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ABSTRACT

Worksite Schools: A Study of Cooperation Between Public Education and Private Business

by

D. Janell Dietz

Dr. Paul Meacham, Examination Committee Chair
Regents Professor, Educational Leadership
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The development of business/educational partnerships in the United States has accelerated in the last few years, fueled in large part by industry concerns over a projected scarcity of future workers who are effectively equipped for the demands of a workforce in an evolving technological environment. This has been accompanied by rising concern over parental choice in the matter of what schools their children will attend.

Lankard (1995) has opined that in the new economy where school and work are intertwined, it is increasingly apparent that a dual approach to public school reform has appeal, and such partnerships will continue to be indicative of the nation’s attempts to improve the quality of education provided to its citizens. One such illustrative example is the worksite school. In 1987 the American Banker’s Group in Dade County, Florida created the nation’s first worksite school, defined as public schools located on the private property of its host corporation (Beales, 1990).

This study utilized quantitative research methodology incorporating a descriptive research design (Gall, 1996 et. al., Gay, 1996, McMillan and Schumacher,
1997) to examine policies and practices of worksite schools in the United States and to identify resources, practices, and incentives that are considered to be necessary elements of a successful operation. Site based management theory was utilized as the focus of the conceptual framework, as it is the essential tool of reform and restructuring which helped form the basis for worksite schools (Caldwell, 1990; Caldwell and Spinks, 1988; David, 1989; Dimmick, 1993; Mohrman and Wohlstetter, 1994).

The important interpersonal skills found necessary to successfully operate a worksite school included teamwork, with consistent communication and curriculum planning between the host corporation and school. Over 75 percent of those surveyed also agreed that the corporation should provide the initial landscaping and building, as well as on-going technology and training assistance. Zoned as other public schools in the school district involved, consensus was also that children living in the area should be allowed to attend the worksite school, with first priority given to employees of the host corporation.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Educational change has surfaced in both educational or political agendas to the point of being viewed as a national crisis. Business leaders are among those who have taken the lead in citing the deficiencies of the American educational system. Their concern has been mainly in the quality of education, and an ill equipped work force.

The 1983 publication of the National Commission on Excellence in Education report, *A Nation at Risk*, triggered one of the longest sustained periods of school reform in U.S. history, as an attempt to answer the questions raised regarding the quality of education in our country. For more than a decade, seemingly endless numbers of education reform reports and proposals have been streaming from U.S. think tanks and policy grinders.

Critics of state reform movements, and national reports, which came as a result of the cry for reform and restructure, argue that schools as institutions, not students, teachers or curricula, must be the target of reform (Timar, 1989). As reform became targeted towards schools themselves, innovative and alternative schools and systems sprang up in the United States. With the creation of vouchers and charter schools the public became more involved in issues which offer parents choices as to where to send...
their children. Site-based management techniques, borrowed from the business world, attempted to utilize effective business practices in the educational arena (Timar, 1989).

One such school, being developed in the United States, to meet the demands of both the educational and business community, is the 'worksites schools'. Taken from the Florida, Delaware, and Arizona state educational departments' definitions (1998), worksite schools are public schools located on private corporation property, and run in conjunction with their host business, thus they not viewed as a threat to the public school system. Legal issues currently under consideration, regarding these schools include attendance issues and causes relative to allowing children of employees in the corporations located on or near the worksite schools, to have the first option of sending their children to these schools.

The impetus for worksite schools came from Dade County Florida's superintendent, Joseph Fernandez, who recognized that creative solutions were needed to relieve overcrowding in the district's schools. The American Bankers Insurance Group took the lead, and together with the United Teachers of Dade County, created the nation's first worksite school, and opened its door to 25 kindergarten students in 1987. It now serves grades kindergarten through fifth, and has 228 students (Beales, 1994).

Worksite schools in Dade County have saved the public millions of dollars in school infrastructure and transportation costs. Other benefits include increased academic performance and attendance among students, and increased interaction between parent, child and teacher. Corporations hosting worksite schools claim absenteeism and turnover of their employees have dropped among parents with children enrolled in the worksite schools (Beales, 1994).
The host corporation contributes the land, classroom and playground space, and may also provide maintenance, utilities and security for the worksite school. The school district provides teachers, administrators, materials, curriculum and management, although input from the corporations is provided through the steering committees. Fiscal resource for the worksite schools typically follow the same procedure as for regular public schools. In Florida, state money is allocated based on the number of "Full Time Equivalent" (FTE) students attending a particular school. As with regular public schools, worksite schools increase their revenues based on student FTE (Beales, 1994).

Each worksite school affiliates with a "host school", the nearest public school serving the same grades as the worksite school. The worksite school looks to the host school for the provision of special programs or events, and students may be brought to the host school to participate in holiday events. Music, art, and physical education teachers, as well as counselors, and nurses who serve the host school, make regular visits to the worksite school to provide their services as part of the district's regular curriculum.

A compelling reason for worksite schools is the advantages they provide to the child. According to Mildred Smith, lead teacher at the Miami International Airport's worksite school, and a thirty-year veteran of public education, children receive more attention and support at these schools than in a regular public school. Proximity of the workplace to the classroom enables children to have more time to interact with their parents during the morning commute together and throughout the day, for example, during the lunch hour or when parent volunteers assist in the classroom. Interaction between parent and teacher is also enhanced because parents must physically enter the school twice each day to sign their child in and out of class (Smith, 1992).
Busing costs are eliminated because children share the commute with their parents to the worksite school. In 1990, Dade County School District saved $65,000 on busing (Beales, 1994).

In a survey of parents, reported as part of Dade County's 1991 evaluation of the worksite school at the American Bankers Insurance Group, parents reported less absenteeism from work, and said they were more likely to remain at their jobs because of the worksite school. They also reported that it had a positive impact on their lifestyles, that they were more involved with their child's education, more likely to volunteer in the classroom, and able to communicate better with their children and teachers. They reported that they spent less time driving weekly, and this had saved them money.

Business benefits to the American Bankers Group of the first worksite school included lower absenteeism and turnover rates. In a survey of parent-employees, 98 percent claimed that having their child attend the worksite school helped them concentrate more on their work. When supervisors were asked to rate the productivity of parent-employees compared to their peers, 70 percent of the 60 parent-employees evaluated were rated "above average" when compared to their co-workers (American Bankers Insurance Group, 1991).

Recognizing the contribution businesses made to the education community with their worksite school sponsorship, the Florida legislature passed a state statute in 1990 to encourage more such cooperation between businesses and schools. One of its provisions is a local ad valorem tax exemption for companies which establish worksite schools. The exemption grants relief from local property taxes (Florida does not have a state ad
valorem tax on property) assessed against the business's property dedicated to the school (Beales, 1994).

Statement of the Problem

Corporations in the United States perceive that public education is not properly training students for jobs in the future. School districts find building and busing costs soaring, with the growth of school enrollment in the United States. The private sector can help by providing school infrastructure in the form of worksite schools. In trying to understand the development of worksite schools, and how those currently in operation are meeting needs, questions that arise include the following: What are the components necessary in the set-up and on-going operation of a worksite school? From the viewpoint of employees, parents and administrators involved, what are the necessary incentives necessary to maintain workers and the operation of the worksite school? To date there has been no comprehensive look at worksite schools that addresses the above outlined questions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to (a) identify all worksite schools in operation in the United States in order to study their advantages and disadvantages to public school children, workers, parents and corporations in the United States, and (b) to add to the body of knowledge regarding the operation and policies of worksite schools to the field of educational research. An additional objective is to determine what the employers and
employees involved in a worksite school, perceive as necessary components and incentives necessary for its initial set-up and on-going operation.

Research Questions

This quantitative, descriptive research design answered the following questions taken from a random sample of employers and employees of worksite schools currently in operation in the United States:

1. What do respondents perceive as the operational components that worksite schools should have?

2. Is there a difference between respondents' perceptions of what worksite components are needed versus what components currently exist?

3. What corporate employee incentives are most important to respondents at worksite schools?

4. What are the most important enrollment factors respondents think should be considered in the operation of worksite schools?

5. Do respondents perceive that the worksite school curriculum should be designed with the host corporations' needs in mind?

6. What do respondents perceive as the most important benefits to the public school district in which the worksite schools are located?

7. Are there differences in the perceptions of corporation employees/parents, teachers and school district administrators concerning worksite operations and incentives?
Definition of Terms

Worksites Schools: In the context of this dissertation, worksite schools are defined as public schools that are located on the property of a private or host corporation. The host corporation provides the school facilities and land, and the school district supplies the teachers, curriculum, materials, and management. Teachers are from the public school sector, and can be unionized, with all the rights and privileges of the public education system, such as a retirement system, and other benefits (Delaware State Assembly, 1998).

Host Corporation: The public school is located on the property of a host corporation. The host corporation, donates the land and school facilities. It also may provide other assets such as capital for equipment, landscaping expenses, tutors, staff development training for teachers and business management expertise, that will enhance the public school district curriculum and aid in its operation.

Host School: Each worksite school affiliates with a "host school", or the nearest public school serving the same grades as the worksite school. Services provided by the host school may include administration, financial budgeting, special programs or events, and school lunches. Music, art, and physical education teachers, along with counselors and nurses, may be provided by the host school, as part of the district's regular curriculum.

Steering Committees: Steering Committees are the groups of teams made up of teachers from the worksite school involved, employees of the host corporation, students, the principal, and school district administrators who decide on the curriculum, playground equipment, the design of the school, and all materials and management decisions for the school. Steering committees are basically, the administrators and managers of the entire
building project and make daily and long-term decisions in the operation of the worksite school.

**Conceptual Framework**

The history of organizations began in the business world, with Max Weber's theoretical analysis of the principles of bureaucracy (Carver, 1969). Attempts to apply business theories and production to education, have led to a current management technique used in public schools known as 'site based management.' Examination of contemporary organizational theory and current corporate innovation reveals patterns of participation, involvement, smallness, work teams, and decision making at the lowest level—various forms of self-determination which have decentralized the workplace (Bailey, 1991). The common thread which runs through the substantial body of contemporary corporate and managerial study is the key function of decentralization, in critical linkage with the increase of productivity. The absence of centralization and entrenched bureaucracies in exemplary organizations is well documented (Peters and Waterman, 1982; Bennis and Nanus, 1985). Collaborative management practices employing shared decision making strategies and performance incentives that provide teamwork rewards for quality and productivity are two powerful business concepts (Siegal and Smoley, as cited in Lewis, 1988) that underlie the concept of school-based management. While decentralization and shared decision-making patterns vary greatly among companies and schools, these are the essential issues involved in school-based management. The challenges of doing more with less, and doing things better are common to both business and education, and can evoke similar responses of downsizing.
(reassigning central-level responsibility to the site-level manager) and blurring "the traditional lines of demarcation between labor and management" (Siegal and Smoley as quoted in Lewis 1988, p. 107), in order to assign that responsibility closer to the delivery point or client.

There are many reasons and rationales why school-based management is currently being touted as a means of improving school districts. Beginning with the publication of A Nation at Risk, warning all readers of the deplorable condition of our schools and urging immediate attention to the restructuring and innovations required to improve them, a wide variety of reports, evidences, and legislative actions have suggested ways to improve our schools. Some of the major reasons for the current emphasis on school-based planning as a method of restructuring are:

* Current research on schools and teaching indicate that the best way to ensure improvement in schools is to focus on the individual school building (Herman, 1990).

* Current research on the principalship indicates that the "key" instructional leader in a school district is the building principal (Herman, 1990).

* Business and industry want schools to improve in order that the schools' products (students) are more productive workers; which, in turn, should make business and industry more competitive with foreign nations.

* The alarming number of adult illiterates and student drop out rates, especially in large cities among minority populations, leads to an undereducated populace and an expensive drain on finances at the national, state and local levels.
* Reactions to organized pressure groups calling for newer ways of restructuring our schools (J.J. Herman, 1990, p. 2).

The history of Effective Schools, school improvement, and school reform are substantially intermingled with school-based management concepts and terminology, whether directly indicated or logically implied. Therefore, the school or site based management theory (Herman, 1993) will be utilized as the focus of the conceptual framework, as it is one of the essential tools of reform and restructuring and helped form the basis for the operation of worksite schools in the United States, as educational and business techniques merge to form this new innovative school.

Research and Design Methodology

This study incorporated quantitative research methodology with a descriptive research design in its analysis of survey responses from employers and employees involved with worksite schools in the United States. A "descriptive research design is appropriate when the purpose of the study is to create a detailed description of a phenomenon: for example, people's opinions about educational issues" (Gall, Borg, and Gall, 1996, p. 371). The descriptive method is the most basic of the quantitative research methods and involves describing characteristics of a particular sample of individuals.

Each public school district office in all fifty states in the United States was contacted by FAX and/or questionnaires, and the data analyzed. From this information, all seventeen operational worksite schools were located in the United States.

The instrument chosen to collect the desired information included a mail survey
developed by the researcher. A survey is an attempt to collect data from members of a population in order to determine the current status of that population with respect to one or more variable (Gay, 1996). According to McMillan and Schumacher (1997), surveys are used frequently in business, politics, government, sociology, public health, psychology, and education because accurate information can be obtained for large numbers of people and are adaptable to a wide range of uses. Therefore, surveys were used and mailed to personnel involved in worksite schools in the United States, to determine what the necessary components and incentives were to develop and maintain worksite schools in the school districts and private corporations involved.

The survey was conducted according to McMillan and Schumacher's steps (1997), and involves defining the purpose and objectives, selecting a target population, developing techniques for gathering the data, sampling, and creating a proper letter of transmittal. Content validity was achieved through two methods: 1) Establishing an oversight committee of individuals with marketing and educational expertise. 2) Contacting the Canon Center for Survey Research at the University of Nevada Las Vegas. Both groups were asked to preview the survey questions for clarity and appropriateness. Modifications were made to conform to the observations submitted.

The population was limited to employees, employers and parents involved with the seventeen worksite schools located in the United States. At Hewlett Packard's worksite school in Santa Rosa, California, on-site interviews with personnel such as the school principals and other key leaders, obtained in-depth information as to the daily administration of its Hidden Valley worksite school, its development, and future projections. Photographs were taken, and personal interviews were also conducted with
several parents and students. The focus was on the processes involved in developing the school, and the purposes were to elaborate on the questions stated earlier on, and to gain insight into how these schools operate.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made in conducting this study:

1. Questions on the instrument elicited appropriate information with respondents possessing accurate knowledge about the characteristics of their company and school.

2. Respondents in the surveyed worksite schools and host corporations understood the questions, had adequate knowledge about their company and school, and answered all items honestly.

3. Because the responses were representative of worksite schools and host businesses in the United States, the information can be generalized to worksite schools.

4. It is assumed that respondents understood the definition of worksite schools as it applied to their host corporation.

Limitations

The results of the study may be affected by the following limitations:

1. The study is limited to stable corporations with the proper characteristics to support the long-term operations of worksite schools. This requires management that will not have a high turnover rate, in order that the school's steering committee will have stability over time to keep the school running smoothly. The corporation must be able to view the joint venture with the public school district, as a long-term investment, that will
decrease employee turnover, and save the company money over many years, in not having
to train and retrain new employees often and have at least 1,500 employees. Thus, the
generalizability of the findings to many national corporations is limited.

2. The study may be limited as the response rate is based upon the willingness of
host corporations and worksite schools to respond to the survey. Moreover, the survey
may not have reached the intended employers and employees with the most knowledge of
the worksite school development and operation. This may have created a limitation where
the true opinions of the companies and schools may not have been adequately
represented.

3. Respondents may have had pre-conceived notions about popular and perceived
correct components and incentives necessary for worksite schools, and not necessarily the
actual components and incentives involved in their particular location. Consequently, the
objectivity of the respondents may be limited, and the findings subject to other
interpretations.

4. Out of 832 distributed surveys, 188 were returned or 22.6%. This may raise
the question of non-response bias, in which the only respondents who replied were either
the most or least satisfied concerning the presence of a worksite school at their locations.
Non-observation errors can happen because part of the population of interest did not
respond, although a sample of this size may be large enough to counteract its effects

Delimitations

This study is limited to the study of public schools on the property of private
corporations, or those schools within the parameters of the definition of worksite schools, and does not include business/education partnerships or voucher and charter schools. Employees and employers involved with worksite schools in the United States were asked to respond to a descriptive survey composed of questions involving important components and incentives necessary to the set-up and on-going operations of these schools.

Significance of the Study

The study will help educators gain a better understanding of worksite schools by identifying what employers and employees consider are necessary components and incentives. Such an understanding will be helpful to the development efforts of future worksite schools.

Implications for further research on the topic of alternative or innovative schools, such as worksite schools, could be a study of their long-term effects, and how well they help meet the crisis of preparing students for jobs. Also, a future study could include the financial benefits they offer to corporations and taxpayers. Using survey research techniques, this study will examine common components and incentives required to set up and run a worksite school in the United States, and may be used as a guideline for future innovators in their development.

Summary

This chapter provided an introduction to the proposed research. The gap between skills needed by employees and the skills workers bring to the workplace is growing and
has become the subject of much controversy (Dole, 1989; Kolde 1991). Private business owners and administrators put much of the blame on the public school system in not providing students with tools and skills needed in the workplace. Other problems such as overcrowding in many school districts, growing transportation and building costs, and many other financial and social burdens on our public schools, prompted business leaders to step in to help find solutions.

There is also a practical need to equip students to enter the technological and scientific twenty-first century workforce challenge and to use extra money, services, and support from the very same corporations that need those future workers. The adverse impact of perceived low quality education on business productivity, has highlighted the ethical implications of market-driven educational reform, with increased privatization from businesses into the public school system, offering goods and services. Legislation has been enacted which introduces competition by extending parental choice to school selection, such as vouchers and charter schools. The search for effective schools, the shift to school-based management, the emphasis on development planning in school, the ensurance of school education quality, and the implementation of various school restructuring programs are examples of efforts on reform movements in the field of education. All of these factors helped form the basis for worksite schools, as the emphasis moved from school improvement to school development (Cheong, 1996).

A survey was developed and was sent to administrators, employers, and employees involved in the concept and operation of worksite schools in the United States. The goal was to find common components and incentives needed to develop and maintain this new innovative school. Finding commonalities to the successful operation and
maintenance of existing worksite schools, can be used to guide administrators, educators, and corporate leaders in their quest to develop a worksite school in their area or school district.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The design of this study made it necessary to briefly review literature on business and education reform and restructuring, which contribute a conceptual context for the site based management style used as the framework for this research. Due to the large amount of information in these areas, this review is not meant to be exhaustive in nature. Computer searches were conducted using the descriptors of school reform, restructuring, and site based management. School reform and restructuring issues are substantially intermingled with school-based management concepts and terminology, therefore, site based management theory was utilized as the focus of the conceptual framework, as it is the essential tool of reform and restructuring which helped form the basis for the operation of worksite schools in the United States.

Schoolwide programs such as Laboratory Schools, Professional Development Schools, and school reform programs currently in use in the United States which closely resemble the worksite school’s design, were studied.

School Reform History Up to 1980

Prior to the 1800s, having left a highly centralized Church of England, the
Puritans abhorred concentrated authority and insisted on local congregational autonomy. As the first formal education law, the "Old Deluder Satan Act" of 1647 required every Massachusetts town of at least 50 families to hire a teacher, setting the precedent of public responsibility for education as overseen by the local community. Schooling was restricted to a few years' instruction in basic skills with the primary goal of having children being able to read the Bible. Only sons of the upper classes attended highly academic secondary schools, preparing them for political leadership or the ministry (Bierlein, 1993).

Thomas Jefferson, during the late 1700s, argued that political stability was enhanced by widespread knowledge. At the Constitutional Convention in 1787, he emphasized that no free nation could survive ignorance. Conflicts as to whether there should be a national system of education or one of state and local control emerged, as well as many believing in public funding of religious schools, while others were adamant that separation of church and state was essential for a free democracy. Out of these conflicts came support for a system of locally controlled and funded, nonsectarian public schools. The system was comprised of only a few years for many white children, and advanced schooling for the elite few (Bierlein, 1993).

The 1830s brought the rise of the "common school" belief. Advocated by men such as Horace Mann, the goal was to develop a publicly financed elementary education system for the masses. Jefferson had advocated minimal schooling for all and additional education for the elite. Mann declared that an educated citizenry would improve the standard of living for all. Education was to be the springboard of opportunity and would equalize diversity among people from different social classes. Horace Mann, in his
famous Fifth Report in 1842, cited education as a means of increasing the value of labor (Yatvin, 1990). Although his idea, as one of the more notable reformers of the time, was not immediately embraced by all businessmen, by the 1860s acceptance in business circles was widespread. Mann's message was one that found acceptance in state legislatures across the country, and as a result, one of the functions the state took on during the nineteenth century was the free education of children.

States gave local communities the authority and responsibility for the operation and financing of schools, whereby property taxes became the major means of support. In addition, a major expansion of higher education institutions occurred, in part to meet the growing need for public school teachers. Many existing state universities originated as "normal schools," or teacher training institutions, initially providing only one or two years of formal training (Draper, 1908).

