UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

The Study of State Education Policy Mechanisms and Goals in Arizona and California: A Comparative Analysis

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Paul Rajabu Kavishe

March, 1985

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Douglas E. Mitchell, Chairperson

Professor Flora I. Ortiz

Professor E. Mark Hanson

The dissertation of Paul Rajabu Kavishe is approved:

Flora Ida Ortiz

E. Marl Hanson

Douglas E. Mitchell
Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside
March, 1985

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply grateful to my chairperson, Dr. Douglas E. Mitchell for his invaluable assistance, guidance, patience, and support which enabled me to complete this study.

I wish also to express my sincere gratitude to Drs. Flora Ida Ortiz and E. Mark Hanson, both of whom served on my committee. Their encouragement, support and sensitiveness in reading the manuscript is highly appreciated.

My wife, Candida, deserves special thanks and appreciation for her continued encouragement, support and patience throughout my program at the University of California, Riverside.

Finally, I should like to thank the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Tanzanian Government for granting me a scholarship to pursue both Masters and Ph.D. programs at UCR.

I wish also to thank the National Institute of Education (NIE) for funding the "Alternative State Policy Mechanisms (ASPM) project for which I served as a research assistant. Without these financial supports I could not have completed my Ph.D. program.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

The Study of State Education Policy Mechanisms
and Goals in Arizona and California:
A Comparative Analysis

by

Paul Rajabu Kavishe

Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program in Education
University of California, Riverside, March 1985
Professor Douglas E. Mitchell, Chairperson

The primary purpose of the study was to investigate the goals and mechanisms of education policies in the states of Arizona and California. Specifically, the dissertation examined alternative approaches taken to seven basic state policy mechanisms (SPMs) and the related educational goals pursued by those states. The goal of the study is conceptual and exploratory rather than hypothesis testing. The initial working hypothesis was that educational goals or values control the selection of alternative approaches. Procedurally the study:
(1) identifies alternative approaches in each of the seven SPMs; (2) examines and differentiates the educational goals

of the key actors; and (3) explores the relationship between the goal preferences of the key actors and the level of attention given to various approaches to policy content.

The study is a comparative case study employing three data collection methods: interviews, questionnaires, and pertinent document analysis. Interview respondents included 66 key education actors--34 in Arizona and 32 in California. These were selected from four categories based on their roles within the state educational policy system: appointed officials in both legislative and executive staff offices; elected officials; educational interest group representatives; and two knowledgeable observers.

The study findings indicated that the identified SPMs accurately describe and classify education policies in the states. Additionally, a relationship was found between the goal preferences of key actors and the state's emphasis on particular policy approaches. From document analysis and interview responses, it was found that among the four educational goals studied (efficiency, equity, quality, and choice), quality surfaced as the critical contemporary issue in both states.

The findings of this study may have potential significance for both scholars and policy makers. Scholars should benefit from the availability of a taxonomic framework capable of describing and comparing the diverse education policies being pursued by various states, and policy makers, by utilizing the framework, may be able to more quickly identify and evaluate alternative strategies for improving the performance of the public schools.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

CHAPTER I

Introduction and Background of the Study

Introduction

Formal responsibility for public education in America rests with the fifty states.

> Although the Constitution of the United States of America contains no direct reference to education, most states' constitutions have specific provisions which make education a legal responsibility of the state (Campbell, 1975).

Education today is viewed as one of the major functions of state governments and most of state politics is politics concerned with public education. Major education policies have always been initiated and set at the state level. The ways in which states are involved in education vary; however, so do the political processes.

The statutes of most states stipulate, in considerable detail, how schools are to be governed. Much control is delegated to school district boards (except in Hawaii, which has no local districts), but major educational policy issues such as definition of programs, certification of personnel, financial support, and establishment of educational standards, are controlled at the state level.

As Campbell and Mazzoni (1976) noted, states occupy a pivotal position in arrangements that have evolved for

educational governance in the United States because they are constitutionally responsible for the establishment, support, and supervision of the public schools.

The importance of the role of the states in education is indisputable, well-documented and widely recognized. Iannaccone (1967) begins his classic chapter on "State Politics of Education" with the following: "Education is a state function--that statement serves as the most universal preliminary description of the public school system in America . . . ." (p. 37). In the same vein, Iannaccone (1975) emphasized the state's role in education by saying:

> The least understood, and singularly important fact about public education, [which] will become popular knowledge: every policy of any importance is determined at the state level (emphasis in original) (p. 97).

There is therefore ample and convincing evidence that there is a strong centralization of the American education system at the state level. Centralized state control manifests itself in practice as well as in theory.

> The state controls the financing of education in several ways. The state also establishes standards for teacher qualifications and teacher tenure; determines part of the required curriculum; sets the minimum school term; approves textbooks; and establishes procedures for student discipline (Keating, 1977, p. 7).

Indeed, education as a state function and the importance

of state-level actors and structures in educational policy making seem to be well established.

Politics and Education

Another important aspect in educational policy making which has been recognized and well-documented and worth mentioning briefly is that educational policy making is a political process. To understand the education policy-making at the state level, one should know the state political apparatus because education is part and parcel of the whole state political system. Education is a political issue and it involves the state political structures, processes, and actors. "The link between politics and education has long been recognized and noted from a variety of perspectives" (McGivney, 1984, p. 48), and education and politics are now recognized as inseparable (Lutz, 1971; Iannaccone, 1967, 1975; Koger, et al., 1975).

The notion that evolved in this country that politics and education should not have anything to do with each other is a myth based on a misunderstanding of politics, of the role of education in a democracy, and of the way in which that role is determined. The relationship between education and politics exists at every level of government: local, state and federal, and the educational policy-

making at the state level is determined by the combination of its political, social, and economic aspects.

State Political Structures and Education

Formal educational policy-making responsibilities at the state level are divided among three main political institutions or structures: the legislature, the executive branch and the judiciary.

The State Legislature.

The power to make state laws is vested in the state legislature, whose membership is elected from districts of substantially equal population for a certain period of time, usually two or four years. The main function of the legislature is to determine and frame public policy by adopting a state budget and passing regulatory laws. It has extensive powers. The legislature controls public finance by appropriating funds, levying taxes and borrowing money. The legislature influences the executive branch extensively through statutes which specify organization and procedures for the administrative agencies and through the funds it appropriates.

The legislature plays the most vital role in the determination of educational policy, especially decisions regarding finance, goals, requirements, etc. In a nutshell, the legislature determines the scope and the procedure

of the education policy-making process at the state level.

The Executive Branch.

Although the powers and responsibilities of the executive branch varies from state to state, generally, the executive branch administers laws and provides leadership in developing state policy. At the state level, the "supreme executive power" is vested in the governor. As chief executive of the state, the governor has extensive financial control, broad powers of appointment and authority over the organization and administration of the state bureaucracy. The governor also advised the legislature as to the condition of the state, recommends legilsation and confers regularly with leaders of the legislature. The governor prepares and submits to the legislature the annual budget covering expenditure for every branch of the state government. Governors are, therefore, generally seen as both the chief executive and the legislative leader of the state. Variations in governors' powers and interest in educational matters is also substantial. Recent studies, however, indicate that many governors in the states are becoming particularly influential in policy-making related to school finance and taxation (Campbell and Mazzoni, 1976; Murphy, 1980), and many are actively interested in other education policies.

The Judiciary.

The judicial branch has the responsibility of seeing that laws are applied justly and with equity in all matters brought before the courts. The courts also see to it that the executive and the legislative branches don't make or administer laws contrary to "constitutional tenets."

Since 1954, the federal courts have assumed a great deal of leadership in formulating or setting educational policy. Citizen dissatisfaction with the educational system or processes has led to court suits, often resulting in major changes, especially in issues concerning resource allocation, desegregation, busing, curriculum, special education, teacher and student rights, accountability, etc.

The courts' decisions have, to a certain extent, shaped both the legislative and the executive branches' actions on various issues, especially in equity issues. Both the legislative and the executive branch have readily complied to court decisions to avoid lawsuits and pressure or resistance from the constituents.

While the courts are an independent branch of the state government, they are affected or influenced greatly both by the legislature, whose statutes determine much of the courts' operations, and by the governor, who makes most of the judicial appointments.

State Educational Structures

There are many educational institutions that participate in educational policy formulation or process at the state level. The main institutions include the State Boards of Education (SBEs), the State Departments of Education (SDEs), the Chief State School Officers' offices (CSSOs), and the State Interest Groups (SIGs). The latter are primarily made up of professional organizations. Increasingly, however, some lay interest groups are quite powerful in state policy functions.

The office of the Chief State School Officer is increasingly powerful in shaping education policies in the states although the overall importance and impact varies considerably from state to state. In a major study, Campbell and Mazzoni (1976), for example, found that State Boards of Education (SBEs) see the CSSO as most important to their understanding of state policy issues and that, although governors and legislatures are not as dependent on the CSSO as state board members, they do attach considerable importance to the office. They also found that, although interest group leaders have some penchant to work directly with legislative leaders, that relationship is often established through the efforts of the CSSO. The overall importance of the office, however, varies from state to state. In some states the CSSO is selected by

the State Board of Education; in others, by the governor; in still others, by popular vote.

Both the state political structures and the state educational structures initiate and shape education policies formulated at the state level.

Organization of the Study

The study presented here examines educational policy making in Arizona and California. The study is a comparative case study, based on interviews with key policy makers, collection of survey data, and examination of pertinent documents including the education codes of the two states.

The study is part of a larger study funded by the National Institute of Education (NIE-G-83-0020) titled "Alternative State Policy Mechanisms for Pursuing Educational Quality, Equity, and Efficiency Goals." The larger study involves a total of six states--Illinois, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Wisconsin in addition to Arizona and California.

In the following chapter, related literature on educational policy-making will be reviewed. It includes also the statement of the problem and the significance of the study.

Chapter III describes the design and methodology of the study. It includes a discussion of the research

procedures used in the study, as well as a rationale for the use of comparative case-study approach.

Chapter IV presents a brief discussion of the dynamics of educational decision making in Arizona and California.

Chapters V and VI provide an in-depth description of the state policy mechanisms (SPMs) and the popular alternative approaches pursued by Arizona and California respectively for the past five years or so.

Chapter VII presents the survey data analysis for the selected demographic and policy-makers' goal orientations.

Chapter VIII presents the statistical analyses of the SPMs, the alternative approaches in each of the SPMs, and the relationships between policy-makers' goal orientations and the selection of the alternative approaches.

The final chapter summarizes the general findings, implications to scholars and practitioners, and the suggested areas for further study.

CHAPTER II

Related Literature on Educational Policy Making at the State Level

For the past two decades or so, attempts have been made to develop a theory of the state politics of education or educational policy making at the state level--a theory that describes, explains, and predicts educational governance change. As a result of this attempt, several different concepts have been utilized by scholars to explain state educational policy formation.

Since the 1950s seven distinct aspects of educational policy formation have been identified and studied by various authors. Some have studied only one aspect at a time and others have studied several of them at once. These aspects of educational policy making include: key actors, structures, process, basic issues, political culture, social science utilization, and basic policy mechanisms.

These concepts derive from the premise that education policy is made by actors who participate in and influence the educational system, and that these key policy actors have a place or role within established structures at the state level. Key actors engage in a process of

decision making and this process is characterized by the formation of basic issues which pass through several stages and are resolved by selecting policy mechanisms with which to exercise control over the performance of the school system. The definition of the basic issues and the orientations and actions of the key actors are shaped by a political culture. Social science utilization is a special problem that has received considerable attention by scholars interested in educational policy making. It has been identified as one significant factor influencing the process of decision making.

Also found in the literature on educational policy formation are various studies of research methods and the development of explanatory paradigms; but these are not particularly relevant to the present study and will not be reviewed here. These aspects or methods of study and paradigm development are, however, of considerable interest to some scholars.

The seven concepts identified and studied are not in any sense mutually exclusive because an author might use several of them at once--but these seven conceptualizations help to understand the differences among the approaches to account for state policy making.

Policy Key Actors in Educational Policy Making at the State Level

A substantial group of studies in educational policy making deals with the individual key actors who participate and make education policies. Studies in this area have focused on who makes education decisions, who has influence and how it is exercised and acquired, and who holds key positions of responsibility in the state's formal structures that shape education policies. Authors who have focused on this area include Bailey, et al. (1962), Masters, Salisbury, and Eliot (1964), Milstein and Jennings (1972, 1973), Iannaccone (1967), Campbell and Mazzoni (1976), Keating (1977), McGivney (1977, 1984), Mitchell (1981), Rosenthal and Fuhrman (1981, 1982). The individual key actors at the state level who have drawn the attention of scholars include legislators, educational professionals, state interest groups representatives, the governor, the chief state school officer, legislative staff, teachers, parents, members of the State Board of Education, and staff in the State Department of Education. Campbell and Mazzoni (1976), for example, studied a broad group of influential state actors, such as legislators, chief state school officers, interest groups, governors, professionals and staffers in twelve

states and found that:

(1) Chief state school officers are influential in education policy making, but not always in legislatures;

(2) some governors are actively involved in the general levels of funding for public schools; and that

(3) state legislators generally found teachers' associations with the greatest lobbying power.

Milstein and Jennings (1973), studying the New York State legislature, found that legislators tended to play a central role in educational policy making. The state legislature emerged as the central actor group in the policy making process in New York State--and also found to be the central locus of educational policy process. They argue, however, that the legislators are but one of the several groups that interact in the educational policy making. Other group actors included the governor, Board of Regents, State Department of Education, and the educational interest groups.

In his work, Shaping Legislative Decisions: Education Policy and Social Sciences, Mitchell (1981) focused mainly on the attitudes and perceptions of legislators, while Rosenthal and Fuhrman (1981) focused on who the leaders are, where they are located, where they get

information, the functions they perform and the impact they have on education policy making at the state level. In their study, Legislative Education Leadership in the States, these authors give a detailed account of legislators and staff members "who play a major role in deciding what education policy will and will not be."

Iannaccone (1967), focusing on the patterns of professional influence, developed a four state typology of linkage structures for examining educational policy making at the state level. The typology showed how state educational interest groups influenced the legislatures in different states, viewing this as the most important link in the state education policy making system. The typology included the following categories: Type I - disparate, with a locally based linkage structure; Type II - monolithic, with a state wide linkage structure; Type III - fragmented, with a state wide linkage structure; and Type IV - syndical, with a state wide linkage structure.

Iannaccone (1967) found that the education professionals are the most important influentials affecting legislative decisions and that their influence depends on how they are organized. He also noted that the politics of education in the states appears to develop over time along a continuum from Type I to Type IV and

that movement from stage to stage in the educational arena is accompanied by changes in the larger political system of state government. Recently, however, Iannaccone's typology or framework has been under careful study and scrutiny. McGivney (1977, 1984), for example, has revised the typology. He has provided more graphic and explicit descriptions of the states in the typology, and further conceptualized the stages as influence structures.

Other scholars, Kirst and Somers (1972), for example, noted that some states did not, and may never, fit Iannoccone's fourth stage and further suggested a fifth stage be added to the typology and labelled it a "collective stage." Mazzoni (1981) also observed that states like Minnesota may never pass through Iannaccone's fourth stage. In any case, Iannaccone's typology has been a useful tool in studying or understanding the influence structures of school professionals at the state level.

Structures

A lot of attention has been given to the formal structures of the stage government to conceptualize or explain how education policies are made. The state structures include the legislatures, State Boards of

Education, State Departments of Education, governors' offices, and other state education agencies.

Concern with the institutional or organizational aspects of policy function has mainly focused on legislative roles, and functions, levels of authority and the organizational set up of these institutions. Structures help to explain where education decisions are made and by whom. Those who have enriched the literature in this area include Milstein and Jennings (1973), Campbell and Mazzoni (1976), Rosenthal (1973), Uslaner and Weber (1977), Rosenthal and Fuhrman (1981, 1982), and others.

Rosenthal and Fuhrman (1981), for example, give a detailed study about the American state legislatures and education. They focused on the structures of legislative education leadership, both in terms of the characteristics of legislators and staff who exercise influence and the nature of the influence structures in the legislatures of 50 states. Their study focused mainly on how legislatures are asserting themselves in education policy as institutions. They argue that legislatures as institutions have been strengthened by the reapportionment and legislative reforms of the 1960s and that the state role in education expanded dramatically at the expense of local educational authority, especially in finance

issues. Another reason for the emergence of the legislatures in education policy making is due to the changes that took place in the institution itself from 1965-1975 by strengthening the legislative professional staff. They further argue that in the educational policy making arena legislatures have little competition from the State Departments of Education. Their study further identified who the leaders are in the legislatures, where they are located, where they get information, the functions they perform and the impact they have in shaping education policies at the state level.

Process

The process of decision making is characterized by issue formation and these issues pass through several stages before becoming education policies or decisions. The general political systems theory, for example, is a sub-category of process theory.

A substantial number of studies utilize general systems theory derived from Easton's work (1965): A Framework for Political Analysis to conceptualize the formulation of education policies. Systems theory views policy making as an interactive process through which inputs, including demands and support for change, are converted into outputs, including authoritative decisions. The impact of the systems literature on education first

became evident during the early 1970s. Scholars who have attempted to utilize the systems approach in examining educational policy making include Ziegler and Johnson (1972), Campbell and Mazzoni (1974, 1976), Glasman (1981), Murphy (1984), and others.

Campbell and Mazzoni (1976) argue that the policy decisions which are the system's outputs establish the goals and priorities governing subsequent choices. Policies declare "who gets what, when and how" (Lasswell, 1936). In this sense it is the education policy that gives direction to the allocation of such socially valued goods as school funds, instructional personnel, curriculum innovations, bargaining authority, etc. System actors consist of the relatively stable group of individuals who have a continuing concern with public school policy and who interact on a regular basis. Functional relationships include four functional stages in policy making, namely, issue definition, proposal mobilization, support mobilization and decision enactment.

Milstein and Jennings (1973), and Ziegler and Johnson (1972) have also utilized systems approach to describe their data. Ziegler and Johnson (1972), for example, in their effort to explain the allocation of educational resources, employed a model based on the systems theory. They attempted a massive quantitative analysis of

educational resources, employed a model based on the systems theory. They attempted a massive quantitative analysis of educational policy making in four states, namely Oregon, Massachusetts, North Carolina, and Utah. However, the model was inadequate in describing or explaining changes in educational expenditures from previous levels. They found that the changes in educational expenditures were a joing product of social, political, and economic aspects. The authors, however, claim that their work presents a general theory of educational policy making in the American states.

In connection with the concept of process, some studies have focused mainly on the various stages in the process of decision making. Scholars in this area look at the various acts at each stage from the initiation stage of education policy to the adoption and implementation stage. Authors who hav enriched the literature in this area include McGivney (1977), Campbell and Mazzoni (1976), Glasman (1981), Mitchell (1981), and others.

Mitchell (1981), for example, focusing on legislative process, described four stages of legislative educational policy formulation, namely, articulation, aggregation, allocation, and oversight. He argues that legislative decision making is appropriately conceptualized as a

legislative workflow process and that the examination of the stages in the legislative workflow will help to understand how legislatures make decisions.

Basic Issues

Another approach in understanding education policy making is the examination of the critical or controversial issue expressed, discussed, and adopted by the education system.

Wirt and Kirst (1983), for example, indicate that between 1970-1980 education research has focused primarily on school finance, categorical programs, school improvement, minimum competency and civil rights regulations. In his work, Critical Issues in Educational Policy, Rukin (1980) identified accountability, collective bargaining, the courts, desegregation, education for the handicapped or gifted, and staff development as critical issues in educational policy. Since the 1960s, equity, school finance, and educational opportunity have consistently been critical issues in education (Coleman, 1966; Wiseman, 1978; Garms, et al., 1979; Alexander, 1982; and others).

Mitchell (1984) argues that the major topics of educational policy research deal with four broad issue clusters: equity, school governance, teaching and learning, and the economics of education. Evaluation of

programs, services, and policies has been another critical issue in educational policy. Stuffle (1980), Glasman (1983), and others have stressed the importance of evaluating school programs, educational services, and policies. Another emerging critical issue in education in the 1980s is the concept of school reform and improvement. Studies in this area focus on quality in education, organizational changes so that they could be more responsive to changes and needs of the education system, emphasis on graduation requirements, technology and productivity. This thrust emerged after the popularized concern by the public that many high school graduates can't read, write or do simple arithmetic (Harris and Davis, 1979), and the unmet expectations of the business community. Those who have worked on this area include Kirst (1979), Turnbull (1981), Wirt and Kirst (1982), Mitchell (1983), Fuhrman (1984), McLaughlin and Catterall (1984), reports and comments of the Presidential Commission on Excellence, and others.

Political Culture

Some studies use the concept of political culture to interpret educational policy making at the state level. Political culture is viewed as consisting of beliefs, values, and symbols that define situations in which

political action occurs (Chilcote, 1981). Both basic issues and actions of policy actors within a system are shaped by political culture. The basic question in political culture studies has focused on how the values, beliefs and orientations of key policy actors and structures have been able to shape educational policy making at the state level.

Those who have worked on this area extensively include Murphy and Milstein (1967), Wirt (1977, 1980), Kimbrough (1982), Wirt and Kirst (1982), and others. Murphy and Milstein (1976), for example, stress the impact of state's political culture on the state's capacity to use federal dollars to achieve federal goals; that is, the ways of doing things in a given state influences the governmental agencies of that state. Work by Wirt (1977) identified the importance of state political cultures in the formulation and implementation of state policies. He further emphasized the point that decentralization and centralization orientations control and guide education policies at the state level.

Social Science Utilization

Social science utilization is a special aspect in the formulation of education policies. It has been studied as one factor influencing education decision making process.

A good number of theorists have focused on the utilization of social science research in recent years. Mitchell (1981), in his work, Towards A Theory of Social Science Utilization, argues that social science utilization has emerged as a major industry during the last three decades. Studies in this area focus on the impact of social science research on education policy formulation. Scholars who have worked extensively on this area include Wirt and Mitchell (1980), Mitchell (1981, 1984), Weiss (1977), Milstein and Jennings (1973), Coleman (1976), Rist (1976), Murphy (1980), and others.

The relationship between utilization of social research findings and formulation of education policies is indeed vital and it is increasingly getting attention.

Basic Control Mechanisms

Recently, an approach based on basic control mechanisms has been advanced as an approach to study or understand the formal educational policy making at the state level.

Mitchell and Iannaccone (1979), looking at legislative impact on school operations, argue that there are at least three basic legislative control mechanisms: namely, resource allocation, rule-making, and ideological articulation. They further suggest that these basic

policy mechanisms interact with structural arrangements, decision-making process, and work orientations operative within local school districts to determine the impact of any legislative policy.

In developing this concept further, very recently, in their work, Alternative State Policy Mechanisms for Influencing School Performance, Mitchell and Encarnation (1984) advanced a conceptual framework identifying the fundamental state policy mechanisms. They argue that state policy makers (whether in the legislative, executive or judicial branches of government) have at their disposal seven strategic mechanisms for influencing school performance. These seven basic mechanisms are: (1) structural organization, (2) revenue generation, (3) resource allocation, (4) program definition, (5) curriculum materials and selection, (6) personnel training and certification, and (7) student testing and assessment. They further argue that these seven state policy mechanisms are used, singly or in combination, to support or pursue particular educational policy goals. The three suggested overlapping educational goals include: efficiency, equity, and quality. They argue that these three competing educational policy goals have dominated the public education policy debates throughout the Twentieth Century. They argue, for example, that efficiency

emerged as a dominant educational policy theme in the 1920s and remained a preeminent concern of policy makers until the late 1950s. Equity emerged as a primary issue beginning with the Brown vs. Board of Education decisions (1954) and remained the most important problem facing education throughout the late 1950s, the 1960s and well into the 1970s. Quality, they suggest, emerged as a central goal in the wake of the Sputnik launching in 1957 and the subsequent decline of test scores, lack of positive findings from major evaluation studies, concern over declining productivity in American industries, and criticism of the skills of entering college freshmen and army recruits.

Mitchell and Encarnation (1984) maintain that these three fundamental educational policy goals exist in tension and that some policy makers and policy decisions continue to give primary attention to problems of the efficient use of resources, some continue to give dominant attention to equity, and others to quality. They argue, however, that demands for improvement in the quality of the education received by America's children has become a dominant force in most state policy systems and is viewed as the primary educational policy goal of the 1980s.

This general theoretical framework embodying the concepts of state policy goals and state policy mechanisms

seems to be a very useful framework for studying or conceptualizing the formal educational policy making at any level of the government. The linkages of these concepts can, in fact, show the nature and the overall direction of the education system. (See Appendix G).

Statement of the Problem

This dissertation has three major problems to investigate. Two are descriptive and one is explanatory.

The first descriptive problem is whether one can meaningfully conceptualize and accurately describe actual differences in the educational policis adopted by the states of Arizona and California. This is a descriptive problem because the states are very different. They have different constitutions, different legislative histories, different sets of actors, and different language systems for describing an approaching policy. The complexity and variations among state policy systems makes research difficult and requires that a descriptive system be developed that makes inter-state comparison possible. There is a general agreement among both scholars and policy makers that education policy is in some sense comparable. Faced with this problem, several scholars have attempted to find a perspective from which diverse policy actions become comparable.

The theoretical framework advanced by Mitchell and Encarnation (1984) can serve as an analytic tool for describing and classifying policies. If this framework is as useful as its authors contend, one should be able to meaningfully distinguish between the profile of policies adopted in Arizona and those found in California by using its core concepts. The differences between the two states will show up, first, with regard to the relative attention given to the various SPMs, and, second, with regard to the specific approaches taken within each SPM.

It should be noted at this stage, however, that Mitchell and Encarnation's framework has undergone substantial revision or modification during the course of this study. First, the notion of alternative approaches which characterizes the various strategies within each SPM is a completely new development not found at all in their work. Second, the Plant and Facilities SPM has been added to the framework. Mitchell and Encarnation apparently overlooked this important policy domain. Third, the SPMs of Revenue Generation and Resource Allocation, which were separated by Mitchell and Encarnation have been combined into a single mechanism (School Finance) in this study. These two were joined for this study because both are closely interrelated and can easily be

classified together; and more importantly, revenue generation is an aspect of the state general fund. There is no specific tax for education in either state. Support for education depends on the general fund revenue generated by the state through various means. With the recent passage of the Lottery initiative in California, however, this picture changes. The State is expected to receive 34% of the total lottery revenue to support public education. About $500 million in lottery revenue is expected annually to go to public education when it is operative. This can be viewed as a special education tax.

The second problem of this study is to determine what accounts for the differences in the states. Given the fact that one can now describe the states and the differences between them, it becomes possible to ask "why do states differ?" Mitchell and Encarnation (1984) suggested (although they didn't provide any evidence on this point) that variations in public policy values or goals account for the differences in the states. This assertion is a researchable problem. By measuring public policy goals or values of key decision makers and comparing them with the policy profiles within each state, it is possible to determine whether the policy goals of the key actors are responsible for shaping the content of the policies being adopted.

This raises a third research problem, one which is closely associated with the second one. How can one describe or assess the public policy goals of key actors within a state in such a way that those goals could be used for explanatory purposes? This problem can only be addressed correctly if there is a vehicle or mechanism to assess or measure the public policy goals of the key actors. For this study, a "Public Policy Value" instrument was designed to measure the public policy goals or value orientations of the key actors. This instrument is described in detail in Chapter III.

Significance of the Study

The state policy mechanisms (SPMs) and public policy goals have not been adequately studied. There is relatively little information about their relationships and usefulness as a common set of concepts in studying and comparing education policies in the states. If the framework advanced by Mitchell and Encarnation reveals to be a useful analytic took or framework for conceptualizing and comparing policies, then scholars and policy makers will have at their disposal a perspective capable of making interstate comparisons of the diverse education policies being pursued. The framework will provide us with a common set of concepts to make comparison across states.

The study will also increase our knowledge regarding the nature of education policies pursued in the two states, and this may stimulate areas for further research.

The Purpose of the Study

As stated earlier, the purpose of this study is to examine the state policy mechanisms (SPMs) and the fundamental public policy goals pursued by Arizona and California. Basically, the study has three objectives:

(1) To identify alternative approaches in each SPM,

(2) to examine and differentiate the educational or public policy goals of key policy actors, and

(3) to explore relationships between goal preference of the key actors and their choices of the alternative approaches.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study has been limited to educational policy making for the K-12 public education system. State courts were not studied because of limitations of resources although it is readily acknowledged that they are of importance in many cases. For the same reason the other levels of government (local and federal) were not studied, though these two levels of government greatly influence state educational policy making.

CHAPTER III

Research Design and Methodology

As stated in Chapter I, the purpose of this study is to examine educational policies in the states of Arizona and California. The study specifically examines the state policy mechanisms (SPMs) and the fundamental educational goals pursued by these two states. The general working hypothesis for the study is that educational goals or values significantly influence the selection of alternative approaches to SPM.

Location of Research Methodology

The study employs comparative case study approach. The two states selected for study are part of a larger study funded by the National Institute of Education (NIE) (NIE-G-83-0020) titled "Alternative State Policy Mechanisms for Pursuing Educational Quality, Equity, and Efficiency Goals" involving six states They were selected for this study, as for the larger study, because: (1) they have substantially different political cultures, levels of fiscal stress, and degrees of urbanization (Arizona is viewed as traditionalist, with a low fiscal stress and a fairly high degree of urbanization, while California is viewed as moralistic, having a medium fiscal stress, and

a high degree of urbanization) and (2) their geographical proximity permitted economical data collection

Rationale for Methodology

The comparative case study approach used in this study seems to be very appropriate methodology because, as Campbell and Mazzoni (1976) state, it

> . . . offers the best hope of understanding the reality of state governance, of generating and refining propositions about causal relationships and perhaps even of helping officials deal with the issues facing them.

A comparative case study approach has been used widely by scholars examining various aspects of education policy making in the states (see for example, Bailey, et al., 1962; Iannaccone, 1967; Berke and Kirst, 1972; Campbell and Mazzoni, 1976; Milstein, 1976; Wirt, 1977, 1980; McGivney, 1977, 1984; Mitchell, 1979, 1981; and Murphy, 1980). The approach is recognized as the most appropriate methodology to collect and analyze data for theory development.

Methods for Data Collection for the Study

Three main data collection methods were employed in this study: (1) interviews, (2) survey instruments (questionnaires), and (3) document analysis.

Interviews

There were two major phases of interview data collection:

First phase interviews were "exploratory" in nature. Respondents for the initial interviews included Chairpersons of the Senate Education and Fiscal Policy Committees, House Education and Fiscal Policy Committees, Legislative Staff Consultants, Superintendents of Public Instruction from the two states, interest group representatives, and two knowledgeable observers. Respondents were asked (1) to identify other key educational policy actors in their respective states; (2) to suggest relevant documents or reports dealing with important issues of policy or practice within the states; (3) to discuss the overall framework of one particular policy area (SPM). Several of the identified policy actors were interviewed in the same manner. The preliminary interviews were semi-structured, tape recorded interviews which took about 30 to 45 minutes each. The interview protocol used for the preliminary or initial interviews with key policy actors is found in Appendix A. During these preliminary interviews, 24 respondents were identified and interviewed in California and 22 in the state of Arizona. The information gained in these preliminary interviews was then used to develop the second round or final interviews.

Second Round Interviews

The final interviews consisted of a series of structured

and semi-structured tape recorded interviews with 30 key actors in Arizona and 16 in California. Interview Protocol and the Data Recording Form used during these interviews are shown in Appendix B. Respondents' views of the seven SPMs and approaches pursued within their own state were solicited. Respondents were presented with a list of the seven SPMs (see Appendix B) and asked "Which of these seven SPMs would you say has been getting the most attention in your state over the last two or three years?" For the few respondents for whom the question was not immediately clear, it was explained that "most attention" in the state meant the amount of time and effort spent by all state policy makers (executive as well as legislative). In addition to the state's ranking o- the SPMs and approaches, the respondents were asked to rank their own personal preferences for the alternative approaches. The personal preferences for the alternative approaches to each SPM were obtained by asking the respondents "Which of these approaches would you personally rank as the most promising way of handling SPM issues?" They were also asked on a scale of 1 to 10 how likely is it that the state will follow his/her preference on SPM policy in the near future.

Survey Instruments (Questionnaires)

Three questionnaires were used to collect supplementary data sets. These were: (1) a Policy Value Instrument, (2) a Level of Influence over Education Policies Exercised by Various Participants, and (3) a Biographical Data Instrument.

Policy Value Instrument

The Policy Value Instrument assessed respondent beliefs regarding importance of major educational policy problems. Respondents were asked to indicate their personal preferences on a series of pairs of problems; what they felt were the most important education policy problems in their respective states. The main objective in developing this instrument was to create a way of measuring differences or similarities in the respondent's orientations or values toward education policies in three major policy domains: finance, program definition and school organization. The instrument was designed to provide a comparative look at the values embraced by the key actors in the two states. The value orientations incorporated included efficiency, equity, quality and choice. One item representing each of these four basic social policy values was formulated for each of the three policy domains. Each item consisted of a short phrase

suggesting strategies that could be used in the improvement of the educational system. The twelve items used in this instrument are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Items Used Constructing the

Policy Value Instrument

Educational Problem Domains	Policy Values			
	Efficiency	Equity	Quality	Choice
School Program	Making programs more cost-effective	Giving more attention to children with special needs	Setting higher program standards	Increase program flexibility
School Finance	Improving the use of education tax dollars	Greater equalization of resources	Increasing the level of funding for schools	Reducing restrictions on local expenditure
School Organization	More efficient school management	Broader participation in decision making	Developing quality conscious leadership	Providing choices for families and children

The instrument is similar to the Resource Rating Scale (RRS) developed by Mitchell (1981). Each respondent is asked to indicate their preferences for alternative orientations. The instructions are given as follows:

Indicate your views by placing an "X" on the line nearer to the phrase in each pair that you feel is more important. Mark the space closest to the end of the line if that item is <u>much</u> more important than the other; mark the next space if it is <u>somewhat</u> more important; and mark the space close to the center of the line if it is only a <u>little</u> more important." The full instrument is shown in Appendix C. A typical item looks like:

Increasing Program Flexibility	_____ :	_____ :	_____ : :	_____ :	_____ :	X	Making Programs More Cost Effective

The X drawn on the above item indicates that a reponsdnet feels that making programs more cost-effective is much more important than increasing program flexibility. The scores of the instrument are comparative--a positive score for any particular policy problem is accompanied by a negative score for the problem shown at the other end of the bi-polar pair. Positive scores are assigned to the items closest to the respondent's X and a negative score to the item further from his/her mark (+3 and -3 if marked as above; +2 and -2 for marks in the next space; +1 and -1 for items marked closest to the center). The respondent's overall orientation becomes clear when the answers for each item are aggregated across all contrast

pairs. For further details about the (RSS) and scoring procedure, see Mitchell (1981), Shaping Legislative Decision: Education Policy and Social Science, pp. 172-174 and pp. 181-182). Analyses of the aggregated data from this instrument are to be discussed fully in Chapter VII.

