

EDMONTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

February 26, 2008

TO: Board of Trustees

FROM: E. Schmidt, Superintendent of Schools

SUBJECT: Framework for Involvement in Site-Based Decision Making

ORIGINATOR: B. Tams, Assistant Superintendent

RESOURCE

STAFF: Donna Barrett, Jenise Bidulock, David Fraser, Allan Jack, Patrick Johner, Catherine LeBlanc, Ron MacNeil, Ellen Ogilvy, Mark Ramsankar

INFORMATION

This report is being presented to Board by the Joint Committee reviewing the current status and application of the Framework for Involvement in Site-Based Decision Making. The report will also be presented to the Edmonton Public Teachers' Council of School Representatives on March 5, 2008.

The Joint Committee was created through a Letter of Intent in the September 1, 2006 to August 31, 2007 Teachers' Collective Agreement. Its main purpose was to examine how the principles expressed in the joint document "Framework for Involvement in Site-Based Decision Making" (May 2000) are being implemented in the district (Attachment I). The new 2007-2012 Teachers' Collective Agreement provides for a new standing committee that will jointly monitor the implementation of recommendations arising from the original committee's work. Attachment II provides background on the process and undertakings of the committee.

One of the key undertakings of the Joint Committee was to conduct a baseline survey of all staff regarding their involvement in site-based decision making within their work location and the district. In total, 2,913 staff members responded to the survey (Attachment III). The findings have been presented to the presidents of the three CUPE Locals. Following presentation to the Board and the Council of School Representatives, the results will be posted on the district and local websites.

Because the committee's work focused on teachers' involvement in decision making, this report highlights the findings related to teaching staff (Attachment IV). Significant information from each of the other four staff groups is found in the broader survey results (Attachment V). A plan for addressing these findings is also found in Attachment V.

Some of the main findings of the survey related to teaching staff are:

- 83% have an opportunity to give input into those decisions that affect them.
- 74% say they can provide open and honest input into decisions without fear.
- 69% have input into the school/DU plan; 54% provide input into how money is spent.
- 68% are satisfied with their involvement in decision making processes.
- 67% believe their input has been considered when decisions are made that affect them.
- 50% are aware of the "Framework for Involvement in Site-Based Decision" document.

Several teachers of the total number who participated (1713) also took the opportunity to provide 238 written comments and the following are representative of many of the views expressed:

- Some teachers noted that their input is asked for, but they feel it does not have an impact on the decisions that are taken.
- Although 91% of teachers indicated they have input into their personal professional development, several teachers commented that they feel their own PD is determined by the district and school foci.
- Several respondents voiced concern that the cost recovery model results in decisions based on finances rather than need. The most frequent examples given were that students with special needs are detrimentally affected and the maintenance of buildings is neglected.
- Many teachers expressed concern and frustration that involvement in decision making varies according to the leadership style in the school or decision unit, and is compromised by a lack of time.

While the Joint Committee acknowledges that the majority of staff indicated positive responses in the survey, there was also recognition that there is room for significant improvement in several areas.

Recommendations

1. Strive to ensure that involvement in decision making is seen as part of our district culture:
 - Build awareness and understanding of the Framework for Involvement in Site-Based Decision Making document at all levels of the organization through vehicles such as the staff orientation program, leadership training programs, a presentation and discussion at the Superintendent's Leadership Meeting, teachers' convention.
 - Link the framework to the values of the district in terms of mission and priorities, working relationships, organizational health, and respectful learning and working environments.
 - Highlight the relationships among meaningful involvement in decision making and employee attraction, development, engagement and retention.
2. Remind administrators and staff of the importance of the meaningful participation of staff in the entire 2008-2011 budget planning process.
3. Develop skills in staff to facilitate their involvement in site-based decision making: e.g. coaching, communication, conflict management, and skills to enhance relationships.
4. Refer the issue of personal professional development to the new joint committee reviewing professional development.

Next Steps

- Establish the standing committee as per the new Letter of Understanding in the 2007-2012 Teachers' Collective Agreement.
- Explore the development and implementation of specific supports noted in the above recommendations.
- Continue work with all staff groups regarding the expectations and issues raised in the survey.

- Attachment I – Framework for Involvement in Site-Based Decision Making (pages 3 – 18)
- Attachment II – Background on the Work of the Joint Committee (pages 19 – 21)
- Attachment III – Staff Survey: Involvement in Site-Based Decision Making (pages 22 – 24)
- Attachment IV – Survey Results for Teaching Staff (pages 25 – 27)
- Attachment V – Addressing Survey Results for Non-Teaching Staff Groups (pages 28 –42)

**FRAMEWORK
FOR INVOLVEMENT
IN SITE-BASED
DECISION MAKING**



PURPOSE

This document provides a framework to facilitate improved involvement in decision making within Edmonton Public Schools.

BACKGROUND

This document is the result of a co-operative effort between the Edmonton Public Local of the ATA and Edmonton Public Schools. It came about as a result of a letter of intent between the two parties that was agreed upon during the 1998 round of bargaining. Teachers had expressed concerns that their level of involvement in decision making seemed to be significantly different from school to school, and they were looking for guidelines about what could be expected. The purpose of the document is to provide a framework and suggestions for effective ways of involving stakeholders in decision-making processes within the context of the district's site-based decision-making model.

A committee was formed consisting of four members appointed by the Local and four members appointed by the district. The representatives of the Local were Karen Beaton, Allan Jack, Catherine LeBlanc, and Peter McNab. The representatives of the district were Mary-Ellen Deising, Avi Habinski, Angus McBeath, and Faye Parker. The committee decided to obtain input regarding the important aspects of involvement in decision making from teachers, principals and parents, as well as support, maintenance, custodial and exempt staff groups through a series of focus groups. The focus groups responded to a series of open-ended questions designed to obtain their views regarding the nature of genuine involvement, the things they wanted to be involved in, and the processes and conditions that encourage genuine involvement in decision making. In addition, through the Local's mailing councillors, all school staffs had the opportunity to respond to similar questions.

An analysis of the input from the various stakeholders revealed many common characteristics of what people perceive to be genuine involvement, and the working environment that fosters it.

This document summarizes the input received and provides a framework to facilitate improved involvement in decision making.

OVERVIEW

“Involvement” means having the opportunity to make or influence decisions in a variety of ways. Individuals want to engage in a meaningful and genuine process and receive feedback on the results of the decision-making process. They would like to be kept informed but would also like to be respected if they choose not to be involved.

In general, staff want to be involved in decisions that affect them and their job including direction setting, the use of available resources and the selection of staff.

The value of stakeholder involvement in decision making is reflected in legislation, policy and practice from Alberta Learning, Edmonton Public Schools and the Alberta Teachers’ Association. Appendix I quotes relevant documents from all three.

When asked what involvement meant to them, individuals shared a number of perspectives, including the following:

- expressing ideas without fear of negative consequences
- having the opportunity to debate and share ideas
- feeling that views are solicited and considered
- having opportunities for input to influence decisions
- being invited to share or being asked for an opinion
- having an impact on the results
- having a right to influence decisions
- having a right to be heard

Others focused on circumstances related to the decision maker. They suggested that both the “asker” and “giver” have responsibilities for involvement. A number of the respondents indicated that involvement must be “genuine”, “real”, and “meaningful” and that the opinion of the participants must be respected. They sent a clear message to the decision maker. **“Don’t involve us if the decision has already been made.”** Involvement should be an on-going process and not a single event. They recognized that not all their views or positions could be adopted. They believed, however, that genuine involvement included receiving feedback in exchange for the input provided and knowing the rationale for the decision that was made.