The period around 1900 was one characterized by a great surge in population due to massive emigration from southern and eastern Europe to the United States. These people came with their own rich traditional cultures, and speaking only their native tongues. Corporations emerged as the primary force in industrializing the nation's economy and work force. Efficiencies of scale allowed for mass production of many items previously produced by individual craftsmen. The trend toward centralization of power along bureaucratic lines was not limited to the business corporations, however. The growth in urban populations and the need for coordination of services fostered a series of experiments in a more systematic, centralized administration of a host of city functions led by reformers known as the "administrative progressives" (Sizer, 1992).
John Dewey wrote in 1902 that the life of the school - as well as the demands for its reorganization - are integrally bound up "with the entire movement of modern life." (Sizer, 1992). Ideas that were seriously pondered and hotly debated in America in 1900 were power and efficacy of science and efficiency to lift society from the morass of waste and corruption, the ambiguous role of the individual in an industrializing economy, the purpose of government in society, the capabilities and the responsibilities of women and children in the social order. Around 1900 the word *efficiency* had social and moral dimensions beyond the mere mechanical definition. It was during this time that efficiency became synonymous with goodness; that 'right' was equated with efficient outcomes. Efficiency was used not only to denote mechanical operations - that is, the ratio between energy input and output - but also to characterize commercial, social, and personal relations. The way to have efficient human affairs was to depend on professional competence and expertise. This was the unifying theme of the administrative progressives who sought to reform government. The highest degree of efficiency was secured by centralizing authority and responsibility in one individual (Bagley, 1912). Many reformers from this time - commonly referred to as the Progressive Era - proposed big government, big schools, and big social service organizations to efficiently minister to the needs of the people. Small decentralized operations were viewed as wasteful. Organizations of all types were seen to require a "critical mass" in order to attain efficiency in their operations (Gelberg, 1997). This gave the school reform movement of one hundred years ago its unique character.

Although not unique to that time period, the pro-efficiency school reformers made efficiency the centerpiece of their program. But, the luster of the efficiency ideal did not
dim with the passage of time. In fact, at the heart of today's education reform movement can be found the argument that schools must be restructured in order for them to efficiently meet the needs of America in the twenty-first century.

The Business and Education Reform Period; 1980s to the Present

The first wave of reform in the early 1980s was an effort to reform American public education (Powell, 1985). It was observed that the United States was on the verge of being displaced as a major player in the world's economy, and the catalysts for reform attempts were primarily economic (Sizer, 1984). The belief that the United States was falling behind other industrial powers in development, productivity, and quality was a theme that led many reform movements. Reformers then made the connection between economic inadequacy and the educational system, and education was viewed as a vehicle to recapture economic superiority (Guthrie and Kurst, 1988).

The feeling that schools could not produce literate citizens was linked to the decline of the United States in economic position in the international marketplace. This led to the dissection of the educational system and search for explanations (Tye, 1992). The central conclusion of these analyses was that schools were soft, lacked expectations and standards, had inadequate leadership, had a dysfunctional organizational structure, conditions of employment that were inconsistent with professional works, and there was an absence of any meaningful accountability (Goodlad, 1984; Sizer, 1984; Boyer, 1983; & Hampel, 1986).

An intense and comprehensive effort to improve American schools was then launched. The reform period witnessed the first ever presidentially convened governors'
summit devoted to education, covering new congressional enactments aimed at reforming long-standing federally financed education programs, proposals for national examination systems, construction of vastly new mechanisms for appraising teacher performance. state-initiated efforts to free schools from layers of long-standing regulatory restrictions. local school districts contracting with private sector firms to manage and operate schools. and numerous proposals to privatize schools even further by relying on voucher plans (Murphy & Beck, 1995).

The present model of school district governance, which often provided central office officials great authority and granted only limited discretion to administrators, teachers, and others at school sites, was replaced by school-based management. Excesses of school district and school consolidation, and the tremendous population growth of the past century combined to shape many school districts as overly large and bureaucratized systems in which the will of the citizenry was neglected. This led many to believe that only the insistent self-serving demands of special interests were heard. The accompanying reform that was frequently called for was parent or citizen empowerment. The solution was seen as decentralization or the establishment of parent advisory councils at school sites. These were the reforms proposed by those who believed that the school system should continue to be publicly managed and operated.

Others contended that the appropriate reform was continued public management, with reliance on private provision, which is in line with the worksite school concept. The more radical viewpoint of those who virtually lost faith in public control, called for complete privatization of the school system.
Sandra Waddock in her *Business and Education Reform: The Fourth Wave* report (1994) describes four waves of reform. The 1980s and into the 1990s were characterized by three "waves" of business involvement in schools. The first wave, occurred largely in response to the publication of the book, *A Nation at Risk*, which included the much-quoted statement that the "educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and people (Washington, DC, 1983).

This was a time of developing "public-private partnerships" or school-business partnerships, such as the pioneer project, the Boston Compact, guaranteeing access to job interviews for graduates of Boston's school system in return for specified and measurable improvements in school performance (Waddock, 1989).

The second wave of reform focused on the application of sound management principles in schools. In an effort to bring management expertise to schools, businesses brought strategic planning and other management seminars to school personnel, used performance-based systems to help some schools struggling with the imperatives of site-based management and accountability for performance, and attempted to provide administrators and teachers the same kind of training they provided for their own personnel (Waddock, 1994).

The third wave involved public policy initiatives, with advocacy and pressure for reform from the business community, emphasis on school choice, and higher national standards of performance (Lund, Leonard and Wild, Cathleen, 1993).

The mid-1990s brought a fourth and new wave of business involvement with schools that had significantly different characteristics than any of the previous waves:
collaborative alliances for systemic reform. The commitment in the fourth wave was to achieve fundamental system reform, by making the choice to bolster educators and their thinking by providing advocacy, pressure, and ideas from external groups like the broader business community. It involved a major reforming away from symptomatic fixes and towards system change. The individual's interests must be subordinated to the interest of the system as a whole, and particularly, to the needs of children. It meant collaboration among business managers, educators, parents, and other key stakeholders, as equals in a long-term process of change, relationship building, goal setting and achievement.

This wave can be viewed as an unending commitment by a range of parties to continuously improve and update the educational system as a whole. There is recognition that there are no "quick fixes" to any problems in public education, and focuses on key systemic factors that provide leverage. This leverage called for real social and organizational change, and included initiatives to deal with actual content and methods of education, such as the curriculum. They involved establishing and sticking to real goals, like the National Education Goals or localized versions of them, which provided guideposts for change initiatives.

The fourth reform movement also dealt systematically with the internal and external relationships and structures of schools. This supported the idea that support systems are necessary to contend with deteriorating family and community infrastructures which can be bolstered (Waddock, 1994).

Another lesson learned from the fourth wave of reform, was that an understanding of the politics of school reform was necessary on the part of businesses and vice versa. Schools are not businesses and really cannot be run like businesses, but they can get
significant help with their management issues and with the processes of restructuring from businesses that have undergone similar change processes.

Restructuring schools is about significant organizational change, which is an inherently political process because a range of stakeholder interests are involved. Recognizing the political nature of change means that the perspectives and interests of all key stakeholders need consideration and that difficult issues and conflicts have to be surfaced and faced.

With real change, power shifts occur, and by understanding the positions and stakes of different interest groups, a coalition can begin building a mutually beneficial agenda for change and school improvement. Schools will need help in understanding processes of change, and will need to be full and equal partners in the change process for they are effectively responsible for it. Mutual respect among coalition members is critical, according to the fourth reform movement theory. These theories provided the structure for the corporation involvement in the management of schools, as offered by the worksite school system, and were a forerunner of the site based management structure.

School Effectiveness

The reform movements of the 1980s and 1990s have had little substantive impact on teaching and learning (Slavin & Fashola, 1998). Scores on the respected National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP; U.S. Department of Education, 1997) have remained essentially the same for all subjects assessed. The one positive trend in test scores, a significant improvement in the performance of African American and Hispanic
students, mainly took place in the 1970s and has leveled off in the 1980s and 1990s; this trend even slightly reversed itself for the first time on the 1994 reading assessments. The best that can be said for the trends in student achievement is that despite public perceptions to the contrary, at least student achievement is not getting worse: on average, students today are doing as well as (but no better than) students in 1971, the year of the first NAEP assessment.

Recent research is finding that systemic reforms are not having much of an impact on classroom practice. State standards and assessments sometimes have an influence on what is taught, but they rarely have any effect at all on how well anything is taught (Goertz, Floden, & O'Dayl, 1996; Newmann, King, & Rigdon, 1997).

Schoolwide programs were considered to be effective if evaluations compared students who participated in the program to similar students in matched comparison or control schools and found the program students to perform significantly better on fair measures of academic performance. Such evaluations were required to demonstrate that experimental and control students were initially equivalent on measures of academic performance, socioeconomic status, and other measures, and were similar in other ways. "Fair measures" were ones assessing objectives pursued equally by experimental and control groups; for example, a curriculum-specific measure would be fair only if the control group were implementing the same curriculum (Slavin, 1998).

Many studies of innovative programs used evaluations that compared gains made by program students on standardized tests, usually expressed in percentiles or normal curve equivalents (NCEs), to "expected" gains derived from national norming samples. This design, widely used in evaluations of Chapter I/Title I programs, is prone to error.
and generally overstates program impacts (Slavin & Madden, 1991). Programs evaluated using NCE gains or other alternative to experimental-control comparisons are discussed as promising if their outcomes are particularly striking, but such data are not considered conclusive (Slavin, 1998).

The best evidence that a program is replicable in other schools is that it has in fact been replicated elsewhere, especially if there is evidence that the program was evaluated and found to be effective in sites beyond its initial pilot locations. The existence of an active dissemination effort is also a strong indication of replicability. Programs are considered low in replicability if they have been used in a small number of schools and appear to depend on conditions (e.g., charismatic principals, magnet schools, extraordinary resources) unlikely to exist on a significant scale elsewhere (Slavin, 1998).

As this research on worksite schools enfolds, research will attempt to discover its replicability to even more than the 17 sites already in place in the United States. To provide a structure which paved the way for worksite schools, innovative, effective schools which utilized the beginnings of site-based management, and Total Quality Management, two business practices used in worksite schools were used as search tools. Elementary schoolwide reform programs already in place in the United States using these methods are Professional Development Schools using also the definition of laboratory schools, and the New American Schools Designs. At this point, worksite schools are geared towards the early elementary grades one through five, so to limit the scope of this research paper due to time and space limitations, the search was also limited to these earlier elementary grade levels.

Since the release of a report entitled A Nation at Risk in 1983, the media has
reverberated with reports of our troubled schools. That report likened the ineptitude of our school system in preparing our youngsters for adult roles, to national disarmament in the face of a threat from a foreign country. A hue and cry was heard across our nation: something had to be done to get our schools to turn out students who had skills comparable to those of children from other industrialized nations. Demands from business leaders and politicians for school reform have followed every subsequent report detailing how dismally our youngsters perform when compared to the children of our economic competitors in this new global economy.

The goals Americans have for schools and our children, are rooted in what is valued in the United States as a society, the beliefs about the nature of childhood, the prerequisites of "the good life", the assumptions about gender, race, ethnicity, and economic status. The demand for reform today, is essentially a replay of a debate on and campaign for education reform that occurred at the beginning of this century. The themes providing the impetus for both the current and the earlier debate on school reform are remarkably similar: fear of global competition, the breakdown of the family, an influx of new immigrants, rampant crime in the cities, corruption in government, and a generation of youth that seems ill-prepared to take its place as adults in the workforce - in essence, a society nearing a state of crisis.

The participants are also the same - business leaders, school managers, teacher unions, government officials, and university professors. Business leaders in both time periods chastise the schools as being wasteful and inefficient, for failing to prepare youngsters for the jobs that await them when they exit the schoolhouse doors. Although nearly one hundred years divide these businessmen, their arguments are nearly identical:
schools must change to efficiently meet the needs of a changing economy. Business leaders in both eras find strong allies among top school executives and government officials in their effort to reform the schools.

Workplace Skills Deficiencies

The effort of reformers to overhaul current educational practices and to drive schools toward alternative forms of governance and management has originated from a variety of forces, such as a crisis in the teaching force, changing population, and a competitive workforce (Moffet, 1994). According to the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983), the reason behind America's failure to sustain its once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation, is the failure of the schools to educate youth adequately. In order to sustain the competitive position in the world economy, the United State will need a better educated workforce (Elmore, 1989).

Reformers argue that the model of schooling previously used for the industrial age, is not suited to prepare workers for the postindustrial, post bureaucratic organizations (Murphy, 1989). As the needs of business evolved, with higher levels of skills being required, and the number of surplus students falling (Seely, 1988), the economy is demanding that schools redesign their operations to produce a better product with a lower error rate (Mitchell, 1990). According to Schlechty (1990); "for the first time in the history of mankind, in America at least, education is essential to livelihood" (p. 31).

workforce has declined steadily over the past few decades. Worker skill deficits have cost businesses and taxpayers an estimated $20 billion in lost wages, profits and productivity prior to the 1990s (Gorman, 1988). Shapiro and Goetz (1998) stated that the "future productivity of American business is dependent on connecting employers and schools" (p. 2). This forms the basis for the link between schools located on the actual worksite of the corporation, or worksite schools.

What is perpetuating the growing deficiency in workplace skills? One reason is rapid technological change and the move to a higher technology and informational society, where our educational system cannot keep pace (Murnane and Levy, 1996). Our advanced economy could not run thirty seconds without computers, according to Toffler (1990), and the new complexities of production, the integration of many diverse (and constantly changing) technologies, the demassification of markets, continue to increase, by vast leaps, the amount and quality of information needed (p. 17).

But technology alone, does not explain why many Americans are deficient in the basic skills when entering the workforce (Johnson, 1995). Cappelli (1993) found that skill requirements are rising in many areas and employment in United States manufacturing has shifted towards higher skills. Cappelli and O'Shaughnessey (1995) suggested that restructuring is influencing skill requirements inside organizations.

Hudson Institute's Workforce 2000 report, indicated that there is a growing mismatch between job skill requirements and the available pool of workers (DOE and DOL, 1988). Brustein and Mahler (1994) and the National Governors Association (1994), contends that the United States is falling behind because of its failure to provide adequate preparation for new entrants to the workforce. Employers find workers lacking
in basic reading, writing, and math skills and *Time* magazine (as reported by Gorman, 1988), announced that as much as a quarter of the American labor force lacks these basic skills which are necessary to perform in an increasingly complex job market. O'Connor (1993) indicated that 40 million adults lack proficiency in basic work skills and Baloun (1995) explained that the mismatch between workplace requirements and the skills of entry-level workers is continuing to grow. "In general, companies report that only about 50 percent of recent high school graduate applicants are qualified for entry-level work positions (Cappelli et al, 1997, p. 157).

The problem of illiteracy also is growing among the younger population. Mullins (1994) reported that more than half of the nation's 17-year-olds do not read well enough to find, understand, summarize, and explain relatively complicated information, nor can they compute with fractions, decimals, percentages, or recognize geometric figures and solve simple equations. Therefore, they are not equipped to make the transition from school to work. The U.S. General Accounting Office reported to Congress that the United States falls short in significant respects in employment preparation of many youth, most notably in preparing them with the necessary workplace literacy skills and providing them for the future workforce (Training Strategies, 1988). Dale Mann, a professor and senior research associate at Columbia University's Teacher College (Richards, 1990), substantiates this idea by indicating that "every fifth person now hired by American industry is both illiterate and enumerate" (p. R10).

Much of the blame for workplace skills deficiencies has been placed on public education (D'Souza, 1991; Kramer, 1994; Dowell, 1994; Sykes, 1995; Will, 1998). Hunt (1995) indicates that "Employers are clearly unhappy. It is not clear, though, whether
they feel that the schools have deteriorated from previous good performance or whether work demands have changed" (p. 24). Supporters of the later assumption believe that schools have not failed, but that the changes at work have resulted in a growing need for workers who can adapt well to a rapidly changing work environment (Cappelli, 1997).

The problem, however, "does not seem to lie with the colleges and universities, but with the elementary and high school (K-12) system" (Hunt, 1995, p. 26). President Clinton recognized shortcomings in the United States' K-12 educational system in his [1997] State of the Union message, and stated that there should be "advanced corrective action" taken. In 1995, only 20 percent of Americans rated the nation's public schools as A or B, down 20 percent in 1986 (Murnane and Levy, 1996). Diehl and Mikulecky (1980) postulated that the skills valued in the workplace are at variance with those taught in schools, and that during the last 20 years, the skills required to succeed in the economy have changed radically, but the skills taught in most schools have changed very little. However, Bailey (1997), implied that education reformers are reluctant to design curricula explicitly to prepare young people for work because many believe that the "short-term needs of employers can be in conflict with the broad goals of education" (p. 3-4). This has created a tension between educational reformers and industry skill standards (Bailey and Merritt, 1997). For example, children clustered in privileged schools - public and private - that do emphasize appropriate skills will get a better education and the good jobs (Murnane and Levy, 1996). "[T]he vast majority of other children will compete for what is left" (p. 7).

The Workforce Commission (1988) pointed out that more than 70% of the jobs in America will not require a college education by the year 2000, yet these non professional
jobs are the backbone of our economy, and the productivity of these jobs will make or break our economic future. The business perception, then, is that a different kind of workforce and preparation is needed to fill those jobs with workers who possess skills in information technology, for example (Bachler, 1998).

Many argue that business and industry should be held partly responsible for filling the skills gap, and that an investment in employee training is necessary to expand productivity (Carenevale, 1991; Fairs, 1983; Kahn, 1986; Naisbitt, 1986; Ouchi, 1982). Very few companies say they are investing in techniques that would help them to use less skilled labor (Cappelli et al., 1997). Yet, there is ample evidence that employers have introduced technology and work systems to reduce the level of skill required of workers. There is a school of thought suggesting that job preparation of potential employees remains more a responsibility of business and industry than the public school system. Callahan (1962) believed that education is not a business and public schools should not be used as factories to produce students for employers.

More agree, however, that there must be a collective investment by both the business and educational worlds in training our youth to properly fill the jobs in the American economy. American students, workers, employers, and educators must know what knowledge and skills are required in the workplace (Reich, 1995). This too, will require collaboration between the business sector and the public school system.

By the year 2000, 50 percent of the labor force will be comprised of women, up from 38 percent in 1970 where only 43.3 percent of all women participated in the work force (Saveri, 1991; Hunt, 1995). Snyder (1996) reported that as much as 66% of married couples aged 20-55 worked full time in 1996, which was a dramatic increase since the
1960s. The proportion of mothers working full time year round, climbed to 39% of households with children in 1996, up 17% from 1969 (Duff, 1998) and about 65 percent of U.S. mothers with children under 18 will work by this year or the year 2000 (Coates, 1996). "Census Bureau data showed that if child care is accessible, labor force participation for women with young children will increase - as much as 20 percent for some subgroups" (Saveri, 1991, p. 127). About 85 percent of new entrants in the workforce in the year 2000 will be minorities, including women, and only 15 percent of the remaining new entrants will consist of white males (Barner, 1996). The department of labor predicts that the number of white women entering the work force will outnumber white men by the year 2005 (Gray and Herr, 1998) and occupational mobility and advancement from entry-level positions will become easier and less restrictive as more women complete higher levels of education (Saveri, 1991). With the entrance of more women and married couples into the work force, more child care and diverse methods of education, preschool, daycare, after school programs, and employment schedules and issues will be brought to the forefront, requiring more flexibility on the part of both the business and educational worlds. Creative and flexible ideas will be needed to provide employers with the workers they need, and to take care of and prepare the youth of America to fulfill these roles.

The federal School-to-Work legislation, which was passed and became law in 1994, was initiated to stimulate states and local government and communities to "build a nationwide system of school-to-work programs with its requirements for school-based activities, work-based activities and activities connecting the two" (Hunt, 1995, p. 245). Another earlier program included the Jobs for American's Graduates program, which
emerged from the effort that Governor Pierre Du Pont started in Delaware (Sum and Heliogi, 1990). This was a program which provided staff from the business community inside schools as educational partners, while the schools allowed for counsel and assistance to be given to teachers and students about what skills are necessary in the workforce.

Many argue that the issue of too much government involvement leads to a loss of local control, and that government mandated reform causes a multitude of separately funded and separately administered programs, which gradually dilute the schools mission and saps its strength (Hunt, 1995). As a result, the corporation may need to become the chief educators of the workforce as the pace of change increases through the introduction of deregulation, competitive pressures, and new technological advances (Meister, 1998). This sets the stage for worksite schools!

Studies of new educational programs have shown that innovations and reform often fall apart when they encounter the realities of the classroom, and leave a wasteland of ineffective resources and enthusiasm; waste which can neither be afforded or tolerated (Hull and Grevelle, 1998). This is where the idea of site-based management may be a better idea, as the teachers themselves participate more in the network of reform.

Site Based Management

The corporate world has faced problems similar to those of schools, and businesses set out to examine organizations that were successful in overcoming impediments (Peters and Waterman, 1982). It was discovered that the most successful organizations had decentralized their operations, pushed decisions down to the level of
those closest to the customer, and empowered their employees to make decisions (Peters and Waterman, 1982). Site-based or school-site management systems is a strategy which promotes the concepts of empowerment and of empowering individuals in schools (Short and Greer, 1989).

The beginnings of site-based management as a distinct concept lie in organizational theory and in private sector managerial innovation (Herman, 1993). Each school is viewed as a center for change and patterns from productive business practices are borrowed for the site-based management view of organizational leadership in schools. Employee involvement, high levels of participation, a team approach, decentralization of decision making, and a down-sizing of structure, such as scope, management, and governance are utilized as the framework for site-based management practices, as schools are, indeed, workplaces (Bailey, 1991).

Reform and restructuring movements give major reasons for the current emphasis on school-based planning as a method of restructuring:

- Current research on schools and teaching indicate that the best way to ensure improvement in schools is to focus on the individual school building.
- The principalship is the "key" instructional leader in a school district.
- Business and industry want schools to improve in order that the schools' products (students) are more productive workers; which, in turn, should make business and industry more competitive with foreign nations.
- The number of adult illiterates and the huge student drop out rates that exist, especially in large cities and in minority populations, alarms the public. This drains the
finances of the national, state, and local governments to take care of the dependency that this under-education creates.