Level of Influence Instrument

An instrument on the level of influence over education policies exercised by various patricipants in the state policy making system was also used with each respondent during the second interviews. The respondents were asked to indicate their personal judgment regarding the relative influence of seventeen key actor groups--ranging from the Governor's office to educational research organizations. Influence levels were reported on a scale of 1 - 7 whereby 1 indicated very low and 7 meant the actor goup had very high influence. The Level of Influence questionnaire is found in Appendix D.

Biographical Data Questionnaire

A Biographical Data Form was designed to solicit personal characteristics of the key actors that participated in the study (see Appendix E). The instrument included twenty selected personal variables. These variables were: (1) duration in present position, (2) age, (3) regular

occupation, (4) highest degree held, (5) bachelor's field, (6) master's field, (7) doctoral field, (8) teaching license, (9) administrative license holders, (10) nursing license holders, (11) law license holders, (12) engineering/arch., (13) medical/dental license, (14) psychology license, (15) other licenses, (16) political party affiliation, (17) political liberalism/conservatism, (18) family income, (19) sex, and (20) ethnicity.

The instrument was designed to see whether various personal characteristics of the key actors are linked with the ranking of the SPMs or policy approaches. The descriptive analysis of the respondents' personal characteristics and relationships will be discussed in Chapter VII.

Document Analysis

One major feature of this study was the analysis of massive documents and reports pertinent to the education policies in the two states. The relevant comparable documents in each state included education codes, state constitutions, annual budget documents, administrative regulations, pertinent legal decisions, pending legislative reports from relevant government agencies and from interest group organizations, journals, and related materials. Secondary sources of document data came from magazines, public statements, dissertations, catalogs, public opinion

polls and newspapers.

Two newspapers were covered during the period of this study, the Arizona Republic and Sacramento Bee. Newspapers proved to be valuable because capitol reporters often had access to different sources of information than the researchers. Often the newspaper reports and data collected in the two capitols proved complementary.

Selection of Respondents

A total of 66 key education actors in Arizona and California participated in the study. The respondents were drawn from four roles categories: (1) appointed public officials, (2) elected political officials, (3) interest group representatives, and (4) one knowledgeable observer from each state. All respondents were individuals who were formally involved with or had achieved a reputation for being influential on educational policy making at the state level. As shown in Table 2, there were 31 appointed public officials with formal responsibility for formation or execution of education policies who participated in the study. These appointed officials included: Legislative Staff Consultants, Executive (Governor's office)/Budget Staff, and State Department of Education officials.

The second group of policy actors were elected

Table 2.2

List of Respondents' Categories and Their Roles

Category	Respondents' Roles	AZ	CA	Total
1	Appointed Officials			
	A. Legislative Staff Consultants			
	Education Policy Committees		3	3
	Fiscal Policy Committees	2	2	4
	Research/Analyst Staff	2	4	6
	Other Legislative Staff	1	3	4
	B. Executive (Governor's Office)/ Budget Staff			
	Special Educational Advisor to Governor	1	1	2
	Division of Finance	1	1	2
	Speaker's Educational Advisor		1	1
	C. State Department of Education			
	Deputy/Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction	3	1	4
	Assistant to the State Superintendent	1		1
	Local Assistance Bureau		1	1
	Program Evaluation, Student Testing and Teacher Basic Competency Programs	2	1	3
	Sub-total Appointed Officials	13	18	31
2	Elected Officials:			
	A. State Superintendents of Public Instruction	1	1	2
	B. Members, State Boards of Education	3		3

Table 2.2 (continued)

Category	Respondents' Roles	AZ	CA	Total
2 (cont'd)	C. Legislators			
	Senate Education Policy Committees			
	Chairpersons	1	1	2
	Members	1	1	2
	Senate Fiscal Policy Committees			
	Chairpersons	1	1	2
	Members	1	1	2
	House Education Policy Committees			
	Chairpersons	1	1	2
	Members	1	1	2
	House Fiscal Policy Committees			
	Chairpersons	1	1	2
	Sub-total, Elected Officials	11	8	19
3	State Interest Group Representatives (SIGs)			
	State Administrators' Associations	2	1	3
	State School Boards Associations	3	1	4
	State Teachers' Associations	3	2	5
	Others	1	1	2
	Sub-total, SIGs	9	5	14
4	Knowledgeable Observers			
	University Scholar and Administrator, University of Arizona	1		1
	Former Senate Education Committee Staff Consultant		1	1
	Sub-total, Knwoledgeable Observers	1	1	2
	Grand Total	34	32	66

political officials. There were 19 elected officials who participated in this study including Chief State Officers (CSS)s) of each state, members of the State Boards of Education, and state legislators (both education and fiscal committee roles).

The third category of respondents consisted of 14 State Interest Group Representatives. These representatives were drawn from the full range of organized interest groups directly concerned with education policies, such as the State Teachers' Association (NEA/AFT affiliates), the State School Boards Association (NSBA affiliates), the State Administrators Association (AASA affiliates), and tax payer association.

The last category of respondents consisted of two knowledgeable observers. These included one university scholar and one former policy actor. In Arizona, a university scholar, who is also Dean of the College of Education, participated in this study as a knowledgeable observer. In California, a former staff consultant to the State Senate Education Committee was selected for the study.

CHAPTER IV

Dynamics of Educational Decision-making in Arizona and California

Formal educational policy making in Arizona and California involves the interactions of various key policy actors--such as Legislators, Legislative staff, State Board of Education (SBE) members, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Departments of Education (SDE) Staff, the Governor's Offices and State interest groups. Educational policy-making is a highly politicized process which involves conflicts, bargaining, building of coalitions and compromises among the competing groups in the attempt to formulate and adopt education policies. As the Director of the Assembly Office of Research noted during the preliminary interviews:

> "Education policies are a result of political and institutional forces rather than rational decisions or compromises."

In both states, the Legislature, SBE, SDE, and the State Interest Groups (SIGs) seem to be the main actors or agencies that influence educational policies. When the respondents were asked to assess the influence of various actors over school policies (using the Level of Influence Instruments), they agreed that Legislative actors dominate education policy making. They differed,

significantly, however, in their views regarding the importance of other key actors. Table 3 shows the ranking of all influential groups. The most notable variation between the two states is the relative influence of the State Board of Education. Arizona respondents viewed the SBE as the third most influential agency while respondents in California ranked it 15th. This concurs with document and interview analyses that the Arizona SBE is relatively more influential than the California SBE in terms of initiating policies or programs.

Both the teacher organizations and administrator organizations were ranked relatively low in Arizona, while the California respondents viewed them as relatively influential. Taken together, all education interest groups were ranked third in California and ninth in Arizona. Teacher and administrator organizations were ranked fifth and eighth respectively in California, while Arizona respondents ranked them eleventh and fourteenth. These rankings concur with data from the preliminary interviews indicating that interest groups in California, especially California Teachers' Association (CTA) and the California Roundtable have exerted a lot of influence on school policies for the past few years. These two groups for example, participated effectively in shaping SB 813 in 1983.

Table 3

Ranking of Influentials in Arizona and California

Actor Group	AZ Rank	AZ Mean	CA Rank	CA Mean	Total Rank	Total Mean
The State Legislature	2	6.10	1	6.23	1	6.14
Key Legislative Committee Members	1	6.17	2	6.10	2	6.13
Superintendent of Public Instruction and SDE Staff	4	5.10	6.5	5.07	3	5.09
Key Legislative Consultants	7	4.80	4	5.43	4	5.00
All the Education Interest Groups	9	4.48	3	5.71	5	4.92
School Boards Association	6	4.93	10	4.07	6	4.66
Non-Education Interest Groups	5	5.07	11	3.64	7	4.61
State Board of Education	3	5.23	15	3.21	8	4.59
Teacher Organization	11	3.80	5	5.36	9	4.29
Federal Policy Mandates	8	4.60	12	3.57	10	4.27
Governor and Staff	12	3.70	6.5	5.07	11	4.14
State and Federal Courts	10	4.00	9	4.21	12	4.07
State Administrators Organization	14	3.37	8	4.64	13	3.77
Lay Groups (PTA, etc.)	13	3.47	13	3.50	14	3.48
Education Research Organizations	15	2.93	16	2.86	15	2.91
Direct Referenda	17	2.38	14	3.43	16	2.72
Producers of Educational Products	16	2.48	17	2.36	17	2.44

The Superintendents of Public Instruction and SDE staffers are viewed as fairly influential in both states. During the preliminary interviews, it was noted that the Superintendent of Public Instruction in the two states had played a dynamic role in influencing education policies. The California Superintendent, for example, participated effectively in the coalition that shaped SB 813 in 1983. SB 813 is seen as the most comprehensive educational reform bill adopted in recent years and resulted from the combined efforts of the Chairpersons of Education Committees of both Houses, the compromising of party leaders, and a keen interest in education finance on the part of the Speaker of the Assembly. The Superintendent of Public Instruction also initiated development of the Model Graduation Requirements which were later adopted by the SBE and the Legislature in January, 1984.

In Arizona, the Superintendent of Public Instruction has also acted forcefully to define the goals of the education system, but with less success. Twice elected, the Arizona Superintendent has tried to define an effective vision of the state's educational system for more than seven years. Building a winning potential coalition in Arizona is more difficult than in California, however. As the Executive Director, Arizona School Administrators, Inc. noted:

> There is inability to make coalition. There is a lot of disagreement among groups. The Legislature is aware that there is no common ground as far as education is concerned. There is a need to have a plan at the state level--to have a purpose.

In Arizona, the SIGs seem to have no clout in influencing education policies in the state. The Arizona Education Association (AEA), for example, has generated a lot of ideas to improve the quality of K-12 education in the state, but has been unable to penetrate the system. In January, 1984, AEA released a report "A Call to Excellence" which contained specific recommendations for improving K-12 public education, but they were not taken seriously by the law makers--none of its central elements were enacted into law.

Limited Written Policy Documents

Another aspect that was observed during the preliminary interviews was the limited number of written documents used within the policy system. Few respondents were able to identify background papers or research documents used to formulate or interpret adopted programs or policies. State budgets and the prepared bills are of course routinely used. But they are the only documents routinely used by most policy makers. The state budget was indeed the most comprehensive means by which state governments make education policies. The budget allocates the limited resources,

regulates human conduct, mediates conflicts among the competing groups, and organizes public action. School politics at the state level in both states always come to focus upon the budget.

Policy Maker's Orientations

When respondents in both states were asked to indicate their policy orientations toward fundamental educational policy goals or values (quality, efficiency, equity, and choice), the results revealed that educational quality is, indeed, the most critical contemporary issue. Although California and Arizona have both stressed quality, California is more interested in quality than Arizona. The recently adopted reform bill (SB 813) and the Model Graduation Requirements are but a few examples indicating the thrust of quality in California. California respondents were clearly less interested in efficiency issues and more interested in quality than were their counterparts in Arizona. Choice orientation was far behind quality, efficiency, and equity in both states.

Local versus State Control

Another salient issue observed during the interviews is the tension between local and state control. The state-level has been given a broad statutory authority in many areas--such as certification or personnel, fiscal policies,

program definition, graduation standards, state-wide testing, professional advice on the selection of curriculum materials and establishment of standards for school facilities and student safety. The local educational agencies (LEAs) have been given limited statutory authority over school programs. There is an increasingly high degree of centralization of the education system in both states through fiscal policies and program supervision. The key actors interviewed split over this issue of state versus local control. Some key actors prefer state level control of K-12 education maintaining that the locals don't have the power and ability to initiate and implement educational reforms or innovations. others who prefer local control argue that the locals should be given the necessary financial assistance by the state, be given more control over the school programs, and be accountable for the student and program performance. The tension of state versus local control is indeed delicate--but it seems, however, that the balance of power is shifting forcefully toward stronger state level control. For the past decade or so, the state level has assumed more responsibility--especially in funding K-12 public education, defining and regulating various programs, and it has aggressively tried to define and give the overall direction of the educational systems in the two states. As one

representative of the California School Boards Association (CSBA) remarked:

> There is a shift of power to the state level--powers of the locals are limited.

As described more fully in Chapters V and VI, there is broad agreement among the respondents across the two states regarding the amount of attention given to each of the SPMs. Finance and Personnel SPMs were reported to have received most attention by both states for the past three years or so. The School Plant and Facilities SPM has received the least amount of attention in both states.

CHAPTER V

Description of the State Policy Mechanisms (SPMs) in Arizona

Chapters V and VI provide an in-depth description of the state policy mechanisms (SPMs) and the most frequently used alternative approaches pursued by each state. Each chapter is divided into sections dealing with each of the seven SPMs: school finance, personnel, student testing, program definition, school organization, curriculum materials, and school plant and facilities. The description of these seven SPMs and the alternative approaches which have received the most attention within each state will provide a clear picture of what is happening in the two states. The analysis is basically descriptive and is drawn from information gathered from relevant documents, reports, regulations, education laws, and interview responses.

I. School Finance in Arizona

School finance in the state of Arizona is characterized by two approaches to finance control: equalization and expenditure limitation. Over the past decade, Arizona has experienced two major school finance reforms. The first

occurred during a Special Session of the Legislature in 1973/74; the second came in 1979/80. During the 1973/74 Special Session of the Legislature, major changes were made in the equalization formula and increased the amount of state aid to schools. Only the General Maintenance and Operation (M&O) section of the budget was "equalized" as a result of SB 1001. Maintenance and Operation budget includes administration, instruction and operation, that is, the basic education program.

In 1980, a second finance reform extended equalization through adoption of control limit formulas to control district income. This reform also did away with categorical funding and established a block grant system of funding special services. In addition, expenditure limitation was introduced through a Constitutional Aggregate Expenditure Limit for all school districts.

A. Constitutional Aggregate Expenditure Limit for All School Districts:

During the summer of 1980, a series of ten amendments to the Constitution of Arizona were presented to the voters. All of the amendments were approved. One of the amendments provided an expenditure limitation for cities, towns, and counties. If cities, towns and counties need to expend above the limitation, they must have voter approval.

Another amendment, approved by the voters, imposed expenditure limitations on community colleges and school districts. Expenditure increases under this limitation were also based on changes in population and the cost of living. The spending limitation for school districts applies to the aggregate expenditures of all districts. It is a restriction on total spending by all districts rather than a restriction on individual school districts.

The Constitutional Aggregate Expenditure Limit includes the majority of expenditures by school districts. This limitation covers most Maintenance and Operation expenditures, capital outlay and federal impact aid (PL874 Funds). Most expenditures for federal grants, capital levy, and debt service are exempt from the constitutional limitation.

The Constitutional Aggregate Expenditure Limitation allows expenditures to grow based upon changes in the state's student population and inflation. The inflationary increase is based upon changes in the Gross National Product (GNP) Price Deflator.

B. Legislative Expenditure Limitation for Individual School Districts

Under terms of the 1980 equalization plan, each school district has an individual expenditure limitation which was to be equalized over a five-year period. Various

factors are used in calculating this limit:

(1) The student count from the previous budget year. Student count is the Average Daily Membership (ADM) reported through the 100th day in session by each district. The ADM is subject to adjustment based on the absence rate and allowable exclusions.

(2) Certain "Special Educational" programs. These include certain vocational programs together with a limited number of programs for handicapped students; e.g. hearing, visual, multiple, and physical.

(3) A Teacher Experience Index (TEI) which compares the average experience level of each school district [measured in years per Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)] to the state average. SB1233 (March, 1984) has permitted school districts to use all years of experience served outside the district to compute the TEI.

(4) Size and type of school district determines the amount in the budget. Smaller districts (as measured in terms of student count) are allowed to increase their budgets by a statutorily prescribed percentage.

(5) "Declining Districts"--that is, districts experiencing a decline in their student count may elect to use statutory provisions which limit the reduction of 95% of the student count in the previous year.

(6) Growing school districts that experience a

significant change in their growth patterns may be eligible to recalculate their budget limits and eligibility for financial assistance.

(7) Equalization Assistance aimed at reducing disparity among the district expenditure levels. Beginning with the 1982-83 school year, no district will be more than 10% below the state-support level. Comparable expenditure capacities for all school districts are expected during the fiscal year 1986.

(8) Capital Outlay Transfer: School districts may transfer up to 50% of their capital outlay capacity to their maintenance and operation budget. The amount utilized cannot exceed 10% of the revenue control limit (RCL). School districts are not eligible for thie transfer if they have any budget overrides in effect. This transfer, however, is only effective through the 1984-85 school year.

Capital outlay funds can be used for textbooks, instructional materials, equipment, buses, etc.

(9) Sale, Lease, or Rental of School Property: Districts are allowed to utilize the proceeds from the sale, lease, or rental of school property to increase their budget limit.

(10) Excess Utilities: School districts are allowed to exclude certain excess utility costs from the revenue control limit.

(11) Heavily Impacted Districts: Districts that are classified as heavily impacted by the federal government are allowed to increase their budget limit based upon receipt of federal impact aid assistance (PL81-874). The maximum allowable increase is 10% of a school district revenue control limit. Under SB1332 (1984), school boards may include P181-874 monies for handicapped children with specific learning disabilities, children residing on Indian land, when determining the M&O budget--without an override election.

(12) Extended School Year: Districts which implement an extended year program are allowed to budget any excess costs outside the budget limit. This provision, however, is only applicable to the first year of operation.

(13) Destruction, Damage or Removing Health or Safety Hazards: Districts may petition to the County Board of Supervisors through the County School Superintendent for authorization to exceed the budget limit in the event of destruction of, or damage to the facilities of a school or to remove a health or safety hazard.

C. Capital Funds:

There are three capital expenditure funds:

(1) Budgeted Capital Outlay: This fund has statutorily prescribed expenditure limit based on the student count from the previous year. The funds are used for textbooks,

instructional materials, vehicles, equipment, etc.

(2) Capital levy fund: This fund is not equalized. This fund is generated by the application of a tax (limited to $.30/.60 per $100 of assessed valuation dependent upon the type of district; that is, common, high, or unified district) on the taxable property located in the school district. Capital levy funds can be used for school construction, purchasing buses, building structures, etc. However, voter approval is required if these funds are aimed at construction and site acquisition.

(3) Debt Service Fund: This fund is utilized to accumulate revenue to be used for paying interest and redemption expenses associated with voter-approved bond issues. School districts are constitutionally limited to maximum debt ceilings.

D. Special Projects Funds:

These funds include those categorically funded programs by either the state or federal governments.

E. Local Leeway Through Overrides:

School districts may secure voter authorization to exceed the statutory prescribed budget limits. Overrides to exceed the Maintenance and Operation limit are restricted to a maximum of 10% of the Revenue Control Limit, and may be authorized for three years. Overrides to exceed the budgeted Capital Outlay limit are not limited in terms of

the amount, but are authorized for one year only. Overrides are generally supported by property taxes. Table 5 shows the district expenditures and percentage of total expenditures for the fiscal year 1982-83 in Arizona.

F. Sources of Revenue for Arizona Public Schools: Arizona public school finance is a combination of federal, state, and local revenues. Local property taxes contribute about 40% of the K-12 education funding while the state contributes about 51%. The federal government's contribution is about 8½%. In Arizona, only 17.9% of the total land is subject to property taxation. The rest is owned by the federal government, the state or Indian tribes (ATRA, 1979, p. 5). About 27% of the land is owned by Indian tribes and on these reservations are located the school districts with the lowest assessed value per pupil. Indian land is not subject to property tax. The federal government has had a responsibility for Indian education and provides major resources for these schools.

G. Uniform System of Financial Records (USFR):

The development of a uniform system of financial records has been mandated by the Arizona legislature to:

(a) "Ensure that state financial assistance is properly accounted for, and

(b) obtain timely and meaningful financial information."

The USFR document, prepared by the State Department

Table 5

District Expenditures and Percentage of Total Expenditures for FY 1982-83 in Arizona

Maintenance and Operation	Amount	Percent
Regular Educational Programs		
Administration	$ 41,729,288.81	3.32
Instruction	492,225,783.36	39.12
Instruction Support	131,983,606.31	10.49
Operation	220,694,295.30	17.54
Total	$ 886,632,973.78	70.47
Special Educational Programs		
Administration	$ 3,318,301.28	.26
Instruction	105,962,184.69	8.42
Instruction Support	17,370,638.40	1.38
Operation	8,992,641.85	.71
Total	$ 135,643,766.22	10.78
Transportation		
Operation	$ 46,448,477.92	3.69
Transfers and Expenditures from School Plant Funds	$ 2,844,022.63	.23
Total Maintenance and Operation	$1,071,569,240.55	85.17
Special Projects		
Federal	$ 57,704,941.30	4.59
State	1,376,695.79	.11
Total	$ 59,081,637.09	4.70
Capital Outlay	75,332,219.41	5.99
Capital Levy	52,147,653.86	4.14
Grand Total Expenditures	$1,258,130,250.91	100.00
Total Resident and Non-Resident ADM	495,855,712	
Grand Total Expenditures per ADM	$ 2,537.38	
Total Maintenance and Operation Expenditures per ADM (Fund 000)	$ 2,161.05	

Source: Arizona Department of Education: Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for FY 1982/83, p. 9.

of Education and the Office of the Auditor General, gives detailed guidance concerning school finance and accounting in all school districts.

Summary

The 1973/74 school finance reform in Arizona produced major changes in the equalization formula and increased the amount of state aid to schools. As noted by Hall and Rawls (1979), between 1972 and 1978, the state aid portion to total school expenditures increased from 37% to 44%. The objectives of the 1980 school finance reform were similar to those of 1974. They included retaining of local autonomy, establishing equalization of wealth and taxation per pupil and providing property tax relief. The legislature produced adjustments to the equalization formula to further support equalization.

The legislature also made changes in the method of distributing state aid from categorical to block grant aid and again increased the amount of state aid to public schools.

As pointed out earlier, the most significant changes in the 1979/80 school finance reform were the constitutional and legislative limitations imposed on expenditures and revenues for the state and school districts.

It seems, then, that during the last decade, three

main approaches to school finance have been pursued: equalization, limiting, and increasing. Equalization has been pursued to remove the variations in funding school districts; expenditure limitation measures are aimed at increasing efficiency and accountability. Overall increases in appropriations have been forthcoming, however, to increase the state's aid portion to public schools. Limitation seems to be the most prominent approach in school finance policy in Arizona although limitation and equalization approaches are being pursued simultaneously.

As one member of the legislative finance committee noted, "limitation is going to be a part of life in the schools for the foreseeable future."

There is, however, a conflict between limitation and increasing and also some doubts as to whether the equalization formula adjustments enacted by the legislature are effective enough to achieve the target of equalization by 1985/1986.

Three educational goals or values have been embodied in the two school finance reforms in Arizona: equity, efficiency, and accountability. Equity has been a major impetus for school finance--not only in Arizona, but also nationwide for the past decade or so. Arizona was among the many states that spent a great deal of time and effort in reforming their school finance systems to move

toward equality of educational opportunity for its citizens. As noted by Arellano (1983), by 1980 there have been thirty-six states in which school finance cases were addressed.

Many studies in the 1960s and 1970s focused on school district tax rates and school finance formulas and the inequitable relationships between them (see for example Conant, Sexton, Coleman, Guthrie, Coons, Clune, Sugarman, and others). They determined that pervasive inequalities in the school finance formulas existed in most states and that it would be extremely difficult to remedy through the legislative process, and instead suggested judicial redress as a more promising method to invoke school finance reforms. Although the school finance reform movement nationwide gained momentum through the judicial system, the task of determining practical solutions remained with the state legislatures. In some states, court cases induced legislative action and in others th threat of a suit was enough to induce legislatures to consider school finance reforms.

In Arizona, finance reform was done by the Hollins v. Shofstall case of 1973 which contended that the state school finance system violated the equal protection clause of both the U.S. and Arizona constitutions. The Maricopa County Superior Court upheld the case in terms of unequal

protection of taxpayers but not of students. Although the case was eventually overturned on appeal by the State Supreme Court later in 1973, the Arizona legislature had already taken steps toward reform in the 1973/74 Special Session.

The pressure for school finance reform in Arizona came from various points: the nationwide court decisions, and especially from the California experience; the political movement calling for property tax relief, the effective role of the Education Commission of the states as a leader in providing technical assistance to states about school finance and demographic pressures.

Arrellano (1983) argues, however, that

> . . . the impetus for school finance reform in Arizona differed from many states due to its unique demographic and economic situation. The state is characterized by large land areas which are sparsely populated, a small percentage of taxable private land, rapid population growth in specific urbanized areas and large native American and Mexican-American populations. During the 1960s and 1970s, Arizona had to contend with a small revenue base, demands for increased services and a mushrooming school-aged population while other states were dealing with declining enrollments. School finance and property tax refurm was focused on increasing state aid to schools and equalizing the tax burdens among the state's taxpayers (p. 5).

Efficiency and accountability goals are also embodied in the school finance system in Arizona. Legislative intent for the 1979/80 school finance law, for example, emphasizes

the fact that the legislature recognizes the need for efficient school funding systems and increased accountability for the expenditures of state and local funds for education in the State. And the Uniform System of Financial Records (USFR) calls for efficient financial management and greater accountability by district governing boards and administrators.

Arizona has put a lot of emphasis on local control over funding and program development. During the passage of the School Finance Law in 1979/80, the legislature stated very emphatically that it intends to increase the authority and responsibility of local school boards in determining how revenues will be utilized, and that the responsibility and authority for establishing program priorities, as well as for seeking more efficient and effective means of educating students, will rest with the ocally elected school boards. This concept of local control has been a guiding principle in most of the education policies in Arizona.

Arizona has had school finance reforms every five years. Finance will probably dominate the 1985/86 legislative session. There is a feeling that the policy debates will continue to be dominated by issues of limiting and equalizing funds. Targeting funds on the needs of special groups of students is also expected to receive substantial

attention in the near future. The groups who are most likely to be targeted are: handicapped children, migrant education, education for the gifted, pre-school programs, and Indian education.

A rhetorical emphasis on the concept of local authority will continue to prevail for some time, but erosion of the local control by the state has been substantial. For the past five years or so, the state-level has been given a broad statutory power of authority over many policy areas. As one respondent noted: "State control is winning. No doubt about it."

II. School Personnel Policies in Arizona

For the past three years or so, the State of Arizona has pursued different approaches to improve the quality of the state's personnel programs. Emphasis has been given to systematically evaluating prospective teachers while at the same time restructuring pre-service teacher preparation programs.

A. Teacher Certification

The Teacher Certification Unit of the Arizona State Department of Education is the agency that sets standards for teacher credentialing. Professional Standards and Certification Advisory Committee "acts in an advisory capacity to the ASBE in regard to matters related to

teacher education programs and rules and regulations governing the certification of teachers for the purpose of maintaining an effective certification procedure in the State of Arizona."

Since October 1, 1980, applicants for the Arizona basic standard or equivalent certificates have had to pass the Arizona Teacher Proficiency Examination (ATPE). Applicants from Arizona institutions of higher learning must pass the ATPE prior to initial certification. All others have until the end of their first year of teaching. Very recently, however, under HBZ156 (1984), an additional requirement that the ATPE be passed before a person qualifies for entrance into a teacher training program at an Arizona university has been adopted. Non-resident applicants must pass the test to qualify for a certificate. Certificates secured in other states are not transferable to the state. All certificates issued in Arizona are based on the preparation of the applicant and not on any certificate held from other states. The ATPE has two components--a basic skills component which includes reading comprehension, grammar and mathematics; and a professional knowledge component which includes classroom management, curriculum and instruction, assessment, evaluation, growing and learning theories, educational foundations, organization and administration of the school. The professional

knowledge component is currently only being utilized on a pilot study basis. Passing score for the basic skills component is 80% correct responses and for the professional knowledge component it is 50%. In addition to the ATPE, U.S. and Arizona constitution examinations must be passed during the first year of certification.

B. Types of Credentials

There are five categories of credentials in Arizona.

1. Teaching Certificates: These include (a) elementary, K-8; (b) secondary, 7-12 (requiring a 30 semester hour major in a subject area); and (c) special education, K-12, for mentally, physically, or emotionally handicapped, learning disabled, etc.

2. Administrative Certificates: There are six of these: (a) supervisor K-8; (b) supervisor 7-12; (c) special education supervisor K-12; (d) principal K-8; (e) principal 7-12; (f) superintendent K-12.

3. Endorsements: There are about ten endorsements in such areas as P.E., Indian Arts, Librarian, Reading, Guidance Counselor, Driver Education, Bilingual Teacher, etc.

4. Vocational Certificates: These include agriculture, home economics, health occupations, adult vocational education, etc.

5. Professional Non-teaching Certificates: These are for school psychometrist, assistant school psychologist, and school psychologist.

C. Pre-Service Training and Certification Improvement

1. University and College Role: There are five accredited institutions of higher learning in Arizona, three public and two smal Baptist colleges. Following the passage of HB2156 (1984), students must pass the basic skills examination prior to admittance to teacher training. It is now regarded as an entry rather than exit examination. The students take teacher training as part of their undergraduate work, however.

2. Arizona Basic Skills Chart: During the current year, the State Board of Education has adopted a series of specific basic skills lists for students at each grade level. The basic skill areas include computation, communication, and citizenship skills. It is usually referred to as the 3Cs. The basic skills charts have been sent to all accredited teacher training institution with the expectation that they will be incorporated into teacher pre-service training programs. The basic skills chart, unique in itself, shows both the content and the process to achieve the desired skills.

3. Northern Arizona University Center for Education Excellence: Northern Arizona University (NAU) has pulled

something of a coup by dismantling its School of Education and getting Regents support for creation of a series of decentralized "Centers for Excellence" across the state. The plan is to have these centers do both pre-service and in-service training. The proposal was initiated by NAU and it was approved by both the Regents and the Arizona State Board of Education. The program was not mandated by the legislature.

4. Arizona Teacher Residency Program (ATRP): The ATRP is a two year field based teacher training and assessment program which allows applicants with a B.A./B.S. plus 15 hours of teaching methodology to be part-time teachers in special areas (notably science and math). The program is still in the pilot stage, but the State Department of Education staff who supervise it clearly hope to have it become a regular program for certifying and monitoring a substantial group of teachers. It is also a voluntary program. During the 1982-83 school year, 40 teachers in five school districts participated in the ATRP. In the second year of the pilot study (1983-84)--it is expected that about 13 school districts with about 100 teachers will take part in the program.

5. Minimum Salaries: In Arizona, there is no state-wide salary requirements. Each school district sets its

own salary schedule. Average starting salary for B.A. and no experience is $11,500 per year. A bill (HB2480) was introduced this year to set minimum salaries at $20,000 beginning in 1985-86, and setting $40,000 for teachers at the top end of the salary schedule. These numbers are based on a 185 day contract year and would require adjustment for longer work years. The bill, backed by the Arizona Education Association (AEA), failed passage in this year's session. There is a feeling, however, that the idea of minimum salaries can get at least some serious support. In a study commissioned by the AEA in 1983, it was found that "Arizona residents believe starting teachers in the state receive less than they actually do" (p. 27). Some policy makers in Arizona, however, maintain that it is important to "clean-up the profession" before increasing salaries.

D. Professional Development:

Recently, the State of Arizona has put great emphasis on in-service training and on the establishment of a principal academy/summer institute--both for teachers and administrators, so as to improve their effectiveness.

1. Arizona Principal's Academy/Institute(APA): APA was created by the State Board of Education, and it started for the first time in the summer of 1984 with at

least 300 participants in two-week residency instructional leadership and teacher evaluation courses advertised as "down to earth and practical." The main objective of the institute is to "provide administrators with the tools to make school improvement a reality" (SDE, 1984). All principals in the state are eligible to participate on a voluntary basis. They may bring one or two teachers as a school improvement team. The sessions are to be offered by outstanding professionals drawn from education and business communities. A fee of $75.00 is set for each session. The Arizona Principal's Academy was endorsed by the legislature under SB1226, and given a $40,000 appropriation. The State Board of Education created a Principal Institute Advisory Committee for planning and organization of the sessions. The sessions are to be held on a university campus. Three graduate credits will be awarded by NAU to graduates.

2. The Northern Arizona University Center for Education Excellence offers both in-service and pre-service training. Local school districts make arrangements with the universities/colleges for their teachers to participate in the various in-service training programs.

3. Arizona Teacher Residency Program (ATRP): The ATRP, discussed earlier, can be viewed as both pre-service and in-service program. The two-year field-setting teacher

preparation program involves systematic and intensive peer evaluation and teamwork. Those residents or particiapnts who demonstrate proficiency within the allotted period of time are issued a continuing certificate.

E. Teacher Performance Evaluation

1. It is the policy of the State Board of Education, in collaboration with all school district governing boards, to develop, establish and implement a continuous uniform evaluation system for pupil achievements in relation to measurable performance objectives in basic subjects at each grade level. Teachers are evaluated at least once a year (at least twice for probationary teachers). Student achievement is intended to be a part of that evaluation. As stated in the Arizona Revised Statutes (ARS), Title 15, p. 188, "the objectives of the teacher performance evaluation system are to improve instruction and maintain instructional strength." The governing board prescribes specific procedures for the teacher performance evaluation system. Evaluations are to be in writing and sent to the teacher within five days of their completion. The teacher may make a written response to the evaluation. Each July 1, the local boards must file with the SDE a report on the teacher evaluation system. Teachers may be dismissed for inadequacy of classroom performance or unprofessional conduct if given notice prior to May 15.

Teachers have a right to a hearing on such dismissal charges.

