

<b>The Ohio State University</b> <b>School of Educational Policy and Leadership</b>
--

**Introduction to Educational Administration**

EDP&L: 846 (3 Credits)

Summer 2007—Room 166

**1. Instructor**

Professor: Wayne K. Hoy	E-mail: <a href="mailto:hoy.16@osu.edu">hoy.16@osu.edu</a>
Phone: 292-5249	Fax: 292-7900
Office: Ramseyer 116	Hours: Tues, Wed, Thurs. by appointment
<a href="http://www.coe.ohio-state.edu/whoy">http://www.coe.ohio-state.edu/whoy</a>	

**2. Description/Rationale**

This course is designed for Master of Arts and/or licensure students concentrating their studies in K-12 educational administration. Students of educational administration will explore the different theories that guide educational administration practices in America and are introduced to the integrated **Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) and Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards**. The course examines conceptual foundations of educational administration with the aim of using theory and research to solve the problems of practice. The focus of this course is on the school as a social system with special emphasis on structure, politics, decision making, and quality outcomes. The class will include discussion and analysis of cases, examination of experiences in schools, and the application of theory to practice. Our goal is to go beyond simply participating in these activities and use experiences together with relevant theory and research to expand your understanding of the school as a social system. In particular, we will deal with the following set of guiding questions:

**Guiding Questions**

- What is the nature of the social as a social system? What are the critical elements of the school social system? How do these elements affect each other?
- What kind of school structures enables teachers to be effective? How can structure be a positive force in teaching and learning? What are the negative consequences of structure? How can they be avoided?
- How can principals empower teachers? How does one make power legitimate in the school? To what extent is school politics dysfunctional to the operation of the school? What are the political games and tactics that face administrators and teachers? How can the administrator avoid destructive school politics?
- What models of decision making are most useful to school administrators? To what extent can school decision making be rational? What are the forces that impede rational decision making? What kinds of decisions are “good enough?”

### 3. Relationship to other Courses

This is the introductory course for the masters and licensure program in Educational Administration.

### 4. Student Outcomes: Knowledge, Dispositions, and Performances

- To understand the nature of educational administration and the body of literature that informs it.
- To develop an awareness of the larger context for educational administration, an historical, social, and cultural context that recognizes different approaches to and understandings of educational administration.
- To gain knowledge of the roles, responsibilities, and expectations as well as the emerging functions and structures that challenge American school administrators in the early twenty-first century.
- To learn concepts and theories important to research and practice in educational administration.
- To begin to be self-conscious of one's own administrative theory and practices.
- To begin to understand how the knowledge, dispositions, and performances comprising the integrated **Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) and Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards** support and advance the work of school leaders.

### 5. Diversity

Through the use of case studies that describe contemporary problems within actual schools, students will have opportunities to acquire and apply knowledge, dispositions, and performances necessary to assess school structure, to implement context-appropriate strategies, to demonstrate leadership, and to show sensitivity and fairness to all. These strategies seek to capitalize on the diversity (e.g., population, language, disability, gender, race, socioeconomic) of the school social system in order to improve the school-learning environment.

#### *Statement of Student Rights*

“Any student with a documented disability who may require special accommodations should self-identify to the instructor as early in the quarter as possible to receive effective and timely accommodations.” If students in the class desire any accommodations to make the course learning experiences more accessible or valuable, please contact the instructor.

### 6. Technology

Students will engage in a systematic study of the structure of schools using descriptive instruments to construct profile of schools. The analyses will include the use of statistical analyses of actual data using SPSS or other scoring and statistical programs. Power-point presentations will be used to summarize, analyze, and interpret the data. Moreover, students will use the internet to find appropriate instruments to map the structure of their school. Students will be given opportunities use technology to enhance their productivity and professional practice (e.g. database decision making, power point presentation, statistical analyses, etc.)