- Organizations such as the Commission of the States, governors' organizations, and federal and state legislatures are being made aware of the political necessity to support school improvement efforts by the lobbyists for business, industrial and educational groups; and they are reacting politically to this pressure by mandating or pressuring in other ways for restructuring of our schools (J.J. Herman, 1990).

Similarly, David (1989) describes the rationale for site-based management as emerging from two well-established propositions; 1) The school is the primary decision-making unit; and 2) Change requires ownership that comes from the opportunity to participate in defining change and the flexibility to adapt it to individual circumstances.

Candoli's 1991 text on site-based management describes it as "achieving a balance between accountability and freedom in all parts of the educational system... The primary idea is that the greatest possible improvements in the school system will be attained when local schools are given the freedom to solve their own problems" (p. 34).

Worksite schools fit under the category of site-based management. As the local schools, in conjunction with the corporations involved, are given the freedom to solve problems such as overcrowding in the school district, and develop a worksite school on the property of the company (The Urban Institute, 1993). The schools are run individually, along with a steering committee, and involve members of the business community, parents, teachers, the students themselves and public school administrators.

The National Governors Association described policy making in terms of empowering leadership at the school level (Lewis, 1988). Site Based Management is
built on two basic beliefs, according to *School-Based Management* (1988), the joint task force statement of the American Association of School Administrators, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, and the National Association of Secondary School Principals. These beliefs are that:

- Those most closely affected by decisions ought to play a significant role in making those decisions.

- Educational reform efforts will be most effective and long-lasting when carried out by people who feel a sense of ownership and responsibility for the process (p. 6).

- The National Governors' Association report, *Time for Results*, in collaboration with the United States Department of Education, focused on exempting districts from inhibiting regulations and suggested that schools be redesigned to create greater teacher decision making, and permitting schools to make decisions and holding them accountable for outcomes.

- The 1988 report on Project Education Reform included suggestions such as the deregulation of laws and standards for successful districts, and an increase in principal decision making on budget, curriculum and personnel issues.

- A publication of the Education Commission of the States, *The Next Wave*, summarized outcomes achieved when almost every state raised standards and implemented other commission-recommended improvements. Reform reports which address the issue of school-based management include:

- The 1985 California Commission Report *Who Will Teach Our Children?*, which recommends the involvement of teachers in decision making.

- The 1986 Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession *A Nation Prepared: Teacher for the 21st Century*, which recommends restructuring schools to provide a professional environment for teachers to decide how to meet goals; and suggests restructuring the teaching force to introduce "lead teachers" to help redesign the schools.

- The 1986 Education Commission of the States' *What Next? More Leverage for Teachers* which suggests that current policies must decentralize responsibly, neither too specifically nor too piecemeal. Things such as giving teachers control over time and materials are more important than money.

- The 1986 National Governors' Association *Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education* which recommends allowing a real teacher voice in decisions, and the provision of incentives and technical assistance to districts to promote school-site management (Green, 1987).

**The Rise and Model of Site Based Management**

In the 1960s and 1970s, numerous innovations and efforts were made to promote new curricula and new teaching approaches but the results often seemed unsatisfactory. It was not until the eighties when there was successful development of modern management in industrial and commercial organizations, that people began to believe that to improve education quality, it is necessary to jump from the classroom teaching level to school organization level, and reform the structural system and management style of schools. Various school reform movements followed. Those emphasizing improvement of certain
school internal functioning such as interpersonal relationship and instructional leadership introduced different kinds of school improvement programs. The effective school movement looked for and promoted the characteristics of effective schools. The self-budgeting school movement emphasized the autonomy of using school resources. Those focusing on decentralization of authority from central education offices introduced school-based activities such as school-based curriculum development, school-based staff development and school-based student counseling, etc. However, some people argued that decentralization of central power to school level could not guarantee that schools would use power effectively to enhance educational quality. Therefore, both school responsibility bearers and education service receivers should share the decision making power at the school level. Thus followed the emergence of the shared decision making movement in school management reform (Caldwell, 1990; Caldwell and Spinks, 1988; David, 1989; Dimmock, 1993; Mohrman and Wohlstetter, 1994).

In contrast to the traditional external control management, characterized by tight control from the central office of the school system, the characteristics of school-based management may be mapped in terms of school mission, and leadership or management strategies, which includes the use of resources, role of school members, interpersonal relationships, quality of administrators, Total Quality Management and the final characteristic or the indicators of effectiveness.

**School Mission**

For schools under school-based management, the ideal of running a school represents a group of shared expectations, beliefs and values of the school, guiding school members in educational activities and the direction of work. This is organizational
culture which greatly affects the functioning and effectiveness of a school (Beare et al., 1989; Eheng, 1993; Sergiovanni, 1984). Vivid and strong school organizational culture should be developed and shared by school members so that they are willing to share responsibility, work hard and be fully involved in school work for achieving their shared ideal. Strong school culture also socializes new members to commit to the school mission and at the same time reinforces old members to cooperate continuously to carry on their mission even when they face difficulties and challenges (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Schein, 1992).

**Management Strategies**

According to McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y (1960), Theory X assumes that humans are born lazy and irresponsible, and require close supervision in management and punishment to control its employees. The latter assumes that humans do not have an innate dislike for work, and under suitable conditions, a human is willing to serve for his/her shared goals without being pushed, not only to bear responsibility, but also to look for more responsibilities to take up. Theory Y suggests that democratic participation, professional development and work-life improvement are important to motivate teachers and students. According to Maslow (1943) and Alderfer (1972), teachers and students may have different levels of needs, apart from economic gains. They pursue social interaction and affiliation, self-actualization and development opportunities. In order to satisfy higher level needs, they are willing to accept challenges and work harder. Schein (1980) further classified human nature into four categories: the rational-economic man, social man, self-actualizing man and complex man. Different managing methods are often based on different assumptions about human nature.
External control management with Theory X assumptions tends to use close supervision to manage teachers and students. But school-based management theory resembles Theory Y and views humans as complex, changeable, and that every school member has different needs and abilities, which provides flexibility and opportunities to satisfy those needs and to give play to their talents.

**Concepts of School Organization**

In both business and education, the concept of organization has changed. People now believe that an organization is a place for life and development, not only a tool for achieving certain static goals, for example, quantity of product (Likert, 1967; McGregor. 1960). The school as an organization should not only be a place for the preparation of the future of children, but also a place for students, teachers and even administrators to live, to grow and to pursue development. Without professional development and enthusiastic involvement of teachers and administrators, a school cannot be developed and improved continuously, and students cannot have a rich learning life. Therefore, a school-based managing school is not only a place to foster student growth, but also a place to foster the development of teachers and administrators. This is also the reason why school-based staff development is important to school effectiveness (Cheng and Tam. 1994).

**Decision-Making Style**

Site-based management should be better than external control management in decision-making because:

* The goals of a school are often unclear and changeable. The participation of teachers, parents, students, and alumni can help to develop goals which will be more able to reflect the present situation and future needs of the school.
* The goals of a school are multiple and the mission of a school is complicated; they need the intelligence, imagination and effort of more people to accomplish. The participation or involvement of teachers, parents, and students in decision-making is an important contribution to the school.

* Participation in decision-making provides opportunities for members and administrators to learn and develop, and to understand and manage the school.

* Participation in decision-making is the process for encouraging teachers, parents, and students to be involved in the school.

**Leadership Style**

Following World War II, the Japanese economy was in shambles and most Japanese products were shoddy. It became clear to W. Edward Deming that American manufacturers were concentrating on production rather than quality. Frustrated with American industry's abandonment of Walter Shewart's and his work, (1986/1931, 1986/1939) Deming responded to the invitation from General Douglas MacArthur to help Japan get back on its feet. So it was then, in 1950, Dr. William Edwards Deming (1900-1993), an American statistician and physicist, proposed a new management theory to Japanese business leaders (Bonstingle, 1992c).

**Total Quality Management: An Application of Deming's Ideas**

Deming's influence on American industry and education today is tremendous. One only has to look at the Japanese products which are consistently of the highest quality and yet sold at competitive prices to recognize that Deming's ideas merit a close examination (Rhodes, 1990). Total Quality Management or TQM has been defined as a "value based, information-driven management process through which the minds and talents of people
at all levels are applied fully and creatively to the organization's continuous improvement" (Rhodes, 1992).

The last two words, "continuous improvement" are the more important and is the lifelong commitment to the betterment for oneself, family, friends, fellow workers, and finally, the whole world. Deming's work, Out of the Crisis, (1986), listed 14 points which have applications in both the educational and business world.

1. Create constancy of purpose for improvement of product and service.
2. Adopt the new philosophy.
3. Cease dependence on mass inspection.
4. End the practice of awarding business on the basis of price tag alone.
5. Improve constantly and forever the system of production and service.
6. Institute training and retraining.
7. Institute leadership.
8. Drive out fear.
9. Break down barriers between staff areas.
10. Eliminate slogans, exhortations, and targets for the work force.
11. Eliminate numerical quotas for the work force and goals for people in management.
12. Remove barriers that rob people of pride in workmanship.
14. Take action to accomplish the transformation.
The TQM Process at Work in American Schools

Even though more a philosophy than a blueprint for action, those who study the compelling case made by many who have written on this movement for the application of Deming's philosophy to education, cannot help but believe that great possibilities exist for educational leaders who practice his principles.

Rhodes (1992) indicates that change is a natural consequence of people governing their own conduct such that they are able to be a little more effective each day. This leads to a continual growth in total organizational and personal capacity to act differently. Because this is the adoption and adaptation of a business model into education, it provides the theory and model for the role that business and education play in the management of worksite schools.

TQM is more than a management process, it is a philosophy of organizational leadership that uses the scientific method and the contributions of everyone in the organization to continuously improve everything the organization does to consistently meet or exceed its stakeholders' needs. The system in this case refers to those elements that impact on the organization in question. For example, TQM in an elementary school would involve not only the students, faculty, staff, and parents of that school, but also other educational institutions, government, and businesses at the local level, and even at state, regional, and national levels. TQM does this by implementing the four philosophical beliefs, which comprise the "Profound Knowledge" necessary for a system to improve, as expressed by its originator, W. Edwards Deming (Deming, 1980; Rhodes, 1990):

1. Psychological Belief: People are purposeful, cognitive beings with an intrinsic
desire to learn and be innovative, as in McGregor's Theory Y (1960). Each individual has the right to enjoy his or her work and be successful. The emphasis in this belief is on human resources.

2. Systems Belief: All organizations should be viewed as system in which subcomponent activities must be aimed at fulfilling the mission of the larger organization. The task of management is to optimize the whole. The emphasis here is on the dynamic character of organization.

3. Perceptual Framework Belief: Knowledge is constructed from experience bound within a framework of theories and beliefs. Everyone within the organization needs the same theoretical roadmap. The emphasis in this belief is on alignment of goals.

4. Causes of Variation Belief: 80% to 90% of the variation from expected outcomes is a result of problems within the system or process, not the worker. To lessen the occurrence of variation, the system's programmatic and behavioral regularities must be modified. The emphasis here is on the scientific method and data collection.

Within this philosophy, there is room for various management/leadership structures, with participatory leadership. School or site-based management fits nicely into this framework, and TQM will provide the sometimes wavering school site councils with the tools necessary to get the job done. Decision-making in TQM organizations is based on data, not hunches, and it provides tools necessary to collect and make decisions. Other core values of TQM relate to empowerment, teamwork, long-range and strategic planning, and accountability. These are concepts that most educators and literature on school administration and change support.
Professional Development Schools/Laboratory Schools

As the National Commission on Teaching & America's Future (NCTAF) noted, "In this knowledge-based society, the United States urgently needs to reaffirm a consensus about the role and purposes of public education in a democracy - and the prime importance of learning in meeting those purposes. The challenge extends far beyond preparing students for the world of work. It includes building an American future that is just and humane as well as productive, that is as socially vibrant and civil in its pluralism as it is competitive."

Renewing schools and renewing teacher education must proceed simultaneously. The nation cannot have good schools without good teachers. Conversely, teachers must learn how to teach in good schools. Reform movements offer many solutions to the problems they see with America's schools, but they also realize that schools will not change until teacher preparation programs change. As the NCTAF also noted is that what teachers know and can do is the most important influence on what students learn. Recruiting, preparing, and retaining good teachers is the central strategy for improving schools, and school reform cannot succeed unless it focuses on creating the conditions in which teachers can teach and teach well. According to Goodlad's National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER); the Holmes Partnership; the National Center for Restructuring Education, and Teaching (NCREST); and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE); they concur that Professional Development Schools are schools that provide a clinical setting for pre-service education, engage in professional development for practitioners, promote and conduct inquiry that
advances knowledge of schooling, and provide an exemplary education for a segment of P-12 students (preschool through twelfth grade).

Currently there are more than five hundred Professional Development Schools in the United States (Clark, 1999). In order to understand the similarities in building worksite school and Professional Development Schools, this paper will emphasize the development and antecedents to the creation of these schools.

Many used Goodlad's school-university model in his book *A Place Called School* (1984), and formed partnerships between the schools and universities or *mutualism*. There should be a beneficially symbiotic relationship and channels of communication between the university and school districts including a governance group consisting of the district superintendents and the dean of the school, college, or department of education (SCDE) as well as key leaders from arts and sciences, a coordinating group of university faculty and school district administrators, and interpersonal relationships that support open and frank exchanges of ideas involving teachers at both the university and school level (Clark, 1999).

**Developmental Stages of Professional Development Schools**

Based on the examination of fourteen school-university partnerships across the country during a three to five year period, Wilson, Heckman, and Clark (1999), generated a five-stage development sequence of professional development schools:

1. **Getting Organized:** During this first stage, founders seek to determine who will be involved, ask why the partnership is being formed, draw up rules for operation and governance, and determine what resources will be invested. The length of time spent at this stage and the degree of conflict present depends strongly on the context in which
the partnership is formed, including past partnership efforts in which participants have been involved.

2. Early Success: Conferences and seminars are used to discover common interests, to meet with outsiders who reinforce the direction of the school, and to recognize the challenges that face them.

3. Waiting for Results: After the first sign of success, there is a lull while participants struggle to achieve some real results from their labors. Some participants pull out during this stage, and partnership leaders retreat to discuss structure, convene meetings to ask what the real goals are, and assign different people to formal leadership roles.

4. Major Success and Expansions: When results significant to participants are achieved, the base of participation expands to include participants from multiple areas of interest. Ethne Erskine-Cullen attributes success in reaching this stage in part to the development of a "critical mass for change", that is, educating a large enough group of persons working on the reform effort to ensure that there is common knowledge and commitment (1991).

Also during this stage, outside recognition accorded the partnership leads others to seek admission, opens up sources of additional funding, and permits the partnership to penetrate more deeply into all segments of the communities, schools, and universities involved. During this stage, all participants commit additional resources.

5. Mature Partnership: During Stage 5, participants provide leadership to other major partnership efforts designed to accomplish similar purposes. All the elements of a
truly symbiotic relationship are present. Significant resources are committed on a long-term basis.

There is another stage for many partnerships:

6. The Death of the Partnership: Frequently, this terminal stage corresponds to the cessation of external funding or the departure of a key player. In other instances, personal agendas of individual members may take the partnership in a different direction. Unfortunately, there are few careful analyses of failures of university-school-community partnerships from which researchers can learn from this sixth stage. Two of the partnerships studied by Wilson, Heckman, and Clark (1999), which failed, had reached the fourth stage, then lost sight of their original purpose and failed to develop a clearly articulated new purpose. There was also an exceptionally high turnover in key participant roles such as deans, superintendents, principals, and university faculty, and did not have the critical mass of informed people in the membership that is needed to sustain its efforts. A lack of resources became the excuse for the dissolution of the partnerships that no longer had the glue to bind purpose, function, and structure. Partnerships that failed to maintain consistent structure, support mechanisms, and purposes were the most likely to reach Stage 6 and then dissolve.

New American Schools

The development of comprehensive, schoolwide designs for school reform has been greatly advanced by the New American Schools Development Corporation (NASDC), now called New American Schools (NAS). Founded in 1991, NAS is a foundation primarily funded by large corporations to support the development and
dissemination of ambitious school designs for the 21st century. Initially, 11 design teams were funded to develop school designs. Four were discontinued for various reasons. The remaining seven are now engaged in national dissemination.

With the exception of the Roots and Wings program, the NAS designs are at too early a stage of implementation and evaluation to have produced conclusive outcome data. Most have anecdotal data noting outstanding gains in one or two schools (among many that might be using the program). However, although the achievement data supporting them are limited so far, these designs have several features that make them attractive alternatives for Title I schoolwide projects and other schools seeking fundamental reform. First, these designs are very comprehensive. To one degree or another, all address curriculum, instruction, school operation, assessments, and parent/community involvement. Second, all are built for replication. All of the designs provide trainers, well-specified professional development strategies, and networks of implementing schools that help mentor new schools into the network (Clark, 1999).

**Roots and Wings**

Roots and Wings (Slavin, Madden, Dolan, & Wasik, 1994: Slavin, Madden, & Wasik, 1996) is a comprehensive reform design for elementary schools that adds to Success for All innovative programs in mathematics, social studies, and science. Funded by New American Schools, Roots and Wings has recently begun to be disseminated nationally.

Roots and Wings begins by implementing all components of Success for All, which provides at-risk students with innovative curricula and instructional methods in reading, writing, and language arts from kindergarten to Grade 6, with extensive
professional development (Clark, 1999). MathWings is the name of the mathematics
program used in Grades 1-5 which is a constructivist approach based on NCTM standards
but designed to be practical and effective in schools serving many at-risk students.
MathWings makes extensive use of cooperative learning, games, discovery, creative
problem-solving, manipulatives, and calculators. WorldLab is an integrated approach to
social studies and science that engages students in simulations and group investigations.
Students take on roles as various people in history, in different parts of the world, or in
various occupations.

A study of Roots and Wings (Slavin, Madden, & Wasik, 1996) was carried out in
four Title I schools in rural southern Maryland. The assessment tracked growth over time
on the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP), compared to
growth in the state as a whole. The MSPAP is a performance measure on which students
are asked to solve complex problems, set up experiments, write in various genres, and
read extended text. In both third and fifth grade assessments in all subjects tested
(reading, language, writing, math, science and social studies), Roots and Wings students
showed substantial growth. On every measure, the percentage of students
scoring at the "satisfactory" or "excellent" levels gained substantially more than the
average for all Maryland schools. Evaluation of MathWings in San Antonio and in
Miami and Palm Beach County, Florida, have also found strong positive effects (Madden.
Slavin, & Simons, 1997).

As of fall 1997, approximately 70 schools have added MathWings and/or
WorldLab to their implementations of Success for All, making themselves into Roots and
Wings schools.
ATLAS Communities

The ATLAS Communities (Comer, Gardner, Sizer, & Whitla, 1996) is a design based on a collaboration among four school reform organizations, those led by James Comer, Howard Gardner, Theodore Sizer, and Jane Whitla. ATLAS incorporates elements of Comer's (1988) School Development Project, and also adds elements from other reform networks and its own unique features. One of these is a focus on working with pathways, feeder systems of elementary, middle, and high schools whose staff work with each other to create coordinated and continuous experiences for students. The emphasis of the design is on helping school staffs create classroom environments in which students are actively participants in their own learning, putting into practice a model (following Sizer's [1992] Coalition of Essential Schools) of student as worker, teacher as coach. Project-based learning is extensively used. Assessment in ATLAS schools emphasizes portfolios, performance examinations, and exhibitions.

Preliminary data from implementing schools show some gains. In Prince George's County, Maryland, reading test scores increased by up to 30% in one ATLAS elementary school, and a middle school reported increases on test scores in math, language arts, science, and social studies on the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program.

Audrey Cohen

The Audrey Cohen College System of Education (Cohen & Jordan, 1996) is based on the teaching methods used at the Audrey Cohen College in New York City. This design attempts to have all learning relate to a purpose that contributes to the community or world at large. Each semester's work is built around a purpose, such as using science and technology to shape a just and productive society, or helping people through the arts.
Curriculum materials appropriate to the semester's purpose are identified or adapted for schools' use. Academic activities build toward "constructive action" projects in which children apply knowledge to contribute to real community needs.

Anecdotal reports of early outcomes have identified individual schools implementing Audrey Cohen design in San Diego, Phoenix, and Miami that have reported above-average gains on standardized achievement tests.

**Co-NECT**

Co-NECT (Goldberg & Richards, 1996) is a design created at a Cambridge (MA) consulting firm, Bolt, Beranek, and Newman. The design focuses on complex interdisciplinary projects that extensively incorporate technology and connect students with ongoing scientific investigations, information resources, and other students beyond their own school. Cross-disciplinary teaching teams work with clusters of students.

Performance-based assessments are extensively used.

On a battery of performance items, one of the original pilot schools for Co-NECT, a middle school in Worcester, Massachusetts, showed significant gains from 1994 to 1995 in reading scores. Other schools also showed gains in selected areas.

**Expeditionary Learning**

Expeditionary Learning/Outward Bound (Campbell et al., 1996) is a design built around learning expeditions, explorations within and beyond school walls. The program is affiliated with Outward Bound and incorporates many of its principles of active learning, challenge and teamwork. It makes extensive use of project-based learning, cooperative learning, and performance assessments. Expeditionary Learning schools in
Boston, Dubuque, and New York City have shown significant increases over time on standardized test scores.

**Modern Red Schoolhouse**

The Modern Red Schoolhouse (Kilgore, Doyle, & Linkowsky, 1996) was begun as a project of the Hudson Institute, a conservative think tank in Indianapolis. The program emphasizes strong core academic subjects, and in the elementary and middle grades is based on the E.D. Hirsch (1993) core curriculum. It makes extensive use of technology in instruction and assessment and has established benchmarks for academic performance that all students must achieve to be advanced into the next unit or grade.