Under HB2059 (1984) "a school board must involve its teachers in developing a teacher performance evaluation system, and the system must include appeal procedures for teachers who disagree with their evaluations are to be used in determining pay levels."

2. Arizona Best Bet Program: The Best Bet Program "involves taking a close look at schools by examining their strengths and weaknesses as to identify areas of excellence and those that should be improved to increase instructional effectiveness" (ASDE, 1983, p. 1). The process of identifying the unique qualities or characteristics of a school is done through the usage of the Arizona's Best Bet Effectiveness Assessment Form. The program is vluntary and it is a combined effort between the school site administration and the State Department of Education.

F. Teachers Responsibilities and Fringe Benefits

1. Teacher Duties: The Arizona Revised Statutes, Title 15, Education Sec. 15-521 describes in detail the duties of teachers and failure to comply is unprofessional conduct; and is subject to disciplinary action by the governing board. Some of these duties include enforcement of the course of study, the use of adopted textbooks and

the rules and regulations prescribed for schools; keep a school register, which the governing board shall carefully preserve as one of the records of the school; make the decision to promote or retain a pupil in grade in a common school or to pass or fail a pupil in a course in high school.

2. Fringe Benefits: Under SB1120 (1984), "the governing board may provide for employee fringe benefits, including sick leave, personal leave, vacation and holiday pay, jury duty pay, merit pay, pay bonuses and other benefits."

3. Teacher Contracts: HB2411 (1984) directed that the two-year teacher contracts be replaced by one-year contracts. School boards are given somewhat wider latitude to set procedures for hearings, notices and appeals of disciplinary actions against teachers. If a board intends to fire a teacher, it must allow the teacher one summer of teaching time to improve.

4. Collective Bargaining: There is no legal recognition of collective bargaining in Arizona. Local school districts and teacher groups frequently hold "meet and confer" session, however.

In a recent statewide education study by the Arizona Education Association it was found that "seven out of ten

Arozonana are unaware that public school teachers do not have the legal right to bargain with school boards over the terms of their employment; two-thirds believe teachers should have the above rights; and eighty percent believe they should have the above rights if having such rights would help attract higher quality teachers to Arizona" (AEA, 1983, p. 33).

When the issue of collective bargaining came up during the interviews, most of the respondents spent very little time on it, and labelled it as a "smoky issue."

G. Development of Career-Ladder Plans

The issue of developing a career ladder plan for teachers in Arizona preoccupied several key policy makers during this year's legislative session. The proposed career ladder plan bill (SB1095) passed by authorizing monies for selected local districts to develop a plan for a multi-level career ladder for teachers, based primarily on teaching skills in which each higher level requires either advanced skills or both advanced skills and additional responsibilities. The legislation specifically requires teacher involvement in the development of the system, requires the development of explicit evaluation procedures which must include more than one measure of teacher performance and directly requires an explanation of measurement concerns such as fairness and objectivity.

Moreover, the legislation highlights the importance of the school principal in providing support for the teacher career ladder program. The bill makes an appropriation of $100,000 effective from May, 1984. Before its passage, the bill had to pass some hurdles however. The Republican controlled legislature had interest in the career-ladder plan while the governor, a Democrat, was more interested in merit pay plan.

Summary

From the foregoing description, one will note that the state of Arizona has adopted at least four alternative approaches to shape personnel policies in the state: pre-service training and certification improvement; professional development; teacher performance-based evaluation; and career ladder plans. These have been the dominant approaches for the past 3-5 years.

Conflicts in Personnel Policies: While Arizona is attempting to pursue the above-mentioned approaches to improve the quality of its personnel policies, conflicts have emerged and surround personnel policies in the state. These conflicts can be grouped around the following concepts: (a) quality and teacher shortage; (b) test validity and teacher performance; (c) efficiency and quality; and (d) leadership coalition and personnel policy reforms.

Quality and Shortage of Teachers: Arizona faces a shortage of teachers, especially teachers in math and science. The state depends heavily on external or out-of-state teachers. The annual output of teachers from the state's colleges and universities ranges from 1,000 to 1,200.

The ATPE "weeds out" the number of people interested in joining the profession and also those within the profession. The objective of the ATPE is to have more academically qualified teachers in the schools. The ATPE is both an entry and exit mechanism to teacher preparation and certification. The accredited colleges and universities have recently been under pressure to restructure their teacher training programs--to become more rigorous in nature and put more emphasis on methodology and classroom management. Many key policy actors in Arizona believe that the basic problem of lack of qualified teachers lies with the schools of education. The adoption of the ATPE as an entry requirement in addition to college/university admission requirements, and the Arizona Basic Skill Chart as a part of undergraduate training, are seen as positive steps toward restructuring the process of the teacher training program in the state.

The ATPE "weed out" mechanism will limit the number of people to join the profession and the schools will

continue to face teacher shortages for a long time to come unless there is a comprehensive policy to attract more qualified people into the profession. According to a report from the Arizona State Department of Education regarding performance on the ATPE, only "about 68% of the examinations administered N = 5000+ at the 80% correct responses criterion have been passed" (Kelley and Surbeck 1983, p. 3). The ATPE is indeed a limiting mechanism but it is equally difficult to do without it. It is a dilemma for policy makers. As one of the staff in the SDE who is well-versed in the state's personnel policy stated,

> With teacher shortages projected to occur in Arizona by the late 1980s either teacher salaries will have to increase to attract more academically able individuals into teaching, or the standards in place will have to be washed out in order to put warm bodies in the classroom. Hopefully this decision will be made rationally rather than politically (Kelley, 1983, p. 9).

The policy makers apparently have only two options to solve the problem: (1) <u>attract</u> more academically qualified individuals into the profession; or (2) <u>improve</u> the quality of teachers already in the field. For the past few years attention has focused on the teacher <u>improvement</u> option.

A study sponsored by the National Institute of Education titled <u>Managing the Incompetent Teacher</u> states

that

> although incompetent teachers are a major problem in public education, they seldom are fired because schools are wary of court fights that can cost upwards of $100,000. The cost of using this approach is probably high. However, the costs of retaining incompetent teachers may be even higher (Arizona Rep., Sunday 12, 1984, p. A-11).

ATPE Validity and Teacher Performance: A technical conflict surrounds the ATPE. Recently, the Arizona Tax Research Association (ATRA) analyzed the Arizona Teachers' Proficiency Examination (ATPE) and the analysis

> indicates that the ATPE does not validly screen the applicants for Arizona teaching certificates partly because it is graded as a whole test rather than component parts. The analysis indicates that persons who pass the test may not be proficient in the basic skills, and that some persons who fail the test could very well be more proficient than some who pass (ATRA, 1983, p. 2).

They further urge that the current ATPE doesn't measure basic skills even by its own criteria.

Quality versus Efficiency: While the state of Arizona pursues the values of quality and efficiency to improve its personnel programs, it is faced with the inherent conflict that surrounds these two concepts. In the management of schools, for example, while the state focuses on efficient management, looking for leaders with managerial skills, it is faced with the need of having an instructional leader who would improve the quality of instruction

in the schools.

Leadership Coalition and Educational Reform: Building consensus among policy makers in Arizona is a tough process. The adversary approach of solving problems dominates education policy formulation and adoption. Most of the education issues discussed by legislature are on partisan lines.

III. Student Testing and Assessment Policies in Arizona

Student testing and assessment has received some attention in Arizona for the past five years or so. To improve the quality of the student testing and assessment programs in the public schools, the state has put most emphasis on specifying the format and content of the testing instruments; using tests to evaluate programs or teacher performance; and testing students for special program placement or promotion.

A. Arizona Pupil Achievement Testing Program

The Arizona Pupil Achievement Testing Program was first administered in April 1981 to fulfill the requirements of Arizona Revised Statutes (ARS) 15-741 through 15-744. The 1980 legislation mandates that a nationally standardized norm-referenced achievement test be administered to all pupils enrolled in Arizona public schools, grades one through twelve, in the subjects of reading, grammar and

mathematics.

Exemptions: Certain groups of students were exempted from the testing program under the law. These groups of students include: (a) trainable mentally handicapped; (b) educable mentally handicapped; (c) seriously emotionally handicapped; (d) visually handicapped; (e) hearing handicapped; (f) multiple handicapped; and (g) who are not required to attend regular classes in a public school. The legislation also gives permission to school districts to exempt pupils who are non-English monolingual or predominantly speakers of a language other than English from the testing requirement.

Following recommendations of a 38 member Task Force, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted the California Achievement Tests, Form C (CAT-C) copyright 1977, for use starting from the 1980-81 school year to fulfill the legislative mandate. The testing program is designed to be given annually in a week in April as determined by the SBE.

The results of the Arizona Pupil Achievement Testing program are reported at six levels: (a) pupil, (b) classroom, (c) school, (d) district, (e) county, and (f) state.

In the first year of the testing program (April 1981), four demographic data/characteristics were collected for

each pupil at the time of testing. These include: sex, primary language, participation in Title I programs, and racial/ethnic background. It is argued that the collection of this information makes possible the analyses of test results for specified groups of pupils.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction maintains a computerized file of test results for research and analysis. The computerized file includes at least the following cumulative data for each pupil: (a) the test scores by year; (b) the pupil's class-size by subject area of the test, if applicable; (c) the teacher's experience by subject area of the test, if applicable; (d) the class format by subject area of the test; and (e) principal textbook series the pupil uses for each of the subjects.

Report on the Statewide Testing Program for 1981

A brief review of the statewide report of the Arizona Pupil Achievement Testing in 1981 indicates that "Arizona pupils in grades one through six achieved at higher than grade level in grammar. This was especially true in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades. They also performed one stanine above the national average on mathematics computation in grades six, seven and eight" (SDE 1981, p. 10).

The report further states that although 17% of the Arizona pupils tested have other than English as a primary

language, the average performance of the total pupil population tested in reading and grammar meets or exceeds the national averages. It is also noted in the report that the racial/ethnic minority group pupils begin first grade slightly behind their white, not of Hispanic origin, counterparts in achievement and that this performance gap widens through the twelfth grade.

District results are usually available in June, and the local districts have the responsibility of collecting all test materials from the schools and for providing parents a copy of each student's scores.

B. Shifting from the Universal Norm-Referenced Tests to Criterion-Referenced Tests in April, 1985

Effective in April, 1985, Arizona will shift from the present universal norm referenced tests to criterion-referenced tests. The recently adopted law directs that the state adopt the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) for K-8 and the Stanford Test of Academic Skills for high schools. According to interviewee data, the CAT was seen as "too easy" for Arizona pupils.

C. Composition Skill Achievement Test

Recently legislation (HB2341 of 1984) was passed which requires the State Board of Education "to review methods of measuring characteristics of effective classrooms,

schools and school districts" and to develop a uniform achievement test assessing composition skills of a representative sample of pupils in grades four, eight and eleven.

D. General Education Development (GED) Test

A recent Senate bill (SB1221 of 1984) reduced from 18 to 16 years the minimum age at which a person passing the General Education Development (GED) test must receive an Arizona high school certificate of equivalency.

E. Teacher Proficiency Examination for Teacher Training Entrance

House bill 2156 of 1984 requires a reading, grammar, and mathematics proficiency examination for all persons considering careers in teaching. Those persons must pass each component of the reading, grammar and mathematics proficiency examination administered by the Arizona Board of Regents, or its equivalent, in order to qualify for entrance into a public university teacher training program.

F. Arizona Basic Skills Chart

As discussed earlier, the Arizona Basic Skills Chart identifies series of specific basic skills lists for students at each grade level. These skills of computation, communication and citizenship are seen as the expectations

of the K-12 education system in Arizona. The State of Arizona has put a lot of emphasis on the development of specific minimum skills which should be acquired by every student in the public schools. Examinations or tests are based on these expected skills.

Summary

We can note from the recent adopted testing and assessment programs that Arizona has focused mainly on the approach of specifying the format and content of tests; and using tests for graduation or promotion purposes.

The 1980 and 1984 legislations regarding the usage of the universal norm-referenced test and the subsequent legislation in 1984 to shift to the criterion-referenced tests are typical examples of an approach which specifies the format and content of tests in the state.

The composition skill achievement test is another example of this approach which adopts new tests for grades 4, 8 and 11. The tests adopted by the State Board of Education and the local school governing boards have also been used for promotion purposes.

The main policy actors who have played a dynamic role in shaping the testing policies in the state of Arizona include: the legislators, the State Board of Education,

the State Department of Education and the local governing boards. All these have played a role in initiating and implementing testing and assessment policies in the state.

IV. School Program Definition Policies in Arizona

The thrust of Arizona's policies in school program definition have focused on the provision of basic education to all pupils; emphasis on the provision of specific basic skills of computation, communication and citizenship; focusing on special needs of specail groups of pupils and emphasis on vocational education.

In an attempt to achieve these objectives, the state has utilized at least four alternative approaches: setting higher program standards such as increasing the high school graduation requirements; developing special programs for special groups of pupils; mandating specific courses or subjects; and changing time requirements such as modifying the school year or increasing the number of hours for particular subjects.

The State Board of Education and the governing board of a school district are the two main agencies which prescribe minimum course of study and competency requirements for the promotion of a pupil from one grade to another. The education code requires that:

> . . . the State Board of Education shall prescribe minimum course of study and competency requirements for the graduation of pupils from high school.

Of the local boards, it appears that the governing board of a school district shall prescribe course of study and competency requirements for the graduation of pupils from the high schools in the school district. The governing board may prescribe course of study and competency requirements for the graduation of pupils which are in addition to or higher than the course of study and competency requirements which the State Board prescribes (ARS, 15-701.01, p. 217).

According to the law, individual teachers determine whether to pass or fail a pupil.

A. Setting Higher Program Standards

1. High School Graduation: Two bills passed recently have dealt with the setting of higher program standards in high schools. HB2213 of 1984 requires that a full-time high school student must be enrolled in four subjects of 120 hours a year.

SB1240 inserts three additional provisions in the statutes relating to high school graduation. First, the bill requires a school district governing board to grant credit toward high school graduation for courses taken as a state community college or university; secondly, it

allows a person to receive an Arizona high school certificate of equivalency by meeting high school graduation requirements through a combination of high school credits and college credits. The college credits would be converted to high school credits by the State Board of Education; and thirdly, the bill prevents Arizona State Community College and universities from denying admission to a student under age 16 because of age, for lack of a high school diploma or certificate of equivalency. The bill also requires the State Board of Directors of Community Colleges and the Board of Regents to prescribe regulations to admit intellectually gifted students under age 18.

In another adopted statute (SB1221, 1984), has changed the age limitation for the General Educational Development (GED) test to be at 16 instead of 18 years old.

2. Arizona Basic Skills Chart: The adoption of the Arizona Basic Skills Chart by the State Board of Education is seen as a landmark action in school program definition for the state. The specific basic skills of computation, communication and citizenship guide most of the educational programs at all grade levels. These specific basic skills are regarded for graduation or promotion at each grade level.

3. Arizona Best Bet Program: The Arizona Best

Bet Program involves examining strengths and weaknesses of school programs and identifying areas of excellence and those that should be improved to increase program effectiveness. Although the program is voluntary, the officials of the State Department of Education anticipate that it will eventually be adopted by all schools.

Each program discussed in this sub-section focuses on setting higher program standards and pursuing the educational goals of quality and program effectiveness.

B. Developing Special Programs for Special Groups of Students

Arizona has substituted emphasis on the development of special programs for special children to commensurate with their needs and abilities. These programs include:

1. Bilingual Programs. The ARS (1983) states that a governing board of a school district may provide a special course of bilingual instruction for common school pupils, not to exceed an accumulated period of four years per pupil, to expand the minimum curriculum and satisfy district goals and objectives. These bilingual programs are for children who are having difficulty in speaking or understanding the English language. These programs are in addition to the regular course of instruction prescribed in all school districts.

A bill which was adopted recently (SB1160 of 1984) provides the authority for school districts to conduct bilingual classes for elementary school students who have difficulty with English because of their background in a more "expanded format." Any district with ten or more of these pupils in any grade must provide bilingual programs. Districts with nine or fewer in any grade must provide either bilingual or English as Second Language (ESL) meeting the cultural and linguistic needs of the pupils.

2. Special Education. All school districts are required to develop a plan for providing special education to all handicapped children within the district and submit it to the State Board of Education for approval and funding. The law states very clearly that "all handicapped children shall receive special education programming commensurate with their abilities and needs" (ARS 15-762).

Special education categories include: (a) hearing handicapped; (b) physically handicapped; (c) trainable mentally handicapped; (d) visually handicapped; (e) multiple handicapped; and (f) homebound or "hospitalized" pupils.

The law also provides special education programs for gifted children--who, due to their superior intellect or advanced learning ability, or both, are not afforded an opportunity for otherwise attainable progress and development in regular classroom instruction to achieve at levels

commensurate with pupil's intellect and ability.

House Bill 2471 allows the governing board of a school district to provide special education for gifted pupils who may have an educational disadvantage resulting from a difficulty in writing, speaking or understanding the English language because of an environmental background where a language other than English is primarily spoken.

3. Pre-School Programs. Each school district is required by law to establish a kindergarten program unless the school district files an exemption claim with the Department of Education that the establishment of such a program is not in the best interest of the district.

4. Improvement of K-3 Program. House Bill 2288 provides funding for special programs to improve the academic achievement of low-achieving pupils in kindergarten through grade three. A five-member advisory committee appointed by the State Board of Education reviews district proposals and recommends approval and funding to the SBE.

5. Remedial and Optional Programs.

a. Remedial programs. School districts are allowed to provide remedial education programs to children with learning problems. These remedial education programs supplement the regular school curriculum to enable them to achieve the expected level in the regular classroom.

b. Part-time schools. In a school district

in which 15 or more children are employed, there shall be a part-time school which shall give instructions for not less than 150 hours per year, or not less than 5 hours per week.

c. Night schools for teaching English. If there are 15 or more persons over 16 years of age who either do not read or write or speak the English language and who desire to attend a night school, the school district may establish a night school for teaching the English language, American ideals and an understanding of American institutions.

d. Adult education. School districts are allowed to offer courses (up to the level of high school equivalency) in adult education programs--including the teaching of English to foreigners in the districts.

e. Alternative education programs. The law provides that school districts may contract with any public body or private body to provide alternative education programs. Alternative education program means the modification of a school curricula and adoption of teaching methods, materials and techniques to be provided to these pupils in grades 9-12 who are unable to profit from regular school curricula and environment.

C. Mandating Specific Course/Subjects.

The state of Arizona has mandated a substantial number of specific courses or subjects to be taken by all students. These mandated subjects include:

1. Instruction in State and Federal Constitutions, American Institutions and History of Arizona.

> All schools must give instruction in the essentials, courses and history of the constitutions of the United States and Arizona and instruction in American institutions and ideals and in the history of Arizona (ARS, 15-710).

These courses are to be given at least in one year of the elementary school grades and in high school grades.

2. Instruction of Free Enterprise System. All high schools are mandated to instruct the "essentials and benefits of the free enterprise system" for at least one semester.

3. Instruction on Alcohol, Narcotic Drugs, Marijuana and other Dangerous Drugs. Instructions on the nature and harmful effects of alcohol, tobacco, narcotics, marijuana and dangerous drugs on the human system are to be included in the course study in the elementary and high school programs.

4. High School Vocational Education. A high school which has satisfactory facilities and equipment shall provide vocational education such as agriculture,

business and office education, health occupations, home economics, etc.

5. Career Education Programs. Career education programs are intended to

> . . . help pupils acquire and utilize the knowledge, skill and attitudes necessary for each to make work a meaningful, productive, and satisfying part of his or her way of living. . ." (ARS, 15-791).

Career programs apply only to grades 6 through 8.

6. Oral and Silent Reading. As part of its training in developing reading skills, each school must devote reasonable amounts of time to oral and silent reading in grades one through eight.

7. Conducting of Schools in Engligh Language. All schools are required by law to be conducted in English, except in special programs of bilingual instruction.

Note that most of these mandated subjects aim at enhancing the general quality of life for pupils, but do not necessarily aim at academic excellence or quality.

D. Changing Time Requirements.

Arizona has also taken steps to change school program time requirements.

1. Compulsory Attendance. Every person who has custody of a child between the ages of eight and sixteen years must send the child to school for the full time school

is in session within the school district. A child is required to attend school sessions not less than 175 days, or equivalent as approved by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

2. Full-Time Student. House Bill 2213 requires that high school subjects meet a minimum of 120 hours in a school year in order for those subjects to be included in the four subjects in which a high school student must be enrolled in order to be counted as a full-time student.

3. Provision for Extending a School Year. Any governing board of public school considering extending a school year must:

> (1) prepare a comparative cost analysis of the extended school year program versus the cost of new facilities and sites;
> (2) hold at least one public hearing to present the alternatives; and
> (3) determine faculty, community, and parental support prior to making a final determination (Arizona Rules & Regulations, 1984, p. 21).

HB2068, however, allows a school district located in a disaster area to extend the length of the school day up to two hours. The disaster area has to be designated by Presidential Proclamation. The bill also empowers the Superintendent of Public Instruction to determine the eligibility of a school district which requests to increase the number of minutes of daily pupil enrollment.

Summary

To improve the quality of school programs in Arizona, the state has pursued four alternative approaches: (1) setting higher program standards, (2) developing special programs for special groups, (3) mandating specific courses, and (4) changing time requirements.

Setting of higher program standards, developing of special programs for special groups of pupils and mandating specific subjects have been given considerable attention by the state for the past three years or so. Changing time requirements has also been given attention, but not so much. As stated by a Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction: "The policy has been to increase more courses, rather than increasing the school year."

The educational goals or values which seem to be incorporated in these approaches include:

(1) Quality -- through the setting of higher program standards, mandating of special subjects, and the adoption and emphasis on the acquisition of the basic skills of computation, reading, and writing;

(2) Program effectiveness--through the systematic evaluation of school program effectiveness;

(3) Equity--through the special education programs for special children with individual needs and abilities--most notably handicapped, gifted and migrant pupils;

(4) Choice--is another value embodied in these approaches, which is seen to be achieved through the alternative or optional education programs.

The value of quality and equity seems to be the dominant forces in shaping and improving the school program definition policies in Arizona.

V. School Organization and Governance Policies in Arizona

Recent governance policy initiatives in Arizona have emphasized: enhanced state-level control and strengthening site-level administration.

The state-level control has been strengthened through various mechanisms such as adopting broad statutory authority over fiscal policies, mandating certain programs, certification of school personnel, establishing more advisory committees at the state level, and articulation of the overall direction of the education system. At the same time, substantial local control has been retained in areas related to prescribing and implementing school programs, adoption of curriculum materials, and control over teacher evaluation programs. The state has also made some attempts to strengthen site-level governance--particularly focusing on the improvement of the school principal effectiveness and efforts to strengthen teacher influence through participation in various areas that

affect education policies.

A. State-Level School Organization and Governance.

1. Legislature. The State Legislature is the primary agency for education policy formation. The legislature is responsible in establishing the legal means by which distribution of state financial assistance to public schools is made and in establishing budgetary requirements. It has delegated substantial powers to two major bodies. These two bodies are the (a) State Board of Education (SBE) and (b) local school districts' governing boards.

2. Arizona State Board of Education (ASBE). The ASBE is the governing and policy-determining body of the Arizona State Department of Education. It has general supervision over the conduct of the school system. The Board's powers and authority are well-defined by statute (ARS, 15-203). Some of the major duties and responsibilities include: (a) delegate to the Superintendent of Public Instruction the execution of policies decided upon; (b) recommend to the legislature changes or additions to the statutes; (c) prepare, publish and distribute reports concerning the educational welfare of the state; (d) exercise general supervision over the conduct of the school system; (e) ascertain that the school laws are properly

enforced; (f) supervise and control the certification of teachers and prescribe rules and regulations therefore; (g) prescribe, in conjunction with the Auditor General, a Univorm System of Financial Records; (h) adopt rules prescribing uniform and competitive bidding and contracting and purchasing practices for districts in Arizona; and (i) promulgate rules to ensure that enrollment is determined by all districts on a uniform basis.

3. Advisory Committees of the ASBE. The ASBE has established various advisory committees: (1) the Advisory Committee on Special Education--which advises and consults with the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Director of the Division of Special Education regarding special education programs; (2) the Professional Standards and Certification Advisory Committee, which advises the ASBE on matters related to teached education programs and rules and regulations governing the certification of teachers for the purpose of maintaining an effective certification procedure in the state of Arizona; (3) the Basic Goals/Course of Study Committee, which advises the ASBE on matters regarding the development of courses of study for each subject area; (4) the State Textbook Evaluation Committee, which deals with studying available instructional materials offered by publishing companies and makes the necessary recommendations; and

(5) the Professional Practices Advisory Committee, which facilitates the investigation of certificated persons charged with immoral or unprofessional conduct issues of professional ethics, professional competence, and fitness to teach or to continue as a fully certified member of the educational profession (R7-2-202 of 1984).

Most of these advisory committees are "balanced" in terms of professional expertise rather than political/ethnic representation. The composition of the ASBE itself is different, however. According to the law, it must have among its members: the president of a state university or a state college, three lay members, a membef or the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges, a Superintendent of a high school district, a classroom teacher, and a county school superintendent.

The governor appoints all the members except for the Superintendent of Public Instruction who is popularly elected. The Superintendent of Public Instruction is the executive officer of the SBE.

4. Indian Education in Arizona. Arizona has a substantial population of American Indians. The statute allows the ASBE to enter into contracts with the Department of the Interior for the welfare and education of Indians in schools of the state. The ASBE administers the expenditure of federal funds provided under such contracts.

B. Local Level Organization and School Governance.

The foundation of the Arizona public school system is the local district governing board. It is the policy-making body at the local level and has prescribed statutory powers and responsibilities. The local school board prescribes and enforces rule for the governance of the schools (so long as they are not inconsistent with law or rule prescribed by the SBE), prescribes courses of study, subject to the approval of the ASBE, and competency requirements or other criteria for the promotion and graduation of pupils. The governing board also has discretionary powers such as expelling pupils for misconduct, entering into intergovernmental agreements with other districts or other government bodies, suspending a teacher or administrator from his/her duties without pay for a period of time. Additionally, the board has authority over the definition of programs, selection of curriculum materials and teacher evaluation programs. The governing board is normally composed of 3 or 5 board members.

1. The Office of the County School Superintendent. A County School Superintendent is elected in each of the 14 Arizona counties. He is the executive officer at the county level on all matters relating to education. His duties and responsibilities are also prescribed by statute. Among his major duties and responsibilities are: (a)

distribution of laws, reports, circulars, instructions, and forms to be used by district officers; (b) maintain reports received from the superintendents, governing boards and teachers; (c) make a report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction on or before October 1, showing the amount of money received from state school funds, district taxes and from other sources, and the total expenditures for school purposes, and the balance on hand to the credit of each district at the close of the school year;, and (d) enforce the course of study and the use of the adopted textbooks as approved by law.

2. Site-level school governance. Recently attempts have been made by the state of Arizona to strengthen and improve the site level school governance by focusing on the roles of the principal, teacher, parents and students. Emphasis has put on the importance of the site level principal in educational reform. Efforts have been made to change the principal's role from "building administrator" to "instructional leader." The Report of the Governor's Committee on Quality Education in November, 1983, for example, stated very emphatically that;

> Effective educational reforms cannot occur without high quality school principals. The primary job of a school principal should be to function as an educational leader who spends a significant amount of time in the classroom evaluating both tenured and non-tenured teachers. The principal should establish

> instructional levels for teachers and academic expectations for students . . . . In addition to having a strong academic background, a most important asset that an academic administrator can have is facility in human relations and communications. The Committee believes that the training provided to administrators is inadequate and doesn't prepare them to deal effectively with the challenges they are expected to meet. Administrators should be provided with special training in human relations, communications, personnel management and evaluation skills (p. 31).

This recommendation by the Governor's Committee may have been instrumental in the establishment of the Arizona Principal's Institute. The Principal's Institute was established recently to provide training in instructional leadership skills and teacher evaluation. At least 300 principals, associate principals and some teachers attend a two-week residency program. The program was operative for the first time the summer of 1984.

3. Strengthening teacher influence in school governance. Attempts have been made by the state for the past few years to strengthen the influence of the classroom teacher in decision making. By statute, teachers in Arizona have the legal responsibility of enforcing the course of study, using the adopted textbooks and enforcing the rules and regulations prescribed for schools. In determining curriculum materials, the teacher, with the consent of the governing board, may use any one of the

prescribed textbooks for the purpose of his/her course. By law also the teacher "makes the decision to promote or retain a pupil in grade in a common school or to pass or fail a pupil in a course in high school" (ARS-15-521, p. 177). Teachers are also involved in performance evaluation. A recently adopted bill (AB2059) provides that certified teachers be involved with the governing board of a school district in the development and periodic evaluation of the teacher performance evaluation system. The bill also provides that the governing board must prescribe specific procedures for teachers who wish to appeal the evaluation of their performance if the evaluation is to be used as criteria for setting compensation. These statutory provisions enable teachers to participate in the decision process that affects their work.

Recently, the Arizona Education Association (AEA) supported a bill (HB 2478) called Teachers As Policy Makers urging for teachers and other school employees with the opportunity to participate in all of the decision-making processes which affect their ability to teach and their students' ability to learn. The bill, however, died in the Rules Committee. The AEA had declared its intention to continue to expand teacher participation on the policy making boards which affect and control the educational process.

4. Expanding parental influence. No concrete legislation or programs have been adopted by the state to expand parental influence in school governance. There is, however, broad recognition of the importance of involving parents in the decision making process. The Report of the Governor's Committee on Quality Education (1983), for example, states that:

> The importance of parental involvement in the educational process should be emphasized over and over. Parental attitudes about education and the extent of their involvement in the process have been shown to have major impact upon student performance. . . . that they be listened to and utilized if educational reforms are to be achieved (p. 32).

5. Student responsibilities and discipline: Student responsibilities and discipline are another area of school governance which has not received much attention by the state.

The law, however, requires that "the governing board of any school district prescribes rules for the discipline, suspension and expulsion of pupils" (ARS, 15-843, p. 293). Principals of each school are also required to ensure that a copy of all rules pertaining to the discipline, suspension and expulsion of pupils are communicated to students and parents at the beginning of each school year, and to transfer students at the time of their enrollment in the

school. Breakdown of student discipline in classrooms is seen as a big problem in schools in Arizona.

In the AEA commissioned study cited previously (AEA, Nov. 1983), about 57% of those interviewed classified breakdown of student discipline as a major problem in the schools. Thirty-two percent identified it as a minor problem, and only 8% did not identify it as a problem. AEA called for implementation of

> firm and fair codes of student conduct that as enforced consistently and automatic and immediate removal of students for possession of deadly weapons or drugs; for assault, arson, extortion or other acts of violence, and allow teachers to remove a disruptive student from their classes (AEA, 1983, p. 19).

C. Political Conflict Among Key Actors.

Political conflict among key policy actors while formulating education policies is inevitable. There is, however, a lot of disagreement and apparent inability on the part of the various key actor groups to create a coalition when formulating education policies or programs intended to improve the quality of education in Arizona.

As one respondent noted: "Public education system is highly politicized--it involves too many people."

During 1984, 45 educational bills were passed by the legislature. Some key actors, however, maintain that "in terms of money, lawmakers did nothing. The legislature

took a lot of action but did not give a lot of support. More money is needed to bring educational reform." The interest groups such as the AEA complain that "education is not given the required priority." In the same vein, the governor stated:

> The legislature is not anti-education by its apparent unwillingness to fund other proposals. It is a case of misplaced priorities. Reform takes time. There just has not been any sense of urgency or public pressure. Maybe public pressure is the way to get things done (Arizona Republic, May 3, 1984, p. A-14).

Summary

Arizona has emphasized local control while at the same time strengthening the state control through various mechanisms. The state has also focused on strengthening the site level governance and some attempts have been made to increase teacher influence in decision-making.

Local control--is viewed as a prime guide in Arizona. As one key policy actor stated.

> . . . we are really a heavy local controlled state, at least people that I know on the National School Boards Association tell me that Arizona still gives much power to local boards more so than the average state does.

Local control in Arizona is manifested through various mechanisms: (a) the statutory authority or power given to the local governing boards in prescribing courses of study, selection of curriculum materials, and teacher

evaluation programs; (b) the locals have the political power through elections--such as bond issue elections, override, boundary and school elections.

Sometimes such elections prevent state level "encroachment." Although the state constitution provides for initiative or referendum measures, only two educational initiatives have been sent to electors for the past two decades.

State level control--The state level has broad statutory powers or authority over many policy areas. These include certification of school employees, student achievement testing programs, fiscal policies (equalization and limitation), mandated programs, establishing standards for graduation, standards for school buildings, professional standards, and articulation of the basic goals of the education system in the state. The ASBE and the SDE have been very aggressive in trying to give overall direction to the education system by articulating concepts and expectations of the system. Some of these include: (a) the state goal of providing basic education to all types of students in the state--this enhances the value of equity; (b) the acquisition of specific basic skills by pupils at each grade level; (c) the emphasis on quality education; and (d) the goal to achieve cooperation among all involved

in achieving the aims and objectives of education in the state.

In brief, the, the state has utilized at least five broad control mechanisms to manifest state control:

Firstly, by adopting legal mechanisms which originate from the state constitution, legislative statutes, and from the Arizona Administrative Rules and Regulations. The state level has been given a broad statutory authority over many policy areas. Secondly, the state level has extended tremendous control over the locals through fiscal policies mandated by the legislature. Thirdly, state level has controlled the locals through mandated programs. As one respondent remarked: "Legislative mandates have eroded local control extensively." Fourthly, state level control has been manifested through the establishment of advisory committees at the state leve--which provide professional expertise or information in making decisions. Expertise can be a very effective mechanism for control. Fifthly, the state level governance has aggressively and consistently tried to define the basic goals of the overall education system in the state.

Local control versus state control--Some key factors advocate for a strong state level control and others prefer local control school governance. Those who favor state control maintain that the locals don't have the power,

ability and expertise to bring educational reforms.

Those who don't favor state level control suggest that the school districts should be held accountable for certain levels of achievements by students and that they should be allowed to use their own methods to accomplish those desired objectives.

As one respondent stated: "Hold the school districts accountable. Give them resources and let them organize however they wish within certain reasonable parameters."