## 8. Topical Outline

June 19	Course Overview—Historical Perspective and Standards
June 21	School as Social System
June 26	Structure in Schools
June 28	Structure in Schools
July 3	Power and Politics
July 5	Midterm Exam
July 10	Decision Making
July 12	Case analysis
July 17	Case analysis
July 19	Final Exam

**Each of the ten classes and the assignments for each are listed below on a class-by-class basis.**

## Class Schedule

### CLASS 1—June 19, 2007

1. Introductions
2. Course overview
3. Historical Foundations & Systems Framework
4. Standards for School Administrators

### **ASSIGNMENT for June 21, 2007**

Read *The School as a Social System*--Hoy & Miskel--Chapter 1

- Rational systems
- Natural systems
- Open systems
- School as an open system

### **SUGGESTED READINGS**

Bacharach, S. B. (1989). Organizational theories: Some criteria for evaluation,” *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 496-515.

Blau, P. M. and Scott, R. W. (2003). Formal organizations: A comparative approach. Stanford, CA; Stanford University Press.

Bolman, L. G. and Deal T. (2003). Reframing organizations. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Burrell, G. and Morgan, G. (1980). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*. London: Heinemann.

DiMaggio, P. J. (1995). Comments on what theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 391-397.

Morgan, G. (1996). *Images of organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hinnings, C. R., & Greenwood, R. (2002). Disconnects and consequences in organizational theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, 411-421.

Scott, W. G. (1992). *Chester Barnard and the guardians of the managerial state*. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press.

Weick, C. (1995). What theory is not, theorizing is. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 385-390.

\*\*\*\*\*

## CLASS 2—June 21, 2007: DISCUSSION

### 1. Review Historical Perspectives

- Scientific Management Perspectives-- Rational Systems Perspective
- Human Relations Perspectives-- Natural Systems Perspective
- Social Science Perspectives-- Open Systems Perspective

### 2. Review Nature and Meaning of Theory

- What is theory? Research? Science?
- What is the relationship between theory and research?
- What is the relationship between theory and practice?

### 3. Discuss the School as a Social System

- Case Study—Rash Decision?

### ASSIGNMENT for June 26, 2007

1. Read and study Chapter 3—*Structure in Schools*
2. Take note of the difference between formal and informal structure.
3. Compare Weber's Model of Structure with Hall's.
4. Is bureaucratic structure bad? Why?
5. Is bureaucratic structure essential in schools? Why?

### SUGGESTED READINGS

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Etzioni, A. (1975). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: Free Press.

Hoy, W. K., and Sweetland, S. R. (2002). Designing better schools: The meaning and nature enabling school structures. *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 37, 296-321.

Ferguson, K. E. (1994). *The feminist case against bureaucracy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Mintzberg, H. *Structuring of organizations* (1979). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Sinden, J., Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2004). Enabling school structures: Principal leadership and organizational commitment of teachers. *Journal of School Leadership*, 14, 195-210.

Tarter, C. J., & Hoy, W. K. (2004). A systems approach to quality in elementary schools: A theoretical and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42, 539-554.

\*\*\*\*\*

### CLASS 3—June 26, 2007: DISCUSSION

1. Discuss and contrast Weber, Mintzberg, and Hall.
2. How would you characterize the structure of your school?
3. Discuss the informal organization of your school.
4. Discuss formal structure of your school.
5. How does one change the structure of a school?

### **ASSIGNMENT for June 28, 2007**

1. Review Chapter 3—*Structure in Schools*
2. **Download and read:**  
Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2001). Designing better schools: The meaning and measure of Enabling Structure, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37, 296-321.
3. Be prepared to discuss the meaning and measure of Enabling School Structures
4. Read and be ready to discuss the case—*Problems at West High*

### **SUGGESTED READINGS**

- Adler, P. S. & Borys, B. (1996). Two types of bureaucracy: Enabling and coercive, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 61-89.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hall, R. H. (1991). *Organizations: Structures, processes and outcomes* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hirschhorn, L. (1997). *Reworking authority: Leading and following in the post-modern organization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hoy, W. K. (2003). An analysis of enabling and mindful school structures: Some theoretical, research, and practical consideration. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41, 87-108.
- Hoy, W. K., Gage, Q. C., & Tarter, C. J. (2004). Theoretical and empirical foundations of mindful schools. In Wayne K. Hoy & Cecil Miskel (Eds.) *Educational organizations, policy and reform: Research and measurement*.
- Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2001). Designing better schools: The meaning and nature of enabling school structure. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37, 296-321.
- Klein, G. (1998). *Sources of Power*. Boston: MIT Press.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Structure in fives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Mintzberg, H. (1989). *Mintzberg on management*. New York: Free Press.