Several elementary schools involved in the Modern Red Schoolhouse design have shown improvement on standardized tests in the early grades. In particular, a school in the Bronx showed substantial gains on a state essential skills test in reading and math.

**National Alliance**

The National Alliance for Restructuring Education (Rothman, 1996) is a partnership of states, school districts, and national organizations affiliated with the New Standards Project. The National Alliance is different from all other NAS designs in that its emphasis is more on systemic reform than on specific school-by-school restructuring. In particular, the National Alliance works to help states and districts establish standards, performance assessments, and accountability methods, and then helps schools design their own approaches to meet those standards. Districts are also urged to give schools greater autonomy and control over resources to find their own ways to meet high standards. In the state of Kentucky, a key National Alliance partner, schools engaged
with the National Alliance were much more likely than other Kentucky schools to earn awards for improving their students' performance.

Assessment of Schoolwide Reform

At the present time in the educational reform movement, there is great danger as well as opportunity for the reform of America's schools, particularly schools serving many students placed at risk. The danger is that after so many years of "reform", policymakers will decide that schools are simply intractable, and the impulse for reform will run out of steam. One concrete manifestation of this danger is represented by the disappointing results of Prospects, the national longitudinal study of Chapter 1 (Puma et al., 1997). This study found few positive effects of Chapter 1, and its successor, Title I. In 1997, there was a serious proposal in the House Committee on Education and the Workforce to zero out Title I. This did not pass, but without major changes in the programs it pays for, Title I will remain vulnerable. At $7.8 billion per year, Title I is the only substantial source of funding that high-poverty schools can use for reform.

On the other hand, there is also unprecedented opportunity for significant change. The 1994 reauthorization of Chapter 1 as Title I enabled schools in which at least 50% of students who qualify for free lunch to implement Title I as a schoolwide project. They can use their Title I dollars flexibly to meet the needs of all children, not just those identified as low performing. Even in non-schoolwide Title I schools, there is a new emphasis on using Title I funds to enhance the quality of instruction, not just to provide remedial services or classroom aides (Slavin & Fashola, 1998).
Action in the U.S. Congress is creating additional possibilities. Recent legislation authorized competitive grants of at least $50,000 per year for schools to use to cover the start-up costs of adopting proven, comprehensive reform models. Two separate grant programs were formed, one ($120 million) for Title I schools and one ($25 million) for non-Title I schools. The possibilities of this legislation are revolutionary. For the first time, evidence of effectiveness could become an essential element in the school reform process. If continued over time, a funding program of this kind could provide an incentive for researchers and developers to create a wide variety of schoolwide reform models, specifically designed to be replicable and rigorously evaluated in comparison to control groups (Slavin & Fashola, 1998).

Among the school designs mentioned in this research, Roots and Wings met with the highest evaluation criteria for achievement based on effectiveness and replicability and was the most wide replicated (Slavin & Fashola, 1998).

A key advantage of comprehensive schoolwide models is that the developers have thought through an overall school plan and the coordination of the elements, and how to phase them in over time. In building a schoolwide model from components that are proven, according to Slavin and Fashola (1998), there are three key types of interventions schools should look for, as follows:

1. Curriculum and Instruction: The most important set of interventions are those that affect what happens between children and teachers every day. Schools should review instructional programs in each major area of the curriculum, focusing on approaches that have evidence of effectiveness in comparison to matched control groups. Robert E.
Slavin and Olatokunbo S. Fashola in Show Me the Evidence! (1998) have come up with a list of elementary and secondary programs with good evidence of effectiveness.

Improving the quality of classroom instruction is the best and most cost effective means of improving overall student achievement and preventing at-risk students from falling behind (Ogden and Germinario, 1994). In addition to extensive professional development, effective models tend to provide for a great deal of classroom follow-up from expert and/or peer coaches. They usually provide extensive curriculum-based assessment to enable teachers to continually adjust their pace and level of instruction and to identify individual children in need of extra assistance. Teachers implementing innovative curricula should have regular opportunities to meet to discuss what they are doing, to visit each others' classes, and to share materials and ideas (Petrie, 1995).

2. Programs for At-Risk Students: An overall school plan must provide services for at-risk students. In general, the best approaches to helping struggling students catch up with their peers involve one-to-one assistance targeted to the unique needs of the student. Most effective are tutoring programs involving certified teachers, such as those used in Reading Recovery (Pinnell, Lyons, DeFord, Bryk, & Seltzer, 1994) and in Success for All/Roots and Wings (Slavin, Madden, Dolan, & Wasik, 1996; Slavin, Madden, Dolan, Wasik, Ross, et al., 1996). However, tutoring approaches using paraprofessionals (Wasik & Slavin, 1993), volunteers (Wasik, 1997), and cross age peer tutors (Cohen, Kulik, & Kulik, 1982) can also be effective. In each case, tutoring and other supportive services are likely to work best if they are closely linked to classroom instruction, using the same materials and objectives but adapting teaching methods to students' needs.
3. Family Support: Any comprehensive schoolwide reform approach should include elements designed both to engage parents and to solve nonacademic problems that could interfere with children's school performance. Such programs are a part of almost all of the schoolwide approaches mentioned earlier in this research. Research has proven that students who perform better in schools generally have a higher degree of parental support at home, than those who do not (Cheng, 1996). In school-based management, parents receive a quality of service in which the students receive the education they need. The role of parents is that of partner and supporter. Parents participate in the school process, educate students cooperatively, put efforts to assist the healthy development of the school by contributing resources and information, and support and protect the school in times of difficulty and crisis (Berger, 1987; Cheng, 1991).

School District Strategies to Support School Change

Models presented to a school district should have the following essential characteristics according to Ogden and Germinario (1994):

- Each should have been rigorously evaluated in comparison to traditional control groups on measures of achievement and found to be markedly more effective.
- Each should have available trainers, materials, assessments, and other supports to enable schools to readily replicate the model.
- Each should have a tract record working in schools like those in the district, especially Title I schools.
- Each should be available and affordable to a large proportion of the district's schools.
Models should address the essential requirements for schoolwide change in areas of curriculum, instruction, assessment, provisions for students who are having difficulties keeping up, professional development, family support and any special needs of the school district in each location.

The school district's responsibility would be to figure out what is required to support each school model by assembling and synthesizing information on costs, requirements for released days for training, the need for any waivers or direct assistance to schools, and so on. This information should be organized in a format that enables schools to make fair comparisons among alternative models and to help the district plan how to support each design. District staffs should be clear on all of the practicalities, especially how the design costs will be paid for and what waivers from district or state policies will be sought or granted (Odgen and Germinario, 1994).

The school district should then decide and communicate to schools, how the new school will fit into the existing district or state initiatives. School staff and administrators should be assured that the new design will be aligned with district and state standards and assessments. Every effort should be made to communicate the idea that adoption of the new school design will not conflict with district or state policies and will in fact help accomplish them.

According to Slavin (1994), the school awareness process follows, in which meetings with the school staff, the corporations involved, parents, teachers, and members of the community are set up. At this time, principals should be encouraged to let everyone involved explore all options, not focus in immediately on one.
In order to understand the innovative model in this research, all printed material which has been discovered on worksite schools by this researcher up to the present time will be presented as follows.

Worksite Schools

The first worksite school opened its doors to 25 kindergarten students in 1987 in Dade County, Florida under superintendent Joseph Fernandez, who recognized the need to relieve overcrowding in the district's schools. After presenting the idea of worksite schools to members of the business community, Superintendent Fernandez's request for corporate participation was fulfilled by American Bankers Insurance Group (ABIG).

Together with the United Teachers of Dade County, these organizations, including the school district, set about creating the nation's first worksite school, a public school located on private corporate property. The business partner typically contributes the classroom and playground space, and may also provide maintenance, utilities and security for the worksite school. The school district provides teachers, administrators, materials, curriculum and management.

In the 1992-1993 school year in Florida, approximately 215 public school children were enrolled in the worksite schools. The worksite schools serve the children of the employees, or the children of college students in the case of the Miami-Dade Community College, but other children in the zone may also attend the worksite school. At the Miami International Airport, employees of the airport itself, and on-site employees of businesses that serve the airport - for example, car rental agencies or food service concessionaires - are eligible to enroll their children in the worksite school.
When the airport's worksite school was created, existing space within the building was dedicated to the school. The hospital and college brought in portable classrooms for their worksite schools. Portables were initially used at American Bankers Insurance Group until the company built a permanent building to house the school (Beales, 1994).

Currently there are seventeen operating worksite schools in the United States. General similarities that exist among these schools are presented below, to identify a review of literature on the subject. Appendix 8 identifies the locations, names, size, and age groups served in the current worksite schools. Most information available is from Dade County, Florida schools. Appendix 7 from the Reason Foundation, identifies "How-To" guidelines for school districts and business partners in setting up a worksite school.

In 1993, Hewlett-Packard Company in partnership with the Santa Rosa City School District established California's first worksite school of its kind. H. Lewis Alsobrook, the School District Superintendent, approached Hewlett-Packard with the idea in 1991. In February 1993, the school opened its doors to approximately sixty public school children in kindergarten and the first grade (Reason Foundation Report, 1995).

The Downtown Open School in Minneapolis, Minnesota, located in an office building in the heart of the city, has two corporate partners, IDS Financial Services and Northern States Power Company (NSP). Beginning in 1991, 150 students in grades kindergarten through the third grade attend the worksite school.

Cost Sharing

Spending allocations for worksite schools follow the same procedure as regular public schools. In Florida, state money is allocated based on the number of "Full Time Equivalent" (FTE) students attending a particular school. Just as with regular public
schools, worksite schools increase their revenues with every child enrolled. Table 1 shows the 1991-1992 school year, operating expenses paid for by the American Bankers Insurance Group.

Table 1 1991-1992 Operating Expenses-American Banker's Insurance Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Expenses</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Maintenance</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Maintenance</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Insurance</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$48,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dade County Public Schools, Reason Foundation, 1993

Under the terms of the agreement with Hidden Valley's school and Hewlett-Packard in California, Hewlett-Packard is leasing 2.6 acres of land to the Santa Rosa City School District for $1-a-year with a ten-year renewable lease. Hewlett-Packard's other major contribution to the project was site preparation, including relocating gas and electrical lines, landscaping, grading, constructing playground areas, installing lighting, and paving a driveway and parking lot. In addition, Hewlett-Packard approved an $89,000 grant to help the District defray start-up costs associated with the new school.
The Santa Rosa City School District supplied two portable buildings to house the students, playground equipment, and school furnishings, and except for grounds maintenance, pays all operating costs including teacher salaries, utilities, maintenance, and school supplies. School District officials estimated that the Hidden Valley School at Hewlett-Packard saved the county $1.9 million in classroom construction costs in their first three years of operation (Wildavsky, 1993).

American Bankers Insurance Group and the Miami-Dade Community College share the cost of liability insurance with their worksite schools. At Mt. Sinai Hospital, the cost is carried entirely by the school district. In every case, the businesses provide after-school child care, charging parents a nominal fee for the service (American Bankers Insurance Group, 1994).

The Downtown Open School in Minneapolis receives $100,000 per year from each of its two sponsors, IDS Financial Services and Northern States Power Company. This helps to pay for start-up costs, leasing space, utilities and janitorial services.

**Organization**

At the center of each worksite school is a single "lead teacher," who has multiple responsibilities such as teaching, supervising and administering the worksite school on site, managing other worksite school teachers and staff, and promoting the worksite school to parents, employers, and the community. Qualification standards for lead teachers are higher than for a regular teacher. Lead teachers generally have extensive teaching experience, a master's degree and management aptitude. They are selected by a panel that includes representatives from the school district, the teacher's union, and the business partner. Lead teachers earn a supplement equivalent to one eighth of their
annual base salary (Interview conducted by Janet Beales with Dan Tosado, Executive Director, Division of Professionalization Technical Assistance and Support, Dade County Public Schools, September 8, 1992).

Each worksite school affiliates with a "host school," the nearest public school serving the same grades as the worksite school. The lead teacher acts as the on-site supervisor at the worksite school, and the principal at the host school oversees the worksite school. In some cases, the worksite school has a principal appointed by the school district at its location. Services provided by the host school include administration, financial budgeting, and school lunches. In addition, the worksite school looks to the host school for the provision of special programs or events. For example, children enrolled at the worksite school may be brought to the host school to participate in holiday programs. Alternatively, music teachers, art teachers, physical education teachers, counselors, and nurses who either serve the host school or the district may make regular visits to the worksite school to provide their services to the worksite school students as part of the district's regular curriculum.

**Educational Benefits**

Educational benefits, according to Mildred Smith, lead teacher at the Miami International Airport's worksite school and a thirty-year veteran of public education, are the advantages they provide to the child. Children receive more attention and support at the worksite school than in a regular public school. Proximity of the workplace to the classroom enables children to have more time to interact with their parents during the morning commute together and throughout the day, for example, during the lunch hour or when parent volunteers assist in the classroom. Interaction between parent and teacher is
also enhanced because parents must physically enter the school twice each day to sign their child in and out of class.

If test scores are used as the criterion for successful academic performance, a 1991 study conducted by the Dade County School District found academic performance to be higher than the district and national average among the 72 students attending the worksite school located at American Bankers Insurance Groups (ABIG). Results from the Stanford Achievement Test, administered to grades K-2, show that the worksite school students consistently ranked higher in reading, math, and science skills across all grade levels. Table 2 shows test scores by grade level and across three comparative groups: worksite school students, students who attend regular Dade County public schools, and the national public school population. No adjustments were made for possible socioeconomic differences between the groups compared.

School attendance was also higher at the worksite school at American Bankers Insurance Group compared to the district average. Students attending regular public schools missed an average of 10.46 days. By comparison, worksite school students missed fewer days of school averaging 8.46 absences (Abella, 1991).
Table 2  
**Wk (WKS) Stanford Scores Vs. Dade County Public School Scores (DCPS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gr K WKS</th>
<th>DCPS</th>
<th>Gr 1 WKS</th>
<th>DCPS</th>
<th>Gr 2 WKS</th>
<th>DCPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Reading</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Math</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: National Average Scores are Scaled to the 50th Percentile

Source: Dade County Public Schools, Reason Foundation, 1990

**Taxpayers Benefits**

Because businesses assume the financial burden of providing school facilities, ultimately the taxpayer is spared the cost of building new infrastructure. In 1990, the Dade County school district estimated that the three worksite schools in operation at that time had saved the county $1.9 million in construction costs alone (Abella, 1991). For every classroom built, Dade County estimates it saves $216,000. This does not include the tens of thousands of dollars saved each year on utilities, maintenance, security, and landscaping (See Table 1 for operating expenses paid by the American Bankers Insurance Group). Between 1987 and 1990, the worksite school located at ABIG saved the district over a million dollars, according to the school district, because expenditures on building construction and some operating expenses were paid for by ABIG ("Worksite Schools," Dade County Public Schools, Division of Professionalization, p. 2).

In addition, busing costs are eliminated because children share the commute with their parents to the worksite school. As of 1990, Dade County School District spent...
$1,400 a year on each child it bused to school. Approximately 17 percent of Dade County school children are bused ("Worksite Schools," Dade County Public Schools, Division of Professionalization). Applying these measures to students enrolled at worksite schools, the district saves $65,000 per year on busing (Based on the 1990 enrollment of 275 students in worksite schools).

These cost savings sprang from the fact that Dade County faced an overcrowded school system. Worksite schools relieved some of that pressure by providing "free" infrastructure. Although teachers had to be hired for the worksite schools, they would have been hired in the absence of worksite schools to keep pace with enrollment growth.

If worksite schools are established in areas that do not have problems with overcrowding, the benefits to the community at large are not as great, and the worksite school could actually end up increasing costs to the state and the taxpayer. Even though the school building may be "free", the teachers, staff, furniture, and supplies needed to fill it are not. If the students enrolled at a worksite school come from an under-enrolled district, the presence of the worksite school will increase fixed costs without increasing revenues to the district(s).

There may be other reasons for establishing a worksite school under conditions of under-enrollment that outweigh the additional costs imposed on districts or the state. Desegregating classrooms, increasing parental involvement, facilitating daycare logistics, improving the classroom surroundings, or better serving student and parent needs are all reasons that a worksite school might be a good investment even when overcrowding or dilapidated facilities are not a problem. However, worksite schools are most cost-effective when they alleviate the need for new construction.
Teachers' Unions Benefit

The teachers' union in Dade County is a strong supporter of worksite schools. The United Teachers of Dade County (UTD), representing 20,000 teachers, was a full partner in the effort to initiate and implement the program. Union leaders joined with their counterparts in the school district and business community to promote the idea of business and community groups. The union participated in designing the program and continues to be involved in selecting lead teachers to staff the worksite schools. The position of lead teacher is one that offers more administrative and decision-making authority, greater supervisory responsibility, and more teacher autonomy. Lead teacher supplements, amounting to one eighth of annual base salary, reflect the more advanced professional status of lead teachers.

Classroom Diversity and Attendance

Desegregation was one of the hoped-for consequences of worksite schools, according to their founders. Ethnic and socioeconomic diversity in the classroom have resulted from taking students out of segregated neighborhoods and educating them at the workplace. In three out of the four worksite schools in Dade County, the worksite classrooms show greater racial balance than exists at the host schools with which the worksite schools are associated. Only the worksite school at the American Bankers Insurance Group could be said to have less diversity in its classrooms as compared to its host school. Table 3 shows the ethnic diversity within each worksite school. While classroom diversity is apparent, many people initially expressed concern during the planning process that the schools would be elitist institutions serving the affluent, white
children of professionals. Worksite school organizers met with parents, individual teachers, and community members to address these initial concerns.

In all the schools investigated, approximately 80 percent of the worksite schools are attended by children of employees of the companies involved. Enrollment is also open to all children, but priority is given to children of the employees (Reason Foundation Report, 1995).

Parents Benefit

Just as attendance rates are higher for students at worksite schools, they are also higher among parent employees with children enrolled in the worksite schools. In a survey of parents, done as part of Dade County's 1991 evaluation of the worksite school

Table 3  Dade County Worksite School Summary (1987-1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Cutler Ridge</th>
<th>Miami Springs</th>
<th>Bunche Park</th>
<th>North Beach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grades:</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>K-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Comp.</td>
<td>77% W/O</td>
<td>28% W/O</td>
<td>9% W</td>
<td>36% W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14% L</td>
<td>38% L</td>
<td>17% L</td>
<td>36% L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4% AA</td>
<td>34% AA</td>
<td>72% AA</td>
<td>26% AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2% A</td>
<td>1% A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W/O - White/Other  W - White  L - Latin Amer  AA - African Amer  A-Asian

Source: Reason Foundation, 1993

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
at the American Bankers Insurance Group, parents self-reported being less absent, more satisfied with their jobs, and more likely to remain at their jobs ("Worksite Schools", 1990). Responses by supervisors confirming lower absenteeism and turnover rates are reported under the next section.

Moreover, parents responded that the worksite school program had a positive impact on their lifestyle. Over 90 percent of the 55 parents surveyed claimed to be more involved with their child's education, more likely to volunteer in the classroom, and better able to communicate with their child during the work week. Nearly all parents said that they spent less time driving during the week because of the worksite school program, and most claimed the program had saved them money ("Worksite Schools," 1990).

**Businesses Benefit**

In every instance, the worksite schools were brought on site because they fulfilled a need of the business partner. Because worksite schools evolve freely under market conditions, a partnership arises when the business perceives that the potential benefits outweigh the projected costs. At the American Bankers Insurance Group, the only business for which evaluative data are available, turnover has declined 9.5 percent and absenteeism has fallen 30 percent among parents with children enrolled in the worksite classrooms. In a survey of parent-employees at the American Bankers Insurance Group, 98 percent claimed that having their child attend the worksite school helped them concentrate more on their work. When supervisors were asked to rate the productivity of parent-employees compared to their peers, 70 percent of the 60 parent-employees evaluated were rated "above-average" when compared to their co-workers (Abella, 1991).

A spokesperson for the American Bankers Insurance Group said that the worksite
school had enhanced the corporate climate of their company, and added to employee satisfaction. The overall opinion is that productivity and morale are increased because of the peace of mind that the parents enjoy (Abella, 1991).

The Florida legislature passed a state statute in 1990 to encourage more such cooperation between businesses and schools. One of its provisions is a local ad valorem tax exemption for companies which establish worksite schools. The exemption grants relief from local property taxes (Florida does not have a state ad valorem tax on property assessed against the business's property dedicated to the school -See Appendix IV. Appendices V and VI show contract agreements for worksite schools).

**Equal Access**

Opponents of worksite schools could cite the equal access laws in which states guarantee equal protection of the law to all children with respect to school assignment. They could petition that worksite schools not restrict enrollment by granting enrollment status to the children of parents working at the host business.

However, supporters of worksite schools indicate that public schools do not now provide equal access. Most students are assigned to schools by neighborhood, not by preference. Even where open-enrollment, or public-school choice policies exist, enrollment is restricted on a space-available basis with priority given to children within a school's or district's boundaries (Beales, 1991).

Access can and should be limited, but not for reasons of discrimination based on factors such as race, gender, or religion. Past experience with the worksite schools in Dade County, Florida, indicates that discrimination based on race has not occurred (See Table 3). These worksite schools educate children from a broad cross-section of different
These worksite schools reflect the diverse ethnic and educational backgrounds of employees in the workplace from whose children they draw. By their very nature, worksite schools promise more classroom diversity than conventional neighborhood public schools whose enrollment demographics correspond directly to living patterns and housing prices (Beales, 1991).