Participants emphasized that involvement should be optional. It should be recognized and accepted that some might want to limit their involvement to simply being kept informed.

The desire for involvement ranged from those who reserved the right not to take part in the process at all to those who wanted to be involved in every decision, even those not directly related to their work.

All staff want to be involved in decisions that affect them and their job.

Participants were asked what kinds of decisions they did and didn't want to be involved in.

Classroom teachers most often cited a desire to be involved in the distribution of budget resources, the school's discipline policy, classroom organization and the selection of staff.

Smaller numbers of teachers identified the learning conditions, the professional development for the school and the overall policy and goal setting for the school.

Principals also want to be involved in decisions that affect them and their job.

Support staff want to be involved in decisions that affect their working environment, their work load and their work deadlines. Custodial staff expressed the need to be involved in decisions about custodial staffing ratios in schools' budget plans. Maintenance staff indicated that they want to be involved in decisions related to the maintenance and repair of district buildings. Exempt staff expressed interest in areas such as the budget and the selection of staff.

Parents most frequently mentioned the budget, the financial state of the school and the discipline policy as the areas of involvement that most interested them. They also want to be involved in decisions directly affecting their child. They expressed interest in having some input into the selection of staff, including the principal, and the establishment of the over-all direction for the school.

With respect to areas in which staff do **not** desire involvement, teachers made it clear that they are not interested in being involved in the maintenance of the physical plant or in fundraising activities. A smaller number of teachers mentioned the budget details, staffing and other areas where they lack expertise. Principals recognized that they do not have to be involved in everything and used the example of day-to-day classroom discipline to illustrate this point.

In general, the other staff groups said they did **not** want to be involved in minutiae that are not part of their responsibilities.

The most frequent response from parents suggested they did **not** want to be involved in the evaluation of staff. The day-to-day operation of the school and the discipline of students were also of less interest to parents.

GUIDELINES FOR INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING

It should be self-evident that when you involve people in the decision-making process they are more likely to support the decisions once they have been made.

The following guidelines recognize the inherent value to be gained when stakeholders are involved in decisions that affect their work environment, their ability to do their job, and the learning environment provided for students. Equally important, stakeholders need to have input into significant school expenditures and strategies for school improvement plans.

- Principals must strive to create a school environment for staff, students, parents and the community that openly welcomes involvement in the decision-making process.
- Principals and decision unit managers need to acquire the skills to implement appropriate involvement in their schools and units respectively.
- Input of staff, students, parents and the community into the decision-making process should be received in a respectful manner and should demonstrate to stakeholders that they may have input without fear of repercussion.
- Input may take many forms including discussions with individuals affected by a decision or those who have expertise in the area, small group staff meetings, full staff meetings, e-mail, committees, questionnaires and surveys, newsletters, parent and school council meetings.
- Involvement in decision making may sometimes include the delegation of authority to stakeholders such as a committee of staff, a department, or a school council to make specific decisions.
- When determining who should be involved in a decision-making process, consider involving both those who will be affected by the decision and those who have expertise in the area. These may be quite different groups or individuals. Also consider any available information on those processes or approaches that have worked well for others.
- It is important that feedback and a rationale be provided for the decision that has been made.
- The process for involving people in decision making needs to demonstrate that their involvement is genuine and that it is expected to have an impact on the outcome of the decision. The process to be used in seeking input should be chosen with care to reflect the magnitude and nature of the decision and the characteristics of those being involved.

- Individuals and groups who are involved in the decision-making process need to be in possession of necessary background information regarding the decision to be made and the necessary time to provide meaningful input into that decision.
- Parents, staff, community and students should be encouraged to attend those meetings where input into decisions takes place. Stakeholders should demonstrate commitment to becoming involved in making decisions by attending meetings and participating fully.
- Decision makers should recognize those areas of importance to stakeholders where involvement in the decision-making process is highly desirable. Not all stakeholders wish to be involved in decisions they perceive are unimportant to them. This position needs to be respected by decision makers. Those who forego involvement in a decision should be respectful of the outcome of the decision-making process.
- The decision maker needs to monitor the involvement process and make adjustments as necessary.
- Stakeholders affected by decisions should provide open and honest input into the decision-making process and support decisions once they have been made.

INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING: MISCONCEPTIONS AND RESPONSES

| Misconception | Response |
|---|--|
| If you are responsible/accountable for the results of a decision, you must make it yourself. | Better decisions usually result from having a variety of perspectives and all the available information. You can delegate the authority to make a particular decision even though you are accountable for the results. |
| If you already know what should be done, there is no point involving anyone. | If you involve others, you may get information or different perspectives that will suggest other possible – perhaps better – solutions. Involvement also engenders support for a decision. |
| You diminish your power by sharing it. | Collaboration and consultation are powerful tools for effective decision making and do not diminish power. Leadership is not synonymous with making decisions by oneself. |
| Involving others is too time-consuming. | It is critical to involve people in decisions that affect them. Time saved by not involving others is often lost in fighting the resistance to an imposed decision. |
| You can retain control of a situation by making the decision yourself and then involving others in the implementation. | People recognize immediately whether their involvement is genuine – that is, whether it has the potential to make a difference. There is often significant resistance to helping implement a decision in which people have had no involvement. |
| As a leader/manager, you should involve others in every decision you make. | There are times when it is not appropriate to involve others in a decision. An example would be in an emergency situation where immediate action is required. Another example would be a situation where, in fact, your decision is already made and you are not prepared to be influenced by what others say. |
| The school has no real ability to make decisions because everything is decided centrally. Therefore, there is no point in getting involved. | One of the advantages of site-based decision making is that it allows schools to address the unique needs of their community and staff. Schools in EPS have a great deal of autonomy. Getting involved in decision making at the school level can have a significant impact. |
| The principal or decision unit manager doesn't really want or value my input. | One of the prime determiners of success is the extent of staff involvement in decision-making processes. |
| The budget is so tight that there is really no point in getting involved – there are no real decisions to be made. | Because the budget is so tight, it is crucial that staff be involved in setting priorities to achieve the greatest possible benefit for students within the limited resources. |
| Only teachers have the expertise to be involved in decisions related to education. | All members of a school staff as well as parents have a commitment to and vested interest in education. All may bring valuable insights and perspectives to a decision-making process. |

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING

The basis for many difficulties in making decisions results from problems with communications and relationships. Therefore, it is recommended that:

- leadership programs, principal training programs and principal institutes incorporate strategies for involving stakeholders in the decision-making process;
- district, school and decision unit professional development and training opportunities include training in communications and relationships skills;
- school councils be assisted in becoming positively involved in the decision-making process;
- Edmonton Public Schools have resources available to assist school staffs in assessing how they make decisions and how they might improve the processes for involvement;
- the Alberta Teachers' Association extend services that currently support members in involving stakeholders in decision making, and in enhancing communications and relationship skills;
- the Edmonton Public Teachers' Local and Edmonton Public Schools work together to compile and disseminate an inventory of effective practices related to involvement in decision making.

EXAMPLES OF SUCCESSFUL EXPERIENCES WITH INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING

The following examples of successful involvement experiences were provided by focus group participants.