In any case, the mechanisms adopted and utilized by the state level are too instrumental to allow local control predominance in Arizona. One inverviewee noted, "State control is winning. No doubt about it."

VI. Curriculum Materials Policies in Arizona

The State Board of Education (SBE) and the local governing boards are the agencies responsible for defining and adopting courses of study and instructional materials. The law states that the SBE develops a list and recommends it to the local districts--and the local districts' governing boards make the final decision on all instructional materials. The most recent curriculum policy thrust has been to provide free textbooks to all students in the K-12 public education system and to specify the scope, type, and sequence of materials to be used by local districts.

For many years, at the elementary level, the law required "free textbooks to be furnished in common schools and all state welfare institutions maintaining educational facilities" (15-723), but this did not apply to high schools. Recently however, under Senate Bill (SB 1125 of 1984), free textbooks to high school students have been supported. Starting with 9th graders in 1985-86 and each year adding another grade, by 1988-89 all high school students will have free textbooks. School district capital outlay budget was amended to allow increased spending for the books. The compulsory school attendance law was also amended to require attendance through grade ten instead of grade eight.

Rental of Textbooks to High Schools. Prior to the passage of SB 1125 (1984), the governing boards had a permissive provision to include in their proposed school districts budget finances required for the purchase of classroom textbooks for the use of registered high school students only at a reasonable rental fee. By law, a

> pupil or parent may purchase from the governing board such books as necessary for high school pupils at the price the governing board pays for the books (15-728).

The law also states that the State Board of Education shall enter into contracts with publishers for the purchase by the school districts of the textbooks and instructional

computer software desired from the suggested lists of the State Board.

A. Adoption of Textbooks and Instructional Materials

As stated earlier, the State Board of Education annually prepares lists of suggested books and instructional computer software from which the governing board of a school district may purchase. The local school districts have options in purchasing the recommended textbooks and other instructional materials.

The process of adopting textbooks and other instructional materials is a fairly complicated one. The State Board of Education has an advisory committee called "State Textbook Evaluation Committee" which advises the SBE by: (1) studying available instructional materials offered by publishing companies; (2) recommending three to five textbooks for selection in each subject area; (3) recommending supplementary textbooks in each subject area; (4) selecting textbooks for adoption for K-8 in all subjects and prescribing suitable teaching materials for Arizona history, American history and free enterprise for high school level.

The twenty-seven member committee is composed of nine laymen and eighteen educators who represent various geographical areas and grade levels. The educator members are chosen from four categories: (1) principal--elementary; (2) content specialist--university based; (3) curriculum

specialist--elementary based; (4) teachers. It is noted in the Arizona Administrative Rules and Regulations that there shall be a "concerted effort to have varied ethnic representation" on the committee.

After the SBE recommendations, the governing board approves for common and high schools the basic textbooks for each course and all necessary supplemental books. The governing board further prescribes up to five textbooks for each course of study and the teacher, with the consent of the governing board, may use any one of the prescribed textbooks for purposes of his course. The adoption process requires also public hearings at the local levels before final selection of the textbooks and other instructional materials.

B. Arizona Basic Skill Chart

The Arizona Basic Skills Chart which was adopted recently by the State Board of Education is seen as an instructional aide or material used by all the schools in the state. The chart identifies the subjects to be taught, the specific skills to be acquired at each grade level, and the process of teaching to achieve the desired objectives. The chart, in fact, identifies the scope and sequence of courses and the expected competencies. The state of Arizona has put a lot of emphasis on the

acquisition of specific skills at each grade level.

Summary

Three aspects have received attention in Arizona as regards curriculum material policies for the past 3-5 years:

First, the state has amended the compulsory school attendance law by extending it to grade 10 instead of grade 8; and because of this provision, the state decided to extend the provision of free textbooks to high school. The state maintains that there is no compulsory attendance without free textbooks. It is the anticipation of the state that with the amendments of the compulsory attendance and the free textbooks law, school performance will improve, thus increasing the quality of education in the state.

Second, Arizona has put a lot of emphasis on the acquisition of specific skills or competencies at each grade level. The skills of computation, communication and citizenship are seen as the main elements in the education system in Arizona. The skills chart adopted by the SBE has reinforced the importance of acquiring specific skills by all students at each grade level. The chart is seen also as a useful guide for selection of instructional materials.

Third, local control in the adoption of curriculum materials is strongly rooted. As one respondent noted:

> Our local governing boards have complete option. Our statute says that the State Board develops a list and recommends it to local districts, the local districts' governing boards make the final decision on all instructional materials, so the state has really not gotten involved in materials. The closest we come is our skills chart.

VII. School Building and Facilities Policies in Arizona

The state of Arizona has not done much in this area of school building and facilities. What has been done has focused mainly on the safety standards of the school buildings and provision of specific facilities and services to handicapped pupils.

A. Fire Marshal Authority to Meet Safety Standards.

Recently two related bills were adopted to insure that school buildings meet the specified standards for fire safety.

1. HB 2396--which was passed this year, requires that public buildings must be designed or built according to the state fire code and applicable local building codes. The law further requires that if there are no local codes the codes of the largest city in the county should apply.

2. Another bill related to Fire Marshal Authority (SB 1402) requires that a city with a population of 100,000

or more, having a nationall recognized fire code and an ordinance assuming fire protection jurisdiction from the state fire marshal, is exemot from minimum state fire protection standards except for state, county and public school buildings. All plans for new construction, remodeling, alterations and additions to buildings must be submitted to state fire marshal prior to construction.

B. Student Safety Standards

Arizona has adopted some statutes to enforce student safety and health standards. The law, for example, state that every student, teacher and visitor in public and private school must wear appropriate "eye protective ware" while participating in, or when observing vocational, technical, industrial arts, art or laboratory science activities involving exposure to: (1) molten metals or materials; (2) cutting, shaping and grinding of materials; (3) heat treatment; (4) welding fabrication process; (5) explosive materials; (6) caustic solutions; or (7) radiation materials. The rules and regulations for the enforcement of this law are prescribed by the State Board of Education.

C. Facilities and Services for Handicapped Pupils

Arizona has established some few specific facilities

for handicapped children. The Arizona State School for the Deaf and Blind is one example. The school is fully recognized as an institution of educational purposes.

The law allows the Arizona School for the Deaf and Blind to build residential facilities for emotionally disturbed, hearing or vision impaired. The school can also lease the necessary facilities and provide for the necessary staff, equipment supplies and other operating costs.

The law also requires the School for the Deaf and Blind to provide daily transportation for a day student once that child has been admitted and is being furnished services by the institution.

One hundred thousand acres of land have been reserved for the use and benefit of the schools for the deaf and blind.

4. Pupil Transportation

Each school district provides transportation for student activity trips and for home-school bound transportation services. According to the statute, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall supervise the provision of pupil transportation services and he/she is responsible for determining the school district's transportation support level for the budget year.

For a school district to be eligible for state aid in

transportation, it must certify to the Superintendent of Public Instruction the following information: (1) the daily route mileage of the school district in the current year; (2) the number of eligible students during the current year; (3) an inventory of each school bus owned by the school district, including manufacturer of the bus, date of purchase, purchase price, capacity for passengers, type of fuel used, etc.; (4) total bus mileage during the current year; (5) total students transported during the current year; and, (6) the road conditions upon which eligible students are transported.

School districts, however, are permitted to transport students for student activity trips in vehicles other than school buses. School districts may, also, if it is found to be economically advantageous, contract for transportation with another school district, a contract carrier, or a private party.

Pupil transportation is increasingly becoming an important educational service, and the state of Arizona provides a state support level for this service for about $250 for each approved student transported in a year.

Summary

Arizona has not done much regarding school buildings or facilities policy. Some focus has been on the safety

standards of the school buildings to ensure safety for pupils and limited facilities for handicapped children. This is the SPM which has received least attention by the state.

Arizona Education Association (AEA), however, is proposing a major package regarding school building and facilities policy. AEA is urging the state to

> provide school facilities which are appropriate to the function, esthetically pleasing, adequately weather-conditioned and well-maintainec. This includes air-conditioning in all school buildings. Provide teachers with the supplies and equipment necessary to enhance the learning environment--including adequate lunchrooms, restrooms, and lavatory facilities exclusively for teachers' use and at least one room appropriately furnished, reserved for use as a faculty workroom. Adequate lighted, off-street paved parking facilities which are well protected against vandalism (AEA, 1984, p. 23).

With time it is possible that the state will focus and adopt more alternative approaches to building and facilities policy such as long-term planning for school construction, emphasis on the provision of instructional facilities to teachers and students, and provision of specific facilities to specific groups of handicapped children. One respondent, for example, remarked during the interviews that:

"Long range planning for school construction is needed because we expect a child boom in the 1990s in Arizona."

CHAPTER VI

Description of the State Policy Mechanisms (SPMs) in California

This chapter presents the in-depth description of the seven SPMs and the popular alternative approaches pursued by California for the past three to five years.

I. School Finance Policies in California

California has utilized various finance control mechanisms in its attempts to improve the funding system of K-12 education. Recently, the state has given most attention to equalization, establishing the general level of school district revenue, and financing particular services and functions.

Finance policy in California is complex, however, and has a long history. Over the past decade there have been five major finance policy actions: (1) the Serrano-Priest court decision of 1973/74; (2) the passage of Assembly Bill 65 in 1977; (3) the passage of Proposition 13 of 1978; (4) the adoption of AB 777 in 1981; and (5) the enactment of Senate Bill 813 in 1983.

A. Serrano-Priest Decision of 1973/74.

The turning point for the present school finance policy in California was in 1973-74 when the Serrano v.

Priest court decision found the California financing system of K-12 education unconstitutional. In 1976, the California Supreme Court:

> Affirmed that the system based on local property tax values and the resulting wealth-related disparities in per pupil spending did violate the State's Constituion (CCFSF, 1983a, p. 1).

Serrano decision called for quality educational programs for all children in California and that a child's education should not be a function of wealth, other than the wealth of the state as a whole. The California Supreme Court gave the legislative and the executive branches of government until 1980 to phase in an acceptable financing system for K-12 education.

B. Adoption of Assembly Bill (AB 65) of 1977.

The passage of AB 65 in 1977 was in response to the Serrano-Priest decision. It was regarded as a long-term comprehensive school finance measure. AB 65 had established equalization mechanisms based mainly on property tax revenues. In the following year, however, the bill became unworkable when voters approved the property tax reforms of Proposition 13 in June, 1978.

C. Proposition 13 of 1978

The passage of Proposition in June, 1978, was another

dramatic turning point in the California financins system. Prop. 13 mandated large cuts (approximately 50%) in local property taxes. As a result, state aid was doubled to fill the gap. The state general fund became the main source of supporting education, providing about 80% of all school district revenues. The Legislature passed an emergency "bail out legislation" in 1979 after Prop. 13, AB 8 which replaced a large share of education's lost property tax dollars with state funds. The bill established revenue limit increases, divided property taxes, and set up a mechanism for reducing state expenditures in case of insufficient state revenues, the deflator. Despite the attempts of the legislature to make AB 8 a long-term solution for school finance, annual changes in funding and in programs are still the rule in California. A major revision in financing education came in 1981 with the adoption of AB 777.

D. AB 777 of 1981

When the legislature passed AB 777, it revised the computation of revenue limits and revenue limit inflation adjustments for the fiscal years 1981-82 and for the fiscal years thereafter. The bill also made some changes in the calculation of district revenue limit adjustment based upon declining enrollment. More significantly,

however, the bill reflected a shift in philosophy about categorical programs. The bill increased the possibilities for districts to combine separate programs into a single consolidated effort at each school, the provisions for waivers and exemptions for categorical programs. The legislature declared that federal education laws should be revised to permit state and local educational agencies greater flexibility in meeting the requirements of the specified laws. Coincidentally, the federal government in 1981 approved a major shift in policy for categorical programs. Starting with the 1982-83 school year, many of the federal programs were combined into a single block grant for distribution to school districts. The 1981-82 FY was characterized by revisions in the financing of education and a shift from the specific categorical aid to a single block grant--thus reducing the federal influence on categorical programs.

E. SB 813 of 1983

SB 813, known as the Hughes-Hart Educational Reform Act of 1983, made significant changes to many of the K-12 education programs and their respective funding. The bill touched almost every aspect of K-12 education and suddenly placed California in the position of innovator and reformer. The main goal of the Legislature in adopting SB 813 was to:

> increase the quality of instruction, improve pupils' preparation for vocations or further education, strengthen student discipline, stimulate innovation, and raise California's spending per pupil (CCFSF, 1983b, p. 1).

The main force behind the adoption of SB 813 was quality education. The adoption of the package was possible because of the combined efforts or momentum created by the California Business Roundtable, the campaign of the new Superintendent of Public Instruction, the publicity given to the studies by several national commissions regarding quality of education, the commitment of the Assembly and Senate Education Committee chairs, and effective coalition building among the party leaders. The financial aspects of SB 813 include increases for general and special purpose programs, funding new programs and incentive funds for certain reforms. SB 813 is basically a two-year financing package and most of the programs become operative in 1984-85. In the 1983-84 fiscal year, $485.4 million was estimated to be spent on SB 813 programs and $1,380.8 m. is proposed for FY 1984-85.

F. School Apportionments

The existing law prescribes a method of determining state apportionments to school districts based generally on the computation of district revenue limits less property tax revenues received. School district income depends

primarily on Average Daily Attendance (ADA) which is "defined as the average number of pupils that actually attend classes for at least the minimum school day plus the average number of pupils having a valid excuse for absence" (see Legislative Analyst, 1984, p. 1430). In the 1984-85 school year, it is expected that California will have an ADA of 4,313,134 in its K-12 public education system. For general expenses of education, each school district is allowed a certain amount of money pere ADA--its "revenue limit." Revenue limits per pupil/ADA va-y from district to district across the state. The state average for the 1983-84 FY was $2,567 and $2,751 in the 1984-85 FY.

G. Computation of Revenue Limits

The computation of revenue limits to school districts is complex and it is calculated by the County Superintendents based on various factors: (1) the base revenue limit for the previous fiscal year; (2) the cost-of-living adjustment (COLA); (3) decline of enrollment adjustment; (4) the type (elementary, high school, unified) and size (large or small) of school districts--school districts are grouped according to type and size for funding purposes; (5) the equalization adjustment--an amount to bring lower districts up to within $50 of the statewide average revenue limit for districts of similar type and size; and (6)

school district revenue limit should not exceed 115% of the present expenditure levels.

In the 1983-84 FY, it is estimated that the total Revenue Limit state aid to K-12 publis. schools to be $5,829,033,s00 and the non-revenue limit funds to be about $3 billion (see Governor's Budget for 1984-85 FY, p. E4).

H. Funding for K-12 Education Programs

Funding for local school districts is of two basic types: general purpose programs and categorical or specialized education programs. General program funds are for instructional programs and general education services. Categorical funds support programs for specific types of children or districts. In FY 1983-84, total general education funding was estimated to be $8,179,553,000 and specialized education to be $929,315,000 (see Governor's Budget FY 1984-85, p. E8).

Table 6 summarizes the major funding programs for the K-12 education in California and the estimated funding for the fiscal year 1983-84 and 1984-85.

I. Sources of Money for K-12 Education.

Support for California K-12 public school systems is a shared responsibility in funding between local, state, and federal governments. The total money for K-12 education system in the fiscal year 1982/83 is estimated at

Table 6

Funding Programs for K-12 Education (in millions of dollars)

	Estimated 1983/84	Proposed 1984/85
Direct Support for K-12 Education	12,030.0 m.	13,421.0 m.
(a) General Education Programs	9,720.8 m.	11,091.6 m.
(b) Specialized Programs	2,128.4 m.	2,158.9 m.
(c) State and Court Mandates	180.8 m.	170.5 m.
SB 813 School Reform Programs	484.4 m.	1,380.8 m.
Ancillary Support for K-12 Education	848.9 m.	1,050.8 m.
Non K-12 Education Programs	270.5 m.	287.2 m.
State Department of Education	64.2 m.	66.6 m.
State Library	32.7 m.	34.1 m.

Source: Legislative Analyst: Analysis of the Bill for FY 1984/85. pp. 1438-1622.

$13,870.5 million. Local property taxes plus the miscellaneous local revenues from interest, food sales, fees, lease of school property, etc. contribute about 31% of the total K-12 funding. All local sources are estimated to be 4.338 billion in FY 1983-84, an increase of about 8.3% over the FY 1982-83. The State revenues (accrued from sales, income taxes, bank and corporation taxes, etc.) contribute about 63% of the total K-12 education funding, and the rest (6%) comes from federal subventions.

The State support is estimated to be $8.354 billion in the FY 1983-84, an increase of about 2.1% over the FY 1982-83. The total federal aid towards K-12 education funding in California is estimated to be $839.2 million for the FY 1983-84--a decrease of about 1.9% over the FY 1983-84 (for details see Legislative Analyst (1983: Analysis of the Budget Bill for FY 1983-84, p. 1270).

J. Proposition 37--The State Lottery

With the passage of Prop. 37 in November, 1984, the K-12 education system will receive additional funding through the state lottery. It is estimated that 80% of the state's share of the lottery revenues will go to K-12 public schools, 13% to Community Colleges, 5% to the California State Universities, and 2% to the University of California.

The state will receive 34% of the total lottery revenue. The monies are

> to be used to augment (rather than substitute for) funds already allocated for public education and that the funds are to be spent exclusively for instructional purposes (see Secretary of State (1984). California ballot pamphlet: 1984 General Elections, p. 47).

About $500 m. in lottery revenue is expected annually to go to public education when it is operative.

Summary

1. Alternative Approaches to Finance Policy

California seems to have utilized three alternative approaches to school finance policy. These include equalization, fixing the total level of school district revenues, and financing of particular programs and services.

The equalization approach originated mainly from the Serrano v. Priest decision, which was subsequently followed by enacting laws such as AB 65 of 1977 and AB 8 of 1979 which established equalization mechanisms for removing the disparities among school districts' funding.

Fixing the overall level of school district revenues has been a concern since the formation of the state in 1850. Recent policy in this area dates from when SP 90 was adopted establishing revenue limits for the first time. With the passage of Prop. 13, however, revenue limits were

strengthened--especially by adopting AB 8 of 1979 which listed specific revenue limit increases, divided property taxes and set up a mechanism for reducing state expenditures in case insufficient state revenues are received. California has approached the issue of limiting expenditure using a different strategy from Arizona. California emphasizes limiting school district revenue, while Arizona tackles the problem by limiting expenditure.

Financing of particular school services or functions has also received some attention in recent years. SB 813, for example, increases support both for general and special purpose funds and created new programs for particular purposes. The support for textbooks and instructional materials almost doubled in the FY 1983-84. Other programs which have received emphasis include staff development, minimum teacher salaries, school facilities, and incentive funds for longer school day and year.

Other alternative approaches which have been pursued, but with little emphasis, include offsetting burdensome costs incurred by school districts, especially those with declining enrollment, small school districts, and home-to-school transportation. Targeting which received substantial attention some years ago is now a declining approach after the adoption of AB 777 of 1981, which de-emphasized the usage of categorical funding and also the adoption of

SB 813 which does not focus mainly on specific individual needs.

2. Educational Goals. Two major educational policy goals have been pursued by California in recent years. These two are equity and quality. Equity and quality have been the major forces for the selection of the alternative approaches discussed above. Equity has been a major force since the Serrano v. Priest decision. After the decision, the legislature had to adopt various laws such as the AB 65 of 1977, AB 8 of 1979, and AB 777 of 1981, which established equalization adjustments and minimum guarantee mechanisms to reduce disparities in funding among the school districts. Quality is now surfacing as a major force governing the selection of the alternative approaches to school finance policy in California. A lot of programs have been adopted for the past three years to enhance quality. The SB 813 law, for example, requires that at least 85% of the funds in seven specific categorical programs must be spent at school sites for direct services to pupils. Furthermore, most of the SB 813 programs are aimed at improving classroom instruction, substantial financial support for textbooks and instructional materials, and the law also introduces a penalty to school districts that reduce instructional time below its 1982-83 levels. A school district will be denied an increase to its revenue

limit if there is no compliance.

School finance policy in California has been a hot issue which has preoccupied the minds and time of most of the key policy makers.

II. School Personnel Policies in California

California has more than 168,000 teachers in the K-12 education system. Most of them have a B.A. degree plus 30 or more semester hours (55.2%). About 79% are tenured, 12.6% are on "probationary" status and the remainder are in other special categories. The teaching force has an average of 11 years of experience and the average age is 41.1 years. Sixty-two percent are female and 38% male (see California State Department of Education, 1983. Characteristics of Professional Staff in California, pp. 1-11).

California has been using at least four different approaches to improving the quality and quantity of school personnel in the public schools. These approaches include: (1) strengthening of pre-service training and certification; (2) strengthening professional development; (3) increasing accountability measures; and (4) changing teacher job definitions. The major driving force in the adoption of these approaches is quality. Improving the quality of school personnel is a much publicized issue in California.

A. Teacher Credentialing.

California has attempted to improve the quality of its teaching and administrative personnel by establishing an independent agency with responsibility for the credentialing of educators in the state, and also by raising the standards for credential issuance.

1. Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). The CTC was established under AB 2530, 1982. It was formerly known as the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing (CTPC) and is the sole agency for credentialing all educators in the state. CTC has responsibility for (a) developing standards and procedures for credentialing; (b) issuing and revoking credentials; (c) evaluating and approving programs of teacher training institutions; (d) evaluating training programs for teachers and administrators--which is done on a five-year cycle; and (e) establishing policy leadership in the field of teacher preparation.

2. Credential Requirements. Chapter 1136, 1981; Chapter 1388, 1982; and SB 813, 1983 have substantially changed teacher certification requirements. Beginning February 1, 1983, the CTC could not issue any credential unless the applicant has demonstrated proficiency in basic skill areas by passing the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST). CBEST is administered by Educational

Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey. There are a few exemptions for the CBEST: substitute teachers, adult designated (non-academic) subject teachers, child care workers or persons providing services to the handicapped, health profession service workers, and applicants for vocational education credentials. Most of these exemptions are based on the non-academic nature of the teaching assignments. Out-of-state applicants who pass district developed proficiency can work for one year before fulfilling CBEST requirements.

3. Types of Teaching Credentials. California has seven different types of teaching credentials.

(1) Teacher training credential--SB 813, 1983, created a new type of teacher certification called "teacher trainees." The CTC shall issue such certificates, valid for two years (with up to one year extension) for teachers working under the guidance of a "Mentor Teacher" in secondary schools. Trainees must have a BA/BS degree and must have passed the CBEST and subject area examination. On district recommendation, after two years, a clear single subject teaching credential is awarded. Districts must develop and implement a "professional development" plan for each trainee in consultation with a teacher training institution. Trainees can only be hired if the board certifies that insufficient fully credentialed teachers are available.

(2) Clear single/multiple subject credentials. These are the credentials awarded at the completion of training for secondary (single subject) and elementary (multiple subject) teaching at a teacher preparation institution. After September 1, 1985, to maintain a clear credential, a teacher must successfully serve as a classroom teacher for at least one-half of a school year and secure at least 150 clock hours of individual professional development experience every five years. Verification is submitted to CTC by a principal, mentor teacher, or district designee. Holder of teaching credential invalidated for failure to meet the criteria above is, however, eligible for a one-time two year reinstatement.

(3) Emergency teaching credential. Emergency, non-renewable credentials, valid for no more than one year pending fulfillment of the CBEST requirement, can be given to teachers who have passed a district proficiency examination and are otherwise qualified to hold a clear credential.

(4) Lifetime credentials. Until September 1, 1985, teachers with two years of successful teaching experience under a clear single or multiple credential are eligible for a lifetime credential which requires no maintenance. No more life credentials will be awarded after September 1, 1985.

(5) Designated subject credential. Mainly applicable to

vocational and technical fields. These credentials can be acquired by applicants with five years of work experience, a high school diploma, passage of the CBEST, and a minimum number of college credits.

(6) Administrative services credentials. There are three administrative credentials--a personnel services credential, a "preliminary" administrative services credential (good for five years), and a "professional" administrative services credential (taken after the preliminary and good for life). The personnel services credential is for special services workers (like school nurses, etc.). The preliminary and professional administrative services credentials are for line administrators.

(7) Specialist instruction credentials. These credentials are offered to applicants with special competencies in reading, math, special education, etc., upon completion of a training program at a teacher training institution.

B. Pre-service Training.

California recognizes the importance of the quality of teacher preparation by the accredited institutions of higher education. As stated in the Report of the Commission on Teacher Quality (1983), which was submitted to the California Senate, September, 1983:

The competency and training of teachers is

> fundamental to our educational system . . . Teacher preparation, along with the requisite dedication to the profession and commitment to students, is a primary factor in the quality of instruction. This Commission concurs with the philosophy that teachers must be educated persons first, and then educators. The Commission regards the strengthening of teacher preparation as essential (Watson, 1983, p. 9).

In California, the CTC sets general guidelines for professional training programs. Institutions propose programs according to guidelines which are reviewed and approved by the CTC. Pre-service teacher training is limited to 9 semester units prior to the start of student teaching. One year internships may be substituted for the regular teacher preparation program if an institution has an internship program approved.

In-service training for teachers is planned and offered jointly by institutions of higher education and local school districts. Under SB 813, 1983, faculty members who teach courses related to teaching methods must have direct knowledge of school operations and the law instructs the CTC to establish standards and procedures to insure that such faculty actively participate in public school classrooms at least once every three years.

Most of the key actors talked to suggest that Schools of Education should offer more demanding courses and raise the standards of entry into their programs so as to

improve the quality of teacher preparation.

C. Professional Development.

For several years, California has directly legislated and funded teacher staff development programs. Under SB 813, teachers have been given various opportunities to increase their professional growth.

1. Professional growth program. Under 813, 1983, to maintain a teaching credential issued after September 1, 1985, the holder must complete successful service as a classroom teacher (minimum one-half scool year) and 150 hou-s of an "individual program of professional growth" every five years. Verification must be submitted to CTC by a principal, mentor teacher, or district designee and must be "independent of any evaluation of performance of the holder." The holder may appeal adverse actions related to professional growth verification to the Commission.

2. Administrator training and evaluation. A three-year program designed to increase the capacity of school administrators to do personnel evaluation was established under SB 813, 1983.

3. Teacher education and computer centers (TEC). TEC Centers are established in 15 regions of the state to provide inservice training in all areas, with special concentration on math, science, and computers. Training is

to be provided in cooperation with institutions of higher education, business and industry.

4. California academic partnership program. This program was also established under SB 813, 1983, but was first funded in 1984. The program is to enable institutions of higher education to provide counseling, tutorial, and inservice training for at least two high schools and their feeder elementary schools.

5. College loan assumption program. The California Teacher Shortage College Loan Assumption Program was also established under SB 813 for pre-service teacher trainees.

6. Classroom teacher instructional improvement program. This program provides grants of up to $2,000 per individual per year to permanent full-time teachers, mentor teachers or groups of teachers for the purpose of improving instruction in the classroom. Funding is expected to be available for up to 5% of the eligible teachers in the local school district.

All of these recently adopted programs are aimed at improving the quality of the teachers in the schools.

D. Accountability Systems.

California has utilized accountability mechanisms such as adopting dismissal laws and tightening criteria for evaluating teachers as an approach to improving the

quality of school personnel.

1. Disiplinary provisions. Under SB 813, probationary teachers may be suspended for a specific period of time without pay as an alternative to dismissal. Permanent teachers may also be suspended for a specific period of time without pay on grounds of unprofessional conduct or for cause. Existing collective bargaining agreements supercede the authorization. Notice time is shortened from 90 to 45 days for unprofessional conduct and is set at 90 days for incompetency. The law provides that non-substantive procedural errors will not reverse decisions in dismissal or layoffs of teachers.

SB 813 made it possible for districts to lay off certificated personnel between 5 days after the governor signs the state budget through August 15, if the district's total revenue increase pere ADA is not 2% or greater. The law also allows for layoff if the state law modifies curriculum. Laid-off teachers may be used as substitute teachers.

As regards administrators, SB 813 states that school site administrators hired after July 1, 1983 may earn only a maximum of three years credit on the seniority list, and other administrators transferring to a teaching position may not count the administrative period toward seniority.

The SB 813 provisions have lessened the cumbersome, paper-loaded procedure that school administrators were facing during the process of teacher dismissal.

As the Assembly Education Committee chairperson remarked:

> I think that we have been pretty tough in terms of teachers and disciplinary measures. We have not been quite as tough in regards to administrators (Interview, 2/15/84).

2. Evaluation of teachers. By statute, school district governing boards are to develop standards of expected pupil achievement at each grade level. Certificated employees are to be evaluated and assessed as to their competencies as they reasonably relate to: (a) progress of pupils, (b) instructional techniques, (c) adherence to curricular objectives, and (d) establishment of a suitable learning environment. However, evaluation shall not include the use of standardized tests. Evaluation shall occur at least annually for probationary personnel and every other year for permanent personnel. Where deficiencies are noted, a program of improvement with annual evaluation is required until a positive evaluation is obtained.

3. Collective bargaining. The Rodda Act (SB 160, 1975) gave California teachers the right to organize and bargain collectively with school districts. The law covers Community College instructors as well as K-12 district

and county office employees--both classified and certificated. The act sought to restrict the scope of bargaining to wages, hours of employment, specified health and welfare benefits, leave and transfer policies, safety conditions of employment, class size, employee evaluation procedures, and grievance processing procedures.

E. Changing Teacher Job Definitions.

Some attempts have been made by California to change teacher job definitions. The best known program incorporating this approach is the "Mentor Teacher Program." SB 813, 1983, created a Mentor Teacher Program which gives a $4,000 annual stipend to "exemplary" teachers who are willing to assist in staff development for other teachers or undertake certain other additional responsibilities. According to the legislation, the objectives of the Mentor Teacher Program are: (1) to encourage continued excellence within the teaching profession; (2) to provide incentives for teachers of demonstrated ability to stay in the public schools; and (3) to restore the teaching profession to its position of primary importance within the structure of the state educational system.

Qualifications for the Mentor Teachers include: (1) permanent status teacher, (2) substantial recent experience in classroom instruction, and (3) demonstrated exemplary

teaching ability--effective communication, subject matter knowledge, astery of teaching strategies, etc.

A person may be a Mentor Teacher for up to three consecutive years--but may be reviewed and renominated. Selection must be done by a committee with a majority of classroom teachers; final designation is by district governing board. No more than 5% of district teachers can be nominated as Mentor Teachers. Selected Mentor Teachers must spend at least 60% of time in direct instruction of pupils

Summary

From the foregoing description, it can be easily recognized that California has adopted at least four approaches to school personnel policy.

The state has focused on pre-service training, and certification improvement to get better skilled teachers by offering more demanding and vigorous courses at the teacher training institutions. By raising the credentialing standards, the state hopes to keep inadequately prepared individuals out of the system.

Professional development is designed to improve and retain those teachers already in the profession through continuing education. This approach provides teachers with new knowledge, or new instructional strategies to enable

them to be more effective teachers.

Accountability systems have introduced disciplinary measures to "weed-out" the incompetent and those who don't meet the professional conduct standards.

The changing teacher job definitions approach incorporated in the Mentor Teacher Program aimed at providing incentives for teachers of demonstrated ability to remain in the profession. In addition to attracting teachers into the profession, the program also provides support and a sense of recognition on the part of the teachers within the system.

Policy workers in California are increasingly concerned about how to attract and retain effective teachers. A report by a legislative mandated Commission on Teacher Quality stated that:

> Attracting and retaining skilled teachers is difficult because prospective teachers must contemplate a career in which they are not supported or esteemed as valued professionals. Teachers are asked to commit their careers to an unvarying pattern of classroom instruction with few opportunities to branch out into new tasks. There is little chance for additional advancement or recognition (Watson, 1983, p. 3).

Ir is widely believed by California policy makers that the present teaching profession is unable to recruit enough academically able students, a profession whose preparation programs need substantial improvement, and a vocation which loses many of its most effective practitioners because of

low pay, lack of recognition and support by the system itself and the community as a whole. One respondent typified this view when asked about ways to tackle the problem of the quality of personnel in California. He replied:

> Well, I think that we just haven't been basically attracting the brightest students. I think that education and the teaching profession has been attracting more mediocre people rather than the academic, high scholastic individuals. If you look at who the people are that we graduate from our institutions and what kind of professions they go into, few of them go into teaching and even those who went into teaching initially, who came out with an institution recommended teaching credential, do not stay in the system long enough because they find the more lucrative opportunities outside the profession. It is just a cold dollars and cents thing. Plus the perception and the status of the teaching profession is not very high, and historically, it had been in the past. People do not look up to the teacher in the community as being the outstanding citizen. Certain college professors have more status than a teacher, but years ago that was not true. People want to feel good about what they do and the society makes that determination.

To make options even more difficult, another respondent remarked:

> There is an acknowledgement that to get the best and the brightest we are going to have to make some changes and the changes are probably going to cost a lot of money. Of course, then you got to stalemate. Our members (CTA) say classrooms go empty; if that is what it takes for people to get the message--let the classrooms go empty for awhile and let them get the message. When I articulate that, people say "how can you say that?" Well,

> we are not getting to any logical conclusions here, we are getting to a certain point and nobody will go past that point.

In an attempt of improving the quality of school personnel, there are least five options to pursue. (1) attracting more skilled individuals to teaching careers; (2) reversing the flow of skilled teachers from the educational system; (3) where necessary, helping teachers presently in the system improve their skills; (4) restructuring and strengthening the teacher preparation program; and (5) improving the morale and public perception of teachers currently in the system.

These options involve major changes ranging from upward mobility, salary considerations, teacher preparation, retraining, establishing standard teaching conditions to basic professional policies. In a nutsell, it involves professionalization of the teaching vocation. This challenge of improving the quality of school personnel is not only for California but for the other states as well.

III. Student Testing and Assessment Policies in California

Student testing and assessment are among the most visible policy mechanisms (SPMs) in California.

In the area of student testing and assessment, the

state has: (1) adopted new tests to be administered to high school students, (2) expanded the statewide testing program to test more students at other grade levels, (3) incorporated higher level content into the testing program, and (4) developed new testing programs to control student placement.

