divided into tasks and sub-tasks. This practice isolated workers and restricted them from understanding and contributing to the big picture. In education, teachers are isolated from the rest of the school system. They are for the most part confined to the activities of the classroom and placed in a disadvantageous position to understand and contribute to the overall policies and programs of the school system.

Pyramid of Supervision. Industrial organizations depended on close supervision of workers. Levels of supervision were created to carry out decisions made at higher levels. The organization thus resembled a pyramid. School systems also resemble a pyramid. A hierarchy of supervision extend from the board of education to the classroom teacher.

The main problems encountered by school systems that continue to rely on such industrial principles may be described as follows.

- 1. Dampening Creativity.** When decisions are made at levels removed from the school with the aim of affecting all schools, there is a tendency to apply uniform requirements to diverse conditions and needs. School personnel may try to be creative and customize educational services to the particular needs of their students but they often run into regulatory and procedural requirements that inhibit change. Their creativity is dampened and they tend to do what the "system" wants.

2. Underutilization of People. Education is a people-intensive function. About 80 percent of Hawaii's school system budget goes to pay its 24,000 permanent and temporary workers. Studies of effective schools indicate that schools need to work hand-in-hand with parents and community members to bring about student performance improvements. The collective effort of school personnel, parents, and community members would make a difference in improving education. However, a school system that continues to operate with industrial-age ideas will undermine this vast human potential to find new and effective solutions to the challenges of education.

The latest research on effective schools and studies of today's successful business enterprises indicate that the organization of school systems must be quite different in order to serve students effectively. A school system, like a business, must rely

<u>Less on</u>	<u>More on</u>
Chain of command	Networking of people in and outside of the school system
Authority of position	Authority of knowledge people can bring to the task
Controls	Flexibility
Functional segmentation	Cross-functional integration
Vertical communication	Horizontal communication
Worker isolation	Teaming and teaming of teams
Distrust and compliance	Trust and integrity

(Adapted from the work of Charles M. Savage in *Fifth Generation Management: Integrating Enterprises Through Human Networking*)

School districts across the country are restructuring their systems. State-sponsored local restructuring projects are underway in Colorado, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, South Carolina, Washington, and others. Colorado's effort is called "Creative Schools Initiative." Washington State's effort is called "Schools for the 21st Century." Others have different names. All, however, relate to site-based decision-making and decentralization of authority.

Hawaii's restructuring is similar in that it strives to decentralize authority, de-emphasize the regulatory function, and emphasize support services to schools, shared decision-making, and reduced bureaucracy. However, Hawaii is the only statewide system; consequently, its approach is different. It focuses on three levels of restructuring.

Schools. Through SCBM, schools are being empowered to make decisions they feel are best for students and the community. SCBM allows decisions to be made at the school level by those responsible for implementation. It is an attempt to bridge the gap between decision making and implementation. It wisely relies on the creative energies of a greater number of people who are in or close to the teaching-learning situation.

Departmental Management. SCBM has caused the department to rethink the relationship of the district and state offices with the schools. If decisions are to be made by people at the point of implementation, the structure and relationship of the district and state offices must be changed. Project Ke Au Hou was initiated to reorganize the district and state offices of the department with the following aims:

- Reduce the size of the state and district offices.
- Shift state and district resources to the schools.
- Provide schools greater flexibility in making site-based decisions.
- Focus the role of the central office as a standard-setting, assessment and support structure for schools.
- Promote collaboration and teaming as a norm to remove worker isolation and attain group results.

Governance. This critical issue involves the authorities that currently make decisions that affect school operations. The Governor, Legislature, Board of Education, other State agencies, and the federal government all affect the public school system today. The State Legislature created a 15-member task force to examine the governance structure and submit recommendations to the 1992 Legislature. Since the State has committed itself to school/community-based management, it is hoped that the Task Force's recommendations will support the SCBM process.

Our most serious challenge is actually changing what and how students learn in schools. If this does not happen, then restructuring at all three levels will have failed to achieve its central purpose of developing in our students the competencies that will be needed to engage the future. However, we have little choice but to embark on a journey to create a new system of public education for the sake of our children's future.

III. PROPOSALS FOR A NEW ORGANIZATION TO SUPPORT SCHOOL/COMMUNITY-BASED MANAGEMENT

HIGHLIGHTS

The Department of Education's district and state levels of administration must be restructured. The resulting organization would be based on teamwork, networking, and collaboration to support school and community initiatives to improve education. Features of the new organization include:

- **Reduced Levels.** The department would operate with two levels of management instead of three. The current tri-level management structure of school, district, and state would be transformed into a school/community-based management level and a systemwide support level.

- **Educational Service Areas.** Nine geographic educational service areas would replace the present seven administrative districts to address more equitable area sizes.

- **School Support Centers.** A school support center in each educational service area would be governed by the schools and would provide a variety of professional and technical services to meet the needs expressed by schools.

- **Systemwide Support Organization.** A systemwide support organization would ensure equity and accountability, and provide services best offered centrally for reasons of efficiency, economy, and parity.

- **Shifting Additional Decision-Making Authority to Schools.** Final decision-making authority in additional areas would be shifted to the school level.

- **Moving Current Departmental Resources to Schools.** About 60 percent of the positions and funds currently assigned to district and state offices would be re-assigned to the nine school support centers and used as decided by schools, including assignment of personnel to specific schools to assist with school improvements.

- **Teaming, Networking, and Collaboration.** The schools, school support centers, and the systemwide school support organization would rely on collaborative approaches to innovate and resolve problems, share information and knowledge, and to assist each other.

1. THE SCHOOL SYSTEM WOULD OPERATE WITH ONLY TWO MANAGEMENT LEVELS

The Department of Education now operates with three levels of management: the school, district, and state levels. These would be consolidated into (1) a school level consisting of individual schools and areawide support centers, and (2) a systemwide support level. The latter would consist of the board of education, the superintendent, associate superintendents, and divisions or offices for administrative services, human resources, information and telecommunication services, renewal and assessment of learning, and school-community relations. As schools operate with increased decision-making authority through the SCBM process, a two-level structure is more efficient and appropriate.

The responsibilities of the two levels may be summarized as follows:

SCHOOL LEVEL

- * Involve parents, community members, and others in a collaborative process to make school an exciting and effective center for learning.
- * Set school development goals and plans.
- * Oversee the school budget with maximum flexibility.
- * Hire and develop school personnel.
- * Develop the school curriculum and instructional materials.
- * Implement educational programs.
- * Evaluate the progress and achievement of each student and the school's educational programs.
- * Provide information on the state of teaching and learning at the school site and on the progress of each student.

SYSTEMWIDE SUPPORT LEVEL

- * Set the educational goals and curriculum requirements of the school system.
- * Establish strategic directions and policies.
- * Acquire resources to operate and improve the school system.
- * Provide centralized operational support services.
- * Negotiate collective bargaining agreements for the system.
- * Set performance standards for students and personnel.