- Staff had effective input into the selection of some staff. Examples included teachers, an assistant principal, and a foreman.
- Maintenance has more equipment and materials in the shops as a result of input.
- A three-member committee wrote a new discipline policy after having input from staff, parents, and students.
- The superintendent's "dumb rules" committee was very effective. Note: this was a district wide committee established several years ago to rid the district of rules and myths that interfered with getting the job done.
- Staff and parents used a collaborative process to agree to early school dismissal.
- Staff were given the flexibility to cross-schedule classes in mathematics and language arts to meet student needs.
- The decision about a school-corporate partnership was made to the satisfaction of everyone.
- The support staff's classification committee took years of work but was highly successful.
- The staff decided to direct professional development resources to a mentorship program for teachers.
- School committees were established to examine early dismissal, academic achievement, and curriculum alignment.
- A new principal made an important decision quickly and respectfully after consulting with staff.
- All staff groups, parents, students, and departments had significant input into the strategic planning committee.
- Staff had significant involvement in the quantum leap concept.

**ALBERTA LEARNING, EDMONTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND ALBERTA
TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION SUPPORT DOCUMENTS RELATED TO
INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING**

A. Policy, Regulations and Forms Manual, Alberta Learning, February 1997

Policy 1.8.2 – School-Based Decision Making

Background

Alberta Education believes that major decisions about policies, instructional programs and services and the allocation of funds to support them must be made collaboratively. School-based decision making should involve collaboration between the principal, superintendent, teachers, instructional support staff, parents, and the community in keeping with the policies of the Board of Trustees.

School-based decision making enables schools to be responsive to local needs.

Under section 15 of the School Act, and the direction set by the Three-Year Business Plan, the principal is the key educational leader at the school level, who will provide leadership in successful school-based decision making. Principals must work with parents, teachers and members of the community to establish a school-based decision-making process to develop school policies and budgets as well as to establish the scope of the school program and extra-curricular activities. Establishing an integral relationship among teaching, learning and the decision-making process should result in higher levels of student performance.

Alberta Education supports excellence in teaching and learning and the involvement of parents and the community in the education of students.

Policy

A school and its community shall have the authority and the support to make decisions which directly impact on the education of students and shall be accountable for the results.

Statute

School Council

7 (4) A school council may, at its discretion,

- (a) advise the principal and the board respecting any matter relating to the school,
- (d) consult with the principal so that the principal may ensure that the fiscal management of the school is in accordance with the requirements of the board and the superintendent,

Additional Definitions

In this policy,

1. "School-based decision making" involves the whole school community in teaching and learning in order to ensure high levels of student achievement. School-based decision making is a process through which major decisions are made at the school level about policies, instructional programs and services, and how funds are allocated to support them; and
2. "Community" means a school's students, their parents and other community-based support elements available to the school.

Procedures

2. School board policy and procedures for school-based decision making shall:
 - (3) encourage input from all staff, parents and the community into school-based decisions on programs, instructional services, extra-curricular activities and the allocation of funds to support them;
 - (7) define the roles, responsibilities and relationships with a focus on broad distribution of power and authority for decision making among all participants: principal, teachers, instructional support staff, parents, school councils, the community, central office and the board of trustees;

- (9) define procedures for widespread communication and information sharing among stakeholders, including: appropriate involvement in school-based planning, evaluating and reporting processes;

1.8.3 Education Programs and Services – School Councils

Background

Parents should have meaningful involvement in their children's education. Such involvement includes ensuring that their children are ready to learn as well as being able to choose education programs that best meet their children's learning needs.

Other members of society also have a responsibility to contribute to the education of young people and an important role to play in education. Everyone has a role and everyone's role is important. In an education system, few decisions can be made by one person or group alone. Parents, students, teachers, principals, superintendents, trustees, government, business and other community members are all participants in the educational endeavour and have a responsibility to work together, cooperate and communicate with one another.

Section 17 of the School Act recognizes and reaffirms the right of parents and the school community to have meaningful involvement in the education of their children through School Councils. School Councils are responsible to the parents and the community they serve.

Policy

In each school operated by a board or a charter school board, parents and the school community have an opportunity through the School Council, as one means, to advise and consult with the principal and to advise the board or the charter board on any matter relating to the school.

B. Edmonton Public Schools, Board Policy and Regulations, (2000)

AE.BP – District Mission

The mission of Edmonton Public Schools, as an advocate of choice, is to ensure that all students achieve success in their individual programs of study.

It is the belief of Edmonton Public Schools that parents, students and community members are committed as partners and accept their respective responsibilities in education.

The mission is being accomplished through exemplary staff performance, program diversity, measured student achievement of outcomes and decentralized decision making.

JA.AR – Parent Involvement

1. Principals shall:

- a. create, facilitate, communicate, and encourage opportunities for meaningful parent and community involvement in school matters;
- b. foster staff acceptance, understanding, and co-operation in matters relating to parent and community involvement;
- c. facilitate the formation of and support for school councils in accordance with section 17 of the School Act and as outlined in the district's School Councils Resource manual;
- d. support School Council participation in the School Council Partners program which connects local school councils with each other, trustees, and district staff;
- e. establish guidelines for the involvement of volunteers in the school;
- f. ensure that parents have access to information about the progress of their children, and about budgets and programs in the school and the district; and
- g. provide parents and community members with information regarding appeal procedures

JA.BP – Parent and Community Involvement

The board believes that:

The education of students is best served through the co-operative efforts of students, parents, district staff, elected school trustees, business, union and association staff representatives, and community members;

Parents should be active participants in their child's education and have a role in guiding student decision making;

School Councils should work closely with their school and the district to ensure that students receive the best possible education; and

Parents, business, and community members can assist in the development of responsible citizens through co-operative working relationships with schools and the district.

AFA.AR – Results Review

4. Trustees, staff, students, parents, and community members shall be provided with an opportunity for involvement in the review process.

C. Collective Agreement between Board of Trustees, Edmonton School District No. 7 and The Alberta Teacher's Association, September 1, 1998 to August 31, 2000

13. Teacher Assignment, p. 13

13.1 Teachers have the right to assist in determining the grouping of students for instructional purposes and in determining instructional duties and other duties in accordance with Board policies and the terms of this agreement. It is the responsibility of each teacher to provide such instruction and perform such duties as assigned by the principal.

D. The Alberta Teachers' Association Members' Handbook, (1999)

Code of Professional Conduct, p.1.

17. The teacher as an administrator provides opportunities for staff members to express their opinions and to bring forth suggestions regarding the administration of the school.

Declaration of Rights and Responsibilities for Teachers, p. 2

3. Teachers have the right to a voice in all decisions of a professional nature, which affect them and have the responsibility to seek the most effective means of consultation and of collaboration with their professional colleagues.

Long-Range Policy, Working Conditions for Professional Service, p. 74 – 75

5.A.1 A voice in the determination of conditions for professional service is a right of the teaching profession.

5.A.5 Teachers have the right to a voice in the determination of educational policy.

5.A.6 Joint teacher/board committees should be established to discuss and recommend policy on educational matters and teacher-board relationships at the local level.

Long-Range Policy, Education Finance, p. 82 – 83

7.A.33 The basic purpose of school-based budgeting should be to meet student needs by involving in decision making those individuals who will be responsible for implementing the decisions.

