

International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies

Volume 6 Number 6 August 2014
ISSN 2141-6656



*Academic
Journals*

About IJEAPS

The International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies (ISSN 2141-6656) is published monthly (one volume per year) by Academic Journals.

The International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies (IJEAPS) is an open access journal that provides rapid publication (monthly) of articles in all areas of the subject such as Educational Governance, Policy and Administration, Educational Ethics, Law and Special Education, Computer Applications in Educational Administration and Policy Studies etc.

The Journal welcomes the submission of manuscripts that meet the general criteria of significance and scientific excellence. Papers will be published approximately one month after acceptance. All articles published in IJEAPS are peer-reviewed.

Contact Us

Editorial Office: ijeaps@academicjournals.org

Help Desk: helpdesk@academicjournals.org

Website: <http://www.academicjournals.org/journal/IJEAPS>

Submit manuscript online <http://ms.academicjournals.me/>.

Editors

Prof. Amalia A. Ifanti

*Department of Educational Sciences and Early
Childhood Education, University of Patras, Rion-
Patras 26504, Greece.*

Dr. Suseela Malakolunthu

*Department of Educational Management and
Policy
50603 Kuala Lumpur,
Malaysia*

Prof. Ugur Demiray

*Anadolu University,
Faculty of Communication Sciences,
26470 Eskisehir,
Turkey*

Dr. Richard J.M. Smith

*Policy and Leadership Studies,
National Institute of Education,
Nanyang Technological University,
1 Nanyang Walk, Singapore 6367616,
Republic of Singapore*

Dr. Napoleon B.

*Social Development Staff (SDS),
National Economic and Development Authority
(NEDA,
Amber Avenue,
Pasig City, Metro Manila
Philippines.*

Dr. H. Gülru Yüksel

*Yildiz Technical University,
Faculty of Education,
ELT Dept., Davutpasa-
Đstanbul - 34210-
Turkey*

Dr. Christopher Joseph Conlan

*School of Education,
Curtin University of Technology
Australia*

Dr. Terrence Edward Paupp

*0597 Porto Court
San Diego, California 92124
USA.*

Dr. Barbara Lieb

*Adjunct Professor, College of Arts and Sciences,
George Mason University,
Fairfax, Virginia
USA*

Editorial Board

Prof. Victor Yu
Cavalry Education Group
Singapore

Dr. Scott Eacott
School of Education,
Faculty of Education and Arts,
The University of Newcastle,
Callaghan NSW Australia 2308
Australia

Dr. Shoki O. Godwin
University of Ibadan,
Oyo State
Nigeria

ARTICLES

Review

- Evaluating education quality in terms of ISO9000 standards** 87
Matebe Tafere

Research Articles

- An examination of the impact of safe school funding on the incidences of violent behaviors in the school environment of a rural and urban school district** 101
Robert Malone Jr¹, Elizabeth K. Davenport^{1*},
Brian M. Hickey¹ and Melvin Robinson²

Review

Evaluating education quality in terms of ISO9000 standards

Cheng Fengchun¹, Linda R. Vogel² and Zheng Zhaoyu¹

¹Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China.

²University of Northern Colorado, U.S.A.

Received 10 October, 2013, Accepted 30 July, 2014

While nations measure the quality of educational systems by different standards, many nations, such as China, have adopted the ISO9000 quality standards to assess the quality of schools. This article explores the various elements of the ISO 9000 standards and how each element relates to the various groups that are consumers or stakeholders in the educational process. The authors then develop a model to explain the relationship of the expectations of stakeholder groups to measures of quality for educational inputs, processes, and outputs. Emphasizing the differences between business and educational systems, a balance of promissory and satisfaction standards based on the ISO9000 standards is suggested in order to appropriately and effectively assess educational quality.

Key words: Education, quality; standards, ISO9000 series, customer satisfaction.

INTRODUCTION

Education quality, which we shall discuss further and suggest revisions, has been one of central theoretic problems in the field of educational theory for a long time. Moreover, with the proliferation of educational options and the emphasis on global competitiveness, education quality has become a central societal issue in the past several years. However, regarding what education quality is and what standards can be used to evaluate it, opinions differ greatly (Husen, 1997; Yongtao and Qingyong, 2003; Minn, 2000; Quanlin, 2000).

ISO9000, which offers organizations and industries regardless of type, size and product provided with a scientific quality assurance system and quality analysis tool which helps in analyzing and improving quality of products and services, is undoubtedly one of the greatest achievements of quality management theory and practice

in present times. Countries all over the world have adopted and implemented ISO9000 as national standards to analyze and improve products and manage the production process. In 1992, China also adopted ISO9000 as its national standard across industries, including education. The article will discuss the application of ISO9000 as it relates to education quality (State Quality Supervision Bureau, 2001), highlighting the differences between products and services in business and educational organizations and examining how educational quality standards can be developed to address the expectations of each education stakeholder group.

Quality is defined in ISO9000 as the "degree to which a set of inherent characteristics (3.5.1) fulfills requirements (3.1.2). Requirement refers to "need or expectation that is stated, generally implied or obligatory" (Jisheng, 2002, p.

*Corresponding author E-mail: cfc1963@sina.cn, linda.vogel@unco.edu. Tel: 86-13501162711.

8). It is obvious that products or services themselves cannot be designated as quality; instead, quality is the degree to which a set of inherent characteristics fulfills requirements. Consequently, an "inherent characteristic (3.5.1) of a product (3.4.2), process (3.4.1) or system (3.2.1) related to a requirement (3.1.2)" determines a "quality characteristic" in ISO9000 (Jisheng, 2002, p. 11).

In accordance with terms defined in ISO9000, we define inherent educational characteristics of schooling related to the requirements of the customers as educational quality characteristics. In light of ISO 9000, education itself cannot be designated as quality; instead, education quality is the degree to which a set of inherent educational characteristics (3.5.1) fulfill the requirements of education consumers. Therefore, the crux of defining education quality lies in establishing the needs or requirements of education consumers. These needs or requirements of the education consumers thus become the characteristics by which education quality can be defined and measured, guiding education improvement efforts. After a discussion of quality characteristics associated with educational services as compared to other enterprise products, a model is presented to explain the expectations of various educational stakeholders or consumers which leads to the recommendation of the development of both promissory and satisfaction standards for education in order to address the multiple and complex facets of true educational quality.

Manifestations of education quality characteristics

The activities of social organizations can be divided into two types: the production of tangible products and the production of a service or information. The qualities of these different products are manifested in varied forms which merit individual discussion. First, service organizations provide customers with services directly which creates a close, interwoven personal relationship between the service supplier and customers which cannot be separated. The interrelation between them is also a component of the service provided. This differs from the production of tangible products where producers and customers may never personally interact and establish relationships. Second, the timeliness of service provision is an element of the service being provided. Third, service cannot be repaired as can tangible products so service requires higher quality, i.e. meeting the needs or requirements of the consumer. It must be correct the first time, because the consumer may not allow a second opportunity for services to be provided if they are unsatisfied with the initial service. Nevertheless, no one can always be flawless. It is unavoidable for people to make mistakes and this means that service is often beset with more difficulties. Fourth, the process of providing a service is as important as or sometimes inseparable

from the results. With regards to the production of a tangible product, quality is manifested or contained in the product. Service, however, is a provision process in which quality is embodied in the process. The "what" and the "how" of the service are often synonymous.

Fifth, service is usually offered to customers by staff or ground-level employees in basic units, rather than by management. Typically, there exists a distance between mid-level and top-level managers of the organization and the customers; administrators and customers may rarely interact. Hence, service organizations must find ways to inspire employees who actually deliver services to offer customers the best possible service on an on-going basis. Compared to tangible products, the needs or requirements of consumers regarding intangible services are harder to definite or measure. For customers, interpersonal attributes or the "soft index" of satisfaction is very important, such as carefulness, manners, kindness, concern, etc., which positively impact customers' perception of a service. This positive perception is doubly important because, unlike tangible products that can be displayed to potential consumers, service providers grow their customer base through reputation. A positive experience of one customer increases the likelihood that the customer will recommend the service to others. Establishing and maintaining a positive image and reputation takes time and can always be impacted by human error, as mentioned above (Cheng and Hong, 2000, pp. 164-168).