- * Evaluate the progress and achievements of individual schools and the statewide system.

Two critical functions which are now shared by state and district offices would be decentralized to the schools and carried out with assistance from their support centers. One is curriculum development, and the other is school staff development.

In general, schools would be responsible and accountable for student achievement; the systemwide support level would be responsible and accountable for unifying the school system, ensuring equal educational opportunities, promoting school/community-based management, providing efficient centralized services, and maintaining school system accountability.

2. EDUCATIONAL SERVICE AREAS WOULD REPLACE ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICTS

The present seven administrative districts of the school system would be converted into nine educational service areas representing different geographic areas. This conversion would relieve the large districts on Oahu and the geographic spread of the island of Hawaii.

These service areas would include: East Honolulu, West Honolulu, Central Oahu, Leeward Oahu, Windward Oahu, East Hawaii, West Hawaii, Maui (including Molokai and Lanai), and Kauai (including Niihau). The number of schools in the areas would range from 39 in West Honolulu to 13 in West Hawaii. (See Appendix 1 for a list of schools by areas)

3. SCHOOLS WOULD BE BACKED UP BY SUPPORT CENTERS

School support centers would provide direct services to schools and communities in the educational service areas. A school support center would be a place:

- where teachers could freely go to for assistance in developing a lesson plan or instructional unit...
- where instructional resources and educational models are available for easy retrieval and use by teachers developing curriculum...
- that sends a resource person or a team to the school to provide direct, on-site assistance as requested by the school...
- that frees a teacher or a principal from the classroom or school periodically to work as a member of a project team...

- that assembles resources for school personnel and links them to other resource centers...
- that arranges for teachers, principals, other school personnel, parents, and community members to spend time elsewhere in the school system or other school systems to observe and learn about promising innovations...
- where students express their educational needs and participate in innovations with the help of resource people...
- that involves and helps parents to grow as co-educators of their children and as life-long learners themselves.

The school support centers would be unique. Their exclusive focus would be to provide support services to the schools and community. They would not supervise schools. The centers would be under the control of the area's schools, governed by a council made up of principals and other representatives from the schools and communities. Each center would be administered by a director, assisted by a core staff, who would be responsible to the council.

The centers would give new meaning to "school level." The school level would consist of individual schools and their support centers. Schools would collaborate to make each center effective, and the centers themselves would collaborate to provide support to schools across the state. Whether decisions are made at the school site or the support centers, the decisions would be made by schools and their communities through a collaborative process. (See Appendix 2 for further description of the support centers and models of how the centers may be governed.)

4. THE SCHOOL SYSTEM WOULD BE UNIFIED AND SUPPORTED BY A SYSTEMWIDE SUPPORT ORGANIZATION

Strong and positive features of the current centralized system should be retained and strengthened. Certain functions need to be performed on a systemwide basis to keep the statewide system of public schools unified and integrated, to ensure equal educational opportunities in the state, and to provide accountability for the performance of the school system. Some operational services are best provided on a systemwide basis for efficiency and economies. The processing of payroll, employee benefits, and purchase orders; or the provision of school maintenance services such as landscaping and lawn mowing; or the development of telecommunication infrastructures for schools are examples of services that are better performed centrally to enable schools to concentrate on their educational mission.

A systemwide support organization would not be a complete replication of the department's state office as it exists today. Together with the state office staff, the current state office was re-designed into a more

streamlined and flexible organization. The new systemwide organization would have less supervisory levels, positions, and funds. Some positions and funds would be transferred to the school level. The new structure would consist of:

- Board of Education
- Office of the Superintendent
- Division for Renewal and Assessment of Learning
- Division for Human Resources
- Division for Information and Telecommunication Services
- Division for Administrative Services

Board of Education. The BOE would establish the goals of the educational system and the policies that would enable the school system to attain those goals, secure sufficient resources to operate and improve the educational system, and establish the standards and assessment methods that would enable the school system to be accountable for its educational mission. Responsibility for the internal management of the school system would be delegated to the appointed superintendent.

Office of the Superintendent. The superintendent would be the chief executive officer of the school system. The superintendent would support the board of education in the exercise of its functions and execute the policies and directions established by the board. The superintendent would have administrative oversight over the operations of the school system and support the schools and the community in their initiatives to improve education through the school/community-based management process.

Nine associate superintendents would be assigned to the office of the superintendent but geographically located in the nine educational service areas of the school system. It would be the role of the associate superintendents to represent the superintendent in assisting the schools on a day-to-day basis. The associate superintendents would supervise school principals on matters relating to federal, state, and departmental requirements but would not superimpose decisions in matters that schools have decision-making flexibility under SCBM. The associate superintendents would also provide principals and school staff administrative and professional support in school renewal and management activities, as well as in school crisis. Rather than relying mainly on the authority of position, associate superintendents would rely on leadership by example, experience, knowledge and empathy. They would be appointed by the superintendent on the basis of their qualifications, including recommendations from school principals, SCBM councils, or other groups from the educational service area to which the position is

assigned. Associate superintendents would have a small staff to assist schools with administrative matters such as personnel and business transactions. Associate superintendents would not allocate funds to schools or their support centers. Operating funds for individual schools and support centers would be allocated directly by the state superintendent.

There would also be a school-community relations office. This office would create and nurture ties between schools and their community, and between the department and the public. Partnerships with the business sector, networks with parents and parent groups, and coalitions and alliances with community organizations would be a major focus of this office. The office would also promote effective internal and external communication.

Division for Renewal and Assessment of Learning. This division would provide a new focus on the assessment of student learning, renewal of education, and policy analysis and development.

The way student learning is assessed would be re-conceptualized and appropriate standards and methods of assessment would be developed. This division would carry out current assessment programs at the same time that it explores and develops new standards and assessment methods.

The division would also work in collaboration with educators, research and development groups, parents, and professionals from different disciplines to examine societal and world trends from the standpoint of the major patterns that are taking hold in society and the strategies in education that would be necessary to renew education to keep it relevant to the external environment. This exploration would lead to the development of strategic long-term plans for the school system.

The policy framework within which all schools are expected to function would also be analyzed on a continuing basis so that separate policies do not compete, overlap, or conflict. The policy analysis would extend beyond the policies established by the board of education and the department of education. Policies generated by federal and state agencies would also be analyzed with the aim of providing schools a coherent policy framework.

This division would also coordinate and manage several programs, such as vocational education and education of the handicapped, in order to meet federal and state legal requirements.

Division for Human Resources. This division would provide systemwide services to ensure that public education is carried out with an adequate number of qualified personnel. The division would carry out functions that attract qualified workers to the school system, promote the continuing development of employees in competencies that are relevant to

their work, provide for just compensation and recognition for work performed, and ensure equal opportunity in employment.

Division for Administrative Services. This division would provide business, budgeting, facilities and other support services that are essential to the daily functioning of the school system.