Opponents to worksite schools may object to the priority status given to the children of the American Bankers Insurance Group or Hewlett-Packard employees, for example, but without it these companies would have little incentive to sponsor a worksite school. Businesses have an incentive to provide worksite schools if they know their employees value the program as an important employee benefit associated with their company. If priority status were taken away, the incentive would be diluted with the unintended result being that fewer businesses would be willing to sponsor worksite schools. For worksite schools to proliferate, priority status for the children of sponsoring organizations must be protected (Beales, 1991).

Conclusion

Since the release of At Nation at Risk in 1983, demands from the business world and politicians for school reform, has made it inevitable that business and educational leaders work together to better equip our youth for future job skills. Although the literature reveals that the reform movements of the 1980s and 1990s have had little impact on teaching and learning, at the heart of today's educational reform movement can be found the argument that schools must be restructured in order for them to efficiently meet the needs of America in the twenty-first century, rather than programs or methods.
Reformers made the connection between economic inadequacy and the educational system, and education was viewed as a vehicle to recapture economic superiority in the world. School-wide replicable systems then became the target of attention to meet the demands of the business world in preparing our students for the workforce.

The former model of school governance, which often provided central office officials great authority and granted only limited discretion to administrators, teachers, and others at school sites, was replaced by site-based management, utilizing practices found to be effective in business. Site based management, along with Total Quality Management, paved the way for worksite schools in the United States, two business tools found also to be effective in educational leadership.

The 1980s and 1990s were characterized by three ‘waves’ of business involvement in schools. The first wave was a time of developing school-business partnerships. The second wave focused on the application of sound management principles in schools. In an effort to bring management expertise to schools, businesses brought strategic planning and other management seminars to school personnel, using performance-based systems to help schools with the imperatives of site-based management and accountability issues.

The mid-1990s brought the fourth wave of new business involvement with schools with different characteristics than any of the previous waves. The commitment in the fourth wave was to achieve fundamental system reform, by making the choice to bolster educators and their thinking by providing advocacy, pressure, and ideas from external groups like the broader business community. There is recognition that there are no real “quick fixes” to problems in education, and focuses on key systemic factors that
provide leverage. This leverage called for real social and organizational change, and included initiatives to deal with content and methods of education and sticking to real goals. Another lesson learned from the fourth wave was an understanding of the politics of school reform, and schools can get help from the business world with their management issues. Restructuring schools is about significant organizational change, which is an inherently political process because a range of stakeholder interests are involved.

Fulfilling the job skills gap requires a collective investment by both the business and educational worlds in training our youth to properly fill the jobs in the American economy, using effective site based management techniques. A study of effective schools which use effective collaboration between businesses or groups and public education revealed similarities with Professional Development Schools, and New American Schools consisting of Roots and Wings, the Atlas Communities, Audrey Cohen schools, Co-NECT, Expeditionary Learning, the Modern Red Schoolhouse, and the National Alliance.

This led up to the present study of the worksite school, in which a private corporation supplies land and the buildings for a public school to be housed on its private property. The business partner typically contributes the classroom and playground space, and may also provide maintenance, utilities and security for the worksite school. The school district provides teachers, administrators, materials, curriculum and management.

Studies of the literature revealed common practices of worksite schools which currently are aimed at grades kindergarten through third, with a few going as high as fifth
grade. The higher grade levels were found to require too costly of materials, classroom supplies, and equipment, to make it feasible for a business partner to afford its operations.

Priority status for enrollment at worksite schools are offered to children of the employees of the company represented, but without that benefit, companies would not have the incentive to open worksite schools and relieve busing, building expenses and overcrowding in public school districts.

The literature suggests that worksite schools could help bridge the gap between business and education, and the need to prepare our students for the technological and higher level thinking skills required for the future.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Training students for the job market and identifying the components and incentives in the structure of a successful, replicable school model have been the themes providing the impetus for both the modern and earlier debates on school reform. The participants are also the same - business leaders, school managers, teacher unions, government officials, and university professors. Business leaders in both the 1800s and up to the present time, chastise the schools as being wasteful and inefficient, and for failing to adequately prepare students for the workforce. Although over one hundred years divides these businessmen, their arguments are nearly identical: schools must change to efficiently meet the needs of a changing economy and compete in a global market. Most do agree on the facts that schoolwide reform movements, and collaboration between education and business, are necessary to train our youth to properly fill jobs in the American economy. One such collaboration between education and business is the worksite school.

This chapter includes a discussion of the methodology used to explore worksite schools currently in operation in the United States. The applied research design, including
the instrumentation, data collected, and research questions, are described, followed by a summary of the chapter.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe the components and incentives identified by the administrators and employees involved, in the operation of worksite schools currently in operation in the United States. Its purpose was also to determine whether commonalities found in the surveys could provide information for further replication and models for worksite schools and to add to the body of knowledge on this new enterprise.

Research Questions

This quantitative research design intended to yield a descriptive study that sought to answer the following questions:

1. What do respondents perceive as the operational components that worksite schools should have?
2. Is there a difference between respondents' perceptions of what worksite components are needed versus what components currently exist?
3. What corporate employee incentives are most important to respondents at worksite schools?
4. What are the most important enrollment factors respondents think should be considered in the operation of worksite schools?
5. Do respondents perceive that the worksite school curriculum should be designed with the host corporations' needs in mind?

6. What do respondents perceive as the most important benefits to the public school district in which worksite schools are located?

7. Are there differences in the perceptions of corporation employees/parents, teachers and school district administrators concerning worksite operations and components?

Instrumentation

Based upon the non-availability of a suitable instrument specific to the purpose of the study, an instrument was constructed. Some survey questions were drawn from a questionnaire conducted by Hewlett-Packard's Hidden Valley Worksite School in California, which assessed the attitudes of 100 families involved in the school. A questionnaire was developed based upon the National Study of School Evaluation (1976) survey criteria and guidelines.

Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) submitted that a "questionnaire that measures attitudes generally must be constructed as an attitude scale" (p. 297). Therefore, a Likert-type scale was used to measure responses because it allows an accurate assessment of beliefs or opinions (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997). Respondents were presented with a fixed-response alternative question format that limited the number of choices and required the respondent to select from a predetermined set of responses ranging from 1 to 5. A response of 1 equaled "disagree", 2 "somewhat disagree", 3 "neutral", 4 "somewhat agree" and 5 "agree".
The final version of the instrument (see Appendix V) was designed to obtain the requested information for analysis with four component domains, and five incentive domains. Questions 1 through 8 addressed "corporate staff involvement component" domains, while questions 9 through 16 dealt with "worksite school staff interpersonal component" domains, 17 through 22 with "worksite school enrollment component" domains, 23 through 30 with "worksite corporation components". Questions 31 through 69 dealt with incentives. Questions 31 through 38 asked corporate employees what they considered important incentives to staying at a worksite school, questions 39 through 48 dealt with school district incentives, questions 49 through 56 with student incentives, questions 57 through 64 dealt with parent-teacher involvement incentives, and questions 65 through 69 with factors regarding the grade levels covered as incentives to enroll students in the worksite schools. The survey questionnaire concluded in questions 70 through 72 with whether those surveyed could provide additional factors that they identified as necessary to the successful operation of a worksite school.

Instrumentation Validation

This instrument was developed using the components and incentives identified in Hewlett-Packard's Hidden Valley's survey administered to its parents in 1996. Parents with students enrolled at the worksite school were asked their perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of having their children enrolled at a school located at their worksite. Administrators at each location were invited to randomly submit the survey to employees.
For purposes of improving upon content validity, the final version of the survey was distributed to members of the marketing faculty at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, the educational leadership department, and the Canon Center for Survey Research located on the campus of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The above members were asked to review the questions in the survey, comment on whether any difficulties understanding the survey questions existed, and asked to suggest any aspects of the questions that needed to be modified, added or deleted. This process was necessary in order to obtain a degree of consensus from a heterogeneous group of experts in the field of business, education and survey research design. Based upon feedback from these members, the instrument was modified to reflect the individual, subjective judgments of the reviewers.

Sample

The population under consideration for this study was worksite schools in operation in the United States, along with the sponsoring corporations. Addresses of the schools were obtained from telephone numbers supplied by “Schools At Work”, a national consulting firm specializing in the development of worksite schools and located in Windermere, Florida under the ownership of Ms. Mary Ann Ward. The database revealed seventeen worksite schools currently in operation in the United States and falling under the definition of a worksite school or free public schools (grades K through 3) which is located and operated on the grounds of private corporations and serves the children of the employees of the host corporation involved. A sample of 64 host corporation employees/parents, worksite schoolteachers, worksite school administrators,
and school district staff were selected from each of the seventeen worksite schools (Macmillan and Schemata, 1997, p. 172).

Appendix IX shows the names of the worksite schools, the year the schools opened, acreages, grade levels covered by each school, the number of students enrolled, square footage of the buildings, and the number of classrooms. They are listed in order of the first worksite school opened, to the latest. Appendix IX also contains contact information for each of the schools listed.

Design of the Study

The descriptive design utilized mail survey data to determine the components and incentives considered as important by employees and parents in the successful operation of worksite schools in the United States. This method was chosen because surveys are used frequently in business, politics, government, sociology, public health, psychology, and education as accurate information can be obtained and adapted to a wide range of uses (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997). Self-addressed, stamped envelopes were included with the survey to increase the likelihood of responses.

Data Collecting Procedures

The survey was conducted according to the steps outlined in McMillan and Schumacher, (1997). This method involves defining purpose and objectives, selecting a target population, developing techniques for gathering data, sampling, creating a proper letter of transmittal, and sending follow-up letters to increase response rates. Morris and Fitz-Gibbon (1978) suggested creating a chart to keep track of the progress of each
response with timelines. This was done in order to either call or send the worksite school another survey in case the original one was lost or misplaced. Contact was made after the initial two-week deadline had gone by with no returned surveys from a particular school and corporation. This contact also invited administrators to randomly select the survey participants.

A letter of transmittal with informed consent information (see Appendix IV) that introduced the questionnaire to the respective corporation's human resource manager was used for the initial mailing. The letter was printed on University of Nevada, Las Vegas letterhead to enhance the credibility of the study. A subsequent mailing and a phone call were performed if there was no response.

Data collected from the returned questionnaires were coded and entered into the Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 1997) for a descriptive analysis. Collected data indicated the mean, standard deviations, and range of scores for the variables addressed. Data presentations were offered using relevant tables and appropriate narrative interpretations to enhance understanding of the related material.

Analysis of Collected Data

The purpose of this study was to determine whether employees, parents, teachers, administrators, and managers perceive the components and incentives presented in the survey as necessary for worksite school operations.

Surveys were coded according to the type of occupation represented by respondents. Three categories were used; host corporation employees/parents, teachers,
and school district administrators who responded to the survey. SPSS software (version 9.0) was used to assimilate this information.

Research question number one which asked; “What do respondents perceive as the operational components worksite schools should have?” was analyzed by using operational component questions 23 through 26 of the survey. The frequencies, mean, and standard deviation of these questions were analyzed to determine what respondents considered the most to least in importance.

Research question number two related to survey questions 27 through 30. Research question number three related to survey questions 31 through 34. Research question number four related to survey questions 17 through 19. Research question number five related to survey question 26. Research question number six related to survey questions 39 through 43. The same method was used in determining frequencies, means and standard deviations for all research question numbers. The data was processed through the SPSS (Version 9.0) statistical software.

Research question number seven asked whether there were differences in the perceptions of corporation employees/parents, teachers, and school district administrators concerning worksite operations and incentives. Surveys were coded based on the three occupational categories; 1. corporation employees/parents, 2. teachers, and 3. school district administrators. A one-way ANOVA was run for mean scores on questions 1-12, 17-19, 23-34, and 39-43 using occupation as the factor.

Significance of the Study

Determining which components identified in the survey are necessary for the
operation of a worksite school, will assist in the development of schoolwide models that will aid educators in operating future successful worksite schools. Determining the components and incentives of worksite schools will help educators gain a better understanding of the needs of all workers involved in the school and host corporation and further the ability of education and training institutions to deliver what they require. If incentives are found for businesses to develop worksite schools, more will be created in the United States. This would also relieve taxpayers’ costs for busing, buildings, and other maintenance costs for schools, and increase employee morale and decrease turnover for the corporations involved. The development of more worksite schools also could assist students in preparing for future jobs, as business expertise and needs are delivered to them firsthand; from the firms requiring the workers.

Summary

This chapter focused on the methodology utilized in this study, including the instrumentation, instrument validation, population and sample size from which the data was collected, as well as research questions that were addressed. A discussion of the methods used to collect and analyze the data, and the significance of the study were also presented. It was noted that this descriptive research design sought to analyze responses from employees and employers of worksite schools in the United States regarding the components and incentives necessary to operate public schools located on private corporate property, and whether the worksite school they are involved with, meets the necessary criteria.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to describe the perceptions of employees, parents and administrators involved with worksite schools concerning the incentives and components necessary for the operation of these schools in the United States. An additional objective determined whether the worksite schools and their host corporations' personnel perceived their locations as having the components necessary to operate a successful worksite school.

The essential tool of reform and restructuring which helped form the basis for the operation of worksite schools in the United States came as a result of the merger of educational and business techniques. The 'school or site based management theory' (Herman, 1993) was used as the focus of the conceptual framework for this study. Examination of the organizational theories and current corporate innovations behind this technique, reveal the following points which will be used as the key characteristics of 'site based management'. They formed the tenets for chapter four as they relate to the findings of each research question:

* Focus on the individual school building.

* Decentralization and the absence of bureaucracy.
* Collaborative management practices employing shared decision-making strategies and consistent communication.

* Performance incentives that provide teamwork rewards for quality and productivity.

This chapter further describes the response rate to the mailed questionnaire and the frequency of the respondents' answers to the survey questions. It also includes a review of the research methodology and summarizes the answers to the research questions.

Methodology/Instrumentation

Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) submit that a "questionnaire that measures attitudes generally must be constructed as an attitude scale" (p. 297). Consequently, a customized questionnaire was developed using a Likert-type scale to measure responses because scales "allow fairly accurate assessments of beliefs or opinions" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997. p. 256). Respondents were presented with a limited number of choices based upon whether personnel involved with operating worksite schools in the United States considered the components and incentives in the survey as necessary operational tools using an interval scale ranging from 1 to 5. A response of 1 equaled "disagree", 2 "somewhat disagree", 3 "neutral", 4 "somewhat agree" and 5 "agree". A "neutral" choice was used but carefully observed given that "respondents have a tendency to cluster evidences in the middle category" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 258).

The final version of the instrument (see Appendix V) was designed to obtain the requested information for analysis with four component domains, and five incentive
domains. Questions 1 through 8 addressed "corporate staff involvement component" domains, while questions 9 through 16 dealt with "worksite school staff interpersonal component" domains, 17 through 22 with "worksite school enrollment component" domains, 23 through 30 with "worksite corporation components". Questions 31 through 69 dealt with incentives. Questions 31 through 38 asked corporate employees what they considered important incentives to staying at a host corporation of a worksite school. Questions 39 through 48 dealt with school district incentives, questions 49 through 56 with student incentives, questions 57 through 64 with parent-teacher involvement incentives, and questions 65 through 69 with factors regarding grade levels covered as incentives to enroll students at the worksite schools. The questionnaire concluded in questions 70 through 72 with whether those surveyed could provide additional factors that they identified as necessary to the successful operation of a worksite school.

Results were analyzed in two ways. First, the distribution of responses were examined to determine the percentage of respondents that agreed and disagreed with each statement, along with those who were neutral. Second, t tests were conducted on the means of the questions to determine whether the differences between means were significant due to something other than random and sampling errors. A random error can manifest itself in the lack of consistency of repeated or equivalent measurements when the measurements are made on the same object or person (Churchill, Gilbert A., 1987, p. 382). Sampling error is the difference between the observed values of a variable and the long-run average of the observed values in repetition of the measurement (Mosteller, Frederick, 1968, p. 113).

The purpose of this analysis was to be able to state whether or not the differences
in means or responses in the various questions were statistically significantly different. When means are statistically significantly different, it can be concluded that the differences are meaningful and substantive.

Response Rate and Frequencies

Responses to the questionnaire were received from surveys that were mailed to the seventeen operating worksite schools in the United States and their host corporations. Administrators from the schools and corporations, teachers, and employees/parents were selected to use the largest sample possible, since the larger the sample “the more representative it will be of the population” (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 172). The sample was selected from a database of employees of the schools and host corporations provided by “Schools at Work,” a national consulting firm located in Windermere, Florida that specializes in the development of worksite schools. The database revealed 17 schools currently in operation in the United States that fit the definition of a worksite school or a free public school (grades K through 3) located and operated on the grounds of a private corporation that serves the children of the employees of the host corporation involved. Because of the small number of worksite schools currently in operation in the United States, all of the 17 schools were contacted, and used in the survey.

Out of 1,088 mailed surveys, the frequency of returned surveys included 188 respondents. However, 256 were returned and not distributed, due to invalid addresses or schools no longer in operation as worksite schools. A sample of 32 host corporation employees/parents, and 32 worksite school teachers/school district staff and
administrators were selected from each of the 17 worksite schools. The administrators at each location were asked to randomly assign the surveys.

Chapter four presents the data in quantitative form. Chapter five of this paper discusses the findings qualitatively and in a more detailed, discussion format.

Returned surveys represented 22.6% (188/832) of the sampled population involved with worksite schools in the United States. The surveys were coded in order to determine the occupations of those responding to the survey. Table 4 reveals the occupations of respondents who answered the survey:

Table 4  Occupations of Respondents Who Returned Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations of Participants</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host Corporation Employees/Parents</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksite Administrators/District Staff</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question Number One

The quantitative research design yielded a descriptive study that sought to answer seven research questions. The first research question was:

1. What do respondents perceive as the operational components that worksite schools should have?
Table 5 includes the means and standard deviations of the responses regarding operational components. Higher standard deviations indicate more variance across responses. A Likert scale was used ranging from 1 to 5. A response of 1 equaled “disagree”, 2 “somewhat disagree”, 3 “neutral”, 4 “somewhat agree” and 5 “agree”.

Table 5  **Worksite School Desired Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 23: have a min. of 1,500 employees</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 24: provide bldg, landsc, &amp; bldg. maintenance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. 25: Provide tech, equip, &amp; ongoing assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. 26: enhance the curriculum to the corp. involved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 23 dealt with the minimum number of employees needed to successfully host a worksite school. Janet Beales, (1992), conducted research at Hewlett-Packard in 1991 which suggested that 1,500 employees or more is a safe threshold for successful worksite school operations. Regarding this issue, 113 out of 186 respondents (61%) agreed with the statement that the host corporation should have a minimum of 1,500 employees worksite schools to be successful. Only 54 of the respondents (29%) disagreed with the statement.
Question 24 asked what host corporations should have to maintain worksite schools besides the building. Table 5 reveals that 97 out of 188 respondents (52%) agreed with the statement that host corporations should supply not only the building, but also the landscaping and the on-going maintenance for the schools. However, only 6 of the respondents (3%) disagreed with the statement. Also, 85 respondents answered with a 3 or neutral which means that 45% or almost half seemed to have no opinion to the importance of the components of the school building, landscaping and maintenance in worksite school operations.

Question 25 asked whether host corporations should provide technology equipment and assistance to worksite schools. Table 5 reveals that 142 respondents out of 188 (76%) agreed with the statement that the host corporations should provide technological assistance and equipment to worksite schools. Conversely, no respondents disagreed with the statement.

Question 26 of the survey dealt with whether host corporations should enhance the worksite school's curriculum to its types of businesses. Table 5 reveals that 167 out of 188 (89%) agreed with the statement that host corporations should be involved with the curriculum to train future workers for the industries involved. The survey question implied that if the host corporations are technology based, should the worksite school's curriculum have more technology integrated into the curriculum? For example, a math lesson could utilize some of the same software that its host corporation uses.

Paired t tests were conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in the levels of agreement of the means. Table 6 displays the results of the paired t tests.
First, the highest and second highest means were compared. Next the second and third highest means were compared. Finally, the third and fourth highest means were analyzed.

Table 6  **Paired t Tests on Survey Questions 23 through 26**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q. 25: provide tech, equip, &amp; ongoing assistance with</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. 26: enhance the curriculum to the corp. involved</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>2.299</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 24: provide bldg, landscape &amp; bldg. maintenance with</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. 25: provide tech, equip. &amp; ongoing assistance</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>5.147</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 23: have a min. of 1,500 employees with</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 24: provide bldg, landscape &amp; bldg. maintenance</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.450</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a p value of .05, statistically significant differences were found between the paired means of questions 25 and 26, questions 24 and 25 and questions 23 and 24. The results indicate that there was significantly more agreement with question 26 than with question 25, and that the differences are substantive and meaningful. Question 25, which asked if the host corporation should provide technology, equipment, and ongoing assistance, was paired with whether the corporation should enhance the curriculum to the
corporation involved. The respondents revealed that there is a discrepancy of opinion as the means differed significantly.

Question 24 which asked respondents if the host corporation should provide not only the building, but also the landscaping and maintenance, was paired with question 25 and asked respondents if the corporation should provide technology, equipment and ongoing assistance to the worksite school. There were also a variety of opinions on that subject as many could feel that corporate toward maintenance costs is more important than technology training for the students and vice versa.

Question 23 which asked if the corporation should have a minimum of 1,500 employees to successfully operate a worksite school, was paired with question 24, which asked respondents if the host corporation should provide the building, landscaping and building maintenance costs for the worksite school. There was also a statistically significant difference in the means of these pairs of questions as displayed in table 6.

While the respondents generally agreed with all four statements relating to questions 23 through 26 of the survey, they most strongly agreed with the statement pertaining to the enhancement of the curriculum, followed by the provision of technological support, equipment, and assistance. The differences were found to be statistically significant, thus reinforcing the ranking order of the means.