7.A.35 Basic requirements for the successful operation of a school-based budgeting system are:

2. Policies that ensure that school staffs have timely and authentic participation in decision making including provision for
 - (a) a consensus model for reaching decisions,
 - (b) adequate time and support for participation,
 - (c) staff development to build required skills,
 - (d) access to all relevant information and
 - (e) effective communication with and among all decision-making levels; and
4. Annual review and evaluation of school-based budgeting procedures.

Long-Range Policy, Administration of Schools, p. 90 – 91

9.A.4 School administration should

2. provide structures that

- (a) ensure that decision making is based on staff involvement as a group,
- (b) encourage respect for and trust in each member's expertise and professional authority,

9.A.5 Conditions should be established that allow for the inclusion of teachers in decision making and evaluation procedures by considering such activities as part of their teaching load.

9.A.6 The decision-making process in education should provide for the involvement of all certificated personnel in matters that concern them.

9.A.8 Schools should be organized to provide structures that ensure teacher involvement in decision making related to program development, allocation of educational resources, staffing policy, use of technology and policies related to student, staff and program evaluation.

9.A.9 In keeping with the collegial model, budgeting within a school is an open matter among all teachers within that school.

9.A.11 It is essential that each school's professional staff have a major voice in the formulation of a school statement of educational philosophy and objectives in conjunction with provincial goals of education and schooling.

9.A.34 The school administrator's role is to facilitate teaching and learning by acting as

- 3. a decision maker who is responsible for establishing an appropriate collaborative, shared decision-making model for the school;

Long-Range Policy, Nature of Teaching Profession, p. 92

10.A.7 Teachers have a right to participate in all decisions that affect them or their work and have a corresponding responsibility to provide informed leadership.

Reference to involvement is also found in the ATA Members' Handbook 1999 in the Position Paper on School-Based Budgeting and Decision Making, p. 127

BACKGROUND ON THE WORK OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

Background

The document “Framework for Involvement in Site-Based Decision Making” (Attachment I) was produced jointly by Edmonton Public Teachers’ Local 37 of the ATA and Edmonton Public Schools as a result of a letter of intent in the 1998 collective agreement between the parties. Teachers had expressed concerns that their level of involvement in decision making seemed to be significantly different from school to school, and they were looking for guidelines about what could be expected. The purpose of the document was to provide a framework and suggestions for effective ways of involving stakeholders in decision-making processes within the context of the district’s site-based decision making model.

The original Framework document was approved for use in the district in May 2000 by then-superintendent Dr. Emery Dossdall. Although it was not a formal policy document, it was clear at the time that it represented the beliefs and values of both the district and the Local with respect to the rights of staff and other stakeholders to have meaningful involvement in decisions that affect them. This has always been a main philosophical pillar of the site-based decision making model that was introduced in Edmonton Public Schools in the late 1970s.

The 1998 committee realized that simply creating and distributing a document would not, in and of itself, result in district-wide implementation and behaviour change. As a result, the committee continued to work together to try and implement some of the recommendations for professional development that are contained in the document. Some of the initiatives that arose from this work were:

- A ten-school pilot project looking at strategies and best practices for involving staff in decision making.
- The introduction in the district of “Healthy Interactions”, a program developed by the Alberta Teachers’ Association.
- The use of the “Framework” document in the district’s leadership and principal training programs.
- The creation and board approval of a document entitled “Necessary Conditions for Collaboration.”

During the 2006 round of collective bargaining, it was pointed out by the Local that teachers still express some of the same concerns regarding their involvement in decisions as those expressed in 1998, and it was agreed that a new joint committee would examine and report on the implementation of the Framework and its underlying principles.

Committee Mandate, Membership and Process

The Joint Committee of Edmonton Public Schools and the Edmonton Public Teachers Local 37 of the ATA related to involvement in decision making was established through a Letter of Intent which reads as follows:

LETTER OF INTENT: “Framework for Site-Based Decision Making”

The parties hereby agree that within ninety (90) days of the signing of this collective agreement, a joint committee (maximum of 10 members) consisting of an equal number of representatives from the board and the Local, shall be formed to investigate and report on the current status and application of the Framework for Involvement in Site-Based Decision Making (May 2000).

The Terms of Reference shall be developed by the committee and will include but not be limited to:

- Completion of an assessment of the current implementation of the “Framework”
- Providing recommendations regarding the future use of the “Framework” within the district; and
- Consideration of a process whereby both parties can collaboratively monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the “Framework” on an ongoing basis.

The committee will issue a written report of its findings to the respective parties no later than six months following the signing of this collective agreement.

(From the September 1, 2006 to August 31, 2007 Collective Agreement)

The impetus for the Letter of Intent came from concerns expressed by teachers to the Local regarding their opportunities to be involved in decisions that affect them, particularly at the level of the school or decision unit. In spite of the principles set out in the Framework document (Attachment I) and the commitment of both the district and the Local to staff involvement in decision making, it appeared that the application of these principles was inconsistent.

The current membership of the committee is: Donna Barrett, Jenise Bidulock, David Fraser, Allan Jack, Patrick Johner, Catherine LeBlanc, Ron MacNeil, Ellen Ogilvy and Mark Ramsankar. Deb Davidson, Karen Redhead and Edgar Schmidt were also on the original committee when it first met in January 2007, but are not longer actively participating.

The joint committee held a series of 12 meetings between January 2007 and January 2008. The members made a commitment to modeling the values and processes of meaningful and full involvement, and agreed that they would work together using a consensus model.

Prior to deciding on the use of a survey as a strategy for carrying out the committee’s mandate, there were many discussions related to the principles underlying site-based decision making and the value of involving staff in decisions that affect them and their work. It was recognized that there are many components involved in fostering a district culture that both values and models the effective engagement and involvement of staff. These might include:

- reaffirmation and communication of the district values underlying involvement in decision making;
- development of a ‘tool kit’ of best practices;
- strategies for building the skills of all staff.

The committee also realized that the work related to involvement in decision making is closely linked and aligned with other important district initiatives such as the healthy workplace

initiative and the new policy on Respectful Learning and Working Environments. It will be important that plans be developed to link all the related pieces of work so that they come together in a philosophically and operationally consistent manner.

After deciding on a survey as the strategy that would be used to carry out the committee's mandate, a number of meetings were spent discussing the content of such a survey and working on its development. At the same time, work was done to inform and seek the involvement of other staff groups, knowing that it was important to have the perspective of all staff and not just teachers.

In the spirit of collaboration and involvement, a joint message was sent from the superintendent and the presidents of all four staff groups encouraging staff to participate in the survey. Response rates from all staff groups were sufficient to create high levels of statistical reliability.

Leger Marketing Consultants were hired to do the statistical analysis of the survey results and presented these results to the committee on December 14, 2007. The presidents of the three CUPE Locals were in attendance at this presentation, at which the aggregate results were presented as well as the results of each staff group.

The survey results will be released to all staff on the district website following the presentation of the committee's report to the Board of Trustees and to the Council of School Representatives.

As one aspect of the mandate of the 2006 committee was to consider "a process whereby both parties can collaboratively monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the 'Framework' on an ongoing basis," the parties agreed on a new letter of intent during collective bargaining in 2007. This letter of intent states:

LETTER OF INTENT: "Framework for Involvement In Site-Based Decision Making"

The parties hereby agree that the joint committee (*maximum of 10 members*) consisting of an equal number of representatives from the Board and the Local, shall continue to investigate and report on the current status and application of the Framework for Involvement in Site-Based Decision Making (May 2000). The committee shall continue to collaboratively monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the Framework for *Involvement in Site-Based Decision Making* on an ongoing basis and provide recommendations regarding the future use of the Framework for *Involvement in Site-Based Decision Making* within the district. The committee shall issue a written report to the Superintendent of Schools and the President of the ATA Local by March 1 of each year.