Division for Information and Telecommunication Services. This division would provide information processing and management, and technology-based communication systems to support instruction, student learning and administration of the school system. The division would provide technical assistance, training, and information on technological systems already established in the school system, as well as information on emergent technologies in information processing and telecommunications. The division would also operate a "teleschool" to provide distance learning opportunities to students throughout the state via telecommunication.

More information on these systemwide support units is provided in the appendices of this report.

5. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY WOULD BE SHIFTED TO THE SCHOOL LEVEL

Actions have already been taken, and will continue to be taken, to provide schools greater flexibility in making decisions. The school/community-based management process includes a procedure by which schools may request waivers and exceptions from the policies, rules, and regulations of the department and other state agencies, as well as the provisions of collective bargaining agreements with employee unions. Waiver and exception requests from SCBM schools are being approved to enable schools and their community to pursue school improvements that would otherwise be unobtainable. Maile Elementary School's four-day school week with a voluntary enrichment program on the fifth day is a good example of the changes that are made possible under SCBM to meet the unique needs of schools.

Departmental initiatives are being taken to shift authority to the schools. For example, with the cooperation of the state department of budget and finance, SCBM schools now have greater flexibility in determining how budgeted funds are used. Funds budgeted for a position, as an example, may instead be used to buy instructional equipment that are sorely needed without clearance from higher authority.

Schools, however, need additional flexibility. Additional authority would be shifted to schools as part of the restructuring effort, such as:

CURRENT

Funds for supplies and equipment not spent at the end of the first year of the biennium are returned to the State.

Personal services contracts under \$1,000 must be approved by the district superintendent. Contracts up to \$4,000 must be approved by the superintendent. Contracts \$4,000 or more must be approved by the board of education.

Instructional Resource Augmentation (IRA) positions must be used for direct instruction of students, must supplement and not supplant regular education.

The State department of accounting & general services has the responsibility and funds for repair and maintenance of schools, including emergency repairs.

Principals recommend the appointment of vice principals and the recommendation is reviewed and approved by the district superintendent, state superintendent, and board of education.

DOE guidelines, as distinguished from federal guidelines, must be adhered to in supplemental programs such as Chapter 1 programs for educationally disadvantaged students.

In-service training activities are approved by the district superintendent. Out-of-state travel connected with in-service training is approved by the district superintendent and state superintendent.

PROPOSED

Unspent funds would automatically be available for use in second year of the biennium.

Contracts less than \$4,000 would be approved by the school. Contracts \$4,000 or more would be approved by the superintendent and board. (The \$4,000 threshold would be adjusted if the law is changed to raise the amount.)

Schools would have flexibility in the use of IRA and other supplementary positions.

Schools would have the authority and funds to do emergency repairs. The department of accounting & general services would continue to be responsible for scheduled maintenance repairs.

Principals would appoint vice principals without higher approval.

DOE requirements would be reduced and schools would have greater flexibility to administer supplemental programs.

In-service training and out-of-state travel would be approved by the school.

The filling of school-level positions other than administrators require the approval of the district superintendent.

The principal would approve the filling of all school vacancies.

In addition to the above, the following change is proposed:

The appointment of principals require the approval of the district superintendent, the state superintendent, and the board of education.

The state superintendent would appoint principals, which may include recommendations from SCBM councils.

Although the designation of the above decision-making authority is stated in terms of authority located at schools or with principals, the authority would be used according to the SCBM guidelines on shared decision-making.

6. RESOURCES OF THE STATE AND DISTRICT OFFICES WOULD BE RE-ASSIGNED TO THE SCHOOL LEVEL

Personnel and financial resources currently assigned to the state and district offices were developed over the years to support a centralized school system. Now, as decision-making is decentralized to the schools under SCBM, there must be concomitant movement of those resources to the school level. However, this must be done without crippling the board of education's and department's capacity to exercise general oversight of the school system and to provide essential services on a systemwide basis.

About 1,563 educational officers, resource teachers, and classified personnel are currently assigned to the state and district offices. About 60 percent, or 953, of the positions would be re-assigned to the nine school support centers and used as decided by schools. The remaining 40 percent, or 610 positions, would staff the systemwide support organization. Schools, through the support center councils, would jointly decide how the resources assigned to the support centers will be used to benefit all schools in the area. The councils would have flexibility to make decisions. For example, vacant positions may not be filled and the funds may be used to purchase equipment or to contract needed services. Some of the center's personnel could be assigned to individual schools to assist with school improvement activities and return to the center to help other schools in the area.

A case can be made to permanently assign the positions to individual schools. However, there are three reasons why the shared approach is more appropriate. First, the support center idea was developed to promote collaboration, shared decision making, and networking among schools. This is a worthy end. Second, each school would receive about two positions if they are equitably distributed among all schools. The benefits would not

outweigh what might be gained from sharing the resources. Positions are filled by personnel with varying expertise. It will be difficult to assign the right combination to every school. Third, it would be possible to assign personnel to individual schools to provide sustained assistance. Schools would have a wider range of expertise to draw upon from the center.

Resources of the School Support Centers. Each school support center would have a director, educational officers (EO) and resource teachers (RT) serving as school support consultants, and classified employees (CE). The size of the staff would be based on the number of school personnel that need to be supported in the service area. Special services teams would also operate from the centers to provide diagnostic services for students who may be in need of special education and related services.

The number of positions that would be allocated to each school support center is shown below.

<u>SUPPORT CENTER FOR:</u>	<u>EO</u>	<u>RT</u>	<u>CE</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
EAST HONOLULU	13	35	59.5	107.5
WEST HONOLULU	18.5	53	89	160.5
CENTRAL OAHU	16	47	81	144
LEEWARD OAHU	13	40	67	120
WINDWARD OAHU	12.5	38.5	65.5	116.5
EAST HAWAII	10	28	44	82
WEST HAWAII	6	17	28	51
MAUI	8	46	55.5	109.5
KAUAI	7	24	31	62
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	104	328.5	520.5	953

In addition to these positions, a significant portion of the \$16 million in non-salary funds now assigned to the state and district offices would be re-assigned to the school support centers.

The remainder of the positions and funds would be assigned to the systemwide support organization. Within that organization are the nine associate superintendents. Each associate superintendent would be assisted by a staff to provide administrative support services to schools in such matters as business and personnel transactions. The table below shows the positions that would be assigned to each associate superintendent.

<u>ASSOC. SUPT.</u>	<u>EQ</u>	<u>CE</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
EAST HONOLULU	7	9	16
WEST HONOLULU	10	14	24
CENTRAL OAHU	9	12.5	21.5
LEEWARD OAHU	7	10	17
WINDWARD OAHU	7	10	17
EAST HAWAII	4	6	10
WEST HAWAII	3	4	7
MAUI	7	10	17
KAUAI	3	5	8
Total	<u>57</u>	<u>80.5</u>	<u>137.5</u>

The shifting of resources to the school level reflect a thoughtful blending of two considerations. The first consideration is the shifting of certain functions to the school level...functions that are best carried out at the school site or through the support centers through the process of school/community-based management. Such functions as curriculum development and school staff training would be planned and carried out primarily at the school level.