Research Question Number Two

Research question number two sought to determine if there is a difference between respondents' perceptions of what worksite operational components are needed
versus what components actually exist at the worksite schools. The second question states:

2. Is there a difference between respondents’ perceptions of what worksite components are needed versus what components currently exist?

Table 7 represents respondents opinions pertaining to what actually exists at worksite schools.

Question 27 on the survey dealt with whether the minimum number of 1,500 employees worked at the corporations. Regarding this issue, 68 out of 188 respondents (36%) felt that the corporations actually had at least 1,500 workers. Conversely, 90 of the respondents (48%) disagreed with this statement.

Question 28 asked respondents to designate whether they thought the host corporations actually provided buildings, landscaping and building maintenance for the worksite schools. Table 7 reveals that 155 out of 188 respondents (82%) agreed that the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Freq: 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 27: has a min. of 1,500 employees</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 28: provides bldg, landsc, &amp; bldg. maintenance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 29: provides tech, equip, &amp; ongoing assistance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 30: enhances the curric. to to the corp. involved</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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host corporations supplied building, maintenance, and landscaping for the worksite schools. Conversely 15 of the respondents (8%) disagreed with the statement.

Question 29 analyzed whether the host corporation at each location actually supplied the worksite school with technology equipment as well as ongoing technological assistance. Table 7 reveals that 135 out of 188 respondents (72%) agreed with the statement that the host corporation provides technological equipment and assistance. Conversely, 34 of the respondents (18%) disagreed with the statement. Question 30 on the survey asked respondents to designate whether the host corporation at their location enhanced the worksite school’s curriculum to the types of businesses involved.

Regarding this issue, 29 out of 188 respondents (15%) agreed with the statement that the host corporation integrated curriculum into the schools related to the industries involved. Conversely, 34 of the respondents (18%) disagreed with the statement.

Paired t tests were conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in the means. Table 8 displays the results of the paired t tests, comparing responses of what should exist versus what actually exists at each school.

Paired t tests were conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in the levels of agreement. Based on a p value of .05, statistically significant differences were found between the paired means of questions 26 and 30. Respondents thought that the worksite school curriculum should be enhanced by the type of business conducted by the host corporation. However, they disagreed that this was actually happening at their worksite school locations. This was verified by a significance level of .000. The mean of 4.62 revealed that respondents agreed that the host corporation should
Table 8  Paired t Tests of Responses of Should versus Actual Worksite School Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Should Exist (Mean)</th>
<th>Actually Exists (Mean)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 23/Q27 Has a min. of 1,500 employees</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>5.359</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24/Q28 Provides Landscaping</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>-4.670</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25/Q29 Provides Technology</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.922</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26/Q30 Enhances Curriculum to the Corporation</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>16.562</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

provide ideas to the worksite school regarding curriculum that correlate to its business interests. However the mean of 2.95 indicated that they thought this was not actually taking place at their schools. They also agreed that technology training and equipment should be provided to worksite school students. Landscaping and the minimum number of host corporation employees, was not as close in agreement.

Of particular interest was the finding that respondents did not agree that host corporation involvement in the curriculum actually existed at their worksite school sites. This was one of the lowest means at 2.95, in contrast to the mean of what should exist regarding the curriculum at 4.62.

Technology received a high percentage of agreement on both what should exist and what currently exists with means of 4.42 and 4.01. Respondents disagreed on matters
relating to the minimum number of employees; the provision of landscaping, and help with the curriculum. These three areas show significance at a p value of less than .05.

For three of the means; minimum of 1,500 employees, the provision of technology, and the enhancement of the curriculum, respondents considered that what actually existed was less than what should exist. However, in the case of the provision of building landscaping and maintenance, respondents felt that the assistance provided was more than respondents thought should be given to the worksite schools.

Out of 188 respondents, 113 (60%) agreed that the worksite schools should have a minimum of 1,500 employees. Only 68 (36%) of the 188 respondents agreed that this actually occurred.

Out of 188 respondents, 97 or 52% agreed that the host corporation should provide the building and its maintenance, plus landscaping to the worksite school. The majority or 155 out of 188 respondents (82%), agreed that this actually occurred at the worksite school locations.

Out of 188 respondents, 142 or 76% agreed that the host corporation should provide technological equipment and assistance to the worksite schools. Almost the same number of respondents or 135 out of 188 (72%), agreed that this actually occurred at the worksite schools.

Out of 188 respondents, 167 or 89% agreed that the host corporation should enhance the curriculum at the worksite school to conform to its business typology. Only 29 out of 188 or 15% agreed that this actually occurred at their worksite school locations.
Influence of Site Based Management Regarding Research Questions One & Two

Research questions one and two asked respondents what their perceptions are of the most important operational components worksite schools should have versus what components actually exist at each site.

The findings of research question one and the focus on the minimum number of employees in the corporation, corresponds with the first characteristic of site-based management as stated in the beginning of this chapter. There is a focus on the individual school building. This would include the building site and everything affiliated with making the school operate successfully. Rather than focus on the entire school district or schools in the entire state, the worksite school concept does focus on the individual school and its operations along with its host corporation’s individual needs. The attention on the school’s curriculum also reveals more attention to the individual school site and what type of business its host corporation is conducting to design the curriculum accordingly.
The third research question was:

3. What corporate employee incentives are most important to respondents at worksite schools?

Table 9 represents the frequencies of those surveyed responding to questions 31 through 34 on the survey, followed by the mean and the standard deviation. Questions 31 through 34 dealt with host corporation incentives and what incentives respondents perceived should exist in order to justify the expense of opening a worksite school on private property. It also provided the viewpoints of employees as to what incentives they considered the most important to the host corporation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Freq: 1 2 3 4 5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 31: increased employee morale</td>
<td>45 49 92 0 2</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 32: decreased employee turnover</td>
<td>8 2 18 26 134</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. 33: improved parent/teacher relationships</td>
<td>6 0 0 25 157</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. 34: lower transportation costs</td>
<td>28 0 16 19 125</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 31 involved the importance of increased employee morale as an incentive to workers at the host corporation. Only 2 out of 188 respondents (1%) agreed
with the statement that an improvement in employee morale was an important incentive
to hosting a worksite school, while 94 of the respondents (50%) disagreed with the
statement.

Question 32 dealt with the importance of decreased employee turnover as an
incentive for host corporation workers. Regarding this issue, 160 out of 188 respondents
(85%) agreed with the statement that decreased employee turnover was an important
incentive for employees. Only 10 respondents (5%) disagreed with the statement.

Question 33 asked if improved parent/teacher relationships was an incentive to
employees. Table 9 reveals that 182 out of 188 respondents (97%) agreed with the
statement that this incentive was important to host corporation employees. Whereas, six
of the respondents out of 188 (3%) disagreed with the statement.

Question 34 on the survey dealt with the importance of decreased transportation
costs as an incentive to host corporation employees, with a mean of 4.13. Table 9
reveals that 144 out of 188 respondents (77%) agreed with the statement that decreased
transportation costs to employees of the host corporation was an important incentive to
remain employed at the corporation. Conversely, 28 of the respondents (15%) disagreed
with the statement.

The lower standard deviation scores indicate that there was less variance in
opinions regarding increased employee morale, less corporate turnover, better
parent/teacher relationships, and lower transportation costs. The employee morale issue
had a lower mean, which indicates that this issue received less agreement that the other
three, in which the means were closer together.
Paired t tests were conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in the means. Table 10 displays the results of paired t tests. First, the highest and second highest responses were analyzed. Next, the second and third highest means were compared. Finally, the third and fourth highest means were analyzed.

Table 10  Paired t Tests on Survey Questions 31 through 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q. 33: improve parent/teacher relationships with</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. 32: decrease employee turnover at the corp.</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.370</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 32: decrease employee turnover at the corp. with</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 34: provide lower transportation costs</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.943</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 34: provide lower transportation costs with</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 31: increase employee morale at the corporation</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>14.148</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions 31 through 34 asked respondents what corporate employee incentives are most important to respondents at worksite school locations. The paired t test analysis on questions 31 through 34 revealed a statistically significant difference between questions 32 and 34, and questions 34 and 31.
Question 32 asked respondents if decreased employee turnover should be evident, paired with question 34 on lower transportation costs. There was a statistically significant difference between these means based on a value of .05. Respondents differed in their opinions based on their occupations and backgrounds. One possibility suggested by the finding is that the incentives of lower employee turnover and lower transportation costs are not highly related in topic. Thus, respondents differed in their opinions based on their occupations and backgrounds.

Question 34 reveals that respondents think that the incentives of lower transportation costs, paired with the incentive of increased employee morale in question 31 is not viewed similarly by all respondents. Lower transportation costs are measurable, whereas, employee morale is nebulous and hard to measure in a concrete sense. Therefore, there is a discrepancy in the opinions of respondents.

Question 33 regarding the employee incentive of improved parent/teacher relationships, was tested with question 32, involving decreased employee turnover at the corporation. There was found to be no statistically significant difference in opinions, which means that the levels of agreement on these two matters were substantially the same.

Influence of Site Based Management Regarding Research Question Three

Findings of research question three, reveals that most respondents consider parent/teacher relationships and decreased turnover as the most important incentives to having a worksite school. This entire question involved incentives that would entice employees to stay at the worksite school and host corporation. Parent/teacher relationship
follows the concept of teamwork, as parents who are also host corporate employees, must work as a team alongside the worksite school staff.

Research Question Number Four

The fourth research question was:

4. What is the most important enrollment factors respondents think should be considered in the operation of worksite schools?

Table 11 represents the frequencies of those surveyed responding to questions 17 through 19 which dealt with the worksite school enrollment components that respondents perceived a worksite school should have to operate successfully.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 17: Offered 1st to corp emp children</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 18: zoned as other public schools</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. 19: offer a waiting list</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 17 analyzed the importance of a worksite school-offering enrollment to host corporation employees' children first. Regarding this issue, 169 out of 188 respondents (90%) agreed with the statement that enrollment being offered to host
corporation employee's children first, was an important component of a worksite school operation. Conversely, only 19 out of 188 respondents (10%) disagreed with the statement.

Question 18 examined perceptions of worksite school zoning issues. Only 45 out of 188 respondents (24%) agreed with the statement that a worksite school being zoned as other public school was an important component of a successful worksite school operation. However, 130 out of 188 respondents (69%) disagreed with the statement.

Question 19 on the survey dealt with the issue of worksite schools offering a waiting list to children whose parents did not work at the host corporation. Regarding this issue, 118 out of 188 respondents (63%) agreed with the importance of a waiting list to non-employee's children as a component to a successful worksite school operation. Whereas, 57 of the respondents (30%) disagreed with the statement.

Paired t tests were conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in the means. Table 12 displays the results of the paired t tests. First, the highest and second highest responses were analyzed. Next the second and third highest means were compared.

Table 12 reveals that there is a statistically significant difference between both pairs of questions. School enrollment perceived as most important at worksite schools asked whether enrollment should be offered first to children of the host corporation employees (question 17). This had the highest frequency in agreement, and it was paired with the second highest or question 19. Question 19 asked respondents if there should be a waiting list for children who live in the area of the worksite school, but whose parents do not work for the host corporation. There was a large degree of discrepancy in the
Table 12  Paired t Tests on Survey Questions 17 through 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q17: offered first to children of host corp. employees</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19: offer an enrollment waiting list</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>5.881</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19: offer an enrollment waiting list with</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18: zoned as other public schools for enrollment</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>8.227</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

means of these two questions. They can be viewed from many perspectives, as host-corporation parents may think that if vacant spaces are filled from a waiting list of children of non-employees, individuals who are employed late in the school year, may not find room at the school for their children.

Question 19 regarding a waiting list was paired with question 18 about zoning the worksite school the same as other public schools for enrollment purposes. This also showed a high range of disagreement among respondents. This may be due to the fact that the employees/parents would want enrollment for their children first, and both questions 18 and 19 deal with opening the school’s enrollment up to children of parents who do not work at the worksite school. Most respondents to the survey were employees/parents, and they would differ in their viewpoint with teachers and school district administrators.
Influence of Site Based Management Regarding Research Question Four

Research question four asked respondents what enrollment factors should be considered in the operation of worksite schools. The components with the most respondents who answered a 5 or “agree” correlated with survey question number 17. Respondents thought that enrollment should be offered first to the children of employees who work at the host corporation. This again corresponds with the site based management theory which is focused on the individual school building itself, rather the bureaucracy of the school district headquarters.

Research Question Number Five

The fifth research question was:

5. Do respondents perceive that the worksite school curriculum should be designed with the host corporations’ needs in mind?

Table 13 represents the frequencies of those surveyed responding to question 26 concerning the host corporation curriculum component that respondents perceived a worksite school should have to operate successfully.

Table 13  Host Corporation Should Design Curriculum to Type of Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 26: Enhance the curriculum to the corp involved</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 26 on the survey dealt with whether the host corporation should design the worksite school’s curriculum to its type of business. Regarding this issue, 167 out of 188 respondents (89%) agreed with the statement that the host corporation should help the worksite school design the curriculum to help suit its needs, with a mean response of 4.62. Conversely, no respondents disagreed with the statement.

Research Question Number Six

The sixth research question was:

6. What do respondents perceive as important benefits to the public school district in which the worksite schools are located?

Table 14 represents the frequencies of those surveyed responding to questions 39 through 43 which dealt with the school district incentives that respondents perceived a worksite school should have to operate successfully.

Question 39 analyzed decreased maintenance costs to the school districts as an incentive to operate a worksite school. Regarding this issue, 129 out of 188 respondents (69%) agreed with the statement that lower maintenance costs was an important incentive to the school districts to host a worksite school. Conversely, only 16 of the respondents (9%) disagreed with the statement.

Question 40 of the survey dealt with the issue of the presence of worksite schools on private property in providing more school building space to school districts. Regarding this issue, 147 out of 188 respondents (78%) agreed that an important incentive to school districts to accommodate worksite schools, was that it provided more
available space for school buildings. Only 6 respondents (3%) disagreed with this statement.

Table 14  School District Incentives to Drive the Inclusion of Worksite Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 39: Decreased Maint. Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 40: More space for buildings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 41: Decreased trans costs to district</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 42: Improved &amp; enhanced curriculum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 43: Improved tech training</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 41 studied decreased transportation costs to school districts as an important incentive to accommodate worksite schools. Regarding this issue, 154 out of 188 respondents (82%) agreed that this was an important incentive to school districts. Whereas, six respondents (3%) disagreed with this statement.

Question 42 questioned the issue of an improved and enhanced curriculum to school districts as an incentive to accommodate worksite schools. Out of 188 respondents, 153 (81%) agreed that an improved curriculum was an important incentive
to school districts. However, 6 out of 188 respondents (3%) disagreed with this statement.

Question 43 of the survey dealt with improvement in technology training as a school district incentive to accommodate worksite schools. Regarding this issue, 155 out of 188 respondents (82%) agreed that the incentive of an improvement in technology training was important for school districts. Conversely, 29 out of 188 respondents (15%) disagreed with this statement.

The least amount of variance with a standard deviation score of only .90 indicated that lower transportation costs received the most agreement among participants. The other four questions had standard deviation scores in the same higher range, indicating more variance across responses to these issues.

Paired t tests were conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in the means. Table 15 displays the results of the paired t tests. First, the highest and second highest responses were analyzed. Next, the second and third highest means were compared. Then, the third and fourth highest means were analyzed. Finally, the fourth and fifth highest means were compared.

There was found to be no statistically significant differences between the paired means found in questions 39 through 43. This suggests that there was an equal level of agreement among the respondents for each of these questions.

Research Question Number Seven

The seventh research question was:

7. "Are there differences in the perceptions of corporation employees/parents,
teachers, and school district administrators concerning worksite operations and incentives?"

Table 15  **Paired t Tests on Survey Questions 39 through 43**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 42: improve &amp; enhance the school dist. curriculum with</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 40: provide more school building space</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 40: provide more school building space with</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 41: decrease transportation costs to the school district</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 41: decrease transportation costs to the school district with</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 39: decrease maintenance costs</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.283</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 39: decrease maint. costs with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 43: improve technology training</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>.865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 represents a disaggregation of the means of the major operations and incentives revealed throughout the survey as important to respondents. The survey questions, which correlate to all of the research questions, are represented.

**Comparison of the Three Occupational Groups**

In comparing the means of the three occupational groups, it was discovered that there were significant differences between the means of questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 17, 18, 19,
and 43 at the .05 level. These questions will be analyzed separately, using an F test, to determine the differences and why they occurred.

Question 1 questioned whether company executives should be involved in the daily operations of the school. The employees/parents agreed with a mean of 4.96. They felt strongly that they should be involved in daily aspects of operations at the worksite school. The teachers ‘disagreed’ with a mean of 1.33, and the school district administrators were ‘neutral’ with a mean of 3.84. This would indicate that the employees/parents want to be more involved with the worksite school, whereas the teachers do not want this to happen. This is a typical response. Many times teachers may not want their host to be involved on a daily basis, interpreting involvement as interference. Whereas, the school district administrators often feel obligated to accommodate both viewpoints by being on the side of the taxpayers as well as their employees.

Question 2 of the survey asked respondents if the host corporation executives should be involved in budgeting activities at the worksite school. Again, the employees/parents fell in the high ‘somewhat agree’ category. This may indicate that they want to know how their money is being spent. The teachers ‘disagreed’ with a mean of 1.50, and the school district administrators were again ‘neutral’ with a mean of 3.82.

Question 3 analyzed whether company executives should be involved in setting up the curriculum for the worksite school. The employees/parents agreed, with a mean of 4.88. They want to provide input into what subjects are taught at the school, and may think that this will aid the company in providing successful future workers. The teachers
Table 16 Disaggregation of Means - Components & Incentives Important to Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Corp Emp/Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>School Dist Ad.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Staff Involvement - Company Executives Should:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 1: Be involved in running the school</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>8.202</td>
<td>.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2: Be involved in budgeting</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>6.302</td>
<td>.040*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3: Be involved in setting up curric</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>9.099</td>
<td>.035*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4: Provide volunteers</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.497</td>
<td>.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Staff Involvement - Company Executives Actually Are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 5: Involved in running school</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6: Involved in budgeting</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7: Be Involved in setting-up curriculum</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 8: Provide volunteers</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.433</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 9: Be participating as a team player</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.467</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 10: Interacting regularly at the school</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.022</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 11: Serving clients as customers 1st - parents</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.108</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 12: Negotiating the curriculum</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Continues
Table 16  Disaggregation of Means - Components & Incentives Important to Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Corp Emp/Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>School Dist Ad</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worksite Corporation Components - To Maintain a School, the Corporation Should:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 23: Have a minimum 1,500 employees</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 24: Provide building, landscaping, bldg main</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25: Provide technology, equipment &amp; assistance</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 26: Enhance the curriculum to corp</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.209</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksite Corporation Components - To Maintain a School, Corp Actually Does:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 27: Have a minimum 1,500 employees</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.4550</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 28: Provide building, landscaping, bldg main</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 29: Provide technology, equipment &amp; assistance</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>2.322</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 30: Enhance the curriculum to corp</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 31: Increased employee morale</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 32: Decreased employee turnover</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 33: Improved parent/teacher relationships</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 Disaggregation of Means - Components & Incentives Important to Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Corp Emp/Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>School Dist Ad.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment factors that should be considered in worksite school operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 17: Offered first to children of employees</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>5.556</td>
<td>.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 18: Zoned as other public schools</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>9.781</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 19: Offer a waiting list</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.646</td>
<td>.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most important school district incentives to areas with worksite schools:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 39: Decreased maintenance costs</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 40: More space for school buildings</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 41: Decreased transportation costs</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 42: Improved &amp; enhanced school curriculum</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 43: Improved technology training</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.037*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'disagreed' with a mean of 1.02 as they may not want the interference. The school district administrators were somewhat 'neutral' with a mean of 3.62.

Question 4 of the survey asked respondents whether corporate executives should provide volunteers on a regular basis to the worksite school. Surprisingly, the corporation
employees, which include managers who are also parents, agreed the most with this survey question. They thought that their corporation should provide volunteers regularly at the worksite school to help tutor the students, provide in-service training to the teachers, and other activities. The school district administrators were in the middle with a mean of 3.21, and the teachers were the least approving of this idea with a mean of 1.56. Many times, teachers may view the presence of host corporation managers, employees/parents at the worksite school as prying and interfering into their daily teaching activities, rather than being supportive and helpful.

Question 17 questioned whether enrollment at the worksite schools should be offered first to children of the host corporation employees. The employees/parents agreed strongly that their children should be offered enrollment first. The teachers did not feel as strongly about this issue, and school district administrators were neutral. This controversy does make sense, as one of the main incentives for attracting workers to a host company is that the corporation does have a public school located on the work location. Many of the employees/parents may have come to work at their particular organization because of that reason. The teachers are employees of the public school district, and therefore, would not feel as strongly about keeping children of non-employees out of the school. The school district administrators must appear fair and impartial to all children, and therefore, the mean of their answers was only 3.53 or in the 'neutral' category.

Question 18 of the survey asked respondents if enrollment at the worksite school should be zoned the same as any public school in their district. The employees/parents fell in the 'disagree' category. The teachers were fairly neutral with a mean of 3.20,
whereas the school district administrators 'somewhat agreed' with a mean of 3.80. This follows the enrollment issue pattern of survey question 17 fairly closely. The employee/parents disagreed that anyone who lived in the area could enroll, as this may not leave enough space for the children of the employees of the host corporation. This would remove one of the main incentives that businesses have to spend the time and money to create a worksite school at their location. The teachers were in the middle, but the school district administrators are concerned with being non-discriminatory. Their mean was 3.80 or in the 'somewhat agree' category.