Service quality is more difficult to define, establish, and maintain for all of the foregoing reasons and arguably requires more effort. The quality characteristics of services have to be manifested in every aspect, from input to procedure and the final output. Comparatively, the quality characteristics of tangible products are contained to the characteristics of the final output or result and customer satisfaction with that finite output or product.

Education can be considered as a service provided rather than the production of a finite product if the criteria for production are based on (1) specialized and controlled supply of raw materials or inputs, (2) the processing of raw materials in a standardized manner, and (3) products meeting predetermined, uniform specifications. Education, however, cannot select its customers who are the raw materials or inputs in the educational process. Furthermore, education cannot "change" or process the raw materials of students in a standardized format and hope to attain any uniformity of outcomes, given the differing needs and attributes of each individual. While the learning goal might be similar for each student, specific goals and processes to achieve those goals vary for each individual (Sallis, 1993, p. 29).

Many people consider educational organizations to be the same as business organizations, comparing the use of resources, product production, external customer

satisfaction, and promoting learner success in both the present and future. Compared to general production and management industries, we usually apply different words to describe education related issues and activities regarding the products of educational organizations and how those products are judged by society (Kaufman and Zahn, 1993, p. 23). Actually, education is viewed as a production activity inferred from the above view. While newly enrolled students are looked upon as “semi-finished products,” graduates who are cultivated in educational institutions are “end products.” As a matter of fact, service and productiveness characteristics co-exist in education. Opinions vary among different stakeholder or customer groups. Customer groups include the following: governments, society, parents, and youngsters. Between and among these groups, opinions are diverse on education, so are each customer group’s requirements from the educational process. Characteristics of education also differ among school systems and individual schools with each manifesting educational quality differently, as well.

As described in ISO9000, the term “customer” refers to organizations or individuals who receive products, either internally or externally. In reality, customers specifically refer to the consumer, shopper, final user, retail dealer, beneficial owner, purchaser, employee, and shareholder (State Quality Supervision Bureau, 2001, p. 10). Compared with the customers of production and services in industrial and commercial enterprises, education customers are much more complicated. For business enterprises, customers are explicit and persistent, while for schools, in the instant when education starts, direct customers are receivers—students and education providers are undoubtedly schools and teachers. Nevertheless, the ultimate customers do not only consist of students, parents, employing units, governments, and society, but schools of higher or lower levels are also included. Demands of different customers vary accordingly. The relationships between different customers and schools are different as well. We can make further divide education customers into three ranks. The first rank, also named basic or direct customers, refers to students; the second rank refers to parents, education administrative departments, schools of higher levels and employing units; and the third rank includes the labor market, government, country, and society in general. Although students are direct customers, they do not directly contribute monetarily. Educational appropriations are offered by the second and third rank customers. Thus, when we consider the students’ requirements, we should also take the requirements of the second and third rank customers into consideration.

To students, education is a special kind of service. Education is a series of services offered by teachers, and educational facilities. According to the American education psychologist R. M. Garnie, education is “an

enterprise whose aim is to help people study” (Garnie et al., 1999, p. 3). Although good educational inputs can lead to good educational experiences, good inputs and good procedures can lead to good educational outputs. From the perspective of meeting students’ learning needs, good inputs and procedures are equally important. As a service offered to students, education quality should be understood as a degree to which QCE input, procedure, and output satisfy the learning needs of students. To students, education quality must be reflected through the whole education process, that is, education input, procedure, and output, as shown in Table 1.

Parents are concerned about the education output and their children’s school performance and grades. They hold high hopes for their children, wanting them to succeed in examinations, enter schools of higher levels, and continuously advance through the educational system. Nevertheless, parents are also concerned about how their children are treated in schools. They all wish their children to be treated fairly and justly at school, in classrooms, and in the pedagogical process. The teaching staff is expected to be kind and patient. To parents, education has the characteristics of both production and service, with the latter process perhaps more obvious. Therefore, education quality can be defined as the degree to which the characteristics of educational input, educational process, and educational output fulfill the parents’ requirements. To parents, education quality is reflected through the whole process of education, that is, education input, process, and output, as shown in Table 1.

What the government and education administration departments are concerned with is the products supplied by school—graduates. They wish the students to be qualified citizens and pillars of the society with the knowledge and moral character to promote the social, economic, and cultural development of a nation. As the government undertakes the duty of providing education for its citizens, including assuring that students are treated fairly, the government is also concerned about the educational process, as well. This can be seen from the government’s educational norms, principles, policies, and laws. In a sense, educational inputs are part of the government’s duty. It usually does not raise any requirements regarding educational inputs (except in the case of some private schools). From the perspective of the government, education has the characteristics of both productiveness and service, but the former one is more obvious concern for government. To governments, education quality can be defined as a degree to which the characteristics of education process and output satisfy the government’s requirements. Education quality is mainly manifested in two aspects, that is, education process and output.

Schools have a much more complicated relationship with society than with students, parents, government, and

Table 1. Customer concerns regarding the educational process.

Customers System element	Students	Parents	Government	Schools of higher levels or employers
Education Input	⊙	⊙		
Education Procedure	⊙	⊙	⊙	
Education Output	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙

⊙means strong concern, no ⊙means weak or no concern.

administrative units individually in that society is complex and multilayered. We define society as consisting of the politics, economy, culture, and technological or scientific infrastructure related to a specific social system, essentially the whole social background of a county. Seen from this macro level, society demands and expects schools to accomplish multiple goals: promoting economic development, fostering social culture, and safeguarding social stability. Compared with the macro-social background, schools have a closer relationship with local communities. Schools depend upon community support and enrich communities with their services. Communities expect schools to provide a high quality education and educational reputation, work with communities, and assist in solving children’s educational problems, as well as preventing unacceptable social behavior that might lead to criminal behavior. There is also the individual level of concern regarding the educational process. Society consists of individuals, including individual citizens and institutions or enterprises. Their demands and expectations towards education vary. These demands are always numerous and complicated and even contradictory sometimes.

Among these three levels of “society,” the requirements of the macro-society, communities, and individuals are often channeled through the government and reflected in governmental policies. The individual level of society is very complicated, and individuals may appear as parents or students, while individual organizations may appear as employing units or schools of lower or higher levels. Schools can treat them separately as students, parents, employers, and schools of higher or lower levels or as potential students, parents, employing units, and schools of lower or higher levels. Since the government, students, and parents have been considered as independent customers, schools should also care about societal customers, which includes those employing units and schools of higher levels. Educational output, which is the main concern of employing units and schools of higher levels, are the educated students. In these customers’ opinion, education is a producing procedure, in which qualified products, i.e. the graduates, are produced through a series of linked processes. These processes include educational input, process, and output, among

which the output—graduates—are the most important. Poor educational inputs and processes will influence output. Compared with output, input and process are a means rather than aim. For employing units and schools of higher levels, the quality of education students receive is a critical concern. From their perspective, education quality is the degree to which educational output characteristics satisfy customers. We can infer from the above analysis that different customers are concerned about different educational elements. To different customers, requirements of educational characteristics are different and different elements are viewed as reflecting a quality education.