The second consideration is streamlining the state office through consolidation and reduction of separate units and supervisory levels. Both considerations are meant to combine the vitality of local school flexibility with the economies and equity that are achieved best through a systemwide support structure.

7. TEAMING, NETWORKING, AND COLLABORATION WOULD BE OPERATING NORMS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

This draft report strives to provide an organizational framework that will move the school system towards an organization that stresses teamwork, mutual support, commitment to student learning, and change. In this new culture, workers dialogue and search for solutions. Leadership is seen as emerging everywhere through the authority of knowledge and skills applied to tasks. Workers work in teams in search of the best answers to difficult problems. Innovation and risk taking are encouraged and supported.

Teaming, networking, and collaboration are not amenable to "officialization" through formal organizational charts and directives. They are dynamic and rather free-flowing human structures that emerge and re-emerge as problems, needs, and opportunities arise. They need to emerge in a flexible organizational environment. It is believed that the proposals provide a structural framework that will indeed support our public schools in new and improved ways.

IV. NEW ORGANIZATIONAL AND ACCOUNTABILITY RELATIONSHIPS

The Ke Au Hou project supports the process that the schools are now engaged in to adopt school/community-based management. Even though expressed in many ways, the primary goal of SCBM is to improve student learning.

Support of SCBM is not complete without mention of how schools under SCBM would relate to the new organization being proposed. For schools to change, authority and accountability relationships now in place must also change.

Research related to site-based management suggests that a spirit of cooperation and teamwork must prevail in defining authority relationships. This project has pinpointed relationships regarded as crucial to the success of the new organization. These include:

Board of Education and School Support Centers. The board of education would continue to set systemwide education goals, policies, and standards, and prepare the school system's budget request to maintain and improve public education. The board would continue to be an advocate of SCBM. It would establish policies and budgets that promote flexibility in decision making by schools and their support centers. The budget requests of school support centers, as approved by the SSC council, would be subject to the approval of the board based on operational plans submitted by the centers and within the budget limitations the board must work with.

SCBM Council and School Support Center Council. The two councils do different things. SCBM councils make decisions affecting education at the school site; by contrast, the SSC council, made up of school representatives, would make areawide decisions to support all schools in an educational service area.

To maintain this separation of roles and, at the same time, obtain new benefits that the school support center can offer schools, principals would sit on their SCBM councils as well as on the area SSC council. They would make (1) school decisions collaboratively with other members of their SCBM councils, and (2) areawide decisions with other principals and representatives on the SSC council.

School Support Centers (SSC) and Associate Superintendents. The school support center would be governed by principals and others in the area that the center serves. Its day-to-day operations would be managed by a center director that the SSC council appoints. Because of that, the associate superintendent would have no authority over the center's operations or management. However, as an ex-officio, non-voting member of the SSC council, the associate superintendent could advise the council with the aim of helping the center to succeed.

Principals and Associate Superintendents. The associate superintendents would supervise principals on administrative matters that relate to federal, state, and departmental requirements but would not superimpose their decisions on matters in which schools have flexibility in making decisions. Where supervision is concerned, associate superintendents would use more of a coaching rather than an authoritative style to help principals. Associate superintendents would use performance evaluation as a tool to advise and assist principals to improve their performance. Associate superintendents would not allocate funds to schools or their support centers. Operating funds for individual schools and support centers would be allocated directly by the state superintendent.

School Staff and School Support Centers. Teachers and school support staff would seek help from the school support center directly, either individually or collectively. The center director and staff would work directly with teachers and school staff to understand and meet their needs.

Parents and School Support Centers. Parents, too, would be able to seek out the services of the center directly or by request of SCBM councils. The center would provide or arrange services ranging from basic obligations of parents to ensure children's health and safety, child-rearing skills needed to prepare children for school, and guides on building positive home conditions that support school learning and behavior. Services also would be provided to develop skills for defining, analyzing, and solving school-site educational problems or for understanding their children's curriculum, instructional programs, and test scores.

The Systemwide Support Organization and Schools. The systemwide support organization would include the office of the superintendent and four divisions. This support structure would relate to schools directly in an enhanced way since there would be no middle management level. The nine associate superintendents from the superintendent's office would be a coordinating point with the schools on many administrative matters dealt with by the four divisions. On the other hand, there would be other activities of the divisions that would be handled more efficiently and effectively by direct interaction between the divisions and the schools. Schools and support centers would deal with the divisions directly on matters not coordinated by the associate superintendents.

The new organization would rely on collegial relationships where, as examples:

- The directors and staff of the nine school support centers would meet periodically to exchange information and coordinate their plans and resources to maximize school support services.
- The directors of the school support centers would meet with the director and staff of the division of renewal and assessment of learning and other research and development groups to explore what efforts should be made to improve curriculum and instructional practices and how they may be able to collaborate and coordinate their efforts to support the schools.

- The state superintendent, board of education members, and associate superintendents would meet with principals and SCBM councils to discuss how the roles and responsibilities of the school and systemwide levels could be better defined and strengthened or what systemwide policies and directions should be pursued to meet the goals of the public education system.
- Teachers, parents, citizens, and school administrators are brought together by the school support centers to learn about educational innovations which are being pursued in the educational service area or in other areas, or to explore how people can be networked more effectively within the area so that the flow of information and involvement with school improvement activities can be strengthened.

A line of authority would exist between the board of education, state superintendent, and principals. The state superintendent would continue to be accountable to the board of education. Principals would be accountable to the state superintendent. The associate superintendents would serve as representatives of the state superintendent to maintain accountability between principals and the state superintendent.

The line of accountability between the board, superintendent, and principals would need to be augmented by group accountability because of shared-decision making. At the school site, SCBM councils would be accountable to the constituents of the school and community for its decisions and actions. The superintendent, on behalf of the board, would intervene in the council's decisions and actions only under the most serious situations involving law violations or when there is serious threat to the health, safety, and welfare (including educational welfare) of students and employees. Otherwise, SCBM councils would have flexibility to make decisions regarding the school.

At each school support center, the SSC council would be accountable to the schools served by the center for the efficiency and quality of services. The superintendent would intervene only under the most serious situations involving law violations or when there is serious threat to the health, safety, and welfare (including educational welfare) of students and employees. Like SCBM councils, SSC councils would otherwise have flexibility to make decisions regarding the school support center.