This new committee, which the parties intend to establish by the end of March 2008, will take on the function of monitoring the district's progress towards the meaningful involvement and engagement of staff in decision making. This includes monitoring the implementation of the recommendations arising out of the work of the 2006 committee.

STAFF SURVEY: INVOLVEMENT IN SITE-BASED DECISION MAKING

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|-------------------|-------|---------|
| Teacher | 1713 | 58.8 |
| Custodial Staff | 326 | 11.2 |
| Exempt Staff | 215 | 7.4 |
| Maintenance Staff | 119 | 4.1 |
| Support Staff | 540 | 18.5 |

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|--|-------|---------|
| Classroom teacher | 1327 | 74.6 |
| Substitute teacher | 5 | 0.3 |
| Administrator (e.g. principal, assistant principal, department head, curriculum coordinator) | 283 | 15.9 |
| Consultant | 46 | 2.6 |
| Other (Please specify) | 119 | 6.7 |

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|-------------------------|-------|---------|
| Kindergarten to Grade 3 | 476 | 32.4 |
| Grade 4 to Grade 6 | 352 | 23.9 |
| Grade 7 to Grade 9 | 315 | 21.4 |
| Grade 10 to Grade 12 | 327 | 22.2 |

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|---|-------|---------|
| Elementary School | 490 | 37.5 |
| Elementary Junior High School | 102 | 7.8 |
| Junior High School | 115 | 8.8 |
| High School | 208 | 15.9 |
| Central Services (Centre for Education) | 203 | 15.5 |
| Other (Please specify) | 188 | 14.4 |

| Percent | | | | |
|--|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|
| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1. I am encouraged to be involved in decision-making processes. | 24.9 | 49.5 | 18.3 | 6.6 |
| 2. I participate in decision-making processes. | 21.5 | 50.7 | 19.8 | 6.9 |
| 3. I can provide open and honest input into decisions without fear. | 25.7 | 47.3 | 18.1 | 8.0 |
| 4. I have the information I need to provide meaningful input into decisions. | 18.4 | 55.3 | 20.0 | 4.6 |
| 5. I am provided with the time to offer meaningful input into decisions. | 14.9 | 44.7 | 29.5 | 9.3 |
| 6. I have an opportunity to give input into those decisions that affect me. | 19.6 | 50.7 | 20.9 | 7.8 |
| 7. I am satisfied with the ways my input is gathered. | 15.5 | 48.6 | 25.6 | 8.4 |
| 8. The processes for involvement are appropriate for the kinds of decisions being made. | 15.6 | 49.3 | 25.1 | 7.7 |
| 9. I have an opportunity to voice my concern if I have not been involved in decisions that affect me. | 17.5 | 51.1 | 22.9 | 7.3 |
| 10. Decision-making processes involve those who have relevant expertise. | 16.6 | 52.1 | 22.0 | 6.6 |
| 11. I am satisfied with the way responsibility for decision making is shared. | 16.4 | 47.5 | 26.2 | 8.3 |
| 12. I am satisfied with my involvement in decision making processes. | 17.3 | 46.6 | 25.4 | 8.7 |
| 13. When a decision is made which affects me, I am provided with reasons for the decision. | 19.5 | 52.9 | 18.9 | 7.1 |
| 14. When decisions are made that affect me, I believe that my input has been considered. | 17.5 | 46.7 | 24.9 | 9.2 |
| 15. I have an opportunity to voice my concern if I disagree with a decision. | 18.3 | 54.3 | 18.7 | 7.0 |
| 16. My choice is respected if I choose not to be involved in a particular decision. | 17.1 | 54.1 | 18.9 | 6.6 |

Question 6: In your school or decision unit do you have input into: (N=2913)

| Percent | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|----------------------------------|
| | Yes | No | Item does not apply to me |
| The school /decision unit plan | 52.8 | 25.2 | 19.5 |
| The school/decision unit professional development | 53.7 | 28.3 | 16.2 |
| Your personal professional development | 82.3 | 11.9 | 4.6 |
| Your individual work assignment | 75.2 | 20.8 | 2.9 |
| Classroom organization | 55.1 | 12.1 | 31.5 |
| School organization for instruction | 38.2 | 26.0 | 34.0 |
| School/decision unit budget (how money is spent) | 41.9 | 38.2 | 18.7 |
| How student programming is delivered in the school | 41.8 | 22.9 | 33.3 |
| The courses offered at the school (e.g. locally-developed courses) | 30.2 | 25.3 | 42.2 |
| Supervision schedule | 42.9 | 25.6 | 30.3 |
| Student conduct and discipline policies | 51.6 | 20.4 | 26.4 |
| Operation of facility | 30.4 | 34.7 | 33.5 |
| Maintenance of facility | 28.9 | 35.3 | 34.8 |
| Development of policies and practices | 51.7 | 28.7 | 17.8 |

SURVEY RESULTS FOR TEACHING STAFF

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|---------|-------|---------|
| Teacher | 1713 | 100.0 |

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|--|-------|---------|
| Classroom teacher | 1326 | 78.0 |
| Substitute teacher | 5 | 0.3 |
| Administrator (e.g. principal, assistant principal, department head, curriculum coordinator) | 279 | 16.4 |
| Consultant | 39 | 2.3 |
| Other (Please specify) | 51 | 3.0 |

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|-------------------------|-------|---------|
| Kindergarten to Grade 3 | 470 | 32.3 |
| Grade 4 to Grade 6 | 349 | 24.0 |
| Grade 7 to Grade 9 | 314 | 21.6 |
| Grade 10 to Grade 12 | 322 | 22.1 |

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|---|-------|---------|
| Elementary School | 85 | 50.0 |
| Elementary Junior High School | 19 | 11.2 |
| Junior High School | 15 | 8.8 |
| High School | 37 | 21.8 |
| Central Services (Centre for Education) | 3 | 1.8 |
| Other (Please specify) | 11 | 6.5 |

| Percent | | | | |
|---|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|
| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1. I am encouraged to be involved in decision-making processes. | 32.1 | 49.5 | 13.4 | 4.7 |
| 2. I participate in decision-making processes. | 28.2 | 51.9 | 14.6 | 4.8 |
| 3. I can provide open and honest input into decisions without fear. | 31.2 | 42.7 | 17.2 | 8.4 |
| 4. I have the information I need to provide meaningful input into decisions. | 22.8 | 55.5 | 17.3 | 3.6 |
| 5. I am provided with the time to offer meaningful input into decisions. | 18.1 | 43.9 | 27.9 | 9.0 |
| 6. I have an opportunity to give input into those decisions that affect me. | 23.0 | 50.4 | 18.7 | 7.2 |
| 7. I am satisfied with the ways my input is gathered. | 18.9 | 49.3 | 22.7 | 7.6 |
| 8. The processes for involvement are appropriate for the kinds of decisions being made. | 19.8 | 49.7 | 22.0 | 7.3 |
| 9. I have an opportunity to voice my concern if I have not been involved in decisions that affect me. | 21.3 | 50.7 | 20.5 | 6.9 |
| 10. Decision-making processes involve those who have relevant expertise. | 20.7 | 51.4 | 20.3 | 5.8 |
| 11. I am satisfied with the way responsibility for decision making is shared. | 20.6 | 47.5 | 23.0 | 7.7 |
| 12. I am satisfied with my involvement in decision making processes. | 21.8 | 46.5 | 22.5 | 7.9 |
| 13. When a decision is made which affects me, I am provided with reasons for the decision. | 24.4 | 51.5 | 16.5 | 6.6 |
| 14. When decisions are made that affect me, I believe that my input has been considered. | 21.3 | 45.8 | 23.3 | 8.2 |
| 15. I have an opportunity to voice my concern if I disagree with a decision. | 22.7 | 52.9 | 16.8 | 6.6 |
| 16. My choice is respected if I choose not to be involved in a particular decision. | 21.2 | 50.8 | 18.7 | 7.2 |