According to the authors, there are mainly two things to consider when grasping education quality. Firstly, it is to treat education roughly as a service, reflecting quality throughout the whole educational process. The reasons are as follows:

- (1) Among all the education customers, students and their parents are the most important external customers and considered education as a service.
- (2) Production in educational systems is quite different from that in factories. What is produced in the factory are lifeless, “semi-finished products,” while schools are faced with conscious, active, and unique students. Schools “model” the students in that the schools attempt to shape students directly and also in that the students shape themselves in response to the experiences and contexts offered by the schools. The former modeling needs to consider students’ characteristics of both mind and body, while the latter can be achieved through educational “service.” That is to say, the education “producing” process has service characteristics.
- (3) Viewing the whole education process, educational “service” quality includes the quality of education in the entire process, covering educational “production” which emphasized the whole course. Second, based on a concrete understanding of education activities and an overall grasp of the educational process, we should work to change the perspective of concern among specific customers purposely. For students and parents, education should be considered from the perspective of service so as to meet their quality requirements, while for the

governments, society school of higher levels, and employing units, concerns should be put more on education productiveness.

The detailed contents of EQC

Service and tangible products have different contents of quality characteristics. Service quality characteristics include approximately six aspects. (1) The characteristic of function, which reflects the efficacy and usefulness of certain services. (2) The characteristic of economy, which reflects the reasonable degree of the expense that the customers should pay for different services. (3) The characteristic of safety, which reflects the capability of assuring customers' lives, health, and morality or goods are not damaged. (4) The characteristic of time, which reflects the ability to satisfy the customer in a timely manner, which includes being prompt, punctual, and efficient. (5) The characteristic of comfort, which reflects the degree of comfort during the service, after meeting the demands of function, economy, safety, and time. (6) The characteristic of civilization, which reflects the degree to which the moral requirements of customers are satisfied during service (Rui, 1995, p. 51).

The quality characteristics of tangible products also have six aspects. (1) The characteristic of function, which reflects the products' functions established by customers and society, including use and appearance. (2) The characteristic of credibility, which reflects the degree to which the products can be used claimed and other influencing elements---reliability, repairing, and guarantee for repairing. (3) The characteristic of safety, which reflects the products' capability of assuring no damage or death, loss of characteristics, and pollution during utilization. (4) The characteristic of adaptation, which reflects the products' capability of adapting to the changing of environments. (5) The characteristic of economy, which reflects products' reasonable life cycle expense. (6) The characteristic of time, which reflects the capability of satisfying customers' requirements on date of delivery and satisfying customers' changing requirements with the changing of time (Rui, 1995, pp. 50-51).

Comparing the characteristics of service quality and production quality, we find several things exactly the same, i.e. the characteristic of economy, safety, time; and something similar in the function of service and the function and adaptation of tangible products. There is, however, a difference in the importance placed on each quality characteristic.

Based on these analyses of education characteristics, we should combine the characteristics of productiveness and service of education together, and lay emphasis on the service property. So we can sum up the concrete intensions of education quality to the following seven aspects: the characteristics of function, comfort, time,

safety, economy, civilization and trustfulness.

(1) The characteristic of function refers to the function and utilization of education and its results, e.g., education promotes students' knowledge level and ability, enables them to attend schools of higher levels, brings a country's and government's educational aim into reality, provides the students with knowledge, skills, and character to be qualified professionals and functioning citizens in society, helps parents to care for and educate children, makes the graduates competent to obtain jobs at employing units. This characteristic of function is the most fundamental to educational quality.

(2) The characteristic of civilization refers to the school's ability to satisfy the customers' needs regarding moral character and the pursuit of positive social engagement that contributes to and upholds the fabric of society. Educational organizations and employees should coordinate their words and deeds with civilized criterion, have a definitive vision of how schools should be run, and shall advocate advanced cultural knowledge and skills, including moral character. This characteristic of civilization is quite important to education quality.

(3) The characteristic of comfort refers to the degree to which the customers feel comfort when in contact with schools. Besides the requirement for the characteristic of good function, the customers also wish to be comfort and happy when contacting with staffs, facilities, and engaging in the learning process. Students and parents want no sense of anxiousness, to be treated fairly and justly, and even to get moral enjoyment. These would be assured by the characteristic of comfort in education.

(4) The characteristic of timeliness refers to education's ability to satisfy the customers in time, which includes three aspects, i.e., to be prompt, punctual, and time-saving or efficient. Promptness means that customers are not kept waiting for very long, students who encounter difficulties are helped as soon as possible, and parents receive quick responses to their inquiries. Punctuality means that schools and associated events, meetings, and activities begin at the scheduled time. Time-saving can also be explained as efficient so that the educational process is accomplished within the proscribed time limits.

(5) The characteristic of security refers to schools' ability to ensure students' health and safety. This characteristic's emphasis lies in assuring educational facilities and interactions are safe and reliable. The schools' should often check and repair facilities to prevent against possible safety risks from developing. The environment of teaching and learning should be clean and also promote mental and emotional well-being throughout the interactions of students and adults.

(6) The characteristic of economy means that education expenses should be reasonable. Education and teaching funds invested by the government should be applied reasonably, and the tuition and/or fees collected should

Table 2. The order of importance of education quality characteristics.

Quality Characteristics	Function	Civilization	Comfort	Time	Safety	Economy	Trustfulness
Education process							
Education Input	⊙	⊙			⊙		⊙
Education Procedure	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	
Education Result	⊙						⊙

⊙means the requirement of relevant characteristics

be reasonable. The expenditures of schools should have a clear budget and final accounts which is transparent in that it can be viewed by other stakeholders. Economy also implies the effective use of human resources.

(7) The characteristic of trustfulness refers to schools' ability to make customers feel that everything in the educational process is done for the benefit of the students, families, community, and society. The students trained by schools should behave in accord with social requirements and national regulations. School educational activities should be conducted with honesty and transparency so people view schools and educators as reliable and acting with the best of intentions. The schools must not conceal any of their problems or issue any false information to parents and society.

The order of importance for education quality characteristics

We cannot simply say which education quality characteristics are more important. Three dimensions should be considered to decide the order of importance of education quality characteristics. These include the customer dimension, whole process of education dimension (input, process, output), and quality property dimension.

We have learned from the analysis above that, to students, the quality characteristics of education input, whole process of education, and education results are all necessary. To parents, the education input, whole process of education, and education output are all necessary. To the government, the whole process of education and education output are necessary, but education output is more important. To schools of higher levels and employers, educational result or outputs are the most important (Table 1)

From the perspective of the whole education process, the characteristics of function, civilization, safety, and trustfulness are the important aspects of education input. The characteristics of function, civilization, comfort, time, safety, and economy are necessary to education process, but the most important characteristics are function and trustfulness (Table 2).

Based on the two points discussed above, the different orders of importance of education quality characteristics can be conceptualized as follows:

- To students, the education characteristics of function, civilization, comfort, time, safety, economy, and trustfulness are all necessary.
- To parents, the education characteristics of function, civilization, comfort, time, safety, economy, and trustfulness are all necessary, while comparatively function, safety and economy are more important.
- To schools of higher levels and employing units function, safety, economy, and trustfulness are most important (Table 3).

Promise + satisfaction: Promissory standard and customers' satisfactory standard

According to ISO9000, whether the education quality is high or not depends on customers' satisfaction. However, customers' satisfaction can be reflected only after the education has been provided. We need to know how to provide quality education before we begin with education inputs. The standards of education quality include two aspects: promissory standards and customers' satisfactory standards. Promissory standards have the characteristic of being promised before hand. It may be formulated by government (education administrative departments) or educational experts according to the demands of different customers and universally accepted within a certain scope. Schools accept and make promises to customers about providing education to a certain standard. Promissory standards may also be constructed by certain customers (students, parents, governments, schools of higher levels, and communities) according to the needs of each group and the ability of the schools. The former would mainly be the local standards or national standards while the latter is usually the combination of both. For example, some schools can accept national and local education quality standards while also making promises to abide by some quality standards with distinguishing features dictated by the

Table 3. Matching of education quality characteristics.

Customers Education Quality Characteristics		Students	Parents	Government	Employers or schools of higher levels
		Education Input	Function	⊙	⊙
	Civilization	⊙	⊙		
	Safety	⊙	⊙		
	Trustfulness	⊙	⊙		
Education Process	Function	⊙	⊙		
	Civilization	⊙	⊙		
	Comfort	⊙	⊙		
	Time	⊙	⊙		
	Safety	⊙	⊙	⊙	
	Economy	⊙	⊙	⊙	
Education Output	Function	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
	Trustfulness	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙

⊙ means the requirement of this characteristic.

specific customer population.