Simply put, accountability tells who is responsible to whom, for what, when, and under what conditions. In a traditional organization that is strongly hierarchical, multi-layered, and oriented toward placing blame or credit on individual workers, accountability stresses:

- Results
- Individual worker performance
- Fixation of leadership, and authority of position
- Once a year evaluation of job performance

In sharp contrast is the proposed networked organization. This organization features teaming of workers and the teaming of those teams, extensive collaboration and sharing of information and knowledge, and the development of task-focused leaders throughout the organization. In such an organization, accountability stresses:

- Process and results equally
- Team performance
- Variable and non-permanent task-focused leaders
- Year-round evaluation of work performance

In the proposed networked organization, accountability has three significant effects on education:

- * Strengthening citizen interest in and involvement with schools.
- * Improving the quality of student learning.
- * Improving school performance.

Citizen Interest and Involvement. At the heart of accountability is the belief that the educational system should know and respond to needs and views of the citizenry. For this to happen, there must be full and free interchange of information. Citizens, if they are to support the schools, must know what school officials are thinking and planning, and why. Similarly, school officials must know what citizens are thinking and why if they are to act wisely. SCBM expedites the exchange of information among major players who make up the school community. It relates to a revered tradition of democratic government... the direct involvement in decision-making at the grassroots.

Improving Student Learning. A very practical question relates to the extent to which site-based accountability alone affects student learning. General answers to this question are difficult to give. The first wave of evaluative data of Dade County, Florida's site-based management shows student academic achievement unaffected to any significant, measurable degree. The data show, however, that other forms of student development, such as behavior, attitudes and attendance, are affected positively. Little else can be said at this relatively early stage. Results take time.

Improving School Performance. Besides students, the school itself is seen as a focus for change and therefore an integral part of accountability in a networked organization. As an institution, the school is a coalescence of beliefs, norms, and practices which provides stability, creates meaning, and shapes the experiences of people within its boundaries. In this sense, the school represents a culture which

influences how people view public education and public schools in the community.

Approached from the perspective of a networked, collaborative, and teaming school system, citizen interest and involvement, student learning, and school performance become the ends of accountability. Accountability cannot be satisfied by student learning alone.

To summarize, accountability takes on a different meaning in a networked organization, as compared to accountability in a traditional organization. Teaming, collaboration, and sharing have a direct bearing on the delivery of services, as well as the manner in which educational services are planned and designed. Accountability, moreover, goes beyond everyday needs of the organization and the traditional management focus on efficiency, span of control, staffing ratios, and the like. In a networked organization, accountability zooms in on the quality of the decision-making process and educational results.

A great deal of work lies ahead to refine these thoughts into a system of accountability that is usable and appropriate for a school system that is renewing itself structurally and culturally. Clearly, an accountability system that might have suited a bureaucratic organization will not have the proper fit in a networked organization. Work must commence on a new accountability system during the transition period.

V. NEXT STEPS

This report has presented preliminary proposals for a new order of public school system management, using school/community -based management as a foundation. Two critical steps must be taken to prepare for change.

1. PUBLIC AND EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT

Although the proposals were developed with the involvement of many individuals in the educational system and from the community, the public and employees of the school system need to be further informed and provided greater opportunity to provide input.

Plans for wider public and employee involvement have been made. Video and written information on the proposals will be distributed to employees, parents, and community groups in January and informational meetings will be held to discuss the proposals. Starting in February and into March, input meetings will be held for employees and the public throughout the state to receive comments and suggestions. Information on these meetings will be published and distributed through various communication channels.

2. TRANSITION PLANNING

Upon completion, the proposals will be re-examined in the light of comments and suggestions, and re-designed as necessary. A final report will be prepared and presented to the board of education. The board will be requested to give the revised proposals its tentative approval in order to proceed with the next step: transition planning.

Ten to twelve months will be spent on developing detailed plans to implement the restructuring proposals. Task-focused groups will be formed to carry out well-defined planning tasks. These groups or teams will be made up of educational officers, principals, teachers, parents, community members, union representatives, and experts from the government and private sectors. Each team will develop a plan for a particular aspect that is crucial to successful implementation of the new organization. The teams will be networked and meet periodically to exchange information and coordinate their efforts.

Using such a teaming structure, the following tasks will be undertaken:

Implementation Strategy	A strategic plan to implement the changes. A plan that describes the phases of implementation, which units of the department will be included in each phase, and how the transition will be managed.
Position & Budget Reassignment	A detailed plan that reassigns the positions, personnel, and budgets of the current state and district offices to the new organizational structure.
New Job Classification and Pay Plan	A new position classification and pay plan based on new roles and responsibilities of positions under the reorganized system, and policies on the rights and privileges of employees with respect to pay and conditions of employment during and after reorganization.
Accountability System	A design and plan for a new accountability system based on the restructuring of decision-making authority and the teaming and shared decision-making processes that the school system will rely on.
Statutory and Policy Reformulation	A plan to change state laws and the policies and regulations of the board of education to enhance school/community-based management and restructuring of the state and district offices.
Employee Welfare	A plan to provide job re-training and counseling to employees during reorganization.
Facilities	A plan to meet the facility requirements of the new organization.

These and perhaps other plans will need to be developed to prepare for implementation. Depending on the matter involved, the plans will be subject to the review and approval of the board of education, governor, and legislature. Implementation will not start until the necessary approvals are obtained.

APPENDIX 1

SCHOOLS IN EDUCATIONAL SERVICE AREAS

EAST HONOLULU (35 Schools)

Kaimuki Complex

Ala Wai
Ali'iolani
Hokulani
Jarrett Inter.
Jefferson
Kaimuki Comm. Sch.
Kaimuki High
Kuhio
Lunalilo
Palolo

Kaiser Complex

Hahai'one
Kaiser High
Kamiloiki
Koko Head
Niu Valley Inter.

Kalani Complex

Aina Haina
Kahala
Kaimuki Inter.
Kalani High
Liholiho
Lili'uokalani
Waialae
Waikiki
Wailupe Valley
Wilson

Roosevelt Complex

Kawananakoa Inter.
Lincoln
Maemae
Manoa
Noelani
Nuuanu
Pauoa
Roosevelt High
Stevenson Inter.

Special School

Statewide Center for
Students With Hearing
& Visual Impairments

WEST HONOLULU (39 Schools)

Farrington Complex

Dole Inter.
Farrington Comm. Sch.
Farrington High
Fern
Ka'ewai
Kalakaua Inter.
Kalihi
Kalihi-kai
Kalihi-uka
Kalihi-waena
Kapalama
Lanakila
Linapuni
Pu'uhale

McKinley Complex

Central Inter.
Ka'ahumanu
Kaiulani
Kauluwela
Lanakila
Likelike
McKinley Comm. Sch.
McKinley High
Royal
Washington Inter.

Radford Complex

Aliamanu
Aliamanu Inter.
Hickam
Makalapa
Mokulele
Nimitz
Pearl Harbor
Pearl Harbor Kai
Radford High

Moanalua Complex

Moanalua
Moanalua High
Moanalua Inter.
Red Hill
Salt Lake
Shafter

CENTRAL OAHU (37 Schools)

Aiea Complex

Aiea
Aiea Comm. Sch.
Aiea High
Aiea Inter.
Pearl Ridge
Alvah Scott
Waimalu
Webling

Leilehua Complex

Hale Kula
Helemano
Iliahi
Kaala
Leilehua Comm. Sch.
Leilehua High
Solomon
Wahiawa
Wahiawa Inter.