Question 6: In your school or decision unit do you have input into: (N=1704)

| Percent | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|----------------------------------|
| | Yes | No | Item does not apply to me |
| The school /decision unit plan | 68.7 | 22.1 | 7.2 |
| The school/decision unit professional development | 69.3 | 27.2 | 3.0 |
| Your personal professional development | 91.0 | 8.5 | 0.1 |
| Your individual work assignment | 76.2 | 22.4 | 0.8 |
| Classroom organization | 80.9 | 13.0 | 5.8 |
| School organization for instruction | 58.1 | 34.5 | 6.6 |
| School/decision unit budget (how money is spent) | 54.2 | 40.7 | 4.5 |
| How student programming is delivered in the school | 64.1 | 29.3 | 5.6 |
| The courses offered at the school (e.g. locally-developed courses) | 44.3 | 32.5 | 22.0 |
| Supervision schedule | 59.9 | 33.0 | 6.9 |
| Student conduct and discipline policies | 72.5 | 23.0 | 4.1 |
| Operation of facility | 31.5 | 42.8 | 24.9 |
| Maintenance of facility | 27.2 | 43.9 | 28.3 |
| Development of policies and practices | 63.8 | 29.4 | 5.6 |

ADDRESSING SURVEY RESULTS FOR NON-TEACHING STAFF GROUPS

While all staff in Edmonton Public Schools were invited to participate in the survey developed by the joint committee on involvement in site-based decision making, it is not the mandate of the Joint Committee to address the results of the survey for the non-teaching staff groups. This responsibility lies with the administration of the district in consultation with representatives of these staff groups.

The results of the responses to the survey questions have been sorted by staff group and shared with the CUPE Local Presidents and will be shared with the exempt staff liaison committee. Comments have been reviewed by the administration. A brief summary of the results of the survey by staff group, and a plan for next steps follows.

Custodial – Number of Respondents: 326 (Appendix I)

Strongest agreement [75%] occurred with the questions related to being able to provide open and honest input into decisions without fear, and their choice being respected if they opt not to be involved in a particular decision. A response rate of 72.5% was noted in relation to input into individual work assignments, and a 60% positive response regarding their input into maintenance of the facility.

Least agreement was noted in response to the question about time provided to offer meaningful input into decisions [55%].

Between 60 and 70% of the respondents were in agreement with the majority of the questions.

Exempt Staff – Number of Respondents: 215 (Appendix II)

Because the exempt staff group includes a variety of different professions with very different roles, caution must be exercised in making assumptions about this data. Overall, the group felt that they had the information needed to make decisions (79%) but only about 70% felt they were encouraged to be involved or were involved in the decision making process. However, 30% of exempt staff are fearful about being open and honest regarding input into decisions.

Many of the consultants voiced concern in the comments section about school staff making decisions about programming for students with special needs, without having the specialized knowledge to understand what the students required for optimum learning. There was a real concern that some students were not being served appropriately, and that there was a lack of regard for the need for professional consultation in determining programming.

Maintenance – Number of Respondents: 119 (Appendix III)

The responses from the maintenance group presented a significant departure from those of the other staff groups. Generally, they were significantly less positive about their involvement in any type of decision making than were other employees. Over 60% noted that they were not encouraged to be involved in decision-making processes and 65% indicated that they did not participate in the decision-making processes. Fifty-six per cent believed that they do not have an opportunity to give input into those decisions which affect them. Sixty-four per cent are not

satisfied with the way responsibility for decision making is shared. Thirty-six per cent of maintenance workers were satisfied with the way their input into decisions was gathered and 31% felt that the processes for involvement were appropriate for the kinds of decisions being made

The concerns of the maintenance staff revolve around decentralized decision making, where maintenance of school buildings is the responsibility of the school administrator, and not the maintenance department. The comments suggest that the maintenance staff believe that their expertise is not respected.

Support – Number of Respondents: 540 (Appendix IV)

Almost three quarters of the support staff indicated that they could provide open and honest input into decisions without fear, and that they could voice their concern if they disagreed with a decision. The response rate for agreement with most other questions was in the 60-70% range.

Of concern was that one third of support staff believe that having input into the school or decision unit plan or professional development plan did not apply to them. Forty percent of support staff were not satisfied with how responsibility for decision-making was shared and with their involvement in the decision-making process.

The Administration's Plans for Addressing the Survey Results for Non-Teaching Staff

In response to the survey results for non-teaching staff groups, the administration plans to undertake the following actions.

1. Examine the implications of the cost recovery model on decision making in the district, particularly as it relates to stewardship of our resources and delivery of services to students with special needs.
2. Build awareness and understanding of the importance of involvement in site-based decision making in all staff groups.
3. Educate administrators about the importance of involving all staff groups in meaningful dialogue around decisions.
4. Provide opportunity for staff to acquire communication skills in the areas of conflict resolution and interpersonal interactions.
5. Meet with representatives of each staff group for the purpose of frank discussion about their perceptions of the issues involved in attraction and retention of staff.
6. Link employee engagement to involvement in decision making, and assist staff to understand the importance of engagement in achieving district goals.
7. Bring forward a report to board regarding the outcome of the work being done with support staff, custodial staff, maintenance staff and exempt staff around these recommendations.

Timelines for these actions will vary, with some of them being immediate and some being of an ongoing nature.

Next Steps:

1. Conclude meetings between administration and employee groups about attraction, development, engagement and retention issues.
2. Explore the development of supports for administration to increase their skill in involving staff in decision making.
3. Explore the possibility of offering a communication skill building program on a pilot basis to certain staff members.

SURVEY RESULTS FOR CUSTODIAL STAFF

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|-----------------|-------|---------|
| Custodial Staff | 326 | 100.0 |

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|------------------------|-------|---------|
| Classroom teacher | 1 | 5.9 |
| Other (Please specify) | 16 | 94.1 |

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|-------------------------|-------|---------|
| Kindergarten to Grade 3 | 1 | 50.0 |
| Grade 10 to Grade 12 | 1 | 50.0 |