\*\*\*\*\*

## CLASS 4—June 28, 2007: DISCUSSION

1. Compare Enabling and Hindering Bureaucracies.
2. Have concrete examples of enabling school structures.
3. Measuring the enabling school structures.
4. Compare a bureaucratic with a professional orientation
5. Case Study Discussion: Problems at West High.

### **ASSIGNMENT for July 3, 2007**

1. Read and Study Chapter 6—*Power and Politics in Schools*
2. **Download and read:** Sweetland, S. R., & Hoy, W. K. (2001). Varnishing the truth: Principals and teachers spinning reality. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39, 282-293.
3. Identify political games played in your school.
4. Identify the power players in your school? Where do they get their power?
5. How much truth spinning happens in your school?

### **SUGGESTED READINGS**

Etzioni, A. (1975). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: Free Press.

Kanter, R. (1978). *Men and women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic.

Marks, H. M., and Louis, K. S. (1999). Teacher empowerment and the capacity for organizational learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35, 707-750.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Pugh, K., and Zhao, Y. (2003). Stories of Teacher Alienation: A look at the unintended consequences of efforts to empower teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 187-202.

Sweetland, S. R., and Hoy, W. K. (2000). School characteristics: Toward an organizational model of student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 5, 703-729.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations*, (4th editions). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yukl, G. & Falbe, C. M. (1993). The importance of different power sources in downward and lateral relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 416-423.

\*\*\*\*\*

**CLASS 5—JULY 3, 2007: DISCUSSION**

- 1. Discuss Power and Political Games.
- 2. Discuss Truth Spinning.
- 3. Discuss Game Playing
- 4. Discuss Power Players
- 5. Discuss Conflict Resolution
- 6. REVIEW FOR MIDTERM EXAM

**ASSIGNMENT for JULY 5, 2007**

**STUDY FOR MIDTERM EXAM—CHAPTERS 1, 3, 6**

\*\*\*\*\*

**CLASS 6—JULY 5, 2007**      **MIDTERM EXAM**

\*\*\*\*\*

**ASSIGNMENT for JULY 10, 2007**

- 1. Read and Study Chapter 9—*Decision Making in Schools*
- 2. What model is most useful to practicing administrators?
- 3. Can administrators optimize or must they satisfice?
- 4. Is the Garbage Can Model useful? How?
- 5. What model do you find most useful? Why?

**SUGGESTED READINGS**

Bacharach, S., Bamberger, P., Conley, S. C., & Bower, S. (1990). The dimensionality of decision participation in educational organizations: The value of multi-domain evaluative approach. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26, 126-167.

Etzioni, A. (1992). Normative-affective factors: Toward a new decision-making model. In Mary Zey (ed.). *Decision making: alternatives to rational choice models*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 89-111.

Etzioni, A. (1982). "Humble decision making," *Harvard Business Review*, 67, 122-126.

Janis, I. L., & Mann, L. (1977). *Decision making: The psychological analysis of conflict, choice, and commitment*. New York: Free Press.

Hoy, W. K. & Tarter, C. J. (2004). *Administrators solving the problems of practice: Decision-making cases, concepts, and consequence, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Lindblom, C. E. (1959). The science of muddling through. *Public Administrative Review*, 19, 79-99.

Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative behavior* (4th edition), New York, Free Press.

Zey, M. (ed.) (1992). *Decision making: alternatives to rational choice models*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

\*\*\*\*\*



## CLASS 7—JULY 10, 2007—CLASS

1. Classical and Administrative Models of Decision Making
2. Incremental and Mixed Scanning Models of Decision Making
3. Garbage Can Model
4. A Contingency Approach to Decision Making
5. When should you use each model?

### **ASSIGNMENT for JULY 12, 2007**

1. Read Chapter 8—School Effectiveness, Accountability, and Improvement
2. Be prepared to discuss the case of the *Teachers Council*
  - What the pertinent facts of the case?
  - What are the problems?
  - How serious are the problems?
  - As superintendent, what would you do?
  - What is the appropriate decision-making model?
  - How confident are you of success?

### **SUGGESTED READINGS**

Gladwell, M. (2005). *Blink*. New York: Little and Brown.

Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1974). *Leadership and ambiguity*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 1-25.

Klein, G. (1998). *Sources of power: How people make decisions*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

March, J. G. (1988). *Decisions and organizations*. Oxford; Blackwell.

March, J. G. (1994). *A primer on decision making*. New York: Free Press.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Tarter, C. J., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). A contingency theory of decision making. *Journal of Educational Administration* 36, 212-228.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **CLASS 8—JULY 12, 2007: Discussion**

1. How can you demonstrate that your school is effective?
2. What are the positive and negative consequences of accountability demands?
3. Analyze the case, Teachers Council.

### **ASSIGNMENT for JULY 16, 2007**

**READ** the case, **Conflict at Washington High (pp. 234-235).**

- Assume you were an assistant principal in this school.
- Assume the role of principal.
- Analyze what occurred and the actions of the administrators.
- Be prepared to discuss this case in some detail.

### **SUGGESTED READINGS**

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

Barnard, C. I. (1938). *Functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bacharach, S. B., Bamberger, P., Conley, S. C., and Bauer, S. (1990). The dimensionality of decision participation in educational organizations: The value of multi-domain educative approach. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26, 126–167.

DiMaggio, P. J. (1988). Interest and agency in institutional theory. In L. G. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional patterns in organizations: Culture and environments* (pp. 3-21). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger

DiMaggio, P. J., and Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147–160.

Hoy, W. K. (1996). Science and theory in the practice of educational administration: A pragmatic approach,” *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 27, 336-378.

Nadler, D. A. and Tushman, M. L. (1989). Organizational frame bending: Principles for managing reorientation, *Executive*, 3, 194-202.

Scott, W. G. (1992). *Chester Barnard and the guardians of the managerial state*. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press.

Thompson, J. D. (2005). *Organizations in Action*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publications.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**CLASS 9—July 17, 2007: Discussion**

- 1. Case—“Conflict at Washington High.”**
- 2. Review for Final Exam**

\*\*\*\*\*

**CLASS 10--July 19, 2007: FINAL EXAMINATION—A CASE STUDY**

**SUGGESTED READINGS**

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hirschhorn, L. (1997). *Reworking authority: Leading and following in the post-modern organization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hoy, A. W. & Hoy, W. K. (2003). *Instructional leadership*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Hoy, W. K. & Tarter, C. J. (2004). *Administrators solving the problems of practice: Concepts, cases, and consequences*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative behavior* (4th edition), New York, Free Press.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations*, (4th editions). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

\*\*\*\*\*

**9. Evaluation and Grading**

A	94-100%	A-	90-93%
B+	87-89%	B	84-86%
B-	80-83%	C+	77-79%
C	74-76%	C-	70-73%
D+	69-72%	D	66-68 %
E	Below 66%		

**Determination of Final Grade:**

<b>Midterm Exam</b>	<b>45 %</b>
<b>Final Exam</b>	<b>45 %</b>
<b>Participation</b>	<b>10 %</b>

<b>1. Midterm Exam: 45% of grade – JULY 5</b>
Comprehensive written exam: Multiple Choice, Short Essays, and Long Essays
<b>2. Final Exam--Case Analysis: 45%-- JULY 19</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Read an actual case describing a school or school district with an administrative problem.</li><li>• Then select the decision-making model that you will use to analyze the case—for example, satisficing, mixed scanning, muddling, or some combination.</li><li>• Describe in some detail the model (s) and the underlying assumptions. Why are you selecting this conceptual perspective? Be sure that you have fully explained the theoretical model you propose to use.</li><li>• Then use the model (s) to analyze the case.</li><li>• Develop a solution strategy for the case. Be sure that you do a comprehensive analysis of the case. Develop a realistic strategy to deal with the problem. Try to anticipate any negative consequences of your action plan. Be sure to consider both the short-term and long-term aspects of the problem and your plan.</li></ul>

**10. Texts and Bibliography**

**Required:**

1. Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. G., (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* [8th edition]. New York: McGraw-Hill.
2. Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards for School Leaders*. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers—Download from Website.
3. Selected Articles.

**Bibliography: See suggested readings for each session above.**

\*\*\*\*\*