Pearl City Complex

Highlands Inter.
Kanoelani
Lehua
Manana
Momilani
Palisades
Pearl City
Pearl City High
Pearl City Highlands
Waiau

Mililani Complex

Kipapa
Mililani High
Mililani-mauka*
Mililani-uka
Mililani-waena
Wheeler
Wheeler Inter.

Waialua Complex

Haleiwa
Waialua
Waialua High

* To open in 9/93

LEEWARD OAHU (27 Schools)

Campbell Complex

Barbers Point
Campbell High
Ewa
Ewa Beach
Ilima Inter.
Iroquois Point
Kaimiloa
Makakilo
Mauka Lani
Pohakea

Waipahu Complex

August Ahrens
Honowai
Kaleiopuu
Waiphau
Waipahu Comm. Sch.
Waipahu High
Waipahu Inter.

Waianae Complex

Kamaile
Leihoku
Makaha
Waianae
Waianae High
Waianae Inter.

Nanakuli Complex

Ma'ili
Nanaikapono
Nanakuli
Nanakuli High/Inter.

WINDWARD OAHU (32 Schools)

Castle Complex

'Ahuimanu
Castle High
Heeia
Kahaluu
Kane'ohe
Kapunahala
King Inter.
Parker
Pu'ohala
Waiahole

Kahuku Complex

Hau'ula
Ka'a'awa
Kahuku
Kahuku High
La'ie
Sunset Beach

Kailua Complex

Enchanted Lake
Ka'elepulu
Kailua High
Keolu
Maunawili
Pope
Waimanalo Elem/Inter.
Olomana

Kalaheo Complex

'Aikahi
Kailua
Kailua Inter.
Kainalu
Kalaheo Comm. Sch.
Kalaheo High
Lanikai
Mokapu

EAST HAWAII (21 Schools)

Hilo Complex

De Silva
Ha'aheo
Hilo Comm. Sch.
Hilo High
Hilo Inter.
Hilo Union
Kalaniana'ole Elem/Inter.
Kapi'olani
Kaumana
Keaukaha

Waiakea Complex

Keaau Elem/Inter.
Mt. View Elem/Inter.
Waiakea
Waiakea High
Waiakea Inter.
Waiakea-waena
Laupahoehoe
Laupahoehoe High/Elem.

Ka'u Complex

Ka'u High/Pahala Elem.
Naalehu Elem/Inter.

Pahoa Complex

Keonepoko
Pahoa High

WEST HAWAII (13 Schools)

Konawaena Complex

Holualoa
Honaunau
Ho'okena
Kahakai
Kealakehe
Kealakehe Inter.
Kona Comm. Sch.
Konawaena
Konawaena High

Honoka'a Complex

Honoka'a High/Inter.
Pa'auilo Elem/Inter.
Waimea Elem/Inter.

Kohala

Kohala High/Elem.

MAUI (29 Schools)

Maui Complex

Haiku
Kahului
Kalama
Kula
Makawao
Maui Comm. Sch.
Maui High
Maui Waena Inter.
Paia
Pukalani

Lanai

Lanai High/Elem.

Baldwin Complex

Baldwin High
Iao Inter.
Kihei
Lihikai
Lokelani Inter.
Waihe'e
Wailuku

Hana Complex

Hana High/Inter.
Ke'anae

Lahianaluna Complex

Kamehameha III
Lahaina Inter.
Lahainaluna High
Nahienaena

Moloka'i Complex

Kaunakakai
Kilohana
Kualapu'u
Maunaloa
Moloka'i High/Inter.

KAUAI (15 Schools)

Kapaa Complex

Hanalei
Kapaa
Kapaa High/Inter.
Kilauea

Kauai Complex

Kalaheo
Kauai Comm. Sch.
Kauai High
Kaunualii
Koloa
Wilcox

Waimea Complex

Eleele
Kekaha
Niihau
Waimea Canyon
Waimea High

APPENDIX 2

SCHOOL SUPPORT CENTERS

SCHOOL SUPPORT CENTERS IN OPERATION

A Place For Teachers, School Administrators, And Staff

In the support center are work stations for teachers to develop lesson plans and instructional units. Materials, supplies, and equipment are readily available. Educational models, such as cooperative learning and instructional strategies for early childhood education, are supplemented with "user-friendly" visual aids and handbooks.

The center operates with "revolving doors." The center's staff works as members of school teams on school improvement activities. The center plans and carries out research and development and enables school personnel to join the center's staff and others on project teams.

The center is stocked with high quality instructional and resource materials to help school personnel plan and deliver instruction. State-of-the-art audiovisual equipment is available for teacher use. Such equipment includes video, recording, and sign-making capability.

Schools needing support may call the center for services. The center has consultants to assist school personnel, including assistance in developing scope and sequence frameworks for curricula, assessing a program, developing non-traditional student assessment instruments, and the like. A consultant or a team from the center is sent to work directly with school personnel as appropriate.

To meet a wide range of school needs, the center links school personnel with resources and people elsewhere. They could be other school support centers in the system or a variety of resource centers located in the state and on the mainland.

To promote innovations in school, arrangements are made by the center to enable teachers, principals, other school personnel, parents, or community members to spend time elsewhere in Hawaii's or other school systems to observe and learn about effective school innovations. The center calls upon substitute teachers or retired school administrators and teachers to relieve school personnel from their regular duties in order to make visitations.

The center coordinates incentive grants to enable schools to pursue innovative projects. It also coordinates sabbatical leaves and other professional improvement opportunities to enable school personnel to engage in research or professional development.

A Place For Students

Students are also center beneficiaries. Students are asked about their educational experiences in school and how learning can be made more effective. They help shape their own learning by participating in the center's curriculum projects, field-testing and reviewing the results of school innovations.

A Place For Parents And The Community

In focusing on educational renewal, the school system needs to consider how it can help parents develop as co-educators of their children and become life-long learners. The Parent-Community Networking Center (PCNC) program was started in Hawaii's school system to assist parents. A project for pre-school children and their families is also being piloted in the Maui and Windward districts. For several years now, the Honolulu district has also brought parents and children together for about an hour during school to discuss the curriculum. In these sessions, parents find out how their children are taught language skills, reading, writing, oral language, listening, computing, as well as painting, music, and poetry. Parents practice teaching skills with their children under the guidance of the teacher in charge of the parent-child activity.

The school support center will continue and expand such assistance to parents. Parents are provided greater opportunities to gain information and participate in activities that can make them more effective partners in the educational process.