Education quality promissory standards usually require education to be specialized, adapted with certain aims and norms, and without any defects (or within the permitted scope). The customers' satisfactory standard requires schools to make customers satisfied and pleased or even going beyond customers' expectation. These two standards have different properties and usages. First, promissory standards pertain to all customers as they are formulated on the basis of different customers' demands. The aim of these standards is to satisfy most of the customers. Customers' satisfaction standards seek to satisfy each customer, individually. Second, promissory standards have a defined scope with definite intentions and extensions. Schools can achieve promissory quality by adhering to these predefined means and methods of educating students. Customer satisfaction standards are open, however, because different customers have different reasons to be satisfied; there is no unified means to satisfying all of the customers. Third, promissory standards are set while satisfactory standards change according to current contexts that impact customer needs. The idea of promissory standards is to achieve success by generally accepted and established means, while the idea of satisfaction standards are to satisfy customers by understanding and responding to their demands in current and changing contexts. Finally, promissory standards are made before hand while satisfactory standards are created and revised on a continual basis. The significance of promissory

standards of education quality lies in that it can offer prior guidance to schools, teachers, and customers, and at the same time provide students, parents, government, community, employers or schools of higher levels with a criteria by which to judge schools, the educational process, and teaching quality and to select schools or graduates. The significance of satisfactory standards is to try to satisfy customers throughout the educational process with the ultimate standard being high levels of customer satisfaction.

The promissory standards and customers' satisfactory standards provide us with two dimensions to inspect education quality practically. According to these two dimensions, we can reduce actual provided education to four typical types shown as Figure 1. Quadrant I refers to "high standard education with deviation," meaning that the provided education can achieve the high promissory standards, e.g., students gain a great deal of knowledge and skills, obtain high scores, and a very high proportion of students enter schools of higher levels, but these achievements are made at the expense of students' spare time and students may view the burden of studying as a hardship. Quadrant II refers to "high standard education," which means that the promissory standards are achieved to a high level and students enjoy the educational process as well. Quadrant III refers to "low standard education," which means that promissory standards are not achieved and students do not enjoy the educational process. Quadrant IV refers to "high satisfaction education," which means that, although students




Figure 1. Interaction of promissory and satisfaction standards.

feel happy, they gain little in their studies and promised standards are not achieved.

One could ask, “Aren’t promissory standards of education quality based on customers’ demands (quality characteristics)? Why does there exist the situation in which the standards are highly achieved but customer satisfaction is low?” In fact, this situation is quite possible. Promissory standards of education quality are transformed from customers’ demands and expectations, but, because of customers’ career choices and view of education value, customer needs may lead to deviation of standards. That is to say, the promissory standards may not be what customers really expect, but they are adopted in the name of customers’ standards. Conducting or directing education in this way may lead to the situation that the standards are highly achieved but customers are not satisfied. The problem lies in that the promissory standards of educational quality may be unreasonable standards.

Even though the promissory standards are scientific and reasonable, there still may be the situation of “high standard with deviation.” Schools have two means to achieve high promissory standards. One is that the teachers try their best to improve teaching methods, selecting appropriate content, but without adding unreasonable burdens to the students. In this situation, high standards are achieved and the students feel satisfied as well. The other means is that the teachers place the preponderance of the burden of learning on the students in an unreasonable manner. Although the promissory standards are highly achieved in the latter context, the

students feel unhappy. The situation is contributed to by the educational process rather than the promissory standards. Seen from the perspective of pedagogy and psychology, making students satisfied and happy has value in the present and as a means to obtaining future goals. In the present, students who are happy more fully participate in the educational process. As a means to obtain future goals, greater participation in the educational process may accelerate students’ learning and accomplishments, leading to greater success both in school and in future employment or higher levels of education. We can see from the above analysis that customers’ satisfactory standards are necessary from the perspective of student customers and also may facilitate the quality of educational outputs.

The education of “high satisfaction with deviation” is not what we should pursue, either. This does not seem in accordance with normal practice. Based on ISO9000, quality is a measure of the degree to which substantial characteristics satisfy customers. Why might “customers’ high satisfaction” not be truly high quality? To enterprises, there cannot be the situation of “high satisfaction with deviation.” This is because, in enterprises, the customers are always right. However, that is not the case in schools. Education is an enterprise oriented towards the future. Education should consider not only students’ present demands but also their demands when they enter society in the future. That is to say, education should not only be concerned about students’ present satisfaction but also about their future satisfaction. Sometimes, the present satisfactions have to be sacrificed for the sake of future

satisfactions. Or from another perspective, present satisfaction may mean the loss of future satisfaction. John White, a British educationist and philosopher, said:

If one's aim is only that children are happy now, then why is their later life to be left out of the picture? Suppose an emphasis on present sacrificed to the present? There is a similar arbitrariness in the other alternative: If happiness as an adult is all the matters, perhaps even at the cost of present unhappiness, then why is a later stage of life to be seen as more important than an earlier one. The only way of avoiding the arbitrariness is to see each stage of life as equally worthy of consideration as each other. If happiness is to be the aim, or an aim, of education, it should be happiness in one's life taken as a whole (White, 1982, p. 52).

So we must achieve a balance between students' present happiness and future happiness. In order to accommodate the relationship between happiness now and later in life, we need to draw support from promissory standards of education quality which reflect more universally held views on students' present and future needs and demands.

At the same time, schools have various customers, including internal customers and external customers. In enterprises, customers do not have any benefit contradiction with each other. One customer's satisfaction usually will not have any influences on another customer's satisfaction. For example, suppose two customers go to the shop and buy cups separately. One's satisfaction with the cup probably will not influence the other person's satisfaction. The same is not true with education. The requirements and expectations of students vary a great deal from those of governments or society. As a result, putting undue stress on students' satisfaction may be at the expense of satisfactions of governments and society. To treat all the satisfaction requirements of all customers equally, we should not blindly chase a certain customer or a certain group's satisfaction. Instead, a balance should be achieved. Support can be drawn from the promissory standards of education quality. Moreover, the capacity of schools should be taken into consideration. We should create realistic standards which schools are capable of accomplishing. Promissory standard are also highly valuable here. Therefore, we can draw the conclusion that promissory standards and customers' satisfactory standards are requisites for guidance in the practical educational work and education quality measurement, and the best way is to try to achieve a certain balance without overemphasizing one at the expense of the other.

The following discussion includes graphic representation of the quality expectations of various education stakeholders regarding the services provided by schools. Stakeholder concerns or expectations with various aspects of the educational process, importance of the

different outcomes to each group, and then how promissory and satisfaction standards can be used to assess education organizations are each discussed and graphically represented, as well as a model of how each element is related to the other elements.

Suppose education quality is EQ, customers' Satisfaction Degree is SD, the degree the promissory standards achieved is PSD, promissory standard of education input quality is PSD₁, promissory standards of education process quality is PSD₂, and promissory standard of education output quality is PSD₃. As we know, educational input, process, and output are equally important and independent from each other. So we can use the following formula to express their relation.

$$PSD = PSD_1 + PSD_2 + PSD_3$$

At the same time, we can use these symbols above to express the four situations in Figure 1, as follows:

- (1) high SD, high PSD, lead to high EQ (quadrant II)
- (2) high SD, but low PSD, lead to low EQ (quadrant IV)
- (3) low SD, high PSD, lead to low EQ (quadrant I)
- (4) low SD, low PSD, lead to lower EQ (quadrant III)

The above reflects a kind of special logical relationship among EQ, SD, and PSD, which can be expressed in the following second formula and, by this formula, four situations above can also be deduced:

$$EQ = SD \times PSD$$

Based on the first formula, we can combine the two formulas to create a third formula as follows:

$$EQ = SD \times PSD = SD \times (PSD_1 + PSD_2 + PSD_3) = (SD \times PSD_1) + (SD \times PSD_2) + (SD \times PSD_3)$$

Three independent items appear at the right of formula equality sign. (SD×PSD₁) reflects the total quality of education inputs. Education, especially elementary education, is a quasi-public product and should not be planned regarding educational inputs according to customers' satisfaction. There are several reasons for this. On one hand, education, especially elementary education, is supported by public funds, cannot be too expensive for the sake of meeting customers' satisfaction, and thus, educational inputs shall be regulated in order to use public funds reasonably, effectively, and fairly. On the other hand, school inputs (especially human resources, financial resources, and material resources) are the responsibility of government's and parents' and not controlled by schools. We should not, therefore, require schools to satisfy customers in terms of school education input. The quality of education input could only be formulated by specialized and professional standards,

Table 4. TEQ standards' order.