A. The California Assessment Program (CAP).

CAP is the most important statewide school testing program in California. It is designed to provide the public, legislature, and local school districts with comprehensive information regarding the level of K-12 student performance in the state. Under this program, standardized achievement tests are administered to all public school students at specified grade levels, with results reported on a school-wide and district-wide basis. Prior to SB 813, CAP tests were administered in grades 3, 6 and 12. SB 813 expanded the CAP to include the testing of students in grades 8 and 10.

The act also authorizes the State Board of Education to expand the range of subject matter tested to include higher level subjects such as literature, history, advanced mathematics, and science. The content areas tested by CAP prior to the passage of SB 813 included only the basic skills of reading, written language and mathematics. CAP is administered annually and is mandated to provide

information about the characteristics of effective schools and the factors related to the quality of their programs. CAP uses a matrix sampling strategy in which no student takes the entire test. Thus it is only useful for assessing the effectiveness of school level programs, not individual student strengths or weaknesses.

The CAP was first fully implemented in 1974-75.

> In design, development, and procedures, it is unique in the nation. The assessment program was designed with several criteria in mind: (1) it must be relevant to California schools; (2) it must cover the full range of instructional objectives; (3) it must provide program--diagnostic information at local and state levels; and (4) it must take only a minimum of testing time.

The current testing time under CAP is 30 minutes. The state assessment program had its foundation in two legislative acts: (1) the California School Testing Act of 1969 which first required an achievement testing program in the public schools; and (2) the Miller-Unruh Basic Reading Act, which originally required reading tests in grades 1, 2 and 3. The testing program was revised by 1972 legislation, which made major changes of the testing program which subsequently resulted in the adoption of the CAP.

Prior to the adoption of the California Assessment Program, all the tests used had been commercially published

instruments with "national" norms. The CAP, however, was constructed specifically for use in California schools.

Reports from the SDE state that:

> For the past eight years, the scores from the basic skills achievement tests given to California students in grades 3, and 6 have been increasing. Basic skills achievement in grade 12, however, decreased through 1979-80, and have either remained constant or have increased slightly since then, depending on the content area tested.

During the 1981-82 school year, the scores of 3rd and 6th grade students again continued an upward trend in all content areas tested: reading, written language, and mathematics. Two of the four content areas (written language and spelling) in grade 12 increased while reading and mathematics decreased.

SB 813 authorizes some incentive funds beginning 1984-85, for districts whose 12th graders' scores improve under the Educational Improvement Incentive Program. Table 7 shows the average test score by grade level from 1979-80 through 1981-82.

B. Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)

Although the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) is not a part of the California Assessment Program, the SAT results for California's college bound seniors and their counterparts throughout the nation are usually included in the CAP annual report.

Table 7

Numbers of Students Tested and Average Test Score by Grade Level and Content Area from 1979-80 Through 1981-82 California Assessment Program

Grade Level, Content area (number tested)	Average Test Score 1979-1 80	1980-81	1981-82	Difference 1979-80 to 1980-81	1980-81 to 1981-82
Grade 3 (254,232)					
Reading	250	254	258	+4	+4
Written language	250	255	260	+5	+5
Mathematics	250	254	261	+4	+7
Grade 6 (293,281)					
Reading	250	252	254	+2	+2
Written language	250	253	257	+3	+4
Mathematics	250	253	258	+3	+5
Grade 12 (220,603)					
Reading	63.1	63.4	63.2	+0.3	-0.2
Written language	62.4	63.1	63.2	+0.7	+0.1
Spelling	68.8	69.0	69.5	+0.2	+0.5
Mathematics	66.8	68.0	67.7	+1.2	-0.3

Source: California State Department of Education (1982) California Assessment Program: Student Achievement in California Schools 1981-82 Annual Report. Sacramento, CA, p. 2.

According to the Legislative Analyst, since 1971-72 the SAT verbal scores of California students have declined from 464 to 425--a drop of 39 points, or 8.4%. Math scores have declined from 493 to 474--a drop of 19 points or 3.8%. Most of the decline, however, occurred during the 1971-72 through 1977-78 period. Since 1977-78, mathematics scores have generally increased and there has been only a slight reduction in verbal scores. Table 8 shows the California and National SAT scores for the years 1971-72 through 1981-82.

C. Golden State Examination for High School Students.

SB 813 establishes the Golden State Examination to recognize the achievement of high school students in specified academic areas. The act requires that the Superintendent of Public Instruction in consultation with representatives of public schools and institutions of higher education develop academic subject matter examinations in each of the following areas by March 15, 1985: (1) English Literature and Composition; (2) Mathematics; (3) Laboratory Sciences; (4) Foreign Languages; (5) United States History; (6) Health Sciences; and (7) other academic subjects which are a part of the high school curriculum as may be designated by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Superintendent of Public

Table 8

California and National SAT Scores 1971-72 Through 1981-82

Year	Verbal			Mathematics		
	California	National	Difference	California	National	Difference
1971-72	464	452	12	493	484	9
1972-73	452	445	7	485	481	4
1973-74	450	444	6	484	480	4
1974-75	435	434	1	473	472	1
1975-76	430	431	-1	470	472	-2
1976-77	427	429	-2	470	470	-
1977-78	427	429	-2	466	468	-2
1978-79	428	427	1	473	466	6
1979-80	424	424	-	472	466	6
1980-81	426	424	2	475	466	9
1981-82	425	426	-1	474	467	7

Source: Legislative Analyst (1983). Analysis of the Budget Bill for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1983 to June 30, 1984. Sacramento, CA, p. 128.

Instruction is also required by the Act to adopt rules and regulations for the administration and assessment of the examination.

A student attaining a qualifying score would receive an honors designation in the tested subject which would be affixed to his or her high school diploma. The Golden State Examination Program is, however, voluntary on the part of each school district maintaining a high school.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction is required by the act to prepare an annual report comparing examination results among all participating school districts including the average scores achieved on the academic subject matter examinations, the number of pupils taking each examination, and the number of pupils qualifying for honors. The legislature directs school districts to encourage local representatives of business and industry to recognize pupils who receive an honors designation based on the Golden State Examination.

D. Measuring Non-Academic Student Outcomes

The CAP, SAT, and the Golden State Examinations attempt to measure academic student outcomes. For some time now, California has also been trying to measure some non-academic aspects related to students and school characteristics. The California Assessment Advisory Committees

have put some emphasis on school attitudes, school characteristics and physical performance tests. The rationale behind this is the belief that student academic achievement is only one measure of the performance of public schools.

1. School Attitudes. During the school year 1981-82, third grade students were surveyed to get their attitudes toward reading, written language and mathematics. The results of the study were incorporated into the annual report of the California Assessment Program.

2. School Characteristics. The California Assessment program is mandated to provide information about the characteristics of effective schools and the factors related to the quality of their programs.

3. Physical Performance Test. Physical performance test is any test which measures or attempts to measure the physical fitness of a pupil. The State Board of Education is designated with the responsibility of devising a physical performance test to all pupils in any three grades.

Summary

From the foregoing description, we can note that California has focused mainly on specifying the format and content of tests. For the past few years, California has

adopted a new statewide testing program for high school students and also expanded the CAP to include the testing of students in grades 8 and 10. The CAP has also been expanded to include higher level content courses in addition to the common basic skills of reading, language, and mathematics.

IV. School Program Definition Policies in California

California has recently made significant policy changes aimed at improving the quality of school programs in the K-12 education system. These policies include extending the school day and year, setting higher standards for high school graduation, providing computer education to meet the technological needs, and strengthening special programs for special groups of pupils.

Several provisions of the omnibus reform measure Senate Bill 813 (SB 813) of 1983 and the "Model Curriculum Requirements" adopted by the SDE January, 1984 represent the truth of the state's most substantial attempts to improve the quality of school programs in the K-12 education.

A. Changing Time Requirements

The current statutory minimum school year in California

is 175 days. According to the State Department of Education, the average California pupil is offered considerably less instructional time than the average pupil nationwide. In order to increase the amount of instructional time offered to students in California, SB 813 provides fiscal incentives to school districts to lengthen the school day and year. The incentives for longer school day and year constitutes SB 813's single most expensive program in the FY 1984-85. Policy makers decided to inject $256.9 million out of the $629.8 million SB 813 total funding for longer school day and year incentives during the FY 1984-85. The program is voluntary rather than mandatory, and the actual increase in the amount of instructional time offered to students will be determined by each local school district. To be eligible for SB 813 funds, school districts must offer a 180-day school year instead of the present 175. SB 813 also offers fiscal incentives to increase the total instructional time offered to their students over a three year period, additional funds are provided if certain target levels of instruction are met. SB 813 target levels of instruction in 1986-87 are shown in Table 9. School districts will receive an additional $20 per ADA for grades K-8 and $40 per ADA for grades 9-12 if they meet those instructional time goals.

Table 9

Minimum School Year - Current Law and SB 813 Targets for 1986-87

	Current Law			SB 813	Change	
Grade	Minutes per day	Days per year	Minutes per year	Minutes per year in 1986/87	Amount	%
K	180	175	31,500	36,000	4,500	14.3
1-3	230	175	40,250	50,400	10,150	25.2
4-8	240	175	42,000	54,000	12,000	28.6
9-12	240	175	42,000	64,800	22,800	54.3

Source: Legislative Analyst (1984). Analysis of the Budget Bill for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1984 to June 30, 1985, p. 1441.

There were at least three main forces which contributed to the thrust of lengthening the school year and the total instructional time as proposed in SB 813. First, the impact of the reports by the National Commission on Excellence in Education and the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth of the Education Commission of States, which recommended the instructional time be added to the school day and that days be added to the school year as a means of increasing student achievement. The National Commission on Excellence in Education, in its report A Nation At Risk, specifically recommended that the school day be increased to 200-220 days. Second, there has been a recognition that the average California pupil is offered less instructional time than the average pupil in the nation. Third, the results of the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BTES) sponsored by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) which found that the total amount of time a student spends in a specific curriculum area is positively related to achievement in that area (see Legislative Analyst, 1984, Analysis of the Budget Bill for the Fiscal Year 1984-85, p. 1446). These forces convinced policy makers to focus on the lengthening of school year and increasing of the total instructional time as one of the best alternative approaches to improve the quality of education in the public schools.

B. Setting Higher Program Standards.

Setting higher program standards has also received a lot of attention for the past three years. The state has not only increased the school year and the instructional time, but it has also focused on the number of courses to be offered, the nature and quality of those courses. Under SB 813 and recently adopted Model Graduation Requirements, high school graduation requirements have been raised, increasing the number of academic courses needed and giving deliberate emphasis to computer education, math, and science.

SB 813 establishes, starting in the school year 1986-87, the following statewide minimum requirements for high school graduation: (1) three years of English; (2) three years of social studies; (3) two years of mathematics; (4) two years of science; (5) one year of fine arts or foreign language; and (6) two years of physical education.

Current high school graduation requirements, which remain in effect until July 1, 1986, provide that each pupil must take English, American history and government, mathematics, science, and physical education but there is no specified number of courses to be completed. SB 813 directs the Superitendent of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education to adopt, by January 1985, model curriculum standards for the required courses. School

district governing boards are, in turn, required to compare their curricula to these standards at least once every three years. SB 813 also requires the State Board of Education to submit to the Legislature by July, 1984, a model course of study for computer education in grades K-12.

The act further requires every school district maintaining grades 7 through 12 to offer a course of study fulfilling the admission requirements of the California State University and the University of California--and also to provide an opportunity to attain entry level employment skills in business or industry upon graduation from high school.

Model Graduation Requirements. In California, high school graduation requirements were mandated by state law until 1969. Since that time the requirements have been established independently by the state's 382 school districts that maintain high schools. Over the years, due to local circumstances and financial inequalities, this resulted in the adoption of disparate standards in which it has been possible for students in one district to graduate with 190 units while students in another district needed as many as 265 units. The Model Graduation Requirements establish uniform standards for high school graduation. They were adopted by the SBE in 1984

and became effective January 1, 1985. The subject areas and time requirements for high school graduation are shown in table 10.

As stated in the Raising Expectations: Model Graduation Requirements (1983):

> By adopting model graduation requirements, the Board challenges local school districts to raise their sights and to recognize what is necessary to achieve excellence in education (p. ix).

C. Courses to Strengthen Program Standards.

SB 813 set standards for several specialized educational programs.

1. New summer programs. Prior to SB 813, state supported school summer programs were available only for pupils in grades 7-12 who had failed proficiency tests, for pupils needing additional course credit in order to graduate, and for certain pupils in special programs. Under SB 813, however, summer school programs are also funded for grades K-12 for mathematics, science, history, English, foreign language, fine arts, and computer education.

2. Five course requirement for most 12th grade pupils. After July 1, 1984 all 12th grade pupils must be enrolled in five courses unless concurrently enrolled in work experience programs, courses of study in accredited

Table 10

Model Graduation Requirements

Subject Area		Requirement
Computer studies		1 semester
English		4 years
Foreign Language		2 years in the same language
Mathematics		3 years
Algebra I	1 year (at least)	
Geometry	1 year	
District Option	1 year	
Natural Sciences		2 years
Science I (Physical Earth)	1 year	
Science II (Life)	1 year	
Social Sciences		3 years
World Civilizations: History, Geography, and Culture	1 year	
The United States: Ideals, Institutions and Traditions	1 year	
Individual Rights and Civic Responsibilities:		
I Political, Legal, and Ethical Perspectives	1 semester	
II Economics	1 semester	
Visual and Performing Arts		1 year

Source: California State Department of Education (1983). Raising Expectations: Model Graduation Requirements. Sacramento, CA, p. 2.

post secondary education institutions or other specified programs.

3. Academic counseling for 10th grade students. The academic counseling program under SB 813 is intended to act as a check point for assessing student progress toward meeting graduation requirements and quality education that will broaden the educational and career options for students.

4. Educational technology program. The main goal of the Educational Technology Program is to strengthen the technological skills of California school pupils. School districts and other local education agencies can be awarded grants by State Board of Education to purchase technology equipment so as to improve technology education in the school districts.

5. Specialized secondary programs. This program is aimed at providing advanced instruction and training in high technology fields and in the performing arts in some high schools. The establishment of these specialized high schools (grades 9-12) is expected to benefit the state economy by providing opportunities to talented pupils.

6. School Improvement Program (SIP). Under this program (first created under AB 65, 1977), schools receive funds to improve the curriculum content, instructional programs, improve school climate and other programs that

make school programs more effective.

7. Demonstration programs in reading and mathematics. Demonstration programs in reading and mathematics were established to provide cost-effective exemplary reading and math programs in grades 7, 8 and 9, using intensive instruction.

C. Developing Programs for Special Groups.

California has put some emphasis on the development of programs for groups of students with special needs. Programs have been created for the handicapped, gifted or talented, minorities, and adults.

1. Special education programs for the handicapped. In California, K-12 public school students receive special education and related services through the Master Plan for Special Education (MPSE). Under the master plan, school districts and county offices of education administer special education services through regional organizations called Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs). Each SELPA is required to adopt a local plan which details the provision of special education services among the member districts. The SELPA may consist of a single district, a group of districts, or the county office of education in combination with districts. In the school year 1984-85, Special Education is expected to serve about

363,000 students who are learning, communicatively, physically or severely handicapped.

a. State special schools. The state operates six special schools for handicapped children. These schools offer both residential and non-residential programs for students who are deaf, blind, neurologically handicapped, and multihandicapped. Only those students who cannot receive an appropriate education in their district of residence are eligible for admission to a special school.

b. Infant programs. The state also serves about 2,200 (1983-84) handicapped infants in 67 programs operated by school districts and county offices of education. These children receive special education and related services through both home-based and center-based programs.

2. Compensatory Education Programs. Compensatory education programs are the state and federally funded programs which assist students who are educationally disadvantaged due to poverty, language barriers, or cultural differences, or who experience learning difficulties in specific subject areas. Compensatory education programs include:

a. Economic Impact Aid Program (EIA)--provides funds for the state compensatory education program and bilingual education programs for limited English-proficient

pupils. The intent of EIA is to provide supplemental educational services, particularly in basic skills to children who have difficulty in reading, language development, and mathematics and who attend schools which are located in high poverty areas or have an excessive number of children with poor academic skills. The migrant education program, for example, was established to provide supplemental educational services to children of migrant workers.

b. Indian Education. There are twelve Indian education centers which serve as regional educational resource centers to Indian students, parents, and schools. These centers are operated by private, non-profit organizations which report to a community elected board of directors. The centers provide tutorial assistance and counseling for Indian pupils, and provide also Native American related curriculum for school districts. In addition, there is the Native American Indian Education Program which seeks to improve the educational accomplishments of kindergarten through fourth grade is selected rural school districts. The objective of the program is to develop and test educational models which increase competence in reading and mathematics.

c. Miller-Unruh Reading Program--is designed

to upgrade the reading achievement of low performing K-6 pupils in the public schools through reading specialists.

d. Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA) Program--is intended to increase the enrollment of "under-represented" ethnic minorities in university and college programs related to mathematics, engineering, and the physical sciences. The program provides tutoring, counseling, study groups, and summer school enrichment for secondary school students who show an aptitude in mathematics and science. MESA is jointly funded by the state and the private sector.

3. Gifted and Talented Education (GATE). The GATE program superseded the Mentally Gifted Minor Program. Under GATE, pupils are identified as gifted or talented based on district criteria and state guidelines. The students are then exposed to different approaches in learning such as independent study, special day classes, part-time or cluster groupings of GATE students, acceleration activities and higher education opportunities.

4. Opportunity Classes. Opportunity classes and programs created under SB 813 are designed to provide pupils in grades 7 to 9 who are identified as potential truants or disciplinary problems an opportunity to resolve their problems so that they may return to regular class

room instruction. The program is intended to be done through counseling and by offering alternative approaches to learning. It is the intention of the State Department of Education to reduce the current average dropout rate for high school students of 29.3% statewide to 23.5% by 1989-90.

5. Adult Education. Adult education programs operated by K-12 school districts offer courses in parenting, basic education, English as a Second Language, citizenship, vocational education, home economics, health and safety classes.

D. Mandating Specific Subjects

The state of California has mandated some specific subjects to be taken in the schools. These mandated subjects include instruction on alcohol and drug abuse, physical education, California history, health and safety programs, instruction on consumer economics in grades 7 to 12 and driver training programs. Most of these programs are aimed at improving the quality of life of the students rather than quality of education which strives for excellence.

E. Non K-12 Education Programs

Several non K-12 education programs are administered

by the State Department of Education. These include: youth programs such as pre-school, child care, foster youth services, and the youth suicide prevention programs; and adult education programs supported by the state and federal governments.

Summary

Setting higher program standards, changing time requirements for high school graduation, and developing special education programs for special groups of children have been the main approaches which the state has utilized to improve its school program definition policies. The main policy has been to increase the number of academic courses, increasing the instructional time, and extending the school day and year. Policies for setting high program standards and of changing time requirements are aimed at enhancing quality while the approach of developing special education programs for specific groups is aimed at enhancing equity. Quality and equity are the main educational goals which dominate program policies in the state. The State Board of Education (SBE) maintains that:

> The twin goals of equity and high-quality schooling have profound and practical meaning for our economy and society, and we cannot permit one to yield to the other in principle or in practice. To do so would deny young people their chance to learn and live according to their aspirations and abilities (Honig, 1983, p. ix).

However, with the adoption of SB 813 and the Model Graduation Requirements, quality has clearly surfaced as the dominant educational goal in California.

The legislature, the SBE, and the SDE have played a leadership role in the thrust and quality. Very recently the SDE outlined a list of high school goals for the state:

1. Achieve better test scores--The present California Assessment Program reading test scores average 62.6% correct. The SDE is aiming for a 64.7% correct statewide average by the end of the decade.

2. Increased enrollment--The SDE is aiming at increasing enrollment in academic subjects.

3. Lowering dropout rate in high schools--The present dropout rate for high school students is 29.3% statewide average. The SDE is aiming at reducing it to 23.5% by 1989-90 (Riverside Enterprise, Dec. 15, 1984, p. 1 and A-4).

V. School Organization and Governance Policies in California

For the past five years California has attempted to improve the quality of its school governance by providing training to the school administrators--especially in evaluation issues, conducting feasibility studies regarding

aspects of school governance; broadening participation in decision-making; building consensus among key policy actors and striving for a well-coordinated, efficient and effective administration.

The Legislature, SBE, SDE, and the California Business Roundtable seemed to have played the most prominent roles in initiating governance policy changes during the past few years. Initiatives (referenda) have also played an important role in shaping school governance policies in California.

A. Programs to Strengthen School Management.

Recently, California has adopted or proposed some programs aimed at strengthening the administration of public schools. SB 813 of 1983 introduces three programs to improve governance through improved school management. These programs include the establishment of the Administrator Training and Evaluation Program; the Pilot Project for Administrative Personnel and the establishment of the Commission on School Governance and Management.

1. The Administrator Training and Evaluation Program. This program, formerly called the California Leadership Institute, allows a school district, county superintendent of schools to apply for funds in order to establish a three-year project for administrator training.

The main purpose of this program is to improve the clinical supervision skills of administrators. The governor's budget for fiscal year 1984-85 included $2.0 million for the program in 1984-85.

2. Pilot project for administrative personnel--allows county offices or consortia of school districts to apply to the State Board of Education for the establishment of a pilot project to assist in the recruitment and selection of administrative personnel. The governor's budget includes $250,000 for this program for 1984-85. The State Department of Education, however, has not issued regulations governing the program.

3. Establishment of the Commission on School Governance and Management. SB 813 establishes a 15-member Commission on School Governance and Management to

> conduct appropriate studies and make recommendations to the legislature and the governor on the following topics.
>
> (a) Methods of eliminating duplication effort among, and consolidating functions performed by, the State Department of Education and various regional and local education agencies;
>
> (b) the appropriate size and scope of authority for schools needed in order to improve educational management capabilities and facilitate community participation in policy development;
>
> (c) reasons for the growth in the number of non-teaching personnel in schools over the past 12 years; and
>
> (d) the appropriate taxing authority to be granted school districts. (Legislative Analyst, 1984, p. 1481).

The act provides that each of the following five persons or groups shall appoint two members to the Commission: the Speaker of the Assembly, the Senate Rules Committee, the Governor, the State Board of Education, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The remaining five committee members who shall serve ex officio include the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Director of Finance, the Legislative Analyst, the Chancellor of the Community Colleges, and the Secretary of Health and Welfare. Staff support to the Commission is to be provided by the State Department of Education.

Several other governance and management studies authorized by SB 813 include: (1) a study of the characteristics of students who drop out of school prior to high school graduation; (2) a study of the high school accreditation process administered by private accreditation associations; (3) a study of the feasibility of developing and maintaining an automated school facilities inventory that would be capable of indicating statewide school facility utilization rates, projecting facility needs, and allocating funds for new construction, maintenance and rehabilitation; and (4) a study of the appropriateness of existing architectural standards and the type of building materials used for school facilities.

All of these studies show the extent of concern by

the policy makers in those areas and degree of state reliance on research findings in formulating education policies.

B. Establishment of Site-Level Councils.

The establishment of school site councils in California is a result of AB 65 (1977) which called upon each district to develop a master plan for school improvement. The site-level councils are responsible for developing a school improvement plan, continuously reviewing the implementation of the plans and assessing the effectiveness of the school programs. The basic principle underlying the establishment of these councils is to involve people in decision making at the site-level. The law requires that school site councils must be composed of the principal, parents, teachers, other school personnel, and, at secondary schools, pupils.

C. Parents Are Teachers Too.

Recently the State Department of Education (SDE) launched a program known as "Parents Are Teachers Too" aimed at encouraging parent participation in the educational policy making process--particularly at the site-level. The SDE is convinced that to improve the quality of education in the state, both educators and parents must cooperate and tackle it together. There is a growing realization among the education policy makers in the state

that what parents do at home with their children is a key factor in student achievement.

D. Task Force on Standards for Effective Schools.

The SDE recently appointed a 27-member task force comprised of educators and school board members "to develop a list of indicators of quality in effective educational programs." The task force identified eleven major indicators of school effectiveness. These are: (1) academic focus; (2) rigorous content; (3) a safe and orderly environment; (4) coordinated curriculum; (5) maximum use of time; (6) regular homework; (7) teacher-directed instruction; (8) variety of teaching strategies; (9) high standards and expectations; (10) regular assessment; and (11) instructional leadership. The SDE is hoping to use the findings of the task force to upgrade the quality of the public schools in California and also to rebuild confidence in the educational system.

E. Initiatives in California.

Popular referenda have significantly shaped the education policies in California. The two major porpositions passed by the people related to education include Proposition 13 of June, 1978, which resulted in cuts in local property taxes, and Proposition 37 of November, 1984, which is expected to increase school revenue through

a state lottery.

Petitions for a proposed "Project Independence" did not qualify for the ballot, but represented the most sweeping reforms of California school finance and governance in recent memory. This initiative would have constituionally guaranteed $3,000 or more per unit of ADA, and fixed tax sources for K-12 education system (earmarking some $14 billion for schools).

Project Independence calls for citizen involvement in governance. It maintains that:

> . . . the delivery of programs and services, and the resolution of problems should be with that level of government that is closest to the people and can still discharge those responsibilities effectively and efficiently. Only those functions which cannot efficiently or effectively be carried out by local jurisdictions shall be the obligation of the state government (California for Community Governance, 1984, p. 1).

The proposed initiative was sponsored by California School Boards Association (CSBA), California School Administration, Inc. and the Community Colleges.

F. Judicial Involvement in Educational Policy-Making in California.

In their study on the Legalization of State Educational Policymaking in California, Griffin and Jensen (1983) maintain that

> . . . the courts have been deciding an

> increasing number of education cases; the cases are increasingly likely to involve educational issues that traditionally have been decided by the other political branches; plaintiffs are increasingly likely to sue over educational rights issues; suits are increasingly brought by "repeater" law firms rather than by individual plaintiffs; and the state is increasingly being sued because of alleged violations by school districts (p. 111).

The authors further maintain that the increase in legalization of education encourages a centralization of educational policymaking in California.

Summary

To improve the quality of school governance, California has provided training to its administrative personnel, established commissions and task forces to study some aspects of school governance, and strengthened or broadened participation in decision making at the site level.

Attempts have been made to simultaneously strengthen both the state and local levels. State-level control, however, has taken predominance through fiscal policies, certification of school personnel, statewide testing programs, setting of high school graduation reqruiements and in school facilities policies. The legal system has also strengthened the state-level control. This expansion

of state-level control has been challenged, albeit unsuccessfully, by a major initiative aimed at reducing state-level control.

VI. Curriculum Materials Policies in California

In California, the Legislature recognizes that

> because of the common needs and interests of the citizens of this state and the nation, there is a need to establish broad minimum standards and general educational guidelines for the selection of instructional materials for public schools, but because of economic, geographic, physical, political, educational, and social diversity, specific choices about instructional materials need to be made at the local level (Education Code Sect. 60002, p. 577).

As a result of this, the Legislature has given school district governing boards broad powers to establish courses of study and that school district governing boards are expected to have the ability to choose instructional materials which are appropriate to their courses of study.

In California, textbooks and other instructional materials are given to pupils without charge. The law states that no school shall require any pupil except pupils in classes for adults to purchase any instructional materials for the pupil's use in the school.

There is a growing recognition among education policy makers of the importance of adequate instructional materials in raising student achievement. In combination,

the governor's budget and SB 813 appropriated a total of $77.6 million for textbooks and other instructional materials for K-12 public schools. Of this amount, $18.2 million was for grades 9-12 and the remaining amount of $59.4 million was allocated to K-8. By doing this, it increased the level of state funding for instructional materials by 91% over baseline expenditures in 1982-83. SB 813 also provided for the first time an annual apportionament of $14.41 per pupil in grades 9-12 for purchasing instructional materials begging in 1983-84.

In addition to the increased funding for instructional materials, the state has also put emphasis on specifying the scope and sequence of the instructional materials to be used in schools. Recently California has placed great emphasis on specialized instructional materials, especially computer software. In a statewide survey of computer use in elementary schools conducted by the State Department of Education in 1982, if was found that "twenty-nine per cent of the elementary schools in California have a terminal or microcomputer and 83% of those schools use them for computer-assisted instruction (SDE, 1982, p. 189). Under SB 813, for instance, various programs have been established with the aim of strengthening the technological skills of California school pupils.

A. Role of State Board of Education (SBE)

The SBE plays a crucial role in the determination and selection of instructional materials and especially textbooks and supplemental materials for schools. According to the statute, the SBE adopts instructional materials for use in kindergarten and grades one through eight for school district governing boards. There are seven subject categories in which the SBE shall adopt instructional material: language arts; math; reading; science; social sciences; bilingual or bicultural subjects; and any other subject, discipline or interdisiplinary areas for which the SBE may determine the need and desirability for instructional materials to promote the maximum efficiency of pupil learning.

For high school textbooks, the law maintains that a school district governing board maintaining one or more high schools shall adopt textbooks for use in the high schools under its control. The SBE, however, shall designate the kinds of books which shall be classified as textbooks for use in the high schools.

B. Process of Adopting Textb-oks and Other Instructional Materials.

The SBE is assisted by two state-level agencies in the process of adopting textbooks or instructional

materials: the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission and the Instructional Materials Evaluation Panels. These two agencies make recommendations to the SBE to assist both the SBE and the school district governing boards in selecting instructional materials for the public schools.

It is the responsibility of the SBE to disseminate to school districts a copy of the recommendations report made by the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission on textbooks and other materials recommended for state adoption. The Commision's recommendations are based on the reviews by the Instructional Materials Evaluation Panels. The SBE is also required to send a brief summary of the strengths of each textbook to the school districts to assist them in selecting the appropriate textbooks and other associated instructional materials. Negative reports made by the panels are not, however, sent to the school districts.

Before the final adoption by the SBE, the Superintendent of Public Instruction is required to display for the public the textbooks and instructional materials for not less than 30 days. A public hearing is also required before the final adoption of the instructional materials intended for use in elementary schools.

The law encourages school district governing boards

to provide substantial involvement by teachers, parents, and the community in selecting instructional materials. The state also directs the SBE to give high priority to the adoption of instructional materials on drug education for classroom use by teachers and pupils. These materials, however, are supposed to be accurate, objective and current.

In California, there are some instructional materials which are prohibited. The law specifies that no instructional materials shall be adopted by a school district governing board for use in the schools which in its determination contains:

(1) any matter reflecting adversely upon persons because of their race, color, creed, national origin, ancestry, sex, or occupation; and (2) any sectarian or denomination doctrine or propaganda contrary to law (Education Code, Sect. 60044).

Purchase of Textbooks and Other Instructional Materials: California has created a special fund known as State Instructional Materials Fund which acts as the means of funding instructional materials to schools as required by the law. The money in the fund is appropriated and administered by the State Department of Education (SDE) under policies established by SBE. The SBE has established a credit for each school district

governing board with which instructional materials adopted may be ordered by districts which choose to order materials through the state. The statute permits schools districts to order all K-8 instructional materials directly from publishers rather than through the state. Under this arrangement or provisions, school districts have two options to purchase their instructional materials directly from the publishers; and the "state order system" whereby school districts order through the State Department of Education. Some school districts--especially large districts prefer the "direct option" because they receive the entire allocation in cash, permitting districts to earn interest and also to secure faster delivery. Other school districts order through the state to reduce local administrative costs and because credits in the districts are not available early enough to purchase the materials before school starts.

C. Emphasis on Technology

Recently, California has put a lot of emphasis on computer education. Under SB 813, for example, substantial amounts of funds are allocated to purchase computer hardware and instructional telecommunications services for schools under the Educational Technology Program. The goal is to strengthen the technological skills of California school pupils.

Computer education has been incorporated into the school curriculum. Under the Model Graduation Requirements adopted by the SBE and to be effective from January 1, 1985, one semester of computer studies is required before high school graduation. The Institute for Computer Technology (ICT) established in 1982 by three school districts provides education and training in computer technology for pupils in grades K-12 and adults. The 1984-85 budget proposes about $257,000 for the Institute for the purpose of training and purchasing instructional materials related to computer technology.

Summary

The state of California has, for the past two years or so, increased the amount to purchase instructional materials. The funds for this purpose have almost doubled for the past two years. This has increased the capability for school districts to purchase more instructional materials. By establishing the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission and the Instructional Materials Evaluation Penels, the state has been more effective in specifying the scope and sequence of the materials to be used in the school districts. The state has also put a lot of emphasis on specialized instructional materials especially in computer instruction.

VII. School Building and Facilities Policies in California

School building and facilities is the state policy mechanism which has received least attention by the state in recent years. There is a growing realization, however, that the development of school buildings and facilities is an important factor in student performance. What has been done in California for the past three years has focused on finding alternative ways of funding the construction of new buildings for the districts which have substantial overcrowding problems; on renovating or repairing the old buildings; and on maintaining safety standards established by the state and federal governments regarding the construction and maintenance of school buildings and facilities.

A. Funding of School Facilities

The state School Facilities Aid Program provides financial assistance to school districts for (1) acquisition and development of school sites; (2) construction or reconstruction of school buildings; (3) purchase of school furniture and equipment for newly constructed buildings; (4) emergency portable classrooms; and (5) deferred maintenance.

Funding for school facilities aid is provided through three major statutory appropriations, each of which is available for expenditures irrespective of fiscal year.

These three appropriations are:

1. School district "excess repayments--that is, the excess of school district principal and interest payments on state school building aid loans over the amount needed for the debt service of state school construction bonds. These excess repayments are principally used to fund school district deferred maintenance projects, with any remaining amount going to fund new construction;

2. a $200 million allocation of tidelands oil revenues annually through 1984-85, which is used principally for new school construction; and

3. the proceeds from bond sales authorized by Prop. 1 of 1982 which can be used for new school construction and rehabilitation of existing school facilities (Legislative Analyst, 1978, p. 1563).

These three statutory revenue sources have not been able to meet the districts' needs for school construction and deferred maintenance.

B. School Construction

Prior to the passage of Proposition 13 in June, 1978, local school districts financed the construction of elementary and secondary school facilities by either issuing school construction bonds, or obtaining a loan from the state under the State School Building Aid Program. District voters, however, had to approve the borrowing beforehand. Funds borrowed from the state or private sources were repaid from property tax revenues. This meant that the district borrower had to levy an

additional property tax in order to provide adequate security for the bonds or loans.