Question 19 asked respondents if the worksite school should offer an enrollment waiting list for children who lived in the area but were not children of host corporation employees. The employees/parents were neutral with a mean of 3.53. The teachers were also, 'neutral', with a mean of 3.44. The school district administrators followed their same pattern with a mean of 4.40 in the 'somewhat agree' range.

The enrollment issues follow the same patterns in all three questions of the survey, or questions 17, 18 and 19, which would point to the fact that members of all three groups agree on their viewpoint of enrollment at worksite schools.

Question 43 of the survey asked respondents if improved technology training would be an important incentive to school districts to allow a worksite schools in their areas. The corporation employees/parents agreed with a mean of 4.04. The teachers were even more in agreement with a mean of 4.30. The school district administrators were even more supportive of the idea that the presence of more technology training into their schools is an incentive with a high mean of 4.95. This question revealed significance at a p value of less than .05.
Influence of Site Based Management Regarding Research Questions Five, Six and Seven

Research question five asked respondents whether the worksite school’s curriculum should be designed with the host corporation’s needs and interests in mind. Most of the respondents agreed that it should, and this correlates to the site based management theory that there should be teamwork and shared decision making to successfully run an organization.

Research question six asked respondents what they perceived as the most important public school benefits as the result of having a worksite school in its area. Most respondents considered more available school space as first, followed by an improved curriculum, decreased maintenance and transportation costs, and improved technology training. This concentrates on the site based management theory tenet with the focus on the individual school building first.

Research question seven asked respondents if there were differences in the conceptions of the major operational components and incentives based on their occupations. In most cases, there were no significant differences, which is consistent with the site based management concept of collaborative practices. Collaboration in the site-based management concept crosses boundaries, whether the respondent’s occupation is that of a host corporation employee/parent, teacher, or a school district administrator. It appears that most of the worksite schools in operation in the United States today, follow these teamwork and collaboration methods, as shown in their patterns of agreement.
Summary

This chapter described the responses to the questionnaire that were received from surveys mailed to worksite schools from December 1999 through August 2000. The frequency of returned surveys included 188 respondents. Data collected from the returned questionnaire were coded and entered into the Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS 9.0 version) for a descriptive analysis. Collected data indicated the frequency of scores, means, and standard deviations. Data presentations were offered using relevant tables and appropriate narrative interpretations and have been provided to enhance understanding of the related material.

This chapter also presented the results and answers to specific research questions based upon the design applied to the descriptive study. Data were presented in tables 5 through 16 as a mechanism for viewing the answers in tabular form. The data in table 5 identified the occupations of those who responded to the worksite school survey. Tables 6 through 15 presented the frequencies, means, and standard deviations of research questions 1 through 6. Table 16 presented a one-way ANOVA for the mean scores based on the occupations of the respondents to research question 7. Question number 70 of the survey asked if respondents felt there were any additional factors that they believed necessary to successfully operate a worksite school. Appendix VIII contains the written comments from survey question 71, which allowed them space in which to write their responses.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to describe the perceptions of worksite school employees concerning the components and incentives identified as important in worksite school operations, and determine whether those components and incentives were perceived to be necessary for worksite school operations. This chapter will provide a summary and conclusions with respect to the purpose of this study and recommendations for further research.

Summary of Findings from Research Question Number One

Based on research question number one, respondents felt that the host corporation should provide the following components to its worksite school (See table 5). This list is ranked in order of the respondents' agreement with each statement based on the means:

1. enhance the curriculum to the corporation involved.
2. provide technology equipment and ongoing assistance
3. provide landscaping and building maintenance, as well as buildings.
4. have a minimum of 1,500 employees.

The paired t test compared the means of the highest ranking component to the
second, the second to the third, and the third to the fourth. There were significant differences in all three pairs. The host corporation employees/parents, teachers, and school district administrators differed in their opinions of the host corporation providing technology equipment along with technology assistance, with the curriculum being tailored to the host corporation's needs for future workers. The three groups also had differences of opinion about the host corporation providing the building, landscaping, and building maintenance with providing technology equipment and assistance. And, at a significance level of .05, they differed in their opinions on the minimum number of employees with the corporation providing the building, landscaping and building maintenance. These areas of controversy should be looked at carefully for companies and school districts considering building and sponsoring worksite schools.

Summary of Findings from Research Question Number Two

Research question number two asked respondents the following question:

2. "Is there a difference between respondents' perceptions of what worksite components are needed versus what components currently exist?"

Taken from findings from research question two, table 7 lists the host corporation components which respondents perceive as actually existing at their worksite school locations. The following findings are listed from the most respondents to the least:

1. actually provide buildings, landscaping, and building maintenance for the worksite school.

2. actually provide technology equipment and ongoing assistance to the worksite school.

3. actually enhances the curriculum to the corporation involved.
4. actually have a minimum of 1,500 employees.

In comparing the rankings of the frequencies of respondents as to what components the host corporation should have from research question number one, versus what components actually exist, from research question number two, the summary of findings are shown in Table 18.

Table 17 Components Corporation Should have Versus Existence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Components Should Have</th>
<th>Components Which Actually Exist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Enhanced Curriculum</td>
<td>Provision of Landscaping/Maint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Technology Equip/Assistance</td>
<td>Technology Equip/Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provision of Landscaping/Maint.</td>
<td>Enhanced Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Minimum of 1,500 Employees</td>
<td>Minimum of 1,500 Employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table reveals that there are matches between the second most frequent responses to research questions number one and two. The ranking of two which is, "that the host corporation should provide technology equipment and ongoing assistance to the worksite school", reveals that this was also the second most frequent response to research question number two regarding the actual existence of this component.

One of the most substantial findings from Table 8 and 17 reveal that respondents did not agree that host corporation involvement in the curriculum actually existed at their worksite schools, although they agreed that it should be present. This may mean that
respondents are concerned with the curriculum and want to see more involvement and interest in its content, but do not think this is actually taking place at their schools.

The fourth largest number of responses to research questions numbers one and two reveals a match between what respondents perceive host corporations should contain, which is a minimum of 1,500 employees at each corporation, and what actually exists.

The paired t test in table 9 compares the means of the top ranking component to the second, the second to the third, and the third to the fourth. There were significant differences between all pairs.

Summary of Findings From Research Question Number Three

Research question number three asked respondents the following question:

3. "What corporate employee incentives are most important to respondents at worksite schools?"

Respondents were asked what host corporation employee incentives should exist at their location. Data from table 9 reveal the following incentives from most important to least important:

1. Improved parent/teacher relationships tied with
1. Decreased employee turnover at the host corporation.

2. Decreased transportation costs to the employees of the host corporation.

3. Increased employee morale at the host corporation.

The paired t test in table 11 reveals significant differences in the means between the second highest incentive paired with the third, and the third with the fourth. There were discrepancies between the incentive of decreased employee turnover with the
provision of lower transportation costs. There was also a difference in the pair of means between questions 34 and 31 or the provision of lower transportation costs with increased employee morale. One of the possible major outcomes of increased morale could be low turnover rates. Employees who are happy where they work do not tend to move to another company. Possibly a further study could compare the means of the morale issue with a decrease in employee turnover.

The significance of .000 for both t test pairs or questions 32 and 34, with questions 34 and 31 suggest that they were on the same level of significance. Question 32 dealt with decreased employee turnover, and was tested with question 34 regarding lower transportation costs. Question 34 was tested with question 31 which dealt with increased employee morale at the corporation. Therefore, in ranking the levels of significance, these paired t tests would be listed equally, as they were both computed with a significance level of .000.

Summary of Findings From Research Question Number Four

Research question number four asked respondents to answer the following question:

4. “What are the most important enrollment factors respondents think should be considered in the operation of worksite schools?”

Data from table 11 reveal the following enrollment factors in the operation of worksite schools as shown from the most important to the least important:

1. Worksite school enrollment should be offered first to children of employees of the host corporation.
2. There should be a waiting list for children of non-employees but who live in the worksite school zone.

3. The worksite school should be zoned exactly the same as other public schools in the district.

The paired t test in table 12 shows a significance in the means of the first highest ranked components compared with the second, and the second with the third. The factor of offering enrollment first to the children of host corporate employees and having an enrollment waiting list showed significance at .000. This makes sense, as those who think that the host corporation's needs should be met first, would differ from those who think enrollment should be open to all students in the area.

The means of questions 19 and 18 differed significantly. An enrollment waiting list factor being compared with the worksite school being zoned as other public schools for enrollment are two controversial issues. If a waiting list were offered, it might take seats away from children of employees who come later in the school year. Those who disagree with this would also disagree that the school should be zoned as all public schools. This would definitely take priority away from children of host corporate employees.

Summary of Findings From Research Question Number Five

Research question number five asked respondents the following question:

5. "Do respondents perceive that the worksite school curriculum should be designed with the host corporations' needs in mind?"

Data from table 13 reveal that respondents did think that the host corporation
should assist the worksite school staff in integrating and designing the curriculum according to the type of business conducted by the host corporation. For example, most of the respondents to this survey were from technological fields or use computers extensively at their businesses.

The respondents agree that the integration of technology, for example, would help prepare their children for the future job market. This may also explain the high mean or average scores in the 5 category or “agree” to questions concerning technology throughout the entire survey.

Table 5 reveals that most of the respondents to the survey were host corporation employees/parents. These people may have the most vested interest in the curriculum of the school but this could bring up a power issue of what group would be in control of the worksite schools’ curriculum. The clients or parents/employees would want the control, as their business would want to mold the schools’ classes to fit their future job market agenda. Whereas, the school district teachers and administrators would want the curriculum to follow school district policies. Because this research is not meant to be exhaustive in nature, this could be an interesting topic for future research.

Summary of Findings From Research Question Number Six

Research question number six asked respondents the following question:

6. “What do respondents perceive as the most important benefits to the public school district in which the worksite schools are located?”

Data from table 15 reveal the following components that respondents thought were the most beneficial to the school districts in which worksite schools are located. As
a result of the presence of a worksite school in the district, respondents ranked the following benefits to the school district from the most to the least important:

1. Worksite schools should provide more space for other schools in the district.
2. The school district should have an improved and enhanced curriculum.
3. The school district should have decreased maintenance costs over previous years.
4. The school district should have reduced bussing costs.
5. The school district should show improvement in technology training.

The paired t tests in table 16 reveals that there were no significant differences in the means on these issues. The respondents' perceptions of the benefits to the school districts were in agreement.

Summary of Findings From Research Question Number Seven

The seventh research question was:

7. "Are there differences in the perceptions of corporate employees/parents, teachers, and school district administrators concerning worksite operations and incentives?"

Survey questions 1 through 12, as well as all survey questions which related to the research questions were disaggregated in table 16 by the occupations of respondents. The means of each of the three groups were displayed.

As stated in chapter four, there were extreme polarizations between the parents/employees and the teachers. Teachers did not want the involvement of the parents who are also employees of the host corporation on matters involving running the school, budgeting, curriculum and providing volunteers. Teachers wanted a "hands off"
attitude, whereas employees/parents wanted involvement with their children in the daily operations of the school in which their corporation had stakes in many areas.

As expected, the employees/parents wanted the opportunity to send their children to the worksite schools first. Involving this question on the survey, or question 17, teachers and school district administrators showed means of 4.68 and 3.53, compared to a mean of 4.89 for the employees/parents, who felt very strongly about this issue.

When asked if respondents wanted the worksite school zoned the same as all public schools, the employees/parents felt strongly against this with a mean of 1.03, teachers were fairly neutral with a mean of 3.20, whereas school district administrators seemingly wanted worksite schools opened up to all of the public, with a mean of 4.04.

Survey questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 17, 18, 19, and 43 all show significant differences at the .05 level. Respondents disagreed on matters relating to corporate staff involvement at the worksite school. This makes sense, as teachers would disagree with interference, and the host corporate staff are also the parents, and would want to contribute ideas and be involved with how and what their children are being taught.

Respondents also disagreed on enrollment factors (survey questions 17 - 19). This has been and continues to be an area of debate concerning worksite school operations.

Survey question 43 dealing with improved technology training for the school district shows significant differences in the means between host corporate employees/parents, teachers and school district administrators. There were differences in the perceptions of corporation employees/parents, teachers and school district administrators as to the importance of improved technology training to the school districts.
Comparison of Groups

Worksite School Employees/Parents

Based on the means of survey questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 17, 18, 19, and 43, components that the corporate employees/parents considered the most important in the successful operation of worksite schools, were as follows: They are ranked from greatest to the least.

1. The corporate employees/parents should be involved with running the schools.
2. The host corporation staff should be involved with the budgeting of the worksite school.
3. Enrollment should be offered to children of the host corporation first.
4. The host corporation should be involved in the worksite school curriculum.
5. The school district should receive an improvement in technology training.
6. The host corporation should provide volunteers to work in the school.
7. The worksite school should offer a waiting list to children in the zone whose parents did not work at the host corporation.
8. The worksite school's zoning policies should be the same as all schools in the district.

In analyzing the above list, it appears that the employees/parents of the host corporation want involvement in the operations, budgeting, curriculum and technology training in worksite schools. The provision of volunteers is also important to corporation employees/parents. In responding in this manner, they possibly feel that they are protecting their investment of time and money into the school. The respondents who returned the survey were obviously the most concerned parents to take the time to fill out
the questionnaire, and therefore would also want more active involvement with their children's schools.

The host corporate employees/parents were the least concerned with children that are not their own, or children in the zone who are children of non employees. Therefore, they did not agree that the school should be zoned the same as all public schools in the district, nor offer a waiting list to children whose parents do not work at the host corporate site.

**Worksite School Teachers**

Based on the means of survey questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 17, 18, 19, and 43, components that the worksite school teachers considered the most important in the successful operation of worksite schools, were as follows: They are ranked from greatest to the least:

1. Enrollment should be offered first to children of host corporation employees.
2. The school district should receive an improvement in technology training.
3. An enrollment waiting list should be available to children of non-corporate employees.
4. The worksite school should be zoned the same as all schools in the area.
5. The corporate staff should be involved in the worksite schools' budget.
6. The corporation staff should be involved in the worksite schools' operations.
7. The host corporation should provide volunteers to the school.
8. Corporation staff should be involved in setting up the worksite school curriculum.

The enrollment issue that the children of host corporate employees should be offered a place in the school first, was of importance to teachers. They want fairness to the employees who are also parents, in providing them with a return for their investment.
Teachers perceived that an improvement in technology training was an important incentive for the school district. In an age where technology is extremely important, these teachers may think that students should receive the most support possible to prepare them for the future.

It is interesting that teachers considered the enrollment factor that a waiting list should be offered to children of non-employees as next in importance. However, this received a 3.44 mean, which is in the neutral range.

As public servants, these teachers seemed rather neutral in issues dealing with equality to all public school children. When asked if the worksite school should be zoned the same as other public schools, they were in the neutral range of 3.20. This may be due to the fact that some of the teachers completing the survey may have been teaching at a worksite school, and understand the delicacy of zoning and enrollment issues between the host corporation and the public.

Question 2 of the survey asked respondents if the host corporation staff should be involved in the budgeting issues of the worksite school. Teachers may have felt that the employees/parents would be too knowledgeable as to how the school staff spent their money, and teachers may feel this could cause a clash between the employee/parents and the worksite school staffs. Budgeting issues tend to be a delicate issue anyway, without the addition of more opinions coming from its contributors.

These teachers’ responses revealed a desire for autonomy in running their schools and classrooms, with a ‘hands off’ attitude towards host corporate employees/parents, with a mean of only 1.33. The teachers did not perceive the host parents involvement in the daily operations of the school as an asset to them, but an invasion of their domain.
This also coincides with the attitude of the teachers towards the provision of volunteers to the school and the involvement of the host corporate parents in the curriculum. These components ranked the lowest among teachers.

**School District Administrators**

Based on the means of survey questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 17, 18, 19, and 43, components that the school district administrators considered the most important in the successful operation of worksite schools, were as follows: They are ranked from greatest to the least.

1. An improvement in technology training for the school district.
2. The offering of a waiting list to children of non-corporate employees.
3. The zoning of the worksite school the same as all public schools.
4. Host corporation employees/parents should be involved in the daily operations of the worksite schools.
5. Host corporate employees/parents should be involved in the worksite school budget.
6. Host corporation employees/parents should be involved in the worksite schools' curriculum.
7. Enrollment should be offered first to children of worksite school employees.
8. Corporate staff should offer volunteer services to the worksite school locations.

The highest priority of school district administrators was predictably, an incentive to the school district, or an improvement in technology training. This was followed by enrollment issues, such as offering a waiting list to the children whose parents did not work at the host corporation site, and zoning the worksite school the same as other public
schools in the area. Budgeting or money and enrollment issues were areas of concern among school district administrators.

Corporate staff involvement in worksite schools received rather neutral ratings among school district administrators. This may be due to the fact that the school district administrators are responsible for the operations of the worksite school, and may not be sure as to how much involvement there should be between themselves and the host corporate staff. This included the involvement of budgeting, curriculum and volunteers to the school.

The lowest ranking among school district administrators went to the issue that the worksite schools should provide volunteers to the schools. Even though in the neutral range rather than the lower end of the means, administrators may want to appear neutral in the extra roles that the host corporation should provide in order to provide the role of a public entity that treats all citizens and taxpayers the same with no extra burdens on host corporate personnel.

Conclusions

This descriptive research was designed to determine whether worksite school and host corporate employees consider the components and incentives identified in the survey as necessary for the organization and daily operations of successful worksite schools in the United States. The results of this research show that the following components and incentives were identified by respondents as important in the daily operations of a worksite school. They are listed in rank from the most to least important using only the survey questions which correspond to each research question. Components and incentives
are listed below according to the highest to least responses to the 5 or “agree” number on the scale. Components and incentives are listed separately:

**Components**

1. Respondents thought that worksite school enrollment should be offered first to host corporation employees.

2. The curriculum should be designed with the host corporate and worksite school employees working as a team. This would ensure that areas of interest to the host corporation are integrated into the classroom studies or curriculum.

3. The host company should provide technology equipment and training to the school staff.

4. A waiting list should be offered to children who live in the worksite area, but whose parents are not employees of the host corporation.

5. The host corporation should provide not only the worksite school buildings, but also landscaping and maintenance.

6. The host corporation should have a minimum of 1,500 employees to ensure the success of the worksite school.

7. The worksite school should be zoned as other public schools in the state. This did not receive a majority of responses and only 21% of the respondents ranked this with a five or “agree”. In fact, 62% answered this survey question with a 1 or “disagree”.

**Incentives**

1. A worksite school should improve parent/teacher relationships.

2. The worksite school should provide more building space to the school district, as it is located on private property which leaves more available space for other public schools.
3. The presence of a worksite school on host corporation property should decrease employee turnover at the company.

4. There should be an improved and enhanced school district curriculum with worksite school(s) in its area.

5. The school district should see a decrease in maintenance costs for schools.

6. There should be lower transportation costs to employees of the host corporation.

7. The school district should observe decreased transportation costs as a result of the presence of a worksite school(s).

8. The school district should receive improved technology training.

9. There should be an improvement in employee morale at the host corporation.

Recommendations

1. Recommendations to host corporations interested in sponsoring a worksite school would include conducting a survey of employees/parents, and school staff in that zone to determine interest. Therefore, if the project is to go forward, any teachers, students, or parents who are uncomfortable or skeptical about a worksite school, can request a transfer to a school unaffiliated with the program. The financial responsibilities should be determined, considering both the advantages and disadvantages of having a worksite school on the corporation’s property. Potential school district partners should be sought at school board and teacher association meetings. Charter schools could be considered in lieu of a worksite school. Legal counsel should be retained in the process. School district building design guideline publications should be obtained through the Department of Education. Consider using portable buildings instead of constructing permanent
buildings to minimize the expenses of both the building costs and having to build to code standards. If the host corporation has under 1,500 employees, consider teaming up with other organizations to help co-sponsor a worksite school.

2. The components and incentives considered the most important in this survey should be used in the initial planning and operation of a worksite school.

3. Various personnel from successful worksite schools as listed in table 4, can be consulted to help implement new schools. Worksite schools with similar surroundings and circumstances as the area under consideration should be used as models. Tour as many worksite schools as possible and interview personnel from those schools who were involved with the planning and initial implementation of them.

4. Layers of bureaucracy should be avoided by communicating with all responsible individuals and keeping them involved and informed during the planning and initial stages of the worksite school process. This would include individuals in the state and district educational and building departments, legislators, senators, school district employees, administrators, and host corporate executives and employees.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. A future study could include the advantages and disadvantages of housing a daycare in the worksite school facilities for children of host corporation employees who are under the kindergarten age level. This would also allow parents with infants and toddlers to transport their entire families to one location, conveniently located close to their jobs. In conjunction, the possibilities of pre-tax deductions for child-care costs could also be researched.
2. Another study could examine the financial or budgeting issues related to corporations and school districts with worksite schools. Tax benefits to corporations and other financial incentives could be investigated. Daily operating expenses and projections could be analyzed and this material used to study the financial advantages and disadvantages to both host corporations and school districts who are considering the construction of a worksite school in the future.

3. A future study could identify business categories and analyze what type(s) would benefit the most by constructing worksite schools, including the minimum number of employees required for a business to host a successful worksite school.

4. An entire study could concentrate solely on the perceptions of respondents based on various occupational groups, such as employees/parents, teachers, and school district administrators.
As reform movements across the country call for a change in the educational institution, along with the demand from the business community for qualified workers, new forms of schools have resulted as a merger of business with education. An innovative school, being developed in the United States, to meet the demands of both the educational and business community, is called the "Worksite School". Taken from the definition of the seventeen operating Worksite Schools in the United States, they are PUBLIC schools, located on the property of host corporations. The corporation involved, donates assets such as land, capital for equipment, and expertise, that enhances the public school district's curriculum.