Education Quality Standards		Customers			
		Students	Parents	Government	Society (Schools of higher levels and employing units)
Education Input	Promissory Standards	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
	Satisfactory Standards				
Education Process	Promissory Standards			⊙	⊙
	Satisfactory Standards	⊙	⊙		
Education Output	Promissory Standards	⊙	⊙		
	Satisfactory Standards			⊙	⊙

⊙Indicates a standard that should be considered in the educational process.

i.e. to evaluate education input quality by promissory standards as shown in Table 4. (SD x PSD2) reflects “education process quality.” To parents and students, happiness with the education process is very important. Thus, satisfactory standards should be a priority rather than promissory standards, which implies that schools shall not only adhere to the education process with promissory standards, the more important thing is to satisfy students and parents. Community, government, schools of higher levels, and employing units care more about educational results, and, in a certain sense, education process has less influence on the satisfaction of governments and society. From the government’s and society’s perspective, promissory standards should be considered as a priority, as shown in Table 4.

(SD x PSD3) reflects “education output quality.” We know that governments, communities, schools of higher levels, and employers are concerned more about educational outputs. To them, educational outputs should be considered above all else. That is to say, schools should coordinate educational outputs with promissory standards. More importantly, outputs should satisfy governments, communities, schools of higher levels, and employing units. The achievement of promissory standards means that students can enter schools of higher levels, gain more knowledge and achieve better academic results, and increase their capability, all of which are what parents and students expect from education. This means that, in the achievement of education outputs, promissory standards meet the requirements of students and parents also. From the perspective of students and parents, education outputs take precedence, as shown in Table 5.

Drafting and Selection of Education Quality Promissory Standard

Seen from the above analysis, every element of the educational process needs promissory standards. From this aspect, education promissory standards are more important than satisfaction standards. In educational practice, education quality promissory standards have encompassing effects. First, they provide education and related work with a reference and guide for action. Second, they provide students and parents with a criterion to judge school’s education quality in the selection of schools. Third, they provide schools with a criteria to evaluate internal teaching quality and external comments, including self-evaluations of every department and every staff member, as well as school administrator’s evaluations of school’s every department and every staff member. Fourth, they provide all customers (students, parents, society, and the government), schools, and educators with a criteria to evaluate and comment on educational facilities and educational outputs provided by a school and its staff. This promotes a common language that all customers can use to communicate regarding educational issues. In order to ensure the above effects, education quality promissory standards should have the following characteristics:

The characteristic of comprehensiveness

The characteristic of comprehensiveness refers to promissory standards that have the function of fully reflecting all aspects of the educational process and

Table 5. Components of Education Quality Standards

Quality Standard Education Processes	Promissory Standard						Satisfactory Standard				
	Function	Civilization	Comfort	Time	Safety	Economy	Trustfulness	Students	Parents	Government	Employers
Education Input	⊙	⊙			⊙		⊙				
Education Process	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		⊙	⊙		
Education Output	⊙						⊙			⊙	⊙

⊙ indicates appropriate inclusion of element or group.

requirements and guiding the school's work in all aspects. Comprehensiveness of promissory standards includes the following aspects:

(1) Consideration of the requirements of a school's internal and external customer needs and expectations to that the school can effectively respond to those needs and expectations. We can never attend to one thing and lose sight of another.

(2) Comprehensively take every element and related factors in the education process into account. We should not only consider the educational achievements of a school, in terms of the proportion of students entering schools of a higher level, academic attainment, knowledge, skills, attitudes, creativity, and so on, but also consider factors that relate to the process of teaching and learning.

(3) Consider the long-term and short-term requirements of customers and schools. Avoid over emphasizing long-term benefits at the expenses of immediate interests.

(4) Comprehensive promissory standards serve a guidance function. Promissory standards should inform a school's staff as to what they should do, how do they do what they do, how they exercise control, and how they evaluate, notifying external customers about what services and products the school provides, and how the school's education and teaching quality will be evaluated.

Comprehensiveness refers to the fact that a promissory standards system ought to be systematic, taking all factors into consideration. In order to create comprehensive promissory standards, standards should include the following:

(1) A combination of single standard indexes and comprehensive standard indexes. For certain or specific jobs, a single index would be adequate if the goal is a single item. For more complex jobs, a comprehensive

index is needed. Single and comprehensive standard indexes should be aligned to ensure the achievement of total education quality.

(2) Include the key or critical aspects of a position or task. The famous Italian economist Vilfredo Pareto made a conclusion, after analyzing economic phenomenon, that in a certain system, key determinants are in the minority while insignificant determinants account for the majority. Juran called the regular pattern the "Pareto Principle." According to the Pareto Principle, we can simplify the standard by looking at key customers, key inputs, key processes, and key outputs to ensure standard comprehensiveness.

(3) Combine practical standards with evaluation standards. Traditional education quality management systems focus on evaluation, emphasizing particularly the setting up of evaluation standards focused on judging and evaluating work quality of every department and every individual. Quality management systems based on ISO9000 should combine evaluation with concrete guidance that outlines work standards. Specifically, promissory standards should indicate what should be taught, how it should be taught, and how the process will be evaluated,

The characteristic of advancement and rationality

Education quality promissory standards shall not only be the reference for work, but a driving force for promoting improvements in education and pedagogy. The advancement of education quality promissory standard includes two elements. First, it should reflect the requirements of development and updates in education and teaching technology, method, and content, so as to encourage educators to use new methods and new technologies. At the same time, it should encourage local school competitiveness. Finally, educational advancement should be

seen as a long-term process rather than a series of dramatic and unstable changes and also adhere to any established laws and policies.

The characteristic of stability and dynamic state.

On one hand, promissory standards are important references to direct education and the work of teaching. A balance must be achieved between systemic stability which provides customers with an understanding of what is to be done and how and responsiveness to external changes which might impact customers' expectations or needs. A stable process focused on continuous improvement will result in a higher quality of education rather than frequent, poorly planned or implemented changes that leave customers and educators unsure of the educational system.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Education Quality

First, education quality is judged by customers. To meet customers' needs is the final goal of EQ. This includes both the obvious customer demands and the "hidden" or future demands which may not be clearly self-evident in the present. For example, students may enjoy school but not be able to demonstrate their learning. Students and parents may still consider the school to be of comparable high quality, until the students graduate and are unprepared to enter the workforce or go on to high levels of education. Customer demands at the present may be met but not future expectations. The opposite can also be true in that students may not enjoy their educational experiences but graduate very well-prepared to enter the workforce or go on to higher levels of education. The ideal situation is that both the immediate and the future demands of customers are met with an enjoyable and effective educational experience.

Second, educational quality rests on key, critical characteristics. Secondly, the characteristics of education quality are the key foundation of education quality. Generally speaking, education quality characteristics include functionality, comfort, well timing, security, economical efficiency, and dependability. Schools must work to continuously improve each of these characteristics to maintain quality. Schools shall improve education quality through its quality characteristic enhancement.