After Proposition 13, however, school districts had no revenue source for school construction because Proposition 13 eliminated the ability of local school districts to levy an additional special property tax rate; and as a result, school districts can no longer issue construction bonds or obtain loans through the State School Lease-Purchase Aid Program.

Because of this the legislature revised the state School Lease Purchase Act so that districts could continue to receive state aid for financing needed school facilities. Under the Act (New Schools Relief Act of 1979), the state no longer provides loans to school districts; instead, it provides "quasi-grants." The state funds the construction of new school facilities and rents them for a nominal fee to local school districts under a long-term lease-purchase agreement that calls for title to the facility to be transferred to the district no later than 40 years after the rental agreement is executed. Rent is paid to the state at the rate of $1 per year, plus any interest earned on state funds deposited in the county school lease-purchase fund on behalf of the district. Because this amount is nominal in comparison to the amount of state aid provided, the state is in fact providing a grant for

school construction, rather than a loan to school districts.

There is at least one major criterion for eligibility for the lease-purchase funds. A school district receiving lease-purchase funds must either (1) provide 10% of the project's cost from other district funds or (2) agree to contribute to the State School Deferred Maintenance Fund 1% of the project's cost each year, for 10 years.

In order to establish eligibility for school construction funds appropriated to the State Allocation Board (SAB) school districts must demonstrate that they are experiencing overcrowding and that they are fully utilizing all available facilities. If a school is destroyed by earthquake it can also receive SAB funds.

The SAB handles all the funding to the districts for construction purposes after receiving and considering districts' requests or needs. Since the passage of Prop. 13, there has been a "large backlog of demand for school construction funds. As of January 23, 1984, school districts had filed applications with the SAB for school construction funds that exceeded--by $481,490,635, the amount appropriated by the SAB."

C. Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of Existing School Facilities.

Proposition 1 of 1982 provided up to $150 m. of the

proceeds from bond sales authorized by the Act to be used for rehabilitation and reconstruction of existing school facilities.

D. Deferred Maintenance

Funds from the state School Deferred Maintenance Fund are provided on a matching basis to school districts for (1) deferred maintenance and (2) elimination of asbestos related health hazards. The SAB apportions to each school district one dollar for every dollar of local funds contributed to the district's deferred maintenance funds. The amount of this apportionment is limited to a maximum of one-half of 1% of the district's total general fund budget (excluding capital outlay). Extreme hardship cases by districts qualify them for a one-year increase in apportionments for deferred maintenance, to be offset by reductions in apportionments in future years. A report by the Legislative Analyst (1984) indicates that most of the hardship applications come from small districts; and most of the funds requested are for repairing roofs, heating systems, plumbing, water systems, and to repair damages resulting from the storms and heavy rains of the past two winters.

E. Role of the State Department of Education

According to the law, the State Department of Education (a) advises the school district governing boards on the acquisition of new school sites; (b) establishes standards for school buildings; (c) reviews all plans and specifications, and (d) employes experts knowledgeable in school building and planning.

Most of the duties of the State Department of Education regarding school facilities is done by the School Facilities Planning Unit which provides consulting services in the area of school facilities planning to local school districts that lack the resources and expertise at the local level. Specific types of services of the School Facilities Planning Unit include: (1) planning a new school facility; (2) planning for renovation of existing facilities; (3) evaluation of existing facilities; and (4) financial planning for school construction.

The School Facilities Planning Unit also assists and monitors the statewide compliance by school districts with federal asbestos health standards. Federal law requires all public and private elementary and secondary schools to: (1) identify building materials which contain friable (crumbly) asbestos; and (2) maintain records and notify employees of the location of asbestos containing materials.

The School Facilities Planning Unit has indirect influence on curriculum related issues such as area specifications needed by each pupil and classroom designs. The present law for example, requires that a K-6 elementary pupil needs 55 sq. ft. in space-area; 75 sq. ft. for grades 7 to 8 and 85 sq. ft. for grades 9 to 12.

At the local level, the law allows the establishment of an Advisory Committee which advises the school district governing board on the development of district-wide policies regarding school facilities. The Committee includes ethnic, business, landowners, teachers, administrators, parents of students, persons with expertise in environmental impact, legal contracts, and land use planning.

Summary

As stated earlier, this State Policy Mechanism had received relatively little attention, but there is a strong understanding among the policy makers that improved school facilities make a difference in teacher and student performance. SB 813 of 1983 recognizes the importance of school facilities by requiring more detailed feasibility studies about school facility needs, material and design needs of the public schools in the state. As one respondent in the interviews remarked:

> SB 813 is talking about great expectations of the teachers and certainly expecting more from our children, but you know this can't really come about until we have the proper facilities. They are talking about increasing the graduation standards as it relates to science and I know you are talking about some laboratories; you are talking about some more space, you are talking about really expanding your facilities.

The major problem, however, seems to be the inability of the state to provide sufficient funds to meet the need for K-12 school capital outlay. The existing financing level and system seems to be inadequate to meet school districts' needs for new buildings, science and language laboratories, smaller classrooms, air-conditioning systems, repairs, renovations to meet structural and safety standards, etc.

CHAPTER VII

Survey Data Analysis for the Selected Demographic and Policy Makers' Orientations Data

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section presents a descriptive analysis of respondents' demographic characteristics. The second section discusses data collected with the Policy Value instrument--a questionnaire designed to measure differences or similarities in the respondents' value orientations toward education policy problems in three substantive domains (school finance, organization, and program).

I. Selected Demographic Data

A "Biographic Data Form" was used to obtain data from twenty selected personal characteristics of the key actors that participated in the final interviews of the studv. The objective of the instrument was to see whether personal characteristics of the key actors are linked to the selection of alternative approaches to the seven SPMs under study. Table 11 lists the frequency counts for each category of the twenty selected demographic variables.

A. Tenure

Tenure identifies the number of years respondents

have held their present positions. The analysis indicates that a majority of the key actors had substantial experience in their positions. Twelve respondents indicated that they had experience of between five and seven years, and eleven actors between two and four years. Eight indicated they had experience of more than eleven years. Only nine key actors had experience of less than two years.

B. Age

Most respondents (28) were between 30 and 49 years old. Seven were more than 60 years old.

C. Occupation

All reported occupations were coded into two major categories: educational related occupations and non-educational related for a more reliable analysis. The educational related included occupations like teachers, educational administrators, educational researchers, etc., while the non-educational related occupations included lawyers, legislators, grocery retailers, etc. There were 31 key actors having educational related occupations and 11 with non-educational occupations.

D. Degree

Variables four through seven report on respondents' educational attainments. All but two respondents had a

degree. Fifteen had either B.A./B.S., seventeen has M.A./M.S. and nine had Ph.D./Ed.D. Fields for B.A./B.S. were broadly distributed. Seven were in humanities, five in education, six in sciences, five in business, and six in social sciences. As regards M.A./M.S. degrees, seven had studied education, eight in the social sciences, four in business and accounting, two in humanities, and one in sciences. All of the Ph.D.'s were in the field of education.

E. Licenses

Licenses included those in teaching, administrative, nursing, law, engineering, medical/dental, and psychology. Because there were too few respondents in each category to be treated as a separate group for analysis, two categories were developed: educational professionals (teaching, administrative and psychology license holders) and non-educational professionals (nursing, medical, dental, engineering, law, and architecture license holders). As a result of this categorization, there were 31 respondents who were classified as educational professionals and 11 as non-educational professionals.

F. Political Party Affiliation

There were only three party affiliations reported:

Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. There were more Democrats (23) than Republicans (17). Only three identified themselves as Independents.

G. Political Liberalism/Conservatism

This was the self-reported degree of liberalism or conservatism by each respondent. When asked to respond on a five point-scale: strongly conservative, conservative, moderate, liberal, strongly liberal, the key actors were fairly clearly divided: fourteen conservatives, thirteen moderates and twelve liberals. Very few espoused extreme positions--that is, strongly conservative or strongly liberal. Only two identified themselves as strongly conservative and two as strongly liberal. California's mean score was somewhat more liberal (3.21) than Arizona's (2.83).

H. Family Income

Self reported family income was recorded in eight categories of income brackets. The analysis indicates that the largest number of respondents have incomes which range from $45,001 to $55,000 per year. The overall mean was 4.94--and the incomes rather evenly distributed. Only one respondent had an annual income of $25,000 or less. Six had an annual income of $85,000 or more.

Table 11

Distribution Statistics: The Selected Biographical Characteristics of Respondents in Arizona and California

Variables	N = 46
1. Time in Present Position	
Less than 2 years	9
2 to 4 years	11
5 to 7 years	12
8 to 10 years	4
11 or more years	8
Missing	2
2. Age	
Less than 30	1
30 to 39	14
40 to 49	14
50 to 59	8
60 or older	7
Missing	2
3. Regular Occupation	
Non-educational related	11
Educational related	31
Missing	3
4. Highest Degree Held	
None	2
BA/BS	15
MA/MS	17
PhD/EdD	9
MD/DDS	0
LLD/LLB	1
5. Bachelor's Field	
Education	5
Science and Maths	6
Social Sciences	6
Humanities	7
Business and Accounting	5
Missing	2

Table 11 (continued)

Variable	N = 46
6. Master's Field	
Education	7
Science and Maths	1
Social Sciences	8
Humanities	2
Business and Accounting	4
Missing	2
7. Doctoral Field	
Educational related	9
Non-educational related	0
8. Teaching Licenses	
Teaching License Holders	18
Non-teaching License Holders	26
Missing	2
9. Administrative License Holders	
Yes	11
No	33
Missing	2
10. Nursing License Holders	
Yes	3
No	41
Missing	2
11. Law License Holders	
Yes	2
No	42
Missing	2
12. Engineering/Arch. License	
Yes	1
No	43
Missing	2

Table 11 (continued)

Variable	N = 46
13. Medical Dental License	
Yes	1
No	43
Missing	2
14. Psychology License	
Yes	2
No	42
Missing	2
15. Other Licenses	
Yes	4
No	40
Missing	2
16. Political Party Affiliation	
Democrats	23
Republicans	17
Independent	3
Missing	2
17. Political Liberalism/Conservatism	
Strongly Conservative	2
Conservative	14
Moderate	13
Liberal	12
Strongly Liberal	2
Missing	3
18. Family Income	
25,000 or less	1
25,001 to 35,000	5
35,001 to 45,000	6
45,001 to 50,000	9
50,001 to 65,000	8
65,001 to 75,000	7
75,001 to 85,000	2
More than 85,000	6
Missing	2

Table 11 (continued)

Variable	N = 46
19. Sex	
Male	34
Female	10
Missing	2
20. Ethnicity	
White	43
Non-white	1
Missing	2

Policy actors in California, however, have a higher family income than those in Arizona. California had a mean of 5.21 (that is, in the $55,001 to $65,000 bracket) while the Arizona mean was 4.53 (in the $45,001 to $55,000 bracket).

I. Sex

There were 34 males and ten females. This, no doubt reflects the limited opportunities for women in educational policy making at the state level.

J. Ethnicity

The respondents were identified as white or non-white. There was only one non-white respondent. This shows also the high dominance of whites and especially white men in the educational decision making in the states.

II. Policy-Makers' Orientations Survey Data

The Policy Value Instrument was designed to measure the relative differences or similarities in the respondents' value orientations toward education policies along three problem domains, namely, school program, finance, and school organization. The fundamental value orientations incorporated included efficiency, equity, quality, and choice. The instrument was developed in order to obtain

a comparative look at the values or goals embraced by the key actors in the two states.

When respondents were asked to indicate their policy orientations, they indicated that educational quality is the most important contemporary issue in both states. California respondents were substantially less interested in efficiency issues and more interested in quality than Arizona respondents. Efficiency ranked second in Arizona while equity ranked second in California (see table 12).

Over the School Program Domain, respondents across the two states identified the quality issue of setting high standards as more important than the efficiency concern with making programs more cost-effective. They also rated the quality goal of setting higher standards over the choice enhancing goal of program flexibility.

Over the School Organization Domain, respondents ranked more efficient school management over providing more choices for families and children. They also ranked the development of quality conscious leadership over the equity problem of providing broader participation. They further indicated that they were more interested in developing quality conscious leadership than in providing more choices in program.

In the School Finance Domain, respondents ranked the

Table 12

Policy Makers' Orientations in Arizona and California

(All values are mean scores)

Problem Domain	Efficiency	Equity	Quality	Choice
Program				
Arizona	-1.27	- .03	2.40	- .83
California	-2.69	.38	3.00	- .69
Total Sample	-1.76	- .07	2.61	- .78
Finance				
Arizona	2.10	-1.10	.23	-1.23
California	- .63	- .25	3.25	-2.38
Total Sample	1.15	- .80	1.28	-1.63
Organization				
Arizona	1.50	-1.53	3.90	-3.87
California	.06	-1.13	4.00	-2.94
Total Sample	1.00	-1.39	3.94	-3.54
Combined Total				
Arizona	2.33	-2.66	6.53	-5.93
California	-3.26	-1.00	10.25	-6.01
Grand Total	.39	-2.26	7.83	-5.95

quality goal of increasing the level of funding for schools over the choice enhancing goal of reducing restrictions on local expenditures.

Educational goals related to quality and efficiency were more highly ranked than equity and choice goals when scores on each of three problem domains are combined. In the Finance and Organization domains, choice was the least preferred educational goal in both states. In the Program domain, however, choice was consistently ranked above efficiency (and behind quality and equity goals).

These results concur with the analysis of interviews and recent pertinent documents that educational quality is the contemporary force or "watchword" in the educational policy system in both states. The interviews and documents also revealed that California has recently put more emphasis on quality and equity while Arizona has focused more on quality and efficiency. Most of the seven SPMs--expecially personnel, program definition, student testing programs, curriculum materials--were dominated by educational quality. As regards finance and school organization, finance equity and organizational efficiency surfaced as dominant goals in the document analysis.

CHAPTER VIII

Statistical Analyses of SPMs, Alternative Approaches and Goals

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section analyzes each state's ranking of the SPMs. The second section reports on a statistical analysis of the alternative approaches in each of the seven SPMs. The third section presents the relationships between respondent orientations toward the goals of efficiency, equity, quality and choice and the selection of specific policy approaches in each state.

I. Ranking of the Seven SPMs

There is broad agreement among the respondents across the two states regarding the amount of attention given to each of the seven SPMs. Finance and Personnel SPMs seemed to have received most attention by both states in recent years. The School Plant and Facilities SPM has received the least amount of attention by both states. There is a growing realization among the key actors, however, that School Plant and Facilities contribute toward student achievement and deserve greater attention.

Table 13 shows the amount of attention given to the seven SPMs in the two states and displays paired t-tests

Table 13

States' Ranking of the SPMs

SPMs	State	N=46	Mean	Std. Dev.	Total Mean	Mean Difference	t-score	p
Finance	AZ	30	1.92	1.45	1.60	0.92	3.47	0.002
	CA	16	1.00	0.00				
Personnel	AZ	30	2.38	1.36	2.70	0.90	-1.78	0.0888
	CA	16	3.28	1.76				
Testing	AZ	30	3.83	1.08	3.40	0.14	-2.21	0.037
	CA	16	3.97	1.39				
Program Definition	AZ	30	3.82	1.50	3.91	0.27	-0.63	0.536
	CA	16	4.09	1.39				
Curriculum Materials	AZ	30	4.85	1.27	4.77	0.22	0.57	0.579
	CA	16	4.63	1.31				
School Governance	AZ	30	5.42	1.11	5.49	0.21	-0.46	0.651
	CA	16	5.63	1.63				
Plant and Facilities	AZ	30	6.53	0.86	6.15	1.12	2.59	0.018
	CA	16	5.41	1.61				

of whether the ranking differ between the two states. The variance of the total mean scores from all respondents is 2.18, which is 54% of the variance in the 1 through 7 rankings given by each respondent (variance = 4.0). Thus there was about 54% agreement among respondents regarding the amount of attention given to each SPM. There were significant differences between the two states on three of the SPMs. California respondents viewed finance and school plant and favilities policies as receiving relatively more attention, while Arizona respondents viewed testing policy as relatively more important.

A. Analysis of the Alternative Approaches

This section presents the ranking of the identified alternative approaches in each of the seven SPMs in the two states. These alternative approaches were developed after the preliminary interviews involving thorough analysis of documents and of interview responses. These identified approaches became a very useful framework to understand in depth what is going on in the two states. Detailed descriptions of the alternative approaches are found in Appendix F.

B. School Finance Policy

Five alternative approaches were identified in school finance policy. These approaches were: (1) Equalizing

the amount of money spent to educate each child in the states; (2) fixing the total amount of money for schooling; (3) targeting funds on children with special needs; (4) financing particular school services or functions; and (5) offsetting burdensome costs incurred by school districts with specific problems.

When respondents were asked to rank approaches in school finance policy that have been receiving most attention by their respective states, the results revealed that fixing the total amount of money for schooling and equalizing the amount of money spent to educate each child were receiving the most attention across the two states. Fixing the total amount of money for schooling ranked first in both states. Equalizing was ranked second in Arizona while financing particular services or functions was ranked second in California. Equalizing was ranked fourth by California respondents.

Table 14 shows the ranking of the alternative approaches to school finance policy in Arizona, California and across the two states. These results, in fact, concur with the interviews and document analyses--that California has recently, under SB 813, focused mainly on fixing the total amount of money for schooling and financing particular school services or functions. SB 813 increased both the

Table 14

T-test of Mean Scores for Alternative Approaches to School Finance Policy

Approaches	Arizona Mean (sd)*	California Mean (sd)*	Total Mean (sd)*	Mean diff-erence	t-score	p
Fixing total amount	2.02 (1.22)	1.46 (.95)	1.83 (1.16)	.56	1.57	.127
EQualizing	2.08 (1.27)	3.35 (1.05)	2.50 (1.33)	-1.27	-3.31	.002
Targeting	3.27 (1.09)	3.24 (1.23)	3.26 (1.12)	.03	.08	.940
Offsetting	3.15 (1.05)	3.85 (1.23)	3.39 (1.14)	- .70	1.75	.097
Financing	4.25 (.97)	3.12 (.96)	3.87 (1.10)	1.13	3.46	.002

*Standard deviation

general and special purpose programs. The bill also funded new programs and provided substantial incentive funding for certain reforms. The support for textbooks and other instructional materials, for example, almost doubled in the fiscal year 1983-84. SB 813 doesn't focus on specific individual needs.

Arizona has for the past five years or so pursued the approaches of equalizing and fixing the total amount of money for schooling simultaneously. Equalizing and limiting of expenditures have been pursued in Arizona for some time now. As one member of the Senate Appropriations Committee in Arizona stated: "Arizona has been pursuing equalization and limiting in the same package all the time." Fiscal year 1985-86 has been set as the target for Arizona to achieve full equalization. Critics, however, maintain that equalization has not worked as intended. During the preliminary interviews, for example, the Executive Director, Arizona School Administrators, Inc. remarked: "Although the concept (equalization) has been adopted, it has been robbed away." In any case Arizona has pursued mainly these two approaches simultaneously to shape the state's school finance policy, while California has mainly focused on increasing the total amount for schooling and financing particular services or functions.

C. School Personnel Policy

Four alternative approaches were identified in this SPM. Personnel policy changes typically fall into one of the following domains: (1) Pre-service training and certification improvement; (2) professional development programs; (3) accountability systems; or (4) changing teacher job definitions.

When respondents were asked to rank these approaches, the results indicated that pre-service training and certification improvement; and professional development were the two approaches that have received the most attention across the two states (see table 15). Pre-service training and certification improvement was ranked first in both states. Professional development was ranked second by Arizona respondents but last by California interviewees. Changing teacher job definitions was ranked second in California. As indicated by the t-scores shown in Table 15, however, the differences between the two states are not statistically significant.

The rank differences do agree, however, with the data from interviews and document analysis presented in Chapters V and VI. Arizona has put a lot of emphasis on professional development, establishing a principal academy, and NAU Center for Excellence. California has recently enacted a "Mentor Teacher Program" to enlarge teacher jobs and attract

Table 15

Ranking of Alternative Approaches to School Personnel Policy in Arizona and California

Approaches	Arizona Mean (sd)*	California Mean (sd)*	Total Mean	Total (sd)*	Mean diff-erence	t-score	p
Pre-Service Training and Certification Improvement	2.20 (1.29)	1.60 (.84)	2.03	1.20	.60	1.62	.118
Professional Development	2.44 (1.05)	3.00 (1.25)	2.60	1.12	-.56	-1.25	.230
Accountability Systems	2.50 (1.06)	2.85 (.94)	2.67	1.02	-.25	- .68	.503
Changing Teacher Job Definitions	2.76 (.98)	2.55 (1.01)	2.70	.98	.21	.56	.584

*Standard deviation

and retain more qualified teachers within the system.

D. Student Testing and Assessment Policy

Five alternative approaches were presented to respondents in the Student Testing and Assessment policy domain. These alternative approaches were: (1) Specifying the format or content of tests; (2) testing students for program placement; (3) using tests to evaluate program or teacher performance; (4) measuring non-academic student outcomes; and (5) requiring local school districts to develop their own tests.

Repondents' rankings of these alternative approaches are shown on Table 16. The results clearly indicate that both Arizona and California have focused mainly on specifying the format or content of tests. Specifying the format or content of tests was ranked first in both states--by a substantial margin. As indicated in previous chapters, both states have recently developed pupil achievement testing programs and have been focusing on specifying their formats or contents. Arizona introduced the Arizona Pupil Achievement testing program since 1981 and the state is now shifting to criterion-referenced tests in April, 1985. California has recently passed a legislation to expand the present state-wide assessment program (CAP) which started in 1974-75 for the first time. California has also

Table 16

T-Test of Mean Scores for Alternative Approaches to Student Testing and Assessment Policy

Approaches	Arizona Mean (sd)*	California Mean (sd)*	Total Mean (sd)*	Mean difference	t-score	p
Specifying the format/ content of tests	1.33 (.73)	1.30 (.45)	1.32 (.68)	.03	.10	.925
Testing students for program placement	2.48 (.85)	3.20 (.45)	2.62 (.83)	-.72	-2.63	.022
Using tests to evaluate program/ teacher performance	3.15 (1.03)	3.00 (1.55)	3.12 (1.13)	.15	.22	.831
Requiring locals to develop own tests	3.15 (1.42)	3.30 (1.64)	3.18 (1.44)	-.15	- .19	.858
Measuring non-academic student outcomes	4.60 (1.58)	3.20 (1.64)	4.32 (1.02)	1.40	1.88	.130

*Standard deviation

introduced a new testing program--the Golden State Examination, for high school students. Both the CAP and SAT have been used mainly for graduation or promotion.

While testing students for program placement was ranked second in Arizona, the California respondents ranked it third. Using tests to evaluate program or teacher performance was ranked second in California. The approaches of measuring non-academic student outcomes and requiring locals to develop their own tests were viewed as receiving the least attention across the two states. Table 16 presents the ranking of the alternative approaches to Student Testing and Assessment Policy in Arizona, California, and across the two states.

E. School Program Definition Policy

There were four alternative approaches identified under this SPM. These four approaches were: (1) Changing time requirements; (2) mandating specific subjects; (3) setting higher program standards; and (4) developing programs for special groups.

When the respondents were asked to rank these approaches in terms of attention, the results clearly indicate that setting higher program standards is the most crucial approach in both states. Respondents in both states ranked it as number one approach (see table 17). Arizona ranked

Table 17

T-Test of Mean Scores for Alternative Approaches to School Program Definition Policy

Approaches	Arizona Mean (sd)*	California Mean (sd)*	Total Mean (sd)*	Mean diff-erence	t-score	p
Setting higher program standards	1.31 (.72)	1.36 (.58)	1.33 (.67)	- .05	- .25	.803
Changing time requirements	3.02 (.95)	1.94 (.78)	2.72 (1.02)	1.08	3.15	.006
Developing programs for special groups	2.67 (.91)	3.38 (.74)	2.85 (.92)	- .71	-2.15	.048
Mandating specific subjects	3.01 (.95)	3.31 (.80)	3.10 (.91)	- .30	- .88	.393

*Standard deviation

developing programs for special groups as second in amount of attention received, while California respondents gave second place to changing time requirements. Mandating specific subjects is the least approach across the two states.

These results correspond with the data presented previously in Chapter V indicating that recent policy in California has been focused on increasing the number of academic courses, increasing the instructional time and extending the school day and year. This policy has been implemented through the adoption of the "Model Graduation Requirements" which sets the minimum courses for high school graduation, the adoption of SB 813 which increased the number of academic courses, revitalized summer school, and offered incentives for extending the school year from 175 days to 180 days.

Arizona has also focused on setting higher standards by specifying the number of courses for high school graduation and emphasis on the acquisition of the minimum basic skills of communication, computation and citizenship. Arizona has, however, put less emphasis on the approach of changing time requirements. As the Associate Superintendent of Public instruction in Arizona stated:

> The bottom line policy question seems to be that we allow high school kids to take the

> easy way out. They have too many options that allow them to select the easy way out. And kids, both bright kids and not so bright kids, know the system and they go in and take the easy way out. And so they are discussing policy issues that can counteract that apparent misguided approach to high school by kids to produce electives and to make them take more courses to get out of high school. But not necessarily to lengthen the day.

F. School Organization and Governance Policy

Eight alternative approaches were identified under this SPM. The identified approaches included: (1) Redistributing authority among state level agencies; (2) strengthening state agencies at the expense of local districts; (3) strengthening site-level governance; (4) strengthening teacher influence; (5) clarifying student rights and responsibilities; (6) strengthening administrative control; (7) expanding parent or citizen influence; and (8) altering local district roles and responsibilities.

When respondents were requested to rank these alternative approaches, the results revealed that strengthening administrative control is the approach which has received the most attention across the two states (see table 18). Although differences between the two states are not statistically significant, they do correspond generally to the data presented in Chapters IV and V. Arizona respondents ranked increased administrative control as

Table 18

T-Test of Mean Scores for Alternative Approaches to School Organization and Governance Policy

Approaches	Arizona Mean (sd)*	California Mean (sd)*	Total Mean (sd)*	Mean diff-erence	t-score	p
Strengthening administrative control	3.38 (1.93)	3.00 (2.16)	3.31 (1.93)	.38	.32	.760
Clarifying student rights and responsibilities	3.23 (1.42)	4.00 (1.41)	3.35 (1.42)	- .77	-1.00	.370
Strengthening site-level governance	3.88 (2.18)	3.25 (2.06)	3.77 (2.13)	.53	.55	.610
Expanding parent/citizen influence	3.80 (1.85)	6.00 (2.71)	4.17 (2.12)	-2.20	-1.55	.203
Strengthening state agencies	4.69 (2.50)	3.25 (2.63)	4.46 (2.51)	1.44	1.01	.368
Redistributing authority among state-level agencies	4.16 (2.09)	3.75 (1.71)	4.48 (2.03)	.85	-1.23	.275
Strengthening teacher influence	5.07 (2.03)	6.25 (1.71)	5.25 (2.00)	-1.18	.90	.413
Altering local district roles and responsibilities	5.93 (2.24)	6.50 (1.92)	6.14 (2.05)	- .57	- .45	.668

*Standard deviation

second while California respondents ranked it as number one. Arizona has focused mainly on clarifying student rights, strengthening administrative control, expanding parent or citizen influence and strengthening site-level governance; while California has focused mainly on strengthening administrative control, strengthening state agencies, strengthening site-level governance, and redistributing authority among state level agencies. These results generally indicate that California has relatively more state-level control than Arizona. Altering local district roles and responsibilities is the least approach pursued by both states.

G. Curriculum Materials Policy

Three alternative approaches were identified under (1) mandating local use of materials; (2) specification of the scope and sequence of materials to be used in local school districts; and (3) development of specialized instructional materials for particular purposes.

When respondents were asked to rank these approaches, the results indicated that specification of the scope and sequence of materials was given the most attention across the two states (see table 19). Although the development of specialized instructional materials was ranked second across the two states, California ranked it as the number

Table 19

T-Test of Mean Scores for Alternative Approaches to Curriculum Materials Policy

Approaches	Arizona Mean (sd)*	California Mean (sd)*	Total Mean (sd)*	Mean diff-erence	t-score	p
Specification of the scope and sequence of materials	1.33 (.62)	1.75 (.96)	1.42 (.69)	- .42	- .83	.459
Development of special-ized instructional materials	2.10 (.60)	1.50 (.58)	1.97 (.63)	.60	1.83	.128
Mandating local use of materials	2.57 (.73)	2.75 (.50)	2.61 (.68)	- .18	- .56	.591

*Standard deviation

one approach receiving the most attention. Mandating local use of materials was viewed by the respondents in both states as one receiving the least attention.

Although neither state exercises legal authority over the final selection of the curriculum materials, both have broad advisory authority. (Until several years ago California adopted and printed all K-8 texts.) Under current law, State Boards of Education prepare lists of curriculum materials to be used by the locals by utilizing the state-level advisory or professional committees or panels and making recommendations.

Recently California has put a lot of emphasis on curriculum materials--and especially the development of specialized instructional materials. A substantial amount of money was allocated under SB 813 to purchase instructional materials, including computer hardware and instructional telecommunications services for schools. The main aim was to strengthen the technological skills of California school pupils. The amount set aside for purchasing textbooks and other instructional materials nearly doubled during the fiscal year 1983-84. There is a strong and growing realization among the policy makers in California that adequate instructional materials make a difference in student achievement.

H. School Building and Facilities Policy

Under this SPM, four alternative approaches were identified. These were: (1) technical or architectural review of local school district building plans to insure that they are cost efficient and meet the required safety standards; (2) long-range planning for school construction; (3) remediation of existing building problems; and (4) providing new instructional capacities.

When the respondents ranked these alternative approaches, it was found that remediation of existing building problems and technical or architectural review of local school district plans were the two most popular approaches when respondents from two states were combined (see table 20). California respondents, however, ranked long-range planning for school construction as the approach receiving the most attention. Provision of new instructional capacities was viewed as the one receiving the least attention in both states.

Analysis of the ranking of alternative approaches in this SPM corroborated the document analysis data, indicating that California has recently put a lot of emphasis on long-range planning for school construction. Under SB 813, for example, two studies were commissioned related to school building and facilities: (1) a study of the feasibility of developing and maintaining an automated school facilities

Table 20

T-Test of Mean Scores for Alternative Approaches to School Building and Facilities Policy

Approaches	Arizona Mean (sd)*	California Mean (sd)*	Total Mean (sd)*	Mean diff-erence	t-score	p
Remediation of existing building problems	1.31 (.60)	2.00 (.82)	1.45 (.69)	- .69	-1.58	.192
Technical/ architec-tural review	2.04 (.84)	2.75 (1.26)	2.19 (.96)	- .71	-1.07	.348
Long range planning for school con-struction	3.39 (.35)	1.50 (.58)	2.97 (.90)	1.89	6.24	.005
Providing new in-structional capacities	3.21 (.47)	3.75 (.50)	3.33 (.57)	- .54	-1.92	.118

*Standard deviation

inventory that would be capable of indicating state-wide school facility utilization rates, projecting facility needs, and allocating funds for new construction, maintenance, and rehabilitation; and (2) a study of the appropriateness of existing architectural standards and the type of building materials used for school facilities. California has also a School Facilities Planning Unit which provides consulting services for local school districts that lack the resources and expertise to do their own planning.

Although school buildings and facilities are reported to have received the least attention among the seven SPMs, there is a growing realization that the development and improvement of school buildings and facilities is an important factor in student and teacher performance.

I. Policy Makers' Goal Orientations and Selection of Alternative Approaches

When Pearson Correlation Coefficients were used to determine the relationship between policy makers' goal orientations and selection of the alternative approaches, the results showed that there were significant relationships between them.

1. Efficiency. Efficiency-oriented respondents have significant interest in four program areas: school

personnel, governance, student testing and program definition.

In school personnel, they tend to rank high an accountability approach to pursue policy (r=.34, p=.024), professional development (r=.27, p=.058), while rejecting changing teacher job definitions (r=-.33, p=.025)--such as mentor teacher programs or development of career ladders.

In the testing area, efficiency oriented respondents preferred using tests to evaluate programs or teacher performance (r=.39, p=.033) rather than allowing local districts to develop their own tests for promotion or proficiency (r=-.43, p=.013) on the part of the students. They are not interested in local control as far as student testing is concerned.

In the program definition area, they prefer changing of time requirements (r=.30, p=.058) like modifying the school day and year rather than developing programs for special groups (r=-.38, p=.021) like bilingual or special education programs.

In school governance, these respondents are interested in expanding parent or citizen influence over school decisions (r=.39, p.033) while rejecting strengthening of teacher influence (r=-.46, p=.013) such as appointment of teachers in policy committees or collective bargaining rights.

Significant relationships between SPM approaches and goals are presented in table 21.

Table 21

Significant Pearson Product Correlations Between SPM Approaches and Goals

SPM Approaches	Efficiency r (p) a b	Equity r (p)	Quality r (p)	Choice r (p)
Finance				
Equalizing		.37 (.013)	- .40 (.007)	
Financing		-.49 (.001)	.43 (.005)	
Personnel				
Professional development	.27 (.058)			
Accountability systems	.34 (.024)			
Changing teacher job descriptions	-.33 (.025)	-.36 (.016)		.31 (.033)
Pre-service training & certification		-.36 (.018)	.29 (.045)	
Testing				
Using tests to evaluate programs	.49 (.005)			-.42 (.016)
Requiring locals to develope own tests	-.43 (.013)			.52 (.003)
Program				
Changing time requirements	.30 (.058)			
Developing special programs	-.38 (.021)	.29 (.063)		.40 (.016)
Setting higher standards		-.34 (.036)		

Table 21 (continued)

SPM Approaches	Efficiency	Equity	Quality	Choice
Organization				
Redistributing authority among state level agencies				.59 (.003)
Strengthening teacher influence	-.46 (.013)			
Expanding parent influence	.39 (.033)			
Curriculum Materials				
Specification of the scope and sequence		.38 (.053)		
Building and Facilities				
Technical/architectural review of local plans				-.47 (.016)

a - Pearson Product Correlation value
b - Probability of significance

2. Equity As expected, the equity-oriented policy makers showed significant interest in equalizing the amount of money spent to educate each child in the state (r=-.37, p=.013) while rejecting financing particular school services or functions such as textbooks or staff training programs (r=.49, p=.001).