You have been selected as a member of the Oversight Committee to preliminarily review the questionnaire, answer the survey questions, and provide feedback regarding any difficulties you might see with the survey before we send it out to the employees, administrators, and parents with children attending worksite schools. Your responses will be held in strict confidence and no information from individual committee members will be released in any way.

Please answer all questions, add any comments, and return the questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope as quickly as possible. It should take only about 15 minutes of your time and thank you for your willingness to help with this research.

Sincerely.

D. Janell Dietz,
Doctoral Student Educational Leadership
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
APPENDIX II

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS
This letter comes as an introduction for Ms. D. Janell Dietz, who is a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of Nevada Las Vegas. Her major research project at this time involves collecting and analyzing data regarding public schools that are located on private, corporate property. These schools are commonly known as "worksite schools." Your organization has been identified as one currently involved with a school that would come under this definition. Therefore we are requesting your participation in a study aimed at identifying those elements that individuals working at various levels within this organizational structure consider to be accurate representations of its institutional mission and operational design.

We feel that as one of the earliest practitioners of the innovative concept of worksite schools, the input of those in your organization would be extremely valuable to this whole effort to identify and isolate those factors that contribute to the success of these institutions. We believe that such a study would have a national impact by adding to the body of educational research knowledge in ways that would be beneficial to those seeking to implement educational changes in their own communities. Therefore we would sincerely appreciate a positive response to this request for your participation. Specific details regarding the completion of the survey instruments are provided by Ms. Dietz. If you have any questions regarding this study you may write to me at the address given, or you may call me at (702) 895-3441.

Cordially yours,

Paul E. Meacham, Ph.D.
Regents Professor of Education
APPENDIX III

INFORMATIONAL LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS
As explained in Dr. Meacham's introductory letter, your innovative organization and school have been selected to receive this questionnaire to find commonalities among worksite schools that exist in the United States. The twelve questionnaires should be filled out by five managers in your corporation, yourself or the school principal, three employees of the corporation who have children attending the worksite school, and three teachers. It was sent first to you, as the director of the organization, to determine who is in the best position to voice opinions as to the necessary components and incentives to successfully operate these schools. All responses will be held in strict confidence and no information from individual companies or schools will be released in any way.

We have included business-reply envelopes for convenience, so the surveys can be returned as soon as they are completed. We hope to receive the completed questionnaires by June 25 so we can begin processing the results as soon as possible.

Your responses and opinions are extremely important in adding to the body of knowledge on this little known topic, and are highly valued. The final results of this dissertation should be available in August. If you would like a copy, the last section of the survey provides information on how you can obtain a copy of the final results.

Again, your feedback is very important and we greatly appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

D. Janell Dietz
Informed Consent

I am D. Janell Dietz, a doctoral student at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas in the Department of Educational Leadership.

I am requesting your participation in a research project on worksite schools. The purpose of this research is to find commonalities among worksite schools that exist in the United States that contribute to their success. The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Your answers will be kept completely confidential. Records will be maintained in the Department of Educational Leadership at UNLV. Results will be compiled in a statistical report format.

If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact:

D. Janell Dietz, or Dr. Paul Meacham at the UNLV Department of Educational Leadership at (702) 895-3441. For questions involving the rights of human subjects, please contact the UNLV office of Sponsored Programs at (702) 895-1357.

Your participation is strictly voluntary and there are no foreseen risks involved in this research. By participating, you will be adding to the general body of knowledge on this subject.

I have read the above information and agree to participate in this study.

Signature of Participant ___________________________ Date _____________

Signature of Researcher ___________________________ Date _____________

Please read and sign the above, and mail this form and the completed survey within 10 days in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided.

Thank-you so much for your participation! At the end of the survey, space will be provided for you to receive an abstract of the results for your information.
APPENDIX V

SURVEY
**Worksite Schools Survey**

Definition of a worksite school (Taken from the Florida, Delaware and Arizona state departments of education): "A public school located on the property of a private corporation in which the corporation donates assets such as land, capital for equipment and expertise, that enhances the public school curriculum, and in which the school is run in conjunction with the public school district." The first part of each section refer to your opinions of what worksite schools should have, and the rest in the section refer to what your worksite school actually contains.

**1. HOW NECESSARY ARE THE FOLLOWING COMPONENTS TO A WORKSITE SCHOOL?** Please circle your response using the following scale:

1 = Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Agree

**CORPORATE STAFF INVOLVEMENT COMPONENTS - Company executives should be:**

| 1. Involved in running the school | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. Involved in the budgeting. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. Involved in setting up the curriculum of the school. | 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. Providing volunteers regularly at the school-teaching others new skills. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

**Company executives at my worksite school are:**

| 5. Involved in running the school | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. Involved in the budgeting. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. Involved in setting up the curriculum of the school. | 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. Providing volunteers regularly at the school-teaching others new skills. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

**WORKSITE SCHOOL STAFF INTERPERSONAL COMPONENTS - School staff should:**

| 9. Participate as a member of a team - with the corporation executives and staff. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. Interact regularly with corporate employees | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 11. Serve clients/customers - with parents viewed as the clients/customers. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 12. Negotiate curriculum - work towards agreements with the company involving curriculum for the school. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
I = Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Agree

**School Staff at my worksite school are:**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13- PARTICIPATING AS A MEMBER OF A TEAM - with the corporation executives and staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- INTERACTING REGULARLY WITH CORPORATE EMPLOYEES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15- SERVING CLIENTS/CUSTOMERS - with parents viewed as the clients/customers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- NEGOTIATING CURRICULUM - working towards agreements with the company involving curriculum for the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WORKSITE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT COMPONENTS - Worksites should be:**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17- OFFERED FIRST TO CHILDREN OF EMPLOYEES OF THE CORPORATION INVOLVED.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18- ZONED AS OTHER PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE STATE.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19- OFFERING A WAITING LIST (FIRST COME, FIRST SERVED).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enrollment at my worksite school is:**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20- OFFERED FIRST TO CHILDREN OF EMPLOYEES OF THE CORPORATION INVOLVED.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21- ZONED AS OTHER PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE STATE.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22- OFFERING A WAITING LIST (FIRST COME, FIRST SERVED).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WORKSITE CORPORATION COMPONENTS - To maintain a worksite school, the corporation should:**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23- HAVE A MINIMUM OF 1,500 EMPLOYEES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24- BESIDES THE BASIC BUILDING, PROVIDE LANDSCAPING, &amp; BUILDING MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25- PROVIDE TECHNOLOGY EQUIPMENT AND ONGOING ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26- ENHANCE THE CURRICULUM TO THE CORPORATION INVOLVED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 = Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Agree

The corporation at my worksite school:

27- HAS A MINIMUM OF 1,500 EMPLOYEES
1 2 3 4 5

28- BESIDES THE BASIC BUILDING, PROVIDES LANDSCAPING, & BUILDING MAINTENANCE
1 2 3 4 5

29- PROVIDES TECHNOLOGY EQUIPMENT AND ONGOING ASSISTANCE
1 2 3 4 5

30- ENHANCES THE CURRICULUM TO THE CORPORATION INVOLVED
1 2 3 4 5

II. HOW NECESSARY ARE THE FOLLOWING INCENTIVES TO MAINTAIN A WORKSITE SCHOOL? Please continue to circle your response using the following scale: 1 = Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Agree

CORPORATION EMPLOYEE INCENTIVES - The worksite school should:

31- Increase employee morale at the corporation.
1 2 3 4 5

32- Decrease employee turnover at the corporation.
1 2 3 4 5

33- Improve parent/teacher relationships.
1 2 3 4 5

34- Provide lower transportation costs.
1 2 3 4 5

Employee Incentives at my worksite school:

35- Increases employee morale at the corporation.
1 2 3 4 5

36- Decreases employee turnover at the corporation.
1 2 3 4 5

37- Improves parent/teacher relationships.
1 2 3 4 5

38- Provides lower transportation costs.
1 2 3 4 5

SCHOOL DISTRICT INCENTIVES - The worksite school should have:

39 - Decreased maintenance costs.
1 2 3 4 5

40- Provided more space for school buildings.
1 2 3 4 5

41- Decreased transportation costs to the district.
1 2 3 4 5

42- Improved and enhanced school district curriculum.
1 2 3 4 5

43- Provided improved technology training.
1 2 3 4 5
1 = Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Agree

**The school district does have:**

44 - Decreased maintenance costs. 1 2 3 4 5
45 - More space for school buildings. 1 2 3 4 5
46 - Decreased transportation costs to the district. 1 2 3 4 5
47 - An Improved and enhanced school district curriculum. 1 2 3 4 5
48 - Improved technology training. 1 2 3 4 5

**STUDENT INCENTIVES - The worksite school should have:**

49 - Improved student district-wide test scores. 1 2 3 4 5
50 - Improved student attendance. 1 2 3 4 5
51 - Improved technology skills. 1 2 3 4 5
52 - Improved student morale. 1 2 3 4 5

**My Worksie school has:**

53 - Improved student district-wide test scores. 1 2 3 4 5
54 - Improved student attendance. 1 2 3 4 5
55 - Improved technology skills. 1 2 3 4 5
56 - Improved student morale. 1 2 3 4 5

**PARENT-TEACHER INVOLVMENT INCENTIVES - The worksite school should have:**

57 - An increased the number of male volunteers at a public school. 1 2 3 4 5
58 - Increased parental involvement at conferences. 1 2 3 4 5
59 - Increased parental involvement with student activities such as field trips. 1 2 3 4 5
60 - Increased parental involvement with their child's homework. 1 2 3 4 5
1 = Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Agree

**My Worksita school has:**

61 - Increased the number of male volunteers at the school. 1 2 3 4 5
62 - Increased parental involvement at conferences. 1 2 3 4 5
63 - Increased parental involvement with student activities such as field trips. 1 2 3 4 5
64 - Increased parental involvement with their child's homework. 1 2 3 4 5

**FACTORS REGARDING GRADE LEVELS COVERED AS INCENTIVES - The worksite school should:**

65 - Cover the lower grades because of cost factors. 1 2 3 4 5
66 - Cover more grade levels. 1 2 3 4 5
67 - Have a preschool and after school program. 1 2 3 4 5

**My worksite school has:**

68 - Covered the lower grades because of cost factors. 1 2 3 4 5
69 - A preschool and after school program. 1 2 3 4 5

**III. HOW NECESSARY ARE ADDITIONAL FACTORS IN THE SUCCESS OF A WORKSITE SCHOOL?**

70 - Are there any additional factors that you believe are necessary for the successful operation of a worksite school? (yes) (no)

71 - If your answer to question number 70 is yes, please identify them in the space provided below:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

72 - Because of the limited information available on worksite schools in the United States, your input is valuable to the success of this research. If you would like a free abstract of the results of this survey, please indicate by marking "yes" and filling in the name and address of where you would like the results mailed:

___ YES - I would like an abstract of the results of the worksite school survey mailed to me at:
Name:___________________________________________________________
Address:__________________________________________________________
City State Zip

___ NO - I do not need an abstract of the survey mailed to me at this time.
APPENDIX VI

FOLLOW UP LETTER
Subject: Survey on Worksite Schools from D. Janell Dietz

It has been two weeks since you received the survey on worksite schools for my doctoral dissertation, and I really appreciate you taking the time to respond. At present, there are only seventeen operating worksite schools in the United States. Therefore, your responses and opinions are extremely important, to aid in the research of this little known topic.

This will be the first dissertation written on the subject, and you can be a pioneer to help find commonalities among the seventeen worksite schools in the United States. Please mail your completed survey in the postage-paid, return envelopes provided, and a copy of the abstract will be mailed to you upon request. In order to process results and ensure validity, the opinions of all personnel involved in the worksite schools currently in operation must be received, as there are so few in operation.

Again, thank you for taking your valuable time to complete and mail the surveys, and I greatly appreciate your assistance in this worthwhile research topic.

Sincerely,

D. Janell Dietz
Doctoral Student
Department of Educational Leadership
University of Nevada Las Vegas
APPENDIX VII

SCHOOL DISTRICT GUIDELINES
SCHOOL DISTRICT GUIDELINES
(IN SETTING-UP A WORKSITE SCHOOL)

Access infrastructure needs. Compare costs (time and money), benefits (savings on infrastructure, ties to business community and parents), and limitations (grades served) of private provision of infrastructure versus public provision.

Actively seek out business partners by making presentations to the Chamber of Commerce and other trade organizations.

Attempt local financing, with public or private funds, of all infrastructure costs to become exempt from state-level review by the Department of Education and the Office of Local Assistance.

Designate a host school and gain its commitment to the worksite school concept.

Gain school board approval and its two-thirds majority vote to exempt the worksite school from city or county zoning ordinances.

Retain or engage legal counsel. Specify respective responsibilities and contributions in a contract with the business partner.

Submit site development plans to OSA for approval.

Seek the full support and participation of teachers’ associations.

Clearly define the role of the lead teacher within the worksite school and describe the career advancement and decision making opportunities at worksite schools.
Be accessible to parents and community groups. Take time to meet with neighborhood groups, parents, and local government.

Get close to the district legislator. Exemptions and waivers may have to be crafted for some types of worksite schools. Establish relationships early on and keep legislative representatives informed.

Be prepared for delays. A contingency plan may be helpful if the site is delayed and children must attend another school temporarily.

Advise those interested in designing charter schools about the potential availability of worksite locations and public-private partnerships.

(Source: Reason Foundation, 1990)
APPENDIX VIII

COMMENTS FROM RESPONDENTS ANSWERING SURVEY QUESTION #71
COMMENTS FROM RESPONDENTS ANSWERING SURVEY QUESTION #71

The preceding question in the survey (#70) asked respondents; “Are there any additional factors that you believe are necessary for the successful operation of a worksite school?” Question #71 of the survey was; “If your answer to question number 70 is yes. please identify them in the space provided below.” The following were their comments.

Teacher Comments

“A worksite school does improve parent involvement, but there has to be a balance. Too much parent involvement can interfere with a teacher’s discipline, teaching and classroom environment. Teachers and parents have to support each other and not undermine each others efforts. Mutual respect and cooperation is essential.”

“More playground space is needed.”

“It would be good if our school had a daycare/preschool and went through the sixth grade, as our school is now K-3.”

“Staff members at my worksite school do not get a duty free lunch as stated in our contract. Administration at our worksite school needs to be more involved. Assistance with discipline problems at our worksite school needs to be improved.”

“Besides the basic building landscaping and maintenance, the corporation’s financial assistance may be of value in the further success of worksite schools.”
“There should be total cooperation between the corporation and the school district. The worksite school should be treated as a regular school, not as a school for parents of the corporation where they insist on making their own rules.”

“Preschool. Much more technology. Staff from the corporation to train teachers. Separate school test scores.”

“Hiring practices for teachers should differ from general hiring - no teachers without a established record with school system and special interviews. The school should be more teacher-driven.”

“Students get bussed weekly to the main campus but parents complain if their children are left out of host school activities, despite the fact that worksite school children receive many benefits that the main campus children do not. Pressure is put on administration to spend extra money to include worksite students in ‘extra’ activities. The main campus should be more concerned about teacher’s needs. The corporation should spend more money to ‘buy’ art, PE, music teachers etc. to come to the worksite school so main teachers have more time during the day.”

**Host Corporation Employees Comments**

“The corporation should commit to adding more grade levels.”

“I’d like to see regular meetings with on-site teachers/school administration/corporate staff (i.e. bi-yearly or yearly).”
“Strong communication among parents, teachers and employees. Our worksite school offers a pre-school but it is not affiliated with the public school.”

A Worksite School Principal’s Comments

“There should be a liaison person at the corporation to deal with facility issues and be a bridge with the schools. There should be more independent, experienced teachers. There should not be an independent PTA but they should meet at the school and be part of the worksite school too, and not just the host school. Students need to come to the main building at least once a week. There should be firm guidelines as to the roles of school as to curriculum and personnel roles.”

Parent Comments

“The main benefits of having a school on a worksite is that it creates a small community.”

“All the parents know each other and can report any mishaps regarding the children. Kids are really aware of strong, watchful eyes.”

“There should be after-school programs that stimulate the schedule of non-working parents such as soccer, story time, gardening etc.”

“There needs to be a playground and library. The property is large enough for them to build a two-story building. The after-school program is very expensive for public schools.”
“Teachers need to see parents as resources and assets to student achievement and learning.”

“Parents should be involved in the worksite school and help with computer training for teachers. We could also serve on technology committees as we are right here next to the school.”
### Worksite Schools Operating in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Yr Opened</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Classrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assurance Group (formerly American Bankers Insurance Group) - Miami, FL</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>23,258</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Florida - Orlando, FL</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami International Airport - Miami, FL</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Bank of St. Paul - St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>800 sf</td>
<td>PreK/K</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Highway Safety &amp; Motor Vehicles - Tallahassee, FL</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeywell Space Components - Clearwater, FL</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radisson Twin Towers Hotel - Orlando, FL</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target - Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4 Floors</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>21,588</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayfront Medical Center - St. Petersburg, FL</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agilent Technology (formerly Hewlett Packard) - Santa Rosa, CA</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M Corporation - St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Office Bldg</td>
<td>PreK/K</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5,563</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America (formerly Barnett Bank and Nation's Bank) - Jacksonville, FL</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Sinai Medical Center - Miami, FL</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Power and Light - Miami, FL</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5,360</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Downtown Partnership School - DesMoines, IA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Manhattan Center Westshore Alliance Choice School - Tampa, FL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Orlando Regional Healthcare Systems - Orlando, FL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4,375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contact Information

1. Assurance Group (formerly American Bankers Insurance Group) - Miami, FL

   Contact: Pat Brack, Principal
             305-235-9761

   Partnership School: Cutler Ridge Elementary
                      Boots Richards, Principal
                      305-235-4611

2. University of Central Florida - Orlando, FL

   Contact: Sarah Sprinkle, OCPS, Early Childhood Program Consultant
            407-354-3200

3. Miami International Airport - Miami, FL

   Contact: Mildred Smith, Principal
            305-876-0842

   Partnership School: Miami Springs Elementary School
                      Susan Lehrman
                      305-888-4558


   Contact: Ann Johnson, Teacher
            612-290-8372

   Partnership School: Riverfront Primary Academy
                      Dr. Nancy Katzmarek
                      612-293-8354

5. Department of Highway Safety & Motor Vehicles - Tallahassee, FL

   Contact: Betty Stimm, Adm. Asst.
            850-488-7370

   Partnership School: Appalachia Elementary
                      Doris Payne
                      850-487-7110
6. Honeywell Space Components - Clearwater, FL

Contact: Laura O'Shaughnessy
813-539-2271

Partnership School: Pinellas Central Elementary
Lon Jenson
813-547-7853

7. Radisson Twin Towers Hotel - Orlando, FL

Contact: Mrs. Close, Lead Teacher
407-351-1000

Sarah Sprinkle, OCPS, Early Childhood Program Consultant
407-317-3200

Partnership School: Palm Lake Elementary
Wayne Sheer
407-354-2610

8. Target - Minneapolis, MN

Contact: Nancy McKinley, Principal
612-338-5765

Kathy Vekich, Facilities Manager
612-304-6681

9. Bayfront Medical Center - St. Petersburg, FL

Contact: Director of Bayfront Child Dev. Center
813-896-5437

Partnership School: Compbell Park Elementary
Mr. Steen
813-893-2650
10. Agilent Technology (formerly Hewlett Packard) - Santa Rosa, CA

Contact: Dan Condron, Public Affairs Manager
707-577-1400

Partnership School: Hidden Valley Elementary
707-522-3180
Dr. Lou Alsobrook, School Board
707-528-5181

11. 3M Corporation - St. Paul, MN

Contact: Eastside Workplace Kindergarten
612-228-7734
Jayne Royse, 3M Employee Services
612-737-1265

12. Bank of America (formerly Barnett Bank and Nation’s Bank) - Jacksonville, FL

Contact: Mary White, Work Life Director
904-791-5089

Partnership School: Beauclerc Elementary
Montelle Trammell, Principal
904-739-5226

13. Mt. Sinai Medical Center - Miami, FL

Contact: Director, Childcare Center
305-674-2307

Partnership School: North Beach Elementary
Aida Marrero, Principal
305-531-7666

14. Florida Power and Light - Miami, FL

Contact: Betty Thomas, Principal
305-245-0270

Partnership School: Campbell Drive Elementary
Gwendolyn Hines
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15. Downtown Partnership School - Des Moines, IA

Contact: Jan Drees, Exec. Dir., Business Ed. Alliance
        515-284-5848
        Becky Brennan, Secretary
        515-284-5848

16. Manhattan Center Westshore Alliance Choice School - Tampa, FL

Contact: Lillian Strauss, Principal
        813-272-3952

17. Orlando Regional Healthcare Systems - Orlando, FL

Contact: Dyana Burke, Work Life Director
        407-841-5111
        Sarah Sprinkle, OCPS, Early Childhood Program Consultant
        407-317-3200

Partnership School: Blankner Elementary School
                       Polly Roper
                       407-245-1720
Schools at Work:

Schools at Work is a customized consulting firm which can guide potential worksite schools through each set of development. Their services include conducting feasibility studies (surveying employees, scouting locations, coordinating with the local school systems), overseeing the establishment of the school (coordinating building placement, supervising registrations, developing advisory boards); and program maintenance (evaluating and reporting on the worksite school’s impact on the corporate bottom line).

Schools at Work was established in 1995 by Mary Anne Ward, a national expert in establishing worksite schools and other non-traditional schools. They can be contacted on the Internet at: sawork@netpass.com.
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