Third, educational quality must be reflected throughout the educational process of inputs, processes, and outputs. Every aspect of education can impact customers' evaluation of education quality. A parent's dissatisfaction with a school's quality may not be related to curriculum, pedagogy, or teachers but rather with school

administration, management systems, or facilities. Similarly, a student may be dissatisfied with a specific teacher but quite satisfied with all of the other facets of the school. Educational quality covers all of these factors, however, from individual teachers, curriculum, and pedagogy to student support services, management, and facilities. A parent's disappointment to school's education quality may be not the dissatisfaction to class teaching but the management staff, managing system or unpleasant teaching facility; a student's dissatisfaction to school's education quality could be referring to the teachers, instead of the course. Education quality covers various aspects of school work, from teaching quality in common sense, to education managing system and assistant teaching activity's quality. The quality of the end results of the educational process—the graduates—are an essential aspect of educational quality as well, of course. Thus, each element of the educational process must be included in assessing and working toward greater educational quality.

Educational inputs should include a rigorous and appropriate curriculum, effective teachers, and sound pedagogy. The educational processes should include effective administration, sound management systems, and good student support services. Outputs would then ideally include graduates with a high level of academic attainment who are very well prepared to enter the workforce or higher levels of education and who also physically, mentally, emotionally, and socially well developed. Educational quality must be manifested throughout each of these elements in the education process. Moreover, it contains the quality of education result-graduates as well as the quality of those activity, course, condition, department and system, individually or combining with one another aiming to help the graduates. So the efforts for school education quality enhancement should not be put on education results, on class, or on teachers only, but education managers should monitor all aspects to promote school education quality as well. We can bring all school education factors into the entire course of education, from education input, education process, and education output. These include education input, such as curricula, teaching material, teachers and so on; education process, such as class interaction, curricula development, educational administration and so on; education output, such as graduates, academic attainments, physical and mental development, social achievement, entering schools of higher levels and so on. Schools' education quality should be manifested through all-round aspects of education input, education process and education output.

Fourth, education quality is dynamic and comparative. Different customers require different things and the education system must respond to each of these needs. Parents in rural areas may have different expectations and needs from the educational system than parents in

highly developed urban areas. This may require development or change in one or more elements of the educational process. Likewise, as the global economy grows and technology continues to develop, graduates will require different skills to be successful in an ever-changing workforce. Societal changes may also bring new, more immediate expectations from education by students and parents. While educational systems must respond dynamically to these change forces, the key components of educational quality discussed in this paper are unlikely to change. How each of those processes is carried out may very well change, of course. There must be stability within the process of planned continuous improvement for the education system to improve.

In many educational systems, schools do not recruit the same type of student and should not be compared to one another. The evaluation criteria should rest on whether a school meets their specific customers' needs. These criteria, applied to all aspects of the educational process, should determine the level of quality of a school.

Evaluation of standards of quality

The evaluation of education quality should continue to be based on a combination of promissory and satisfaction standards. Different elements in the educational process may emphasize different standards. Education inputs should emphasize promissory standards, whereas education processes and outputs must emphasize both satisfaction and promissory standards. Education quality promissory standards should include prescribed education quality characteristics which include parameters for evaluating the characteristic of function, civilization, comfort, time, safety, economy, and trustfulness.

As we know from the above analysis, the order of importance of educational quality characteristics is different for each element in the educational process. Regarding education input, the characteristics of function, civilization, safety, and trustfulness are important. For the educational process, the characteristics of function, civilization, comfort, timeliness, security, and economy are important. For educational outputs, the characteristics of function and trustfulness are important. In this way, we can arrive at a basic structure of education quality standards (Table 5).

In the past, we used to understand education quality as "students' learning degree of goodness or badness reflected through teachers' teaching and students' learning in the education process," and education quality defined as "talents' quality," that is, the quality of the students cultivated by schools (Ming, 1997, p. 362). This distinguishes the education process quality from the education output quality to some extent. However, when dealing with the relationship between the elements in the

educational process, "education process quality is the precondition and basis of education output quality; education output quality is realization and end-result of education process quality" (Ming, 1997, p. 362). This opinion actually claims that only education output quality is fundamental and the ultimate aim, while education process quality, on the other hand, is method, means, or tool. This neglects the decisive effects of education's direct customers, that is, the students, on education quality. With significant improvements in science and technology, coupled with rapid social progress and in accordance with society's and people's demands of education becoming more and more individualized and varied, we should include the opinion of all customers in defining quality and establishing an evaluation process regarding educational quality. The balance of promissory and satisfaction standards related to the various elements of the educational process, as outlined in this paper, would accomplish this goal and provide a much more accurate depiction of education quality rather than the application of the ISO9000 standards without any modifications to address the unique and complex aspects of the service of education. The feedback of students, parents, government officials, and society as a whole can improve the elements that make up the educational process and improve education quality effectively.

Conflict of Interests

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

- Cheng FC, Hong CW (2000). "Ideas of the total quality management in the West educational management in the 1990s," *Comparative Educ. Rev.* 7.
- Garnie RM, Briggs LJ, Wager W (1999). *Principles of instructional design* (In Chinese, trans. Pi L S, Pang W G). East China Normal University.
- Husen T (1987). "On the quality of education," *Journal of East China Normal University.* 3.
- Jisheng Z (2002). "New understanding of education quality," *J. Chongqing University,* 5.
- Kaufman R, Zahn D (1993). *Quality management plus: The continuous improvement of education.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Minn W (2000). "Implication of education and its standard of testing," *J. Northeast China University,* 2.
- Ming L (1997). *An introduction to the modern teaching management.* Beijing, China: Educational Science Publishing House.
- Quanlin W (2000). "Studying of the evaluation of teaching achievements and the standards of education quality," *Teach. Educ. Res.* 1.
- Rui L (1995). *Quality management and quality assurance standards implementation guide.* Beijing, China: Standards Press of China.
- Sallis E (1993). *Total quality management in education.* London: Kogan Page Limited.
- State Quality Supervision Bureau. (2001). *National standards of the People's Republic of China—Quality management system standards.* Beijing, China: Standards Press of China.
[http://www.sirris.be/uploadedFiles/SIRRISSubsites/ROHS/GB18455_2001_marking\(1\).pdf](http://www.sirris.be/uploadedFiles/SIRRISSubsites/ROHS/GB18455_2001_marking(1).pdf)

White J (1982). *The aims of education restated* (in Chinese, trans. Li Y H). Beijing, China: Education Science Publishing House.

Yongtao J, Qingyong Y (2003). "Studying on connotations and criteria of the quality of education," J. Dalian University, 5.

Full Length Research Paper

An examination of the impact of safe school funding on the incidences of violent behaviors in the school environment of a rural and urban school district

Robert Malone Jr¹, Elizabeth K. Davenport^{1*}, Brian M. Hickey¹ and Melvin Robinson²

¹Florida A& M University, Tallahassee, FL, United States.

²Alabama State University, United States.

Received 6 May, 2012, Accepted 14 July, 2014

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of additional revenues for safe school programs and services on the incidences of violent behaviors in the educational environment of a rural and urban school retrieving data from the fourth and final calculation of the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) for the 2001 to 2002, 2002 to 2003, 2003 to 2004, school years through the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE). The data for the independent variables were abstracted from the Division of K-12 Public Schools. The dependent variable and primary unit of analysis in the study were the mean revenues per pupil for each of the two school districts under examination. The variables examined were the district crime rates for various categories of offense (personal property; harassment; alcohol; tobacco and other drugs; fighting; disorderly conduct; and weapons). This study used descriptive statistics to determine the impact of additional monies on two south Florida school districts in an urban and rural school district. Comparisons were made to determine the effectiveness of state funding to combat violent behaviors in these schools. From this analysis, it was concluded that while the report of specific violent activities decreased; others increased based on the funding received; while still, others had no appreciable difference. An additional finding was that money from the FEFP did not appear to cure the problem of school violence and more attention should be placed on creating strategies and building community support systems for support of schools, parents and students.