Members of the community also gain from the services of the center. The center provides information on what is happening in the area's schools and at the center itself. Community members are assisted in developing skills, along with school personnel, in such areas as collaborative planning, decision making, or conflict resolution.

MODELS FOR GOVERNING SCHOOL SUPPORT CENTERS

How would the centers be governed? Three models serve as possible examples and suggest how the centers might be governed. Given the diversity of school and community needs, no two centers would be expected to provide services that are exactly alike. By the same token, no two centers would be expected to be governed in the same way. The three models, at best, suggest how governance requirements might be met. Other variations are possible. It would be up to the schools in the area to arrive at a governance model to suit their needs.

Model A

The council would include principals of all schools in the area, together with two teachers, a staff person, a parent, and a student from each school complex. The council would appoint the center's director, set long-term goals, set operating policies, agree on program and budget priorities, and evaluate the director's and center's performance. The council would meet once each quarter.

The council's executive committee, made up of the council's chairperson and other officers, would advise the center's director regarding operations. The executive committee would also make decisions and perform other tasks delegated to it by the council. The executive committee would meet once each month.

Model B

The council would include principals of two elementary schools from each school complex on a two-year rotation cycle together with principals of the secondary schools. The council would also include one teacher, staff person, parent, and student from each school complex. The council would carry out functions similar to those described in Model A and would meet once each quarter.

Like Model A, the council's executive committee would advise the center's director, make decisions and perform other tasks delegated to it by the council.

Model C

The council would be made up of all principals in the area. The council would perform the same functions as in Model A and B. Each principal would be advised by the school's SCBM council on matters relating to the support center. If a school does not have a SCBM council, the principal would appoint a representative group to advise. The council would meet once each quarter.

Like the previous models, the council's executive committee would advise the center's director and make decisions and perform other tasks delegated to it by the council. The executive committee would meet once each month.

As to the selection of teachers, parents, and others to serve on the support center councils, SCBM councils may make those choices. Schools without SCBM councils may select their representatives through similar groups formed by principals.

APPENDIX 3

ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENTS OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

Nine associate superintendents would be assigned to the office of the superintendent but geographically located in the nine educational service areas of the school system. Associate superintendents would be appointed by the state superintendent. Appointments may take into consideration recommendations from school principals or SCBM councils from the educational service area to which the associate superintendent would be assigned.

Associate superintendents would represent the state superintendent in the supervision of principals in meeting federal, state, and departmental laws or policies. They would establish accountability between the principals and the state superintendent in meeting those requirements. They would assist principals in their leadership role in managing school operations and in improving education at the school site. Associate superintendents, however, would not make decisions in matters where schools have decision-making flexibility under school/community-based management.

Functions

Associate superintendents would carry out the following functions:

- * Assist principals in carrying out their leadership role in establishing a collaborative decision-making process at the school site, developing the school's educational goals, and developing and carrying out school improvement plans.
- * Explain federal, state, and departmental policies and regulations and provide assistance to principals in meeting those requirements.
- * Provide advice and assistance to principals on matters pertaining to the daily administration of the school, such as curriculum planning and scheduling.
- * Assist principals in setting their performance goals, evaluate their performance, and provide help in improving their performance. Assemble information from multiple sources to enable the superintendent to evaluate principals.
- * Mobilize people and resources to help principals overcome crisis at school.

- * Handle public inquiries and complaints. Serve as a communication link between principals, the superintendent, the community, and units of the systemwide support organization.
- * Promote networking and collaboration among principals to address common problems or needs, and to share information on school improvement efforts.
- * Provide assistance in administrative matters; such as budgeting, personnel and business transactions, and facility development and maintenance.

Organization

Associate superintendents would have a staff of professional and clerical personnel to coordinate business and personnel transactions with the schools, and to monitor school compliance with federal, state, and departmental requirements. The staff would range from 7 to 24 professional and clerical positions, depending on the size of the educational service areas.

The associate superintendents assigned to the educational service areas on Oahu and Maui would be assisted by "lead principals" due to the larger number of schools in those areas. A lead principal would be on temporary assignment for one or two years to assist the associate superintendent in supervising and mentoring principals.

The number of educational officers (EO) and classified employees (CE) that would be assigned to the associate superintendents would be:

	<u>EO</u>	<u>CE</u>	<u>Total</u>
East Honolulu	7	9	16
West Honolulu	10	14	24
Central Oahu	9	12.5	21.5
Leeward Oahu	7	10	17
Windward Oahu	7	10	17
East Hawaii	4	6	10
West Hawaii	3	4	7
Maui	7	10	17
Kauai	3	5	8
Total	57	80.5	137.5

APPENDIX 4

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS OFFICE OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

A school-community relations office would be located in the superintendent's office to promote and nurture partnerships with various sectors of the community, and to promote effective internal and external communication.

Functions

The office would carry out the following functions:

- * Create partnerships and networks between the school system and parent groups, businesses, community groups, the military, and other government agencies in an effort to collaborate in meeting the needs of public education.
- * Assist schools in adopting and implementing school/community-based management.
- * Develop an effective public information program to keep the public informed about the goals, plans, and progress of the school system.
- * Handle information requests and complaints from the public and coordinate public access to information under the State Uniform Information Practices Act.
- * Give advice to the department's units on the community relations aspect of plans and actions.
- * Review and clear official publications of the department and coordinate public hearings of the board of education, recognition activities for student and school excellence, and the review of proposed community-sponsored activities in the school system.

Organization

The office would have a staff of six educational officers, one resource teacher, and three clerical employees. The head of the office would be responsible to the superintendent.

APPENDIX 5

DIVISION FOR RENEWAL AND ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING

This division would provide leadership and be a catalyst for long-range systemwide planning, assessment, and improvements in public education. It would also manage systemwide educational programs to keep them vital and consistent with federal, state, board of education, and departmental requirements.

Functions

The division would:

- * Examine social, economic, political, and technological trends in Hawaii, the nation, and the world; identify issues of strategic importance to the public school system; create forums to re-examine fundamental educational values, assumptions, and practices to keep public education relevant to the demands of the future; and develop long-range plans for the school system.
- * Conduct or provide current research on effective teaching and student learning strategies.
- * Analyze the policy framework of the public school system and develop policies and standards that support the goals of public education, ensure equal educational opportunity, provide a coherent policy framework for schools, and ensure accountability.
- * Analyze the organizational and management structure of the public school system and develop proposals to strengthen school/community-based management and the systemwide support organization.
- * Assess school and student performance, evaluate the educational and support programs of the school system, and report on their progress and achievements.
- * Develop or adapt promising instructional programs based on educational research, and provide schools and their support centers technical assistance in adopting instructional models to meet their needs.
- * Develop and maintain educational standards and specifications for the school system's foundation program, authorized courses, approved instructional materials, and school facilities and equipment.
- * Coordinate special educational programs and compliance with federal and state requirements.
- * Serve as a clearinghouse for information on federal and other grants and coordinate applications for grants, including the provision of technical assistance in developing grant proposals.