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|---|-------|---------|
| Elementary School | 142 | 48.0 |
| Elementary Junior High School | 29 | 9.8 |
| Junior High School | 34 | 11.5 |
| High School | 69 | 23.3 |
| Central Services (Centre for Education) | 10 | 3.4 |
| Other (Please specify) | 12 | 4.1 |

| Percent | | | | |
|--|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|
| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1. I am encouraged to be involved in decision-making processes. | 12.1 | 52.4 | 23.5 | 8.9 |
| 2. I participate in decision-making processes. | 7.9 | 50.5 | 27.3 | 10.2 |
| 3. I can provide open and honest input into decisions without fear. | 13.7 | 61.3 | 17.1 | 4.8 |
| 4. I have the information I need to provide meaningful input into decisions. | 9.5 | 58.7 | 21.6 | 5.1 |
| 5. I am provided with the time to offer meaningful input into decisions. | 8.3 | 47.0 | 33.7 | 7.3 |
| 6. I have an opportunity to give input into those decisions that affect me. | 13.3 | 55.6 | 21.6 | 6.7 |
| 7. I am satisfied with the ways my input is gathered. | 9.2 | 53.3 | 25.1 | 9.2 |
| 8. The processes for involvement are appropriate for the kinds of decisions being made. | 7.0 | 54.0 | 24.8 | 8.6 |
| 9. I have an opportunity to voice my concern if I have not been involved in decisions that affect me. | 10.8 | 55.9 | 24.8 | 6.0 |
| 10. Decision-making processes involve those who have relevant expertise. | 7.0 | 57.8 | 21.3 | 7.3 |
| 11. I am satisfied with the way responsibility for decision making is shared. | 7.3 | 56.8 | 26.0 | 7.0 |
| 12. I am satisfied with my involvement in decision making processes. | 7.6 | 52.4 | 26.0 | 9.5 |
| 13. When a decision is made which affects me, I am provided with reasons for the decision. | 11.8 | 58.4 | 21.3 | 5.1 |
| 14. When decisions are made that affect me, I believe that my input has been considered. | 8.9 | 55.2 | 22.9 | 8.6 |
| 15. I have an opportunity to voice my concern if I disagree with a decision. | 8.6 | 60.3 | 20.3 | 6.4 |
| 16. My choice is respected if I choose not to be involved in a particular decision. | 10.8 | 64.1 | 16.2 | 4.4 |

6: In your school or decision unit do you have input into: (N=320)

| Percent | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|----------------------------------|
| | Yes | No | Item does not apply to me |
| The school /decision unit plan | 21.6 | 25.9 | 47.5 |
| The school/decision unit professional development | 25.0 | 21.6 | 45.6 |
| Your personal professional development | 59.1 | 14.4 | 21.3 |
| Your individual work assignment | 72.5 | 13.8 | 10.3 |
| Classroom organization | 16.6 | 15.0 | 61.9 |
| School organization for instruction | 10.3 | 16.9 | 67.2 |
| School/decision unit budget (how money is spent) | 15.3 | 35.9 | 43.4 |
| How student programming is delivered in the school | 5.3 | 18.1 | 68.8 |
| The courses offered at the school (e.g. locally-developed courses) | 15.3 | 17.5 | 59.7 |
| Supervision schedule | 21.6 | 17.5 | 56.3 |
| Student conduct and discipline policies | 17.8 | 18.8 | 57.2 |
| Operation of facility | 54.4 | 16.9 | 24.7 |
| Maintenance of facility | 60.0 | 15.6 | 21.9 |
| Development of policies and practices | 29.4 | 24.7 | 41.9 |

SURVEY RESULTS FOR EXEMPT STAFF

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Exempt Staff | 215 | 100.0 |

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|--|-------|---------|
| Administrator (e.g. principal, assistant principal, department head, curriculum coordinator) | 1 | 4.5 |
| Consultant | 7 | 31.8 |
| Other (Please specify) | 14 | 63.6 |

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|---------|-------|---------|
|---------|-------|---------|

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|---|-------|---------|
| Elementary School | 14 | 7.3 |
| Elementary Junior High School | 5 | 2.6 |
| Junior High School | 1 | 0.5 |
| High School | 13 | 6.7 |
| Central Services (Centre for Education) | 120 | 62.2 |
| Other (Please specify) | 40 | 20.7 |

| Percent | | | | |
|--|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|
| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1. I am encouraged to be involved in decision-making processes. | 20.7 | 49.3 | 23.9 | 6.1 |
| 2. I participate in decision-making processes. | 19.3 | 52.6 | 22.1 | 5.6 |
| 3. I can provide open and honest input into decisions without fear. | 20.7 | 49.8 | 21.6 | 7.5 |
| 4. I have the information I need to provide meaningful input into decisions. | 12.7 | 55.9 | 24.9 | 5.6 |
| 5. I am provided with the time to offer meaningful input into decisions. | 11.3 | 47.0 | 31.0 | 9.9 |
| 6. I have an opportunity to give input into those decisions that affect me. | 14.6 | 52.6 | 24.9 | 8.0 |
| 7. I am satisfied with the ways my input is gathered. | 10.3 | 45.5 | 32.4 | 10.8 |
| 8. The processes for involvement are appropriate for the kinds of decisions being made. | 8.0 | 48.8 | 32.9 | 7.0 |
| 9. I have an opportunity to voice my concern if I have not been involved in decisions that affect me. | 9.4 | 55.9 | 25.8 | 7.5 |
| 10. Decision-making processes involve those who have relevant expertise. | 9.4 | 50.7 | 31.0 | 7.5 |
| 11. I am satisfied with the way responsibility for decision making is shared. | 9.4 | 45.5 | 34.3 | 9.4 |
| 12. I am satisfied with my involvement in decision making processes. | 10.3 | 46.5 | 33.8 | 8.0 |
| 13. When a decision is made which affects me, I am provided with reasons for the decision. | 9.9 | 58.7 | 22.5 | 7.5 |
| 14. When decisions are made that affect me, I believe that my input has been considered. | 11.3 | 48.8 | 29.1 | 10.8 |
| 15. I have an opportunity to voice my concern if I disagree with a decision. | 10.3 | 58.7 | 25.4 | 5.6 |
| 16. My choice is respected if I choose not to be involved in a particular decision. | 7.5 | 64.8 | 17.8 | 4.7 |

Question 6: In your school or decision unit do you have input into: (N=210)

| Percent | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|----------------------------------|
| | Yes | No | Item does not apply to me |
| The school /decision unit plan | 52.4 | 32.4 | 12.9 |
| The school/decision unit professional development | 57.1 | 32.9 | 9.1 |
| Your personal professional development | 82.9 | 15.2 | 1.4 |
| Your individual work assignment | 83.3 | 16.2 | 0.0 |
| Classroom organization | 6.2 | 4.3 | 88.1 |
| School organization for instruction | 4.3 | 3.8 | 90.5 |
| School/decision unit budget (how money is spent) | 41.9 | 35.2 | 22.4 |
| How student programming is delivered in the school | 9.1 | 8.1 | 81.0 |
| The courses offered at the school (e.g. locally-developed courses) | 4.3 | 7.6 | 86.2 |
| Supervision schedule | 6.7 | 7.1 | 84.8 |
| Student conduct and discipline policies | 8.1 | 6.7 | 82.4 |
| Operation of facility | 16.2 | 27.6 | 54.3 |
| Maintenance of facility | 14.3 | 29.1 | 55.2 |
| Development of policies and practices | 56.2 | 23.3 | 18.6 |

SURVEY RESULTS FOR MAINTENANCE STAFF

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|-------------------|-------|---------|
| Maintenance Staff | 119 | 100.0 |

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|------------------------|-------|---------|
| Other (Please specify) | 6 | 100.0 |

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|---------|-------|---------|
|---------|-------|---------|