Key words: violent behaviors, School Safety and Security, rural and urban school district.

INTRODUCTION

School officials have long used *Zero Tolerance* policies, which have pre-determined disciplinary consequences for students who commit specific offenses (notwith-standing individual circumstances), to counter the proliferation of

drugs and illegal weapons which have become a part of school culture (Underwood and Verstegen 1990). In 1990, the United States Congress passed the *Gun-Free School Zones Act* which made it "unlawful for any individual

*Corresponding author E-mail: elizabeth.davenport@fam.u.edu

knowingly to possess a firearm at a place that the individual knows, or has reasonable cause to believe, is in a school zone" (18 U.S.C. §922(q)(1)(A)). Two years after the implementation of the statute, the constitutionality of the law is challenged in *U.S. v. Lopez* (1995) in which the Supreme Court found the Act to be beyond the scope of authority of Congress under the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution. In view of the *Lopez* decision, in 1994 Congress passed the *Gun-Free Schools Act*, which authorized any school district receiving *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA) dollars to establish a policy, which called for a mandatory one-year expulsion for any student carrying a firearm on school property (20 U.S.C. § 8921). Legal scholars have often noted that one sanction does not fit all violation policies creating a criminal justice system, which provides little or no constitutional protection for all, regardless of the nature of the offense.

However, these same policies have historically demonstrated a disparate impact upon minority children who have been disproportionately suspended or expelled from their individual learning communities (Stover, 2000). Nevertheless, over the last decade the vast majority of states and their governing authorities have embraced *Zero Tolerance* policies for their schools in an effort to provide a secure and controlled learning environment for its children (Stover, 2000; Russo, 2001). To address the problem of school violence, extra resources have been allocated from Florida to school districts to support programs aimed at decreasing incidences and the presence of school violence.

Extra costs for educational programs were historically related to legitimate differences based on regional characteristics of school districts, type of program in which a student enrolled, or characteristics of student populations such as the learning disabled, students with English as a second language, and the poor (Berne and Stiefel, 1999; Addonizio 2003).

Florida established the Safe School Program aimed at providing funds to primarily large urban districts to combat the problem of school violence. Authorized initially by the *Florida Safe Schools Act* in 1986, the Florida legislature appropriates an annual amount for distribution to all 67 school districts. Each district is guaranteed a minimum of \$30,000.00, from the residual appropriation, 67% is allocated to each based on its latest Florida Crime Index, provided by the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE); and 33% is allocated to each district based on each its share of the state's total unweighted student enrollment. More specifically, the program is established to support activities for students that include:

1. After school programs for middle school students,
2. Improvement to enhance the learning environment which includes the implementation of conflict resolution,

3. Alternative school programs for adjudicated youth, and
4. Other programs and services designed to make the schools safe places to learn (Florida Department of Education, 2003).

Over the years, it has been assumed that money can lessen the incidents of violent behaviors in school environments. The State of Florida allocates safe school dollars to all the 67 school districts to support safe school programs. Florida has provided resources to its learning communities to support the development of preventive strategies and interventions to counteract the swell in school hostility. Through the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP), the Florida Legislature allocates Safe School dollars to the 67 school districts to create and maintain safe school environments. However, there has been little discussion or research regarding the impact of the distribution of school resources for students across the State of Florida violent behaviors in schools. Therefore, this study examines the impact of additional revenues for safe school programs and services on the incidences of campus violent and criminal behaviors in the two district settings: rural and urban.

The State Florida

The Florida Department of Education releases the School Environment Safety Incident Report (SESIR) that assessed "school safety" in the State of Florida. The data on school and violent behaviors contains information on 21 incidents of violent acts, and behaviors, disruptions and discipline. The areas focused in the SESIR included:

1. Time of incidents;
2. Persons involved;
3. Location of incidents;
4. Violent acts against persons;
5. Alcohol, tobacco, or other drugs;
6. Property;
7. Harassment;
8. Other non-violent incidents;
9. Fighting;
10. Disorderly conduct; and
11. Weapons possession (SESIR, 2004).

The school population in 2000 to 2001 is 2,556,615; the school population in 2001 to 2002 is 2,607,593; and the school population in 2002 to 2003 is 2,650,293. The incidences used as data in this investigation occurred in the school years of 2000 to 2001, 2001 to 2002 and 2003 to 2004. In the 2000 to 2001 school year, 96.11% of school incidents occurred during school hours compared to the 2002 to 2003 school year were 96.76% (SESIR, 2004). In all three years under study, students instead non-students (those individuals who are not in the school system) yielded the highest percentage (93.86% in 2002 to 2003) of school incidents. School incidents

often time occurred on school grounds with 96.15% in the 2001 to 2002 school year (SESIR, 2004). With regard to actual attacks, 11,746 students were victims of battery in 2000 to 2001 compared to 10,305 in 2002 to 2003 school year (SESIR, 2004). In 2001 to 2002, 11,121 students were victims of battery (SESIR, 2004). In terms of property damage, SESIR (2004) reported that vandalism (4,848 in 2000 to 2001) and Larceny/theft (4,797 in 2003 to 2004) occurred more often (SESIR, 2004). Finally, weapons possession is highest in 2000 to 2001 where only 3,596 students incidents were reported compared to 3,360 students incident reported (SESIR, 2004). Lastly, in 2001 under Section 1006.07(6) of the *Florida Statutes* or *Safe Passage Act*, required all 67 school districts to annually make a self-assessment of their safety and security best practices, operations. The self-assessments from the 67 districts are submitted to the Department of Education, where the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA) determine whether or not the districts met each best practice. The school districts that were unable to accomplish safety and security goals would offer strategies and actions to meet the best safety and security practices (OPPAGA, 2004).

The OPPAGA have the responsibility of developing and improving the safety and security best practices assessment instrument. The 29 safety and security best practices involved seven program goal areas which included the following:

- (a) Effectiveness and efficiency.
- (b) Safety planning.
- (c) Discipline practices and code of student conduct.
- (d) School climate and community outreach.
- (e) Safety programs and curricula.
- (f) Facilities and equipment, and
- (g) Transportation.

In a recent report released by OPPAGA (2004), the report revealed the following:

1. Ninety (90) percent of overall districts reported were in compliance of the overall best practices goals;
2. Twenty-nine (29) percent of the districts were not successful in providing the appropriate safety and security equipment to protect property and official records;
3. Twenty (20) percent of the districts were not successful in meeting best practices for safety and security programs;
4. Twenty (20) percent of districts reported not developing better emergency response; and
5. Eighteen (18) percent of districts reported an inappropriate system in place to minimize the risk of students with suicidal behaviors or tendencies.

Safe School Data: Florida

The total of school disciplinary and violent incidence is

the State of Florida for the years under consideration are summarized in Table 1. SESIR incident totals in the areas of Violent Acts Against Person, Alcohol and Tobacco, or Other Drugs, Property, Harassment, Other Non-Violent Incidents, Fighting, Disorderly Conduct, and Weapons Possession for the years under consideration are listed in Table 2. At the same time, Florida is making expenditures to abate violence in the schools. In the 1999 to 2000 school years, total safe school appropriations were the lowest with \$70,350,000.00. From the 2000 to 2001 to 2003 to 2004, the appropriations were the same with \$75,350,000.00 being allocated in each year (Florida Department of Education et al). In terms of allocations to the 67 school districts, only 2000 to 2001 school years received the most funding with \$75,199,219.00 (Florida Department of Education et al). In the 1999 to 2000 school years, safe school funding is the lowest with \$70,242,326.00. Expenditures for Safe Schools were the highest in the 2000 to 2001 school years (Florida Department of Education, 2004). Safety/Security Program activities received the highest percentage of funding in 2001 to 2002, 2002 to 2003, and 2003 to 2004 school years (Florida Department of Education, 2004). More specifically, in the 2002 to 2003 school years, 86% of the safe school funding went towards Safety/Security Program (Florida Department of Education, 2004). Six (6) percent, the lowest percentage of safe school funding, went towards Alternative Placement for Adjudicated Youth in the 2002 to 2003 school years (Florida Department of Education, 2004).