Organization

The division would be staffed by 66 educational officers and 39 classified employees. The staff would be organized into seven units to carry out assigned functions.

The units would also be matrixed to form cross-functional project teams to carry out task-focused projects in early childhood, pre-adolescent, adolescent, and adult education along with personnel from school support centers, schools, parent groups, universities, regional educational laboratories, private schools, businesses or other sectors. For example, a project may be initiated to develop proposals to help all children to be ready for kindergarten or first grade (one of Hawaii's long-range education goals). The project may be staffed by representatives from all or several of the division units in addition to representatives from various sectors of the school system and community.

The division's organization would blend the stability that is needed to carry out on-going functions and the flexibility that is needed to engage in cross-functional developmental projects. The division's structure is depicted below.

Division Units	Cross-Functional Project Teams			
	Early Childhood	Pre-Adolescent	Adolescent	Adult
<u>Policy Analysis & Accountability System</u> Analyze and develop the policy, organizational, and accountability frameworks of the public school system.	•	•	•	•
<u>Evaluation & Assessment</u> Evaluate educational and support programs and assess the performance of schools and students.	•	•	•	•
<u>Basic Skills Education</u> Relating to basic skills education, conduct or provide current research information on effective teaching and learning strategies; develop foundation program goals and expectations, program goals and guidelines, educational standards and specifications for authorized courses, instructional materials, and school facilities and equipment; and coordinate compliance with federal or state requirements.	•	•	•	•

Science & Technology Education
(Same functions as in basic skills education for the thematic areas of science & technology education.)

• • • •

Humanities Education
(Same functions as in basic skills education for the thematic area of humanities education.)

• • • •

Extended Learning
(Same functions as in basic skills education for the thematic area of extended learning.)

• • • •

Special Programs
(Same functions as in basic skills education for special educational programs.)

• • • •

APPENDIX 6

DIVISION FOR HUMAN RESOURCES

This division would focus on recruiting adequate numbers of qualified personnel to staff the school system, promoting the well-being and growth of employees, administering sound certification, classification, and compensation systems, administering employee performance evaluation and recognition programs, providing assistance in collective bargaining negotiations, and ensuring equal employment opportunity.

Organization and Functions

The division would have a staff of 21 educational officers, one resource teacher, and 52 classified employees. The division would be organized into two units:

Human Resource Development Unit

- * Evaluate the current and future human resource requirements of the public school system.
- * Develop and implement effective strategies and programs to meet the system's human resource needs; including programs to train teachers to become school administrators, programs to upgrade the skills and competencies of school administrators and other personnel, and special certification programs for teachers.
- * Collaborate with colleges and universities to prepare prospective teachers, school administrators, and school support personnel (e.g., school counselors) for employment in the public school system.
- * Provide a program of employee recruitment, certification, referral and placement, and performance evaluation.
- * Administer classification and compensation systems for employees.
- * Provide services relating to employee leaves, probation and tenure, and personal contracts.

Human Relations Unit

- * Provide support to state negotiating teams in collective bargaining with employee unions.
- * Serve as the department's liaison with employee unions on contract interpretations.
- * Provide coordination and support in resolving employee grievances under collective bargaining agreements.

- * Coordinate employee benefit programs, including provision of information and counseling on available employee benefits and application/claim procedures.
- * Coordinate employee incentive and award programs.

The division would also rely on a "human resource consortium" made up of representatives from the various sectors of the public school system, institutions of higher learning, employee unions, businesses, and the community to identify long-term trends in human resource requirements, pinpoint issues and problems, suggest solutions, and advise and guide the division in meeting the human resource needs of the public school system.

APPENDIX 7

DIVISION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

This division would provide a wide range of administrative, budget, facilities, and support services to schools and other units of the department that are most efficiently and effectively delivered on a systemwide basis.

Organization and Functions

The division would be staffed by 26 educational officers and 161 classified employees. The staff would be organized into four units:

Budget Unit

- * Coordinate the preparation and execution of the operating budget for the public school system.

Administrative Services Unit

- * Provide centralized accounting, payroll, temporary disability insurance program, vouchering, internal audit, equipment inventory, mail, procurement and distribution, and reprographic services to schools and other department units; and maintain the financial management system.
- * Coordinate the development and adoption of administrative rules and maintain the department's compendium of policies and regulations.

School Food Services Unit

- * Develop and administer statewide program plans, budgets, policies, standards, and specifications for food service operations of the public school system as well as non-DOE agencies and institutions that receive funds and food commodities from U.S. Department of Agriculture grants-in-aid programs.

Facilities and Support Services Unit

- * Coordinate master planning, site selection, educational specifications, architectural and landscape planning, construction, facilities inventory, school custodial and grounds maintenance services, and repair and maintenance services for schools and department facilities.
- * Provide centralized maintenance services, such as lawn mowing, carpet cleaning, furniture moving, and automotive repair; and operate a nursery.
- * Coordinate student transportation and traffic safety services; school safety, security, and civil defense preparedness; environmental safety measures; and an energy conservation program.

APPENDIX 8

DIVISION FOR INFORMATION AND TELECOMMUNICATION SERVICES

This division would provide information and telecommunication services to schools and other units of the department by developing plans, policies, and standards, providing leadership in the management and use of informational and technological resources, planning the school system's information and telecommunication infrastructure, and managing an information resource program.

Organization and Functions

The division would be staffed by 19 educational officers, 10 resource teachers, and 74 classified employees. The staff would be organized into five units:

Advanced Technology Research Unit

- * Carry out research and disseminate information on new technologies.
- * Coordinate the development of strategic plans and budgets for improving the DOE's use of existing and emerging technology for instructional and administrative purposes.
- * Provide technical assistance to users seeking to test and evaluate prototype advanced technology products or applications in their administrative or instructional operations.
- * Assist in developing policies, procedures, and standards for the purchase and use of end-user hardware and software to insure compatibility, portability, and cost-effectiveness.

Information Resource Management Unit

- * Assist in planning new information processing systems to insure compatibility and usability of data.
- * Develop a uniform information classification system for information generated in administrative and instructional operations.
- * Provide statistical analysis and reporting services for the department.
- * Develop a departmental records management program.

Telecommunication Systems Services Unit

- * Plan and support interactive telecommunication systems and services for instructional applications.
- * Select, produce, and program instructional television systems and services.

Information Systems Services Unit

- * Develop policies, procedures, standards, and guidelines for information processing.
- * Provide systems development, enhancement, and maintenance support for centralized and distributed information processing applications.
- * Manage the operation of the department's host and distributed computer systems.

Network Support Services Unit

- * Develop policies, procedures, standards, and guidelines for telecommunication.
- * Develop and implement statewide voice, data, and video communications systems to support instructional and administrative operations.
- * Provide technical assistance to schools and other department units in developing and implementing local voice, data, and video communication systems.