In the program domain, they are interested in developing programs for special groups (r=.29, p=.063). while rejecting strongly setting higher program standards (r=.34, p=.036) like new graduation requirements or higher promotion standards. Surprisingly, they are not interested in any of the four alternative approaches to school personnel. They reject strongly the approach of pre-service training and certification improvement (r=-.36, p=.018), and changing teacher job defintions (r=-.36, p=.016) such as differentiated staffing plans, mentor teacher programs, or development of career ladders. These results indicate that equity-oriented people are mainly interested in finance and program domains.

3. Quality. There are four strong positive relationships that surfaced among the quality-oriented policy makers; and two were negative ones. First quality oriented respondents showed significant interest in financing particular school functions or services (r=-.43, p=.005)

while rejecting equalizing the amount of money to educate each child in the state (r=.40, p=.007). The quality-oriented policy makers are clearly at odds with equity-oriented policy makers as regards finance policy. While the quality-oriented respondents embraced the approach of financing particular services or functions and rejecting equalizing the amount of schooling, the equity-oriented respondents embraced equalizing and rejected financing of particular functions or services.

In personnel, the quality-people are also strongly interested in pre-service training and certification improvement, unlike the equity-people.

In school governance, the respondents with quality orientation would like to see more redistribution of authority among state level agencies (r=.59, p=.003) such as creating new commissions, advisory committees, giving new powers to the chief state school officer, etc., while rejecting strongly expanding parent influence (r=-.67, p=.001). They are indeed more interested in state-level control than local control.

4. Choice. A choice-orientation among policy actors showed significant correlations in four policy areas: school personnel, program definition, student testing and school buildings and facilities.

In personnel, they have interest in changing teacher

job definitions (r=.31, p=.033). While they embraced the approach of requiring local districts to develop their own tests for proficiency or promotion of students, (r=.52, p=.003) they rejected strongly the idea of using tests to evaluate programs or teacher performance (r=-.43, p=.016). They would like to see tests be developed at the local level. In program definition, they embraced the approach of developing programs for special groups (r=.40, p=.016) like minority, handicapped, low achievers, alternative schools, etc. They rejected technical review of local school building plans by the state-level to insure whether they are cost-efficient or meet the safety standards (r=-.47, p=.016).

One thing of interest in these results is that, while the efficiency-oriented policy makers rejected the approaches of changing teacher job definitions, developing programs for special groups, and requiring local school districts to develop their own tests, all these alternatives were embraced by choice-oriented policy actors. This clearly reveals that choice value is "at odds" with the efficiency value.

In summary, at least three interesting observations or revelations can be drawn from the analysis of the relationships between policy makers' goal orientations and selection of the alternative approaches.

First, the policy values of quality and equity do not

"co-exist" comfortably. This applies also to choice and efficiency values. They are not compatible. Second, it is clear from the analysis that choice and equity oriented policy makers are more interested in local control, while efficiency and quality oriented actors tend to prefer state-level control. Third, there were no major differences between personal and state preferences in the selection of the alternative approaches. Most of those embraced by the state were also ranked high on personal preferences. None of the approaches rejected by either state or personal preferences was embraced by either of the two.

J. Personal Characteristics and the Selection of Approaches

When Pearsons Correlation Co-efficient was used to determine the relationship between the 20 demographic variables and the selection of the alternative approaches, the results revealed that there were very few significant relationships. The only powerful personal variables were: (1) tenure; (2) possession of degree; and (3) degree of liberalism. (see table 22).

1. Tenure. The longer the tenure of the key actor, the higher tendency for the actor to select or rank high the approach of specifying format or content of tests used in student assessment (r=.35, p=.048) while rejecting

Table 22

Significant Relationships Between SPM Approaches and Personal Characteristics of the Key Actors

SPMs	Tenure r (p a b)	Degreee r (p)	Liberalism r (p)	Age r (p)
Finance (none)				
Personnel				
Professional development			.30 (.047)	
Accountability systems			-.48 (.003)	
Changing teacher job definitions			.32 (.037)	
Testing				
Specifying the format or content of tests	.35 (.048)		-.48 (.009)	.36 (.037)
Requiring locals to develop own tests		.52 (.004)		
Program Definition				
Changing time requirements				-.32 (.048)
Setting higher standards				.40 (.018)
School Governance				
Strengthening teacher influence	-.34 (.047)			
Clarifying student rights	-.34 (.049)	.37 (.031)		
Strengthening state agencies		-.43 (.034)		
Altering local district roles & responsibilities		.52 (.049)		
Expanding parent influence			-.39 (.033)	

SPMs	Tenure	Degree	Liberalism	Age
Curriculum Materials				
Mandating local use of materials			-.46 (.022)	
Specification of the scope and sequence			.51 (.013)	
Building and Facilities				
Technical/architectural review of local plans				.41 (.031)

a - Pearson Product Correlation value
b - Probability of significance

strengthening teacher influence in school governance (r=.34m o=.047). Experienced key actors would like to see the adoption of new tests, expansion of testing programs, shifting from norm-referenced to criterion-referenced tests; while rejecting the policies teacher oriented policies such as collective bargaining, or appointment of teachers to policy committees.

2. Degree. There were two positive and four negative relationships between the possession of a degree and selection of the approaches--in two policy areas: student testing and school governance. The higher the degree of the kay actor, the more frequent the tendency of selecting the approach of requiring local school districts to develop their own tests (r=.52, p=.004) while rejecting using of tests to evaluate program or teacher performance.

In school governance, they are interested in expanding student rights (r=.37, p=.031) while objective strongly the options of strengthening state agencies at the expense of local school districts (r=-.43, p=.034), expanding parent or citizen influence, and altering local district roles and responsibilities (r=-.52, p=.049).

They are clearly interested more in local control than in state-level control.

3. Political liberalism. The degree of political

showed three positive relationships and four negative ones in the policy areas of school personnel, testing, curriculum materials, and school governance. Of all the personal variables, political liberalism surfaced as the most powerful variable that influences the selection of the alternative approaches. The respondents with a high degree of political liberalism tended to embrace the approaches of changing teacher job definitions (r=.32, p=.037), and professional development programs (r=.30, p=.047) such as in-service training, establishment of teacher centers, principal academies, and summer institutes, while rejecting accountability systems (r=-.30, p=.047).

In the areas of curriculum materials, they were more concerned with the specification of the scope and sequence of the materials to be used in the local districts (r=.51, p.013) rather than mandating local use of the materials developed or selected by state agencies (r=-.47, p=.022). They are also disinterested in expanding parent influence (r=-.39, p=.033) and in specifying the format or content of tests to be used in the schools.

4. Age. Age also showed some relationship to policy approach. The older the policy maker, the higher the tendency of ranking high the approach of setting higher program standards (r=.40, p=.018) while ranking low the alternative of changing time requirements (r=-.32, p=.048).

Summary

In summary, the analyses of these personal variables reveal which ones influence education policies. In this case, the personal variable of political liberalism, possession of a degree, tenure, and age influence education policies in the states. Surprisingly, the variables of occupation, professional background, income, and sex didn't show significant differences.

CHAPTER IX

Conclusions and Implications of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine education policies in the states of Arizona and California by using Mitchell and Encarnation's (1984) theoretical framework of state policy mechanisms (SPMs) and fundamental educational goals of efficiency, equity, quality and choice. Specifically, the study examined the SPMs, the approaches in each of the seven SPMs and the fundamental educational goals expressed in the policies adopted by these two states. The theoretical framework served as a guide to describe and compare the education policies in the two states systematically. A comparative case study approach was used to examine and compare the education policies in the two states. The study was exploratory or descriptive in nature rather than hypothesis generating or verifying. The main advantage noted about this research methodology is that it allows an in-depth exploration of a number of variables. The approach enabled the researcher to conduct a systematic study in the two states regarding the SPMs, alternative approaches and educational goals. Three main research methods were employed to collect data for this study (interviews, questionnaires, and document analysis). This

chapter is divided into three sections. The first section will present the general findings of the study organized around its objectives. The second part will discuss the implications of the study; and the third section will suggest and identify areas which need further study or investigation.

General Findings of the Study

The first objective of the study was to identify the alternative approaches in each of the seven SPMs. The alternative approaches in each of the SPMs were identified and developed after the preliminary interviews with the education key actors in both states--and after thorough pertinent document analysis regarding the SPMs in each state. The identified alternative approaches in each of the seven SPMs and their definitions or characterizations were discussed in detail in Chapter VIII. These identified alternative approaches became very useful framework to understand in-depth the strategies used by each state in improving education policies in each of the seven SPMs. They helped the researcher to get the inner picture of what is going on in the two states. These alternative approaches have received different emphasis across the two states. Table 23 shows the two approaches which have been receiving the most attention and the least attention across

Table 23

Approaches Receiving the Most Attention and the Least Across the Two States

SPM	Receiving Most Attention	Receiving Least Attention
Finance	Fixing amount of money spent on schooling;	Offsetting burdensome costs incurred by school districts;
	Equalizing amount of money spent to educate each child in the state	Financing particular scool services or functions.
Personnel	Pre-service training and certification improvement;	Accountability systems;
	Professional development programs.	Changing teacher job definitions.
Testing	Specifying the format or content of tests;	Measuring non-academic outcomes;
	Testing students for special program placement.	Requiring local districts to develop their own tests.
Program	Setting higher program standards;	Mandating specific subjects;
	Changing time requirements.	Developing programs for special groups.
Curriculum Materials	Specification of scope and sequence of materials to be used in local districts;	Mandating local use of materials selected or developed by state agencies.
	Development of specialized instructional materials.	

Table 23 (continued)

SPM	Receiving Most Attention	Receiving Least Attention
School Organization	Strengthening administrative control; Clarifying student rights and responsibilities.	Strengthening teacher influence; Altering local district roles and responsiblities.
Plant and Facilities	Remediation of existing building problems; Technical/ architectural review of local school district building plans.	Long range planning for school construction; Providing new instructional capacities.

the two states. All approaches identified are pursued in each state but with different emphasis.

The educational goals of efficiency, equity, quality, and choice were the major forces in the development of these alternative approaches. The present momentum for education quality has played an important role in influencing the states to pursue particular approaches. The national commission reports on education and especially the report on The Nation At Risk may have contributed in influencing the states to adopt certain approaches. Political culture of the key actors may contribute also in influencing states to embrace or put more emphasis on certain approaches. These observations, however, are speculative and need further investigation.

The second objective of the case study was to examine and differentiate the educational goals of the key actors. When the key actors in both states were asked to indicate their policy orientations toward fundamental educational policy goals of efficiency, equity, quality, and choice, the results revealed that educational quality is indeed the most critical contemporary goal in both states. Although California and Arizona have both stressed or embraced quality, California is more interested in quality than Arizona. The California key actors were clearly less interested in efficiency issues and more interested in quality

than were their counterparts in Arizona. The educational goal of choice was far behind quality, efficiency, and equity in both states. Analysis indicated that there were no significant differences between the goal preferences of key actors in California and Arizona.

The third objective of the study was to explore relationships between goal preference of the key actors and choices of the alternative approaches. When the Pearson Correlations Coefficient were used to determine the relationships between the key actors' goal preferences and the selection of policy approaches, the result indicated that there were statistically significant relationships between respondents' goal orientations and the ranking or selection of the alternative approaches. Chapter VIII discusses in detail the relationships between the goal preference of the key actors and the selection of the approaches.

Analysis revealed that there were very few personal variables which showed significant relationship in the selection of the approaches. The only powerful statistical relationships between personal variables of the key actors and the selection of the approaches were those relating to tenure, possession of a degree, and degree of liberalism. This clearly indicates the type of personal variables that contribute in shaping or influencing education policies at the state level.

Implications of the Study

The implications and significance of the present study can be viewed at two levels: application of theoretical framework and improvement of education policies at the state levels. Theoretically, the general framework embodying the concepts of state policy mechanisms (SPMs), alternative approaches, and fundamental educational goals has turned out to be a very useful and solid framework for studying and describing systematically the formal education policies at the state level. The framework has enabled the research to describe and compare the education policies in the states of Arizona and California. The theoretical framework advanced by Mitchell and Encarnation (1984), now supported and modified by comprehensive data, can be a useful framework to understand and study the nature of education policies at the state level.

The present study has also enriched the literature on state policy mechanisms, alternative approaches and education goals in the states of Arizona and California. The study results about SPMs, alternative approaches, and fundamental goals may also prove helpful in the future study of education policies in other states.

In practice, the general findings of this study can be utilized by education policy makers in improving education

policies in the states. Policy makers may be able to choose the limited strategies or approaches available to improve particular policy areas in the K-12 education system.

Need for Further Research

This study provided a broad overview of the formal education policies in the states of Arizona and California. It covered mainly areas related to the state policy mechanisms, the alternative approaches and the fundamental goals pursued by those states.

There are at leat three areas where further study should prove useful:

1. The dynamics of the education policy making process within the theoretical framework were not adequately studied. The focus of this study was mainly on the policies themselves rather than on the actors and their interactions during policy function. An extended investigation may give some insights on how the interactions of the key policy makers are related to their selection of specific policy options.

2. The study also did not examine sufficiently the influence of socio-political and economic variables that shape education policies. A further study of these variables would determine those factors most responsible for shaping education policies at the state level.

3. The most important constraint on the present study is its small sample size, especially in California. Future study should include a larger sample of key actors to see whether there is any significant difference with the present study findings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, A. J. (1975). Inequality in California school finance: Dimensions, sources, remedies. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Alexander, K. (1982). Educational fiscal policy and judicial difference. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18, 131-149.

Ammentorp, W. M., Popper, S. H. & Morris, J. R. (1979). A methodological approach to the problem of administrative control in human service organizations. Educational Administration Quarterly, 15 (1), 83-103.

Arellano, S. J. (1983). The politics of school finance reform in Arizona: A comparison of two special legislative sessions, 1973-1974 and 1979-80. Unpublished master's thesis, Arizona State University, Arizona.

Arizona Department of Education. (1983). Arizona basic skills chart. Phoenix, Arizona: Arizona Department of Education.

Arizona Department of Education. (1983). Arizona's best bet program. Phoenix, Arizona: Arizona Department of Education.

Arizona Department of Education. (1984). Arizona's principals' academy. Phoenix, Arizona: Arizona Department of Education.

Arizona Department of Education. (1982). Certification in Arizona: General Information. Phoenix, Arizona: Arizona Department of Education.

Arizona Education Association. (1983). Statewide education study: A research analysis. Phoenix, Arizona: The Arizona Education Association.

Arizona Education Association. (1983). A call to excellence: Phase I implementation. Phoenix, Arizona: The Arizona Education Association.

Arizona Education Association. (1983). "Reform at risk: Status of bills." AEA Advocate, 10 (6), 1.

Arizona Republic. (May 3, 1984, p. A-14).

Arizona State Board of Education. (1983). Requests for proposal #1-84-1 for purchase of standardized norm-referenced achievement test and related materials. Phoenix, Arizona: Arizona Department of Education.

Arizona State Board of Education. (1984). Arizona statewide reading, grammar and mathematics achievement testing of pupils in grades 1-12. Phoenix, Arizona: Arizona Department of Education.

Arizona State Board of Education. (1981). An evaluation of vocational education. Phoenix, Arizona: Arizona Department of Education.

Arizona State Board of Education. (1984). Purchase of standardized norm-referenced achievement test and related materials for Arizona statewide reading, grammar, spelling and mathematics achievement testing for pupils in grades 1-12. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Arizona School Boards Association. (1984). Beliefs and policies resolutions. Adopted by Delegate Assembly, June 25, 1983. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona School Board Association.

Assembly Office of Research. (1983). Annual report 1982. Sacramento, CA: Assembly Office of Research.

Aufderheide, J. (1974). State policy making for the public schools of California. Columbus: Ohio State University, Educational Governance Project.

Badarak, G. W. (1982). Educational policy formation and the work-orientations of state legislative staff. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Riverside.

Bailey, S. K., Frost, M. W. (1963). School men and politics: A study of state aid to education in the Northeast. 2nd ed, 103-108. NY: Syracuse University Press.

Bardach, E. (1983). The dissemination of policy research to policy-makers. pp. 1-9. CA: University of California, Berkeley.

Bhandari, R. K. (1982). Financing of education. The Educational Administration Quarterly, 34, (1), 1-6.

Borges, G. W. (1980). The politics of proposition 13: California public education and the Moreno Valley Unified School District. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Riverside.

Bowles, B. D. & Raskas, H. I. (1976). Policymaking in American public education: A framework for analysis. Educational Administration Quarterly, 12 (3), 110-113.

Bowles, B. D. (1966). Educational pressure groups and the legislative process in California, 1945-66. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate School Claremont, CA.

Bradley, J. (1983). Evaluating staff development schemes. Educational Research, 25 (2), 137-143.

Brown, D. E. (1974). State policy making for the public school of Wisconsin. Columbus: Ohio State University Educational Governance Project.

Bruce, J. & Renee, C. (1984). "The Phoenix agenda: Essential reform in teacher education." Educational Researcher, 13 (4). 5-19.

Burlingame, M. & Geske, T. G. (1979). State politics and education: An examination of selected multiple-state case studies. Educational Administration Quarterly, 15 (2), 50-75.

Burrup, P. E. (1977). Financing education in a climate of change. Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

California Coalition for Fair School Finance (CCFSF). (1983a). Serrano 1983. Menlo Park, CA: CCFSF.

California Coalition for Fair School Finance (CCFSF). (1982). Schools: California's K-12 school finance system. Menlo Park, CA: CCFSF.

California Coalition for Fair School Finance (CCFSF). (1983b). Senate Bill 813: The Hughes-Hart educational reform act of 1983. Menlo Park, CA: CCFSF.

California Coalition for Fair School Finance (CCFSF). (1983c). Provisions of Senate Bill 813. Menlo Park, CA: CCFSF.

California for Community Governance. (1984). Project Independence: The community governance initiative sponsored by California for community governance. Sacramento, CA: Secretary of State.

California State Department of Education. (1983). Characteristics of professional staff in California public schools 1982-83. Sacramento, CA: CSDE.

California State Department of Education. (1982). California assessment program: Student achievement in California schools, 1981-82, annual report. Sacramento, CA: CSDE.

California State Department of Education. (1983). Critical issues and promising practices; career, vocational assessment of California secondary students with exceptional needs. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1983). Report of the Commission on Teacher Quality. Report submitted to the California Senate in response to Senate Resolution 35. Sacramento, CA: Commission for Teacher Credentialling.

California State Department of Education. (1983). Model graduation requirements: Raising expectations. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1982). Guidelines for implementation of State billingual programs. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1983). Enrollment date: California elementary and secondary public schools, 1982-83. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1983). Selected education statistics: California public and private schools 1982-83. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1982). Racial or ethnic distribution of staff and students in California public schools 1981-82. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1977). Establishing school site councils: California school improvement program. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1976). California master plan for migrant education 1976 edition. Elementary and secondary education act of 1965, title I, public law 89-10 as amended by public law 89-750 of 1966 and public law 93-380 of 1974. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1983). Consolidated categorical aid programs regulations as published in the

California administrative code, title 5. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1981). California school accounting manual 1980 edition. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1979). California school beyond Serrano: A report on assembly bill No. 65 of 1977. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1981). Guide for reviewing school program compliance 1981-82. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1983). Fingertip facts on education in California. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1983). Program advisory: Hughes-Hart educational reform act of 1983 (SB813) sections 48431.6 and 48431.7 of the education code. (See sections 84 and 85 of Chapter 498/83--tenth grade student progress review and counseling. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1983). Program advisory: School improvement and provisions of SB 813 and AB 70. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1983). Program advisory: Changes in consolidated programs. SB 813 (1983) and AB 70 (1983). Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1983). Program advisory: Provisions of law and administrative determinations relating to instructional time and average daily attendance. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1983). Program advisory: State summer school programs. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1983). The Hughes-Hart educational reform act of 1983 and related legislation. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1979). Student achievement in California schools 1978-79 annual report. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1982). Student achievement in California schools 1981-82 annual report. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education (1982). California's students: 1990 and beyond. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1983). Guide for reviewing school program compliance 1982-83. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1979). Profiles of school district performance 1978-79. A guide to interpretation. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1977). Attendance and enrollment, accounting and reporting in California public schools. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

California Coalition for Fair School Finance. (1983). An update on school finance, 1982-83. Menlo Park, CA.

Campbell, R. F. (1978). A history of administration thought. Administrator's Notebook, 26 (4).

Campbell, R. F. et al. (1975). The organization and control of American schools. Columbus, Ohio: Bell & Howell Co.

Campbell, R. F. & Layton, D. H. (1970). Policy making for American education. Education Administration Quarterly, 6 (2), 82-86.

Campbell, R. & Mazzoni, T. (1976). State policy making for the public schools. Berkeley, CA: McCuthan.

Campbell, R. & Mazzoni, T. L. (1972). Investigating state education policy systems: Methodological approach and research framework.

Chilcote, R. H. (1981). Theories of comparative politics: The search for a paradigm. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Cohen, D. & Garet, M. S. (1975). Reforming educational policy with applied research. Harvard Educational Review, 45, (1), 7-45.

Coleman, F. M. (1982). Politics, policy, and the constitution. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Coleman, J. S. (1966). Equity of educational opportunity. Washington, DC: United States Department of HEW.

Coleman, J. S. (1976). Policy decisions, social science information and education. Sociology of Education, 49 (4), 304-312.

Cool, B. A. (1971). The role of the Arizona State Board of Education from 1961-70.

Conway, J., Jennings, R. & Milstein, M. (1974). Understanding communities. Prentice Hall, Inc.

Coombs, F. S. and Merritt, R. L. (1976). Politics and educational reform. Comparative Education Review, 21 (2 & 3), 247-273.

Coons, J. E., Clune, W. H. & Sugarman, S. D. (1970). Private wealth and public education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Crew, R. E., Jr. (1968). State politics: Readings on political behavior. Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc.

Doyle, W. (1977). Paradigms for research on teacher effectiveness. Review of Research in Education, 5, 163-198.

Dror, Y. (1972). Challenge in policy science. Policy Studies, 2.

Dye, T. R. (1969). Politics in state and communities. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Eastow, D. (1965). A systems analysis of political life. NY: Wiley.

Encarnation, D. J. & Mitchell, D. E. (1983). Critical tensions in the governance of California public education. Paper prepared for the California Educational Management and Evaluation Commission. Stanford, CA: University of California, IREFG.

Etzioni, A. (1971). Policy research. American Sociologist, 6, 8-12.

Eulau, H. (1962). Bases of authority in legislative bodies. A comparative analysis. Administrative Science Quarterly, 7, 309-321.

Eye, G. G. (1975). Many researchers but few synthesizers. Journal of Educational Research, 68 (8), 294-299.

Fahey, L. J. (1966). The California legislature and educational decision making. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate School, Claremont, CA.

Fesler, J. W. (1967). The 50 states and their local governments. Knopf Inc.

Fogarty, B. M. (1983). Educational administration 1959-1981: A profession in evolution. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19 (3), 141-152.

Fuhrman, S. (1984). The excellence agenda: State's response. Educational Horizons, 62 (2), 48-51.

Fuhrman, S. & Rosenthal, A. (1981). Shaping education policy in the states. Washington, DC: The Institute for Educational Leadership.

Geiogue, H. E. (1982). Tax limitation measures, their impact on recurrent education in California. Education and Urban Society, 14 (3), 345-366.

Gennaro, N. (1979). Arizona statistical abstract: A data handbook. Phoenix, AZ: University of Arizona.

Geske, T. G. (1978). State educational policy-making a changing scene. Administrator's Notebook, 26 (2).

Glasman, N. S. (1984). Increased centrality of evaluation and the school principal. Administrator's Note, 30 (7).

Glasman, N. S. (1981). Input-output analysis of schools. Review of Educational Research, 51 (4), 509-539.

Goodell, F. (1970). Budgeting in California Intermediate and local education agencies. United States Department of Education, 1970.

Governor's Committee on Quality. (1983). Education in Arizona: Popular concerns, unpopular choices. A report of the Governor's Committee on Quality Education. Phoeniz, AZ: Department of State.

Governor's Office. (1984). Governor's budget for the fiscal year 1984-85. Sacramento, CA: Governor's Office.

Griffin, T. M. & Jensen, D. N. (July 1982). The legalization of state educational policy making in California. Paper prepared for the IFG seminar on law and education. Stanford, CA: IFG.

Gubser, M. M. (1973). Accountability as a smoke screen for political indoctrination in Arizona. Phi Delta Kappan, (pp. 64-65).

Guthrie, J. W. (1982). The future of Federal education policy Education and Urban Society, 14 (4), 511-530.

Guthrie, J. W. (1981). Emerging politics of educational policy. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 3 (3), 75-82.

Guthrie, J. W. (1980). An assessment of educational policy research. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 2 (5), 41-55.

Guthrie, J. W. (1980). United State's school finance policy 1955-1980. School finance policies and practices. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Co.

Hall, J. S. & Rawls, M. B. (1979). "Tax equity and who gets what: The case of education in Arizona." Toward Tax Reform. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Academy.

Hansen, K. H. (1963). Public education in American society (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hanson, M. E. (1979). Educational administration and organizational behavior. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon Inc.

Harber, C., Meighan, R. & Roberts, B. (1984). Alternative educational futures. London: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston, Ltd.

Harder, J. C. (1983). The Federal-State relationship: A traditionalist view. Education and Urban Society, 16 (1), 81-93.

Harman, G. (1983). The education policy process at the State level: Report of an Australian-United States comparative study. In G. Hancock, M. W. Kirst and D. L. Grossman (eds), Contemporary issues in education policy: Perspective from Australia and U.S.A. (pp. 97-126).

Hartle, T. W. (1983). The changing context of Federal education aid. Education and Urban Society, 15 (4), 408-431.

Havelock, R. (1972). A bibliography on knowledge utilization and dissemination. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Hines, E. R. (1974). The governor's role in State policy making for the public schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Ohio.

Hines, E. R. (1974). State policy making for the public schools of New York. Columbus: Ohio State University, Educational Governance Project.

Hinman, F. (1975). Collective bargaining in California public education: SB 160--the Rodda Act. Policy and practice papers presented at a statewide conference held in Los Angeles, Dec. 5-6, 1975. Sponsored by the Institute of Industrial Relations, UCLA.

Hoekstra, R. B. (1973). The governor as policy maker in education. A case study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Ohio.

Hollins v. Shofstall, Cir. No. C-25 36652 (Arizona Supreme Court, June 1, 1972), reviewed, 110 Arizona 88, 515 p. 2d 590. (1973).

Honig, B. (1983). A special note from Bill Honig: Superintendent Bill Honig's report to the state on current issues in California education. The New California Schools, 1 (3). 1.

Honig, B. (1983). The New California Schools: Superintendent Bill Honig's report to the state on current issues in California education. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

Hoos, I. R. (1983). Systems analysis in public policy: A critique. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

House, P. W. (1982). The art of public policy analysis: The arena of regulations and resources. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Howel, D. A. & Brown, R. (1983). Educational policy making: An Analysis. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Hoy, W. K. (1978). Scientific research in educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 14 (3), 1-12.

Huckshorn, R. J. (1965). Decision making stimuli in the state legislative process. Western Political Quarterly, 18, 164-185.

Huddleston, M. W. (1984). Comparative public administration: An annotated bibliography. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Hughes, J. F. (1975). Education and the state. American Council on Education, Washington, DC.

Innaccone, L. (1967). Politics in education. New York: Centre for Applied Research in Education.

Inbar, D. E. (1980). Educational planning: A review and plea. Review of Educational Research, 50 (3), 377-392.

Ingram, N., Mann, D. (1980). Why policies succeed or fail. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publication Inc.

Jenkins, W. I. (1978). Policy analysis: A political and organization perspective. London: Martin Robertson & Co., Ltd.

Johns, R. L. & Morphet, E. L. (1969). The economics and financing of education: A systems approach. Prentice Hall, Inc.

Johnson, G. R. & Glasman, N. S. (1983). Evaluation authority and financial control: A study of state mandates. Studies of Educational Evaluation, 1 (26), 59-76.

Johnstone, J. N. (1977). The dimensions of educations systems. Comparative Educational Review, 21 (1).

Jones, C. O. (1970). An introduction to the study of public policy. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc.

Keating, T. E. (1977). Political linkages and state educational reform. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, CA.

Keller, C. M. (1982). Parameters of quality control and decision making at state level. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 4 (4), 487-494.

Kelly, J. A. (1977-78). The public policy control of education finance. Administrator's Notebook, 26 (1).

Kelley, M. F. & Surbeck, E. (1983). Evaluation issues in performance-based compensation systems. Morrison Institute for Public Policy Newsletter.

Kelley, M. F. & Surbeck, E. (1983). "Arizona's performance-based teacher certification program." (Invited manuscript to be published in the Arizona Teacher Education Journal, Fall, 1983). Phoenix, AZ.

Kelley, M. F. & Surbeck, E. (1982). "Performance-based teacher assessment: A model for linking educational levels." American Middle School Education, 5 (3), 5-11.

Keppel, F. (1970). New relationships between education and industry. Public Administration Review, 30 (4), 353-359.

Kimbrough, R. B. (1982). Do political ideologies influence education in the United States. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18 (2), 22-38.

Kirst, M. (1979). Organization in shock and overload: California's public schools 1970-80. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1 (4), 27-30.

Kirst, M. (1982). How to improve schools without spending more money. Phi Delta Kappan, 64, 6-8.

Kirst, M., Meister, G. & Rowley, S. R. (1984). Policy issue networks: Their influence on state policy making. Stanford, CA: Institute of Research on Educational Finance and Governance, School of Education, Stanford University.

Kirst, M. W. (1984). State policy in an era of transition. Education and Urban Society, 16 (2), 225-237.

Klausmeier, H. J. (1982). A research strategy for educational improvement. Educational Researcher, 11 (1), 8-13.

Knapp, T. R. (1982). Methodological perspective. The unit and context of the analysis for research in educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18 (1), 1-13.

Koehl, R. (1977). The comparative study of education: Prescription and practice. Comparative Education Review, 21 (2-3), 177-194.

Kogan, M. (1975). Educational policy making. Allen & Unwin.

Koger, R. (1975). Educational policy making in the Kansas Senate. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). The structure of scientific revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Langlois, D. E. (1972). The politics of education in New Jersey. A study of Legislator behavior and four major interest groups. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, N.Y., pp. 1-2.

Lasswell, H. D. (1936). Politics: Who gets what, when, how. NY: P. Smith.

Legislative Analyst. (1983). Governor's budget for fiscal year 1983-84 to the California legislature. Sacramento, CA: pp. E-E63.

Legislative Analyst. (1984). Governor's budget for fiscal year 1984-85 to the California legislature. Sacramento, CA: pp. E1-E118.

Legislative Analyst. (1980). Analysis of the budget bill of the State of California for the fiscal year July 1, 1980 to June 30, 1981: Report of the legislative analyst to the joint legislative budget committee. Sacramento, CA: pp 956-1257.

Legislative Analyst. (1981). Analysis of the budget bill of the State of California for the fiscal year July 1, 1981 to June 30, 1982: Report of the legislative analyst to the joint legislative budget committee. Sacramento, CA.

Legislative Analyst. (1976). Analysis of the budget bill of the State of California for the fiscal year July 1, 1976 to June 30, 1977: Report of the legislative analyst to the joint legislative budget committee. Sacramento, CA: pp. 647-753.

Legislative Analyst. (1977). Analysis of the budget bill of the State of California for the fiscal year July 1, 1977 to June 30, 1978: Report of the legislative analyst to the joint legislative budget committee. Sacramento, CA: pp. 671-772.

Legislative Analyst. (1982). Analysis of the budget bill of the State of California for the fiscal year July 1, 1982 to June 30, 1983: Report of the legislative analyst to the joint legislative budget committee. Sacramento, CA: pp. 1257-1383.

Legislative Analyst. (1982). Analysis of the budget bill of the State of California for the fiscal year July 1, 1983 to June 30, 1984: Report of the legislative analyst to the joint legislative budget committee. Sacramento, CA.

Legislative Analyst. (1984). Annual budget for the fiscal year 1985: Analysis and recommendations of the staff of the joint legislative budget committee. (summary) Sacramento, CA.

Legislative Analyst. (1984). Annual budget: Legislative staff analysis and recommendations for fiscal year 1983-84. Sacramento, CA.

Legislative Budget Analyst. (1984). Annual budget fiscal year 1985: Legislative staff analysis and recommendations. Prepared by the legislative budget analyst for the joint legislative budget committee, Arizona legislature. Phoenix, AZ.

Legislative Analyst. (1983). Analysis of the budget bill for the fiscal year 1983-84. Sacramento, CA.

Legislative analyst. (1984). Analysis of the budget bill for the fiscal year 1984-85. Sacramento, CA.

Lieberman, A. & McLaughlin, W. (1982). Policy making in Education. In Eighty-first yearbook of National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lindblom, C. E. (1968). Policy making process. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Loheyde, K. M. J. (1982). The philosophy of Reagonomics and the retreat from equity. Educational Horizons, 61 (1), 10-11.

Louis, K. S. (1984). Organizational decline: How state agencies adapt. Education and Urban Society, 16 (2), 165-188.

Lutz, F. W. (1977). Methods and conceptualizations of political power in education. In J. D. Scribner (ed.) The politics of education. Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education, pp. 30-64.

Lynch, K. B. (1983). Qualitative and quantitative evaluation: Two terms in search of a meaning. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 5 (4), 461-464.

Madge, J. (1965). The tools of social science: An analytical description of social science techniques. Garden City, NY.

Mann, D. (1974). Public understanding and education decision making. Educational Administration Quarterly, 2 (2), 1-18.

Marker, G. W. (1984). The new crisis: Teacher education responds. Educational Horizons, 62 (2), 55-59.

Martin, M. T. (1981). Career education: Death at an early age? Phoenix, AZ: The Arizona Tax Research Association.

Martin, M. T. (1981). Vocational education: Wasted in High School. Phoenix, AZ: The Arizona Tax Research Association.