In 2003 to 2004, thirteen Florida school districts used a portion of their funding for after-school programs, which accounted for 7% of the total appropriated dollars expended (Florida Department of Education, 2004). Only four school districts (DeSoto, Duval, Palm Beach and Taylor) spent at least 25% of their total appropriation dollars on after school programming (Florida Department of Education, 2004). In 2003 to 2004 Duval (\$1,478,597.09) and Palm Beach (\$1,657,252.00) School districts spent the most on after school programs (Florida Department of Education, 2004). The alternative placement programs for adjudicated youth represented the second largest category in Safe Schools Appropriations. In 2003 to 2004, Safe School Appropriations supported twelve school districts in a wide range of on- and off-campus alternative programs (Florida Department of Education, 2004).

The Broward county school district spent \$3,025,276.00, the most for on and off campus alternative programs combined. In all three years from 2001 to 2004, Broward County, served the most adjudicated students (Florida Department of Education, 2004). The funding of the School and Safety Security Program Activities is a priority in the State of Florida. Most of the money spent in the school districts support school safety and security program initiatives (Florida Department of Education,

Table 1. SESIR incident summaries.

State of Florida	2001-2002		2002-2003		2003-2004	
Time of Incidents	%	Raw Data	%	Raw Data	%	Raw Data
During School Hours	96.46	116,114	96.46	108,948	97.40	110,680
Not During School Hours	2.53	3,048	2.03	2,283	1.80	2,045
Unknown	1.01	1,211	1.21	1,365	0.80	909
Total Number of Incidents		120,373		112,596		113,634
Persons Involved						
Students	93.45	112,493	92.86	104,552	93.84	106,631
Non-Students	1.39	1,673	2.09	2,353	1.10	1,246
Both Students and Non-Students	1.36	1,643	1.78	2,008	1.40	1,589
Unknown	3.79	4,564	3.27	3,683	3.67	4,168
Total Number of Incidents		120,373		112,596		113,634
Location of Incidents						
School Grounds	96.15	115,736	95.91	107,994	96.50	109,654
School Sponsored Activity	0.80	969	0.99	1,112	0.75	847
School Sponsored Transportation	3.05	3,668	3.10	3,490	2.76	3,133
Total Number of Incidents		120,373		112,596		113,634
Number of Schools Reporting No SESIR Incidents^a						
Elementary ^b	23.44	391	24.08	400	20.15	329
Middle ^c	1.95	9	0.86	4	0.63	3
High ^d	8.17	33	7.69	32	5.88	25
Total	20.93	18	16.44	12	17.65	12
Charter	72.27	159	61.64	143	51.20	128
Total Number of Schools		610		591		497

^aSome schools may have no SESIR incidents.

^bElementary includes kindergarten through grade five.

^cMiddle includes grades six through eight.

^dHigh includes grades nine through twelve.

^eCombination includes schools combining elementary, middle, or high groupings or overlap grade levels, e.g., K-6, 6-12, or K-12.

Please note that schools report SESIR incidents by incidents, not by individual student

2004). Table 2 illustrates that in 2003 to 2004, 97% of school districts spent Safe Schools Appropriation funds on school safety and security programs (Florida Department of Education, 2004). Approximately, 69% of the school districts spent 100% (\$30.1 million) see table of their Safe Schools Appropriation Funds on Safe and Security programs (Florida Department of Education, 2004).

The majority of the Florida school districts spent more on School Resource Officers from 2000 to 2004 (Florida Department of Education, 2004). Very few districts funded metal detectors, Teen Court, guidance services, trained dogs to search for drugs/gun, and student crime watch activities. In 2003 to 2004, Dade county school district spent the most of its allocated funds in the area of safety and security, \$12,694,218.00 (Florida Department of Education, 2004). In the area of Critical Safety Issues, it is reported in 2003 to 2004 three categories received top

priority in these districts—disrespect toward teachers, controlling aggressive student behavior, and controlling access to campus (Florida Department of Education, 2004). Lack of security equipment and controlling drugson campus were not viewed as priority. In summary, from 2000 to 2006 Safe Schools Appropriations has remained at \$75,350,000.00. School districts carried forward approximately \$7.8 million funding appropriation to assist, support, and strengthen school safety efforts (Florida Department of Education, 2004). At the end of the 2003-2004, \$11.3 million went unspent in the school districts, which is rolled forward (Florida Department of Education, 2004). In 2003 to 2004, most districts expended the majority of their Safe Schools Appropriations funds on After School programs (\$5.2 million), Alternative Placement Programs (\$5.2 million), and Safety and Security (\$6.2 million) to make Florida school districts safe (Florida

Table 2. SESIR totals.

State of Florida	2001-2002		2002-2003		2003-2004	
Student Population	2,607,593		2,650,293		2,705,674	
	Per 1,000	Raw Data	Per 1,000	Raw Data	Per 1,000	Raw Data
Violent Acts Against Persons	4.43	11,549	4.05	10,732	3.68	9,969
Homicide	0.00	0	0.00	3	0.00	5
Sexual Battery	0.05	139	0.05	128	0.05	123
Robbery	0.11	277	0.11	283	0.09	249
Battery	4.26	11,121	3.89	10305	3.54	9,585
Kidnapping	0.00	12	0.00	13	0.00	7
Alcohol, Tobacco, or Other Drugs	6.08	15,843	5.59	14,804	5.71	15,452
Drugs	2.31	6,032	2.19	5,798	2.40	6,505
Alcohol	0.42	1,086	0.42	1,112	0.48	1,300
Tobacco	3.35	8,725	2.98	7,894	2.83	7,647
Breaking/Entering	0.48	1,241	0.49	1,290	0.39	1,064
Larceny/Theft	1.78	4,630	1.81	4,797	1.75	4,747
Motor Vehicle Theft	0.03	81	0.04	97	0.04	110
Arson	0.08	210	0.09	228	0.08	214
Vandalism	1.59	4,146	1.54	4,069	1.32	3,571
Harassment	4.87	12,710	3.98	10,548	3.75	10,146
Threat/Intimidation	3.70	9,646	3.06	8,120	2.80	7,582
Sexual Harassment	1.18	3,064	0.92	2,428	0.95	2,564
Other Non-Violent Incidents	2.73	7,123	2.42	6,421	2.57	6,944
Sexual Offense	0.64	1,656	0.62	1,650	0.61	1,646
Trespassing	0.44	1,136	0.44	1,168	0.46	1,247
Other Major	1.66	4,331	1.36	3,603	1.50	4,051
Fighting	20.35	53,056	19.02	50,408	18.86	51,032
Disorderly Conduct	2.45	6,382	2.20	5,842	2.22	6,014
Weapons Possessions	1.30	3,402	1.27	3,360	1.62	4,371
Total	46.16	120,373	42.48	112,596	42.00	113,634

Department of Education, 2004).

Conceptual framework

This study examines the districts' violent behaviors within schools as it relates to the infusion of resources and the increase or decrease of violent behaviors on-campus. Figure 1 below illustrates the Conceptual Framework by displaying the sequence of activities. The issue to be answered is whether Safe School Program Resources have an impact on violent behaviors on campus.

METHODOLOGY

Research questions and hypotheses

This research examined the allocation of money in a rural and urban county in the State of Florida—Glades and Miami-Dade. The

research question explored was what are the effects of the allocation of additional revenues from the Safe School Programs on violent behaviors in schools in the counties under consideration?

The research hypotheses are:

1. HO₁: There is a positive relationship between the implementation of strategies and the incidences of violent behaviors in a rural and urban school district;
2. HO₂: There is a significant difference between incidences of violent behaviors in a rural area and urban school district; and
3. HO₃: The allocation (decreases and increases) of monies to a rural and urban school district results in different effects on the school environment.

Research design

This study is Ex Post Facto