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|---|-------|---------|
| Elementary School | 16 | 15.5 |
| Elementary Junior High School | 2 | 1.9 |
| Central Services (Centre for Education) | 4 | 3.9 |
| Other (Please specify) | 81 | 78.6 |

| Percent | | | | |
|--|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|
| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1. I am encouraged to be involved in decision-making processes. | 5.1 | 33.1 | 43.2 | 17.0 |
| 2. I participate in decision-making processes. | 2.5 | 31.4 | 46.6 | 18.6 |
| 3. I can provide open and honest input into decisions without fear. | 7.6 | 50.0 | 28.0 | 13.6 |
| 4. I have the information I need to provide meaningful input into decisions. | 5.9 | 50.0 | 37.3 | 5.9 |
| 5. I am provided with the time to offer meaningful input into decisions. | 0.9 | 35.6 | 44.9 | 17.8 |
| 6. I have an opportunity to give input into those decisions that affect me. | 3.4 | 40.7 | 45.8 | 10.2 |
| 7. I am satisfied with the ways my input is gathered. | 1.7 | 33.9 | 45.8 | 17.0 |
| 8. The processes for involvement are appropriate for the kinds of decisions being made. | 0.9 | 29.7 | 55.1 | 14.4 |
| 9. I have an opportunity to voice my concern if I have not been involved in decisions that affect me. | 0.9 | 40.7 | 44.1 | 12.7 |
| 10. Decision-making processes involve those who have relevant expertise. | 3.4 | 48.3 | 28.8 | 18.6 |
| 11. I am satisfied with the way responsibility for decision making is shared. | 2.5 | 33.1 | 45.8 | 17.0 |
| 12. I am satisfied with my involvement in decision making processes. | 5.1 | 36.4 | 39.0 | 18.6 |
| 13. When a decision is made which affects me, I am provided with reasons for the decision. | 1.7 | 38.1 | 39.0 | 20.3 |
| 14. When decisions are made that affect me, I believe that my input has been considered. | 1.7 | 28.8 | 48.3 | 20.3 |
| 15. I have an opportunity to voice my concern if I disagree with a decision. | 5.1 | 44.1 | 35.6 | 14.4 |
| 16. My choice is respected if I choose not to be involved in a particular decision. | 4.2 | 48.3 | 33.1 | 10.2 |

Question 6: In your school or decision unit do you have input into: (N=109)

| Percent | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|----------------------------------|
| | Yes | No | Item does not apply to me |
| The school /decision unit plan | 5.5 | 38.5 | 53.2 |
| The school/decision unit professional development | 5.5 | 37.6 | 55.1 |
| Your personal professional development | 27.5 | 42.2 | 26.6 |
| Your individual work assignment | 58.7 | 24.8 | 15.6 |
| Classroom organization | 2.8 | 8.3 | 87.2 |
| School organization for instruction | 0.9 | 9.2 | 88.1 |
| School/decision unit budget (how money is spent) | 0.9 | 33.9 | 63.3 |
| How student programming is delivered in the school | 0.9 | 7.3 | 89.9 |
| The courses offered at the school (e.g. locally-developed courses) | 1.8 | 9.2 | 86.2 |
| Supervision schedule | 3.7 | 15.6 | 78.0 |
| Student conduct and discipline policies | 0.0 | 6.4 | 89.0 |
| Operation of facility | 7.3 | 41.3 | 47.7 |
| Maintenance of facility | 32.1 | 43.1 | 22.0 |
| Development of policies and practices | 11.9 | 43.1 | 40.4 |

SURVEY RESULTS FOR SUPPORT STAFF

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|---------------|-------|---------|
| Support Staff | 540 | 100.0 |

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|--|-------|---------|
| Administrator (e.g. principal, assistant principal, department head, curriculum coordinator) | 1 | 3.1 |
| Other (Please specify) | 31 | 96.9 |

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|-------------------------|-------|---------|
| Kindergarten to Grade 3 | 5 | 45.5 |
| Grade 4 to Grade 6 | 2 | 18.2 |
| Grade 7 to Grade 9 | 1 | 9.1 |
| Grade 10 to Grade 12 | 3 | 27.3 |

| Choices | Count | Percent |
|---|-------|---------|
| Elementary School | 227 | 43.3 |
| Elementary Junior High School | 46 | 8.8 |
| Junior High School | 64 | 12.2 |
| High School | 82 | 15.6 |
| Central Services (Centre for Education) | 66 | 12.6 |
| Other (Please specify) | 39 | 7.4 |

| Percent | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1. I am encouraged to be involved in decision-making processes. | 16.0 | 51.8 | 23.2 | 8.4 |
| 2. I participate in decision-making processes. | 14.3 | 50.7 | 25.1 | 9.3 |
| 3. I can provide open and honest input into decisions without fear. | 21.7 | 52.1 | 18.2 | 7.2 |
| 4. I have the information I need to provide meaningful input into decisions. | 15.0 | 54.9 | 21.7 | 6.3 |
| 5. I am provided with the time to offer meaningful input into decisions. | 13.4 | 47.5 | 28.0 | 9.3 |
| 6. I have an opportunity to give input into those decisions that affect me. | 18.6 | 51.4 | 20.2 | 9.1 |
| 7. I am satisfied with the ways my input is gathered. | 14.1 | 48.4 | 26.9 | 7.4 |
| 8. The processes for involvement are appropriate for the kinds of decisions being made. | 14.1 | 50.5 | 24.3 | 7.6 |
| 9. I have an opportunity to voice my concern if I have not been involved in decisions that affect me. | 16.1 | 50.3 | 23.2 | 8.0 |
| 10. Decision-making processes involve those who have relevant expertise. | 15.4 | 52.9 | 23.0 | 5.6 |
| 11. I am satisfied with the way responsibility for decision making is shared. | 14.1 | 46.4 | 28.2 | 8.5 |
| 12. I am satisfied with my involvement in decision making processes. | 14.3 | 46.2 | 27.3 | 8.9 |
| 13. When a decision is made which affects me, I am provided with reasons for the decision. | 17.1 | 55.7 | 18.6 | 6.5 |
| 14. When decisions are made that affect me, I believe that my input has been considered. | 16.3 | 47.7 | 24.1 | 10.0 |
| 15. I have an opportunity to voice my concern if I disagree with a decision. | 16.7 | 57.0 | 17.3 | 7.1 |
| 16. My choice is respected if I choose not to be involved in a particular decision. | 14.8 | 55.8 | 18.0 | 6.3 |

Question 6: In your school or decision unit do you have input into: (N=539)

| Percent | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|----------------------------------|
| | Yes | No | Item does not apply to me |
| The school /decision unit plan | 32.1 | 28.8 | 37.1 |
| The school/decision unit professional development | 31.4 | 32.3 | 34.7 |
| Your personal professional development | 81.5 | 13.2 | 4.5 |
| Your individual work assignment | 75.0 | 21.3 | 2.6 |
| Classroom organization | 27.6 | 11.0 | 60.5 |
| School organization for instruction | 14.1 | 17.6 | 66.8 |
| School/decision unit budget (how money is spent) | 27.8 | 34.1 | 37.7 |
| How student programming is delivered in the school | 15.2 | 15.0 | 68.7 |
| The courses offered at the school (e.g. locally-developed courses) | 10.8 | 18.2 | 69.8 |
| Supervision schedule | 24.7 | 17.3 | 57.1 |
| Student conduct and discipline policies | 33.8 | 21.5 | 43.4 |
| Operation of facility | 21.9 | 22.5 | 54.9 |
| Maintenance of facility | 19.7 | 21.5 | 58.1 |
| Development of policies and practices | 33.8 | 28.6 | 36.7 |