Martin, M. T. (1983). The 'principal' findings of research on effective schools. Phoenix, AZ: The Arizona Tax Research Association.

Martin, M. T. (1983). Arizona teacher proficiency examination of the basic skills. Phoenix, AZ: The Arizona Tax Research Association.

Masters, N. A., Salisbury, R. H. & Eliot, T. H. (1964). State politics and the public schools: An explanatory analysis. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Mazzoni, T., Jr. (1978). Administrator associations, influence strategies, and the state school policy process. Administrator's Notebook, 26 (7), 7.

Mazzoni, T. L., & Campbell, R. F. (1976). Influentials in state policy making for the public schools. Educational Administration Quarterly, 12 (1), 1-26.

McCarthy, M. M. (1983). Minimum competency testing for students: Educational legal issues. Educational Horizons, 61 (3), 103-110.

McGivney, J. H. (1984). State educational governance patterns. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20 (2), 43-63.

McGivney, J. H. (1977). The state politics of education: Towards and emerging theory. Planning and Changing, 8, (2), 66-84.

McLaughlin, M. W. and Catterall, J. S. (1984). Notes on the new politics of education. Education and Urban Society, 16 (3), 375-381.

Mellor, N. (1960). Legislative behavior research. Western Political Quarterly, 13, 131-153.

Meter, E. J. (1982). The perspectives model: Alternative approaches to planned educational change. Administrator's Notebook, 30 (2), 1-47.

Mettsner, A. (1976). Policy analysis in the bureaucracy.

Miller, V. (1965). The public administration of American school systems. MacMillan Co., Inc. pp. 117-142.

Milne, A. M. & Moskowitz, J. (1983). Implications of state programs: A case of special needs pupils. Education and Urban Society, 15 (4), 500-524.

Milstein, M. M. (1976). Impact and response: Federal and state education agencies. New York: Columbia Teacher's College Press.

Milstein, M. & Jennings, R. E. (1973). Educational policy making and the state legislature: New York experience. New York: Praeger Publishers, Inc.

Milstein, M. & Jennings, R. E. (1972). Educational interest group leaders and state legislators: Perceptions of the educational policy making process. Educational Administration Quarterly, 9 (1), 54-70.

Miskel, C. & Sandlin, T. (1981). Survey research in educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17 (4), 1-20.

Mitchell, D. E. (1981). Shaping legislative decision: Education policy and the social sciences. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath & Co.

Mitchell, D. E. (1980). Social science impact on legislative decision making: Process and substance. Educational Researcher, 9 (10), 9-19.

Mitchell, D. E. (1981). Social science utilization in state legislatures. Review of Research in Education, 9, 257-308.

Mitchell, D. E. (1984). Educational policy analysis: The state of the art. Educational Administration Quarterly, (forthcoming).

Mitchell, D. E. & Iannaccone, L. (1980). The impact of California's legislative policy on public school performance. Berkeley, CA: Institute of Government Studies.

Mitchell, D. E. (1974). Ideology and public school policy making. Urban Education, 9, 35-59.

Mitchell, D. E. & Encarnation, D. J. (1984). Alternative state policy mechanisms for influencing school performance. Educational Researcher, 13 (5), 4-11.

Mockler, J. B. & Birdsall, P. (1983). Streamlining Federal education programs. Education and Urban Society, 16 (2), 7-28.

Mofford, R. (1983). Constitution of the State of Arizona. Phoenix, AZ: Secretary of State, State of Arizona.

Monk, D. H. (1980). A comprehensive view of resource allocation for education. Administrator's Notebook, 28 (3).

Monk, D. H. (1982). Educational cost differentials and rural schools: A broadened view. Administrator's Notebook, 30 (4).

Moore, M. T., Goertz, M. E., & Hartle, T. W. (1983). Interaction of Federal and State programs. Education and Urban Society, 15 (45), 452-478.

Murphy, J. A. (1984). Policy analysis at the local level: A framework for expanded investigation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 6 (1), 5-13.

Murphy, J. A. (1980). The state role in education: Past research and future directions. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 2 (4).

Nagel, S. S. (1980). The policy-studies handbook. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath Co.

National Association of State Board of Education (1979). A report to the Office of Research, Assembly California legislature on State level educational governance.

Northern Arizona University. (1984). Center for excellence in education. Phoenix, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

Owens, R. G. (1982). Methodological vigor in naturalistic inquiry: Some issues and answers. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18 (2), 1-21.

Percy, E. B. (1977). Financing education in a climate of change. (2nd ed.) Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Piper, D. L. (1977). Decision making made by individuals vs. those made by group consensus or group participation. Educational Administration Quarterly, 10 (2), 82.

Politics and Legislation (1983). California Teacher's Association. An affiliate of the National Education Association, 4 (1-35). Sacramento, CA.

Price, D. W. (1971). Arizona school finance: A summary prepared for 30th legislature of State of Arizona. Phoenix, AZ.

Research Staff of the Joint Select Committee. (1979). Public school and community college finance in Arizona: A report to the joint select committee on tax reform and school finance of the Arizona legislature. Phoenix, AZ.

Riles, W. (1981). Measuring school quality: What the California assessment program is all about. Sacramento, CA: CSDE.

Rosenthal, A. & Fuhrman, S. (1981). Legislative education staffing in the states. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 3 (4), 5-16.

Rosenthal, A. & Fuhrman, S. (1981). Legislative education leadership in the states. Washington, D.C.: IFEL (Institute of Educational Leadership).

Schuttenberg, E. M. (1963). Present values and future studies. Educational Horizons, 61 (2), 97-100.

Secretary of State. (1983). Arizona revised statutes-title 15-education. Phoenix, AZ: Department of State.

Secretary of State. (1975). The Rhodda act (SB 160). Sacramento, CA.

Secretary of State (1984). California ballot pamphlet: 1984 general election, Nov. 6. Sacramento, CA.

Secretary of State. (1984). House bill 2480: Minimum salaries for teachers. Phoenix, AZ: Department of State.

Secretary of State. (1984). House bill 2059: Teacher performance evaluation system. Phoenix, AZ: Department of State.

Secretary of State. (1984). House bill 2396: Public buildings and building codes. Phoenix, AZ: Department of State.

Secretary of State. (1984). Senate bill 1402. State fire prevention standards. Phoenix, AZ: Department of State.

Secretary of State. (1983). Arizona administrative rules and regulations. Phoenix, AZ: Department of State.

Secretary of State. (1984). House bill 2413: School discipline. Phoenix, AZ: Department of State.

Secretary of State. (1984). House bill 2213: High School subjects. Phoenix, AZ: Department of State.

Secretary of State. (1984). Senate bill 1240. High School graduation. Phoenix, AZ: Department of State.

Secretary of State. (1984). Senate bill 1221: G.E.D. Test. Phoenix, AZ: Department of State.

Secretary of State. (1984). Senate bill 1160: Bilingual program. Phoenix, AZ: Department of State.

Secretary of State. (1984). House bill 2471: Gifted pupils. Phoenix, AZ: Department of State.

Secretary of State. (1974). Arizona official compilation of administrative rules and regulations. Phoenix, AZ: Department of State.

Secretary of State. (1984). Senate bill 1125: Compulsory education, free textbooks. Phoenix, AZ: Department of State.

Secretary of State. (1984). House bill 2341: Pupil achievement. Phoenix, AZ: Department of State.

Secretary of State. (1984). House bill 2156: Teacher proficiency test. Phoenix, AZ: Department of State.

Serrano v. Priest, Civil No. 938 254 (California Supreme Court, April 10, 1974).

Shipman, M. D. (1972). The limitations of social research. London: Longman.

Sterwart, D. W. (1981). Systems theory as a framework for analysis of politics of adult education. Adult Education, 31 (3), 142-154.

Stuffle, D. L. (1980). An analysis of alternative approaches to evaluation. Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 2 (3).

Thesis, G. N. (1974). Simulation analysis of policy making: Decisions in education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate School, University of Minnesota.

Thompson, J. T. (1976). Policy making in American public education: A framework for analysis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Thompson, M. S. (1974). Evaluation for decision in social programs.

Track, D., Kirst, M. & Hansot, E. (1980). Educational reform: Retrospect and prospect. Teachers' College Record, 81 (3), 253-264.

Turnbull, B. J. (1984). States propose schools dispose: Prospects for state initiatives in quality improvements. Education and Urban Society, 16 (2), 207-224.

Tuthill, D. & Ashton, P. (1983). Improving educational research through the development of educational paradigms. Educational Researcher, 12 (10), 6-14.

Usdaw, M. D. (1963). The political power of education in New York State. New York: Institute of Administrative Research, Columbia University.

Uslaner, E. M. & Weber, R. E. (1977). Patterns of decision making in state legislatures. NY: Praeger Publishers.

Wahlke, J. C., Eulau, H., Buchanan, W., & Ferguson, L. C. (1962). The legislative system: Explorations in legislative behavior. New York: John Wiley.

Warner, C. (1983). Effective schools are Arizona's best bet. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Warner, C. (1983). Arizona pupil achievement testing: Statewide report. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Warner, C. (1980). Annual report of the superintendent of public instruction for fiscal year 1979-80. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Warner, C. (1981). Annual report of the superintendent of public instruction for fiscal year 1980-81. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Warner, C. (1982). Annual report of the superintendent of public instruction for fiscal year 1981-82. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Warner, C. (1983). Annual report of the superintendent of public instruction for fiscal year 1982-83. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Warner, C. (1980). Uniform system of financial records. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Warner, C. (1979). Report on the blue ribbon task force on certification. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Warner, C. (1979). Reading achievement test report 1978-79. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Warner, C. (1979). Mathematics achievement test report 1978-79. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Warner, C. (1983). 1984 educational proposals: Speech delivered to Phoenix Aritan Club on December 22, 1983. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Warner, C. (1979). Suggested guidelines for the development and implementation of a continuous uniform evaluation system. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Warner, C. (1981). Arizona pupil achievement testing. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Warner, C. (1982). Arizona pupil achievement testing: Statewide report appendix. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Warner, C. (1984). Arizona's principal's academy (APA). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Warner, C. (1983). Arizona pupil achievement testing: Instructions for test coordinators. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Watson, D. E. (1983). Report of the commission on teacher quality: Report submitted to the California Senate, September 1983. Sacramento, CA.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 1-19.

Weiss, C. H. (1977). Using social research in policy making. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Weiss, C. H. (1977). Research for policy's sake. The enlightenment of function and social research. Policy Analysis, 3 (4), 531-545.

Whitty, G. (1984). The "privatization" of education. Educational Leadership, 41 (7), 51-57.

Wiley, T. (1965). Public school education in New Mexico. Albuquerque: Division of Government Research, University of New Mexico.

Wirt, F. M. & Kirst, M. W. (1972). Political and social foundations of education. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Wirt, F. M. & Mitchell, D. E. (1982). Social Science and educational reforms: The political uses of social research. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18 (4), 1-16.

Wirt, F. M. (1978). "What state laws say about local control." Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 517-520.

Wirt, F. M. (1977). School policy culture and state decentralization. In J. D. Scribner, (eds.), The politics of education (pp. 164-187). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Wirt, F. M. (1980). Comparing educational policies: Theory, units of analysis, and research strategies. Comparative Education Review, 24 (2), 1974-181.

Wiseman, M. (1978). Understanding the equity consequences of school finance reforms. Harvard Educational Review, 48, 193-226.

Wolf, R. L. (1979). "The use of judicial methods in the formulation of educational policy." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1, 5-9.

Worthley, J. A. & Crane, E. G. (1976). Organizational dimensions of state legislatures. Midwest Review of Public Administration, 10, 14-30.

Wright, J. D. & Kohut, S., Jr. (1984). Merit pay movement: 1980's style. Educational Horizons, 62 (2), 52-54.

Wynkoop, R. J. (1974). Prognosis for change in state finance plans: An analysis of recent commission reports and court decisions. Educational Administration Quarterly, 10 (3), 20-32.

Yeakey, C. C. (1982). Block grants and public schooling: Implications for educational policy and decision making. Educational Horizons, 61 (1), 18-24.

Yin, R. K. (1984). Case study research: Design and methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Zeigler, H. & Johnson, K. (1972). The politics of education in the states. New York: The bobbs Merril Co., Inc. pp. 3-18.

APPENDIX A

Protocol for the Preliminary Interviews

Interviewee:_____

Interviewed by:_____

Interview Location:_____

Date: ___/___/___/ Time:_____

1. OK, let's talk about the key education policy people in this state.

If we could only do 8 or 10 interviews on education policy issues in this state, who would you suggest that we talk to?

(Ask about knowledgeable people in each of the seven policy areas: governance, revenue generation, resource allocation, program definition, personnel certification, student assessment, and curriculum materials development.)

Person (Get address & phone)	Area	Person (Gett address & phone)	Area
1._____ Phone: ( ) _____		5._____ Phone: ( ) _____	
2._____ Phone: ( ) _____		6._____ Phone: ( ) _____	
3._____ Phone: ( ) _____		7._____ Phone: ( ) _____	
4._____ Phone: ( ) _____		8._____ Phone: ( ) _____	

2. Let's talk a bit about printed material which might help us get a handle on policy and practice in this state.

Can you put me onto any good reports or summaries of education policy in this state?

(Probe for help regarding each of the seven policy areas, as well as general information about issues and practices.)

DOCUMENT TITLE	CONTENTS
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	

3. Could we turn now to a bit of background in the area of_____ _____ (particular policy area). I know this state has_____ _____ and _____ (Name a Couple of Policy Elements) in this area. How would you describe the overall framework of (Particular Policy Area) policy?

What do you feel are the most important goals or objectives of policy in this area?

Have there been major changes in this area in the last few years? (What brought those changes about?)

Are you personally happy with the way these policies are working?

APPENDIX B

Interview Protocol for the Final Interviews and Data Recording Form

ALTERNATIVE STATE EDUCATION POLICY MECHANISMS PROJECT

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT:

To those interviewed previously: Since we last talked I have met with the other team members on our state-level education policy research project. We have had a chance to to compare notes on the different approaches to K-12 education policy being used in our six state sample.

Now we would like to ask you, along with the others we have previously interviewed, to respond to a common set of questions so that we can compare policies and programs across the states.

To those not previously interviewed: As I mentioned in our letter, I am part of a team funded by the National Institute of Education to take a look at state-level education policy in six states. Preliminary interviews were held in each state a few months ago. The people interviewed in this state identified you as a person we should be sure to talk with in order to get a full understanding of K-12 education policy in this state.

Since doing our preliminary interviews, the research team met to discuss the various approaches to K-12 education policy being taken in our six sample states. We have developed a common set of questions to be used in each state so that we can more fully understand the similarities and differences in approach across the sample states.

If you don't mind, I would like to tape record our interview.

*** TURN ON TAPE RECORDER ***

Although the specifics differ from state to state, our preliminary work indicates that similar basic issues are being worked on in most states. I would like to go over some of these issues with you -- they are described on the pages of this notebook.

*** GIVE RESPONDENT THE NOTEBOOK ***

1. On the first page of the notebook, you will see a list of seven of broad educational policy issues areas that we have found to be important in the six states we have been studying. Which of these seven policy areas would you say has been getting the most attention in your state over the last two or three years?

   Which has been receiving the least amount of attention?

   Could you rank order the others?

2. How do you feel about the relative amount of attention being given

to each of these policy domains? Do you feel that some areas should be getting more attention? Are some getting too much attention? Which ones?

3. Would you look at the list of seven policy domains once again and pick the three areas in which you feel most knowledgeable -- I would like to have you look somewhat more closely at ___State___ policy in each of these areas.

FOR THE THREE SPMs FOR WHICH EACH RESPONDENT IS MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE ASK:

4. If you would turn to the next (next) page in the notebook you will see that our preliminary work identified:

Five....	basic approaches	.....School Finance
Four	to policy making	School Personnel Policy
Five....	in the area of	.....Student Testing & Assessment
Four		School Program Definition
Eight.....		School Governance
Three		Curriculum Materials Development
Four.....		School Buildings & Facilities

Would you look at the alternative approaches to ___SPM___.

Which of these ___No.___ approaches has been reveiving the most attention in recent ___SPM___ policy decisions in this state?

Which has been given the least attention?

(If more than 3) Could you rank the others?

5. Could you give me an example of a specific policy incorporating the ___Approach___ which you cited as getting the most attention?

6. Would you look at the whole list of ___No.___ approaches to ___SPM___ again. Which of these approaches would you personally rank as the most promising way of handling ___SPM___ issues?

Which would you personally view as the least promising?

(If more than 3) How would you personally rank the others?

7. Could you give me an example of how you would like to see this state incorporate ___Approach given as #1___ into ___SPM___ policy?

8. On a scale of 1 to 10, how likely is it that this state will follow your preferences on ___SPM___ policy in the near future?

GO BACK TO QUESTION 1 UNTIL ALL SPMs ARE COVERED
AFTER ALL OF THE SPMs HAVE BEEN COVERED, GO TO NEXT PAGE.

9. Please turn to the next page in the notebook. This page asks you to indicate whether ___State___ has responded directly to the report of the President's "Commission on Excellence". Five recommendations from the Commission report are presented in a sort of "box-score" format. Would you mark directly on the form provided whether any of these recommendations have been receiving attention. Mark the appropriate column for each recommendation that has gotten attention.

10. The next two pages ask you to record your own personal judgments regarding the relative importance of various educational policy problems and the relative influence of various participants in the state policy making system. Would you take 5 minutes or so to record your views on these two pages.

11. The last two pages in the notebook asks for a little information about your personal background and training. If you would complete them now, I will be finished with my questions -- then I'll be glad to answer any questions you may have about any aspect of our project.

*** THANK EACH PARTICIPANT FOR THEIR COOPERATION ***

ALTERNATIVE STATE EDUCATION POLICY MECHANISMS PROJECT

DATA RECORDING FORM FOR FINAL INTERVIEWS

RESPONDENT:_____

STATE:_____

POSITION:_____

DATE:_____TIME:_____

CODE:_____

-On the seven policy domains:

-	1. Attention.	2. Needs + or -	3. Knowledge
-I. School Finance			
-II. Personnel			
-III. Test/Assessment			
-IV. Program Definition			
-V. Governance			
-VI. Curriculum Materials			
-VII. Plant & Facilities			

-I. SCHOOL FINANCE:

1. State's rank order of approaches:

___A. Equalizing ___B. Limiting/Increasing

___C. Targeting ___D. Financing

___E. Offsetting

2. Example of a specific policy incorporating the approach getting the most attention:

3. -Personal- ranking of approaches:

___A. Equalizing ___B. Limiting/Increasing

___C. Targeting ___D. Financing

___E. Offsetting

4. -Personal- example of how state should incorporate approach ranked #1:

5. Estimate of likelihood that state will follow -personal- preferences:

1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 10.

-II. SCHOOL PERSONNEL POLICY:

1. State's rank order of approaches:

___A. Pre-Service/Cert. ___B. Professional Development

___C. Accountability ___D. Changing Tchr. Job Definitions

2. Example of a specific policy incorporating the approach getting the most attention:

3. -Personal- ranking of approaches:

___A. Pre-Service/Cert. ___B. Professional Development

___C. Accountability ___D. Changing Tchr. Job Definitions

4. -Personal- example of how state should incorporate approach ranked #1:

5. Estimate of likelihood: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 10.

-III. TESTING & ASSESSMENT:

1. State's rank order of approaches:

___A. Format or Content ___B. Special Program Placement

___C. Evaluate Tchrs/Pgms ___D. Measure Non-academic Outcomes

___E. Require Locals to Develop Own Tests

2. Example of a specific policy incorporating the approach getting the most attention:

3. -Personal- ranking of approaches:

___A. Format or Content ___B. Special Program Placement

___C. Evaluate Tchrs/Pgms ___D. Measure Non-academic Outcomes

___E. Require Locals to Develop Own Tests

4. -Personal- example of how state should incorporate approach ranked #1:

5. Estimate of likelihood: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 10.

-IV. PROGRAM DEFINITION POLICY:

1. State's rank order of approaches:

___A. Changing Time Reqs. ___B. Mandating Specific Subjects

___C. Setting Higher Stds. ___D. Dev. Pgms. for Special Groups

2. Example of a specific policy incorporating the approach getting the most attention:

3. -Personal- ranking of approaches:

___A. Changing Time Reqs. ___B. Mandating Specific Subjects

___C. Setting Higher Stds. ___D. Dev. Pgms. for Special Groups

4. -Personal- example of how state should incorporate approach ranked #1:

5. Estimate of likelihood: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 10.

-V. SCHOOL GOVERNANCE POLICY:

1. State's rank order of approaches:

___A. State Level Redist. ___B. State at Expense of Locals

___C. Strength. Site Level ___D. Strengthen Teachers

___E. Student Rights ___F. Administrative Control

___G. Citizen Influence ___H. Alter Local District Role

2. Example of a specific policy incorporating the approach getting the most attention:

3. -Personal- ranking of approaches:

___A. State Level Redist. ___B. State at Expense of Locals

___C. Strength. Site Level ___D. Strengthen Teachers

___E. Student Rights ___F. Administrative Control

___G. Citizen Influence ___H. Alter Local District Role

-Personal- example of how state should incorporate approach ranked #1:

5. Estimate of likelihood: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 10.

-VI. CURRICULUM MATERIALS POLICY:

1. State's rank order of approaches:

___A. Mandating Local Use ___B. Specifying Scope and Sequence

___C. Develop. Specialized Materials

2. Example of a specific policy incorporating the approach getting the most attention:

3. -Personal- ranking of approaches:

___A. Mandating Local Use ___B. Specifying Scope and Sequence

___C. Develop. Specialized Materials

4. -Personal- example of how state should incorporate approach ranked #1:

5. Estimate of likelihood: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 10.

-VII. BUILDING & FACILITIES:

1. State's rank order of approaches:

___A. Tech./Arch. Review ___B. Long Range Planning

___C. Remediation of Probs. ___D. New Instructional Capacities

2. Example of a specific policy incorporating the approach getting the most

attention:

3. -Personal- ranking of approaches:

___A. Tech./Arch. Review ___B. Long Range Planning

___C. Remediation of Probs. ___D. New Instructional Capacities

4. -Personal- example of how state should incorporate approach ranked #1:

5. Estimate of likelihood: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 10.

APPENDIX C

The Policy Value Instrument

WHAT DO YOU FEEL ARE THE IMPORTANT EDUCATION POLICY PROBLEMS IN YOUR STATE?

Indicate your views by placing an "X" on the line nearer to the phrase in each pair that you feel is more important. Mark the space closest to the end of the line if that item is much more important than the other; mark the next space of it is somewhat more important; and mark the space close to the center of the line if it is only a little more important.

INCREASING PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY	___:___:___::___:___:___	MAKING PROGRAMS MORE COST-EFFECTIVE
IMPROVING THE USE OF EDUCATION TAX DOLLARS	___:___:___::___:___:___	GREATER EQUALIZATION OF RESOURCES
MORE EFFICIENT SCHOOL MANAGEMENT	___:___:___::___:___:___	PROVIDING MORE CHOICES FOR FAMILIES & CHILDREN
MAKING PROGRAMS MORE COST-EFFECTIVE	___:___:___::___:___:___	SETTING HIGHER ACADEMIC STANDARDS
REDUCING RESTRICTIONS ON LOCAL EXPENDITURES	___:___:___::___:___:___	IMPROVING THE USE OF EDUCATION TAX DOLLARS
INCREASING PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY	___:___:___::___:___:___	GIVING MORE ATTENTION TO CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS
INCREASING THE LEVEL OF FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS	___:___:___::___:___:___	GREATER EQUALIZATION OF RESOURCES
BROADER PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING	___:___:___::___:___:___	MORE EFFICIENT SCHOOL MANAGEMENT
GIVING MORE ATTENTION TO CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS	___:___:___::___:___:___	SETTING HIGHER ACADEMIC STANDARDS
REDUCING RESTRICTIONS ON LOCAL EXPENDITURES	___:___:___::___:___:___	INCREASING THE LEVEL OF FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS
DEVELOPING QUALITY CONSCIOUS LEADERSHIP	___:___:___::___:___:___	PROVIDING MORE CHOICES FOR FAMILIES & CHILDREN
SETTING HIGHER ACADEMIC STANDARDS	___:___:___::___:___:___	INCREASING PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY

GREATER EQUALIZATION OF RESOURCES	___:___:___::___:___:___	REDUCING RESTRICTIONS ON LOCAL EXPENDITURES
PROVIDING MORE CHOICES FOR FAMILIES & CHILDREN	___:___:___::___:___:___	BROADER PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING
MORE EFFICIENT SCHOOL MANAGEMENT	___:___:___::___:___:___	DEVELOPING QUALITY CONSCIOUS LEADERSHIP
GIVING MORE ATTENTION TO CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS	___:___:___::___:___:___	MAKING PROGRAMS MORE COST-EFFECTIVE
IMPROVING THE USE OF EDUCATION TAX DOLLARS	___:___:___::___:___:___	INCREASING THE LEVEL OF FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS
DEVELOPING QUALITY CONSCIOUS LEADERSHIP	___:___:___::___:___:___	BROADER PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING

Code:_____

APPENDIX D

Level of Influence Instrument

PLEASE CIRCLE A NUMBER FROM 1 TO 7 TO INDICATE THE LEVEL OF INFLUENCE OVER EDUCATION POLICY EXERCISED DURING THE LAST FEW YEARS BY EACH OF THE FOLLOWING IN YOUR STATE:

	Very low ---------- Very high
a. The Governor and Executive Staff . . .	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
b. The Chief State School Officer and Senior Staff in the State Dept. of Education	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
c. The State Board of Education	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
d. The State Legislature	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
1. Leading members of Legislative Committee	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
2. Key Legislative Staff Consultants .	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
e. All Education Interest Groups combined	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
1. Teacher Organization(s)	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
2. State Administrator Organization(s)	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
3. State Assocation of Local School Boards	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
4. Lay Groups (PTA, advisory councils, etc.)	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
f. Non-Educator Interest Groups (business leaders, taxpayer groups, etc.) . . .	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
g. Producers of Education Related Products (textbook mfr, test producers, etc.)	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
h. Direct Referenda Initiated by Citizens	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
i. The Courts (State or Federal) . . .	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
j. Federal Policy Mandates to States . .	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
k. Education Research Organizations . .	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
l. Any others:_____	1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7

APPENDIX E

Biographical Data Form

Code:_____

PERSONAL DATA

Please check the appropriate response to each of the following questions about yourself:

1. How long have you held your present position?

___ Less than 2 years

___ 2 to 4 years

___ 5 to 7 years

___ 8 to 10 years

___ 11 or more years

2. How old are you?

___ Less than 30

___ 30 to 39

___ 40 to 49

___ 50 to 59

___ 60 or older

3. What do you consider to be your regular occupation?_____

_____

4. Which of the following degrees do you hold? (indicate all degrees held)

___ BA or BS - Major:_____

___ MA or MS - Field_____

___ PhD or EdD - Field _____

___ Doctorate in Medicine or Dentistry

___ Law Degree

5. Are you profesionally licensed in any of the following fields?

___ Teaching

___ Law

___ Psychology

___ School Administration

___ Engineering/Architecture

___ Other:_____

___ Nursing

___ Medicine/ Dentistry

6. What is your political party affiliation?

___ Democrat ___ Republican ___ Independent ___ Other ___ None

Code:_____

7. How would you describe your overall political orientation?

___ Strongly Conservative

___ Moderately Conservative

___ Moderate

___ Moderately Liberal

___ Strongly Liberal

8. What is the range of your current family income?

___ $25,000 or less

___ $25,001 to $35,000

___ $35,001 to $45,000

___ $45,001 to $55,000

___ $55,001 to $65,000

___ $65,001 to $75,000

___ $75,001 to $85,000

___ More than $85,000

APPENDIX F

Description of the Alternative Approaches

SEVEN MAJOR POLICY DOMAINS FOR K-12 EDUCATION POLICY

I. School Finance: controlling who pays for education, how those costs are distributed, and how human and fiscal resources are allocated to the schools.

II. School Personnel Training and Certification: controlling the conditions for getting or keeping various jobs in the school system.

III. Student Testing & Assessment: fixing the timing and consequenses of testing, including subjects covered and the distribution of test data.

IV. School Program Definition: controlling program planning and accreditation, or otherwise specifying what schools must teach and how long they must teach it.

V. School Organization & Governance: the assignment of authority and responsibility to various groups and individuals.

VI. Curriculum Materials: controlling the development and/or selection of textbooks and other instructional materials.

VII. School Buildings & Facilities: determination of architecture, placement and maintenance for buildings and other school facilities.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO SCHOOL FINANCE POLICY

A. Equalizing the amount of money spent to educate each child in the state (perhaps under court order).

B. Limiting or Increasing the total amount of money spent on schooling.

C. Targeting funds on children with special needs -- non-English speakers, disadvantaged minorities, low achievers, handicapped, gifted, etc.

D. Financing particular school services or functions -- textbooks, staff training, program planning, minimum salaries, building maintenance, etc.

E. Offsetting burdensome costs incurred by school districts with specific problems -- declining enrollment, extensive pupil transportation, high cost urban environments, building construction, etc.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO SCHOOL PERSONNEL POLICY

A. Pre-service Training and Certification Improvement: credentialing reform, basic skills testing, increasing minimum salaries, etc.

B. Professional Development Programs: in-service training requirements, teacher centers, principal academies, summer institutes, etc.

C. Accountability Systems: linking compensation or job security with performance assessments, merit pay, special conpensation for outstanding work, new evaluation or employee discipline requirements, etc.

D. Changing Teacher Job Definitions: mentor teacher programs, development of career ladders, differentiated staffing plans, etc.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO STUDENT TESTING & ASSESSMENT POLICY

A. Specifying the Format or Content of Tests: adopting new tests, shifting from norm-referenced to criterion-referenced tests, adding new subjects, new grades, or new student groups, etc.

B. Testing Students for Special Program Placement: certification of handicapped or gifted students, requiring tests for graduation or promotion, etc.

C. Using Tests to Evaluate Program or Teacher Performance: linking salaries or program funding to test scores, etc.

D. Measuring Non-academic Student Outcomes: assessment of physical skills, attitudes, interests, or other personal and social characteristics.

E. Requiring Local Districts to Develop Their Own Tests: local promotion or proficiency testing for students, requiring local tests for program evaluation, etc.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO SCHOOL PROGRAM DEFINITION POLICY

A. Changing Time Requirements: modifying the school day, school year, or specifying the number of minutes or hours for particular subjects, etc.

B. Mandating Specific Subjects: physical education, alcohol/drug abuse, creationism, driver education, American economic or policital system, etc.

C. Setting Higher Program Standards: new graduation requirements, promotion/retention policies, etc.

D. Developing Programs for Special Groups: remedial courses, special education, bilingual, alternative schools, etc.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO SCHOOL ORGANIZATION & GOVERNANCE POLICY

A. Redistributing Authority Among State Level Agencies: creating new commissions, giving new powers to the chief state school officer, expanding oversight by the legislature, etc.

B. Strengthening State Agencies at the Expense of Local Districts: moving personnel, curricular, fiscal, or other policies into the hands of state level decision makers.

C. Strengthening Site-Level Governance: advisory committees, school site councils, or other mechanisms for broadening participation at this level.

D. Strengthening Teacher Influence: appointment of teachers to policy committees, giving them meet-and-confer or collective bargaining rights, etc.

E. Clarifying Student Rights and Responsibilities: defining due process requirements, mandating discipline programs, modifying suspension or expulsion regulations, etc.

F. Strengthening Administrative Control: more discretionary authority over program or personnel, reorganizing school districts, mandating evaluation and employee discipline programs, etc.

G. Expanding Parent/Citizen Influence: more parental rights in student assignment or transfer, requiring citizen involvement in decisions, perhaps even tuition tax credits or educational vouchers.

H. Altering Local District Roles & Responsibilities: reorganization and consolidation of districts, granting new powers to local boards, changing election or appointment procedures for board members, etc.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO CURRICULUM MATERIALS POLICY

A. Mandating Local Use of Materials selected or developed by state agencies: textbook review and approval procedures, tight control over curriculum materials budgets, etc.

B. Specification of the Scope and Sequence of materials to be used in local districts: identification of topics to be covered in various courses or grades.

C. Development of Specialized Instructional Materials for particular purposes: new technologies, computer literacy, materials for gifted or handicapped children, bilingual materials, etc.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO SCHOOL BUILDING & FACILITIES POLICY

A. Technical/Architectural Review of local school district building plans to insure they are cost efficient, meet safety standards, etc.

B. Long Range Planning for School Construction: demographic studies, allocation of state construction funds, etc.

C. Remediation of Existing Building Problems: asbestos, earthquake safety, energy conservation, access for handicapped students, etc.

D. Providing New Instructional Capacities: science and language laboratories, libraries, media centers, etc.

APPENDIX G

A Summary of Relationships Between State Policy Mechanisms and Educational Policy Goals

A SUMMARY OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN

STATE POLICY MECHANISMS AND EDUCATIONAL POLICY GOALS

	EFFICIENCY	EQUITY	QUALITY
1. STRUCTURAL ORGANIZATION	Centralized Professional Authority	Enhanced Client Access: Decentralized Advisory Grps.	Development of New Planning & Support Structures
2. REVENUE GENERATION	Local Control of Taxation	Highlight Federal & State Responsibility	Attention to Funding Levels and Decision Timing
3. RESOURCE ALLOCATION	Professional Dominance: "Economies of Scale"	Categorical Funding for Target Populations	De-regulation with focus on Accountability & Incentives
4. PROGRAM DEFINITION	Universalistic Standards: Carnegie Units and Tracking	Heterogeneous Grouping: Mainstreaming & Remediation	Local Planning, Dissemination of Innovative Programs
5. PERSONNEL TRAINING & CERTIFICATION	Certification & Tenure Laws	Multicultural Experience & Affirmative Action	More Teacher Training & Competency Testing
6. STUDENT TESTING & ASSESSMENT	Achievement & Ability Testing for Program Placement	Testing for Program Evaluation & Stud. Diagnosis	Testing for Certification of Competence on Exit
7. CURRICULUM MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT	Standardization of Texts by Professionals	Representative Portrayal of Minorities in All Texts	Technical Sophistication & Sequencing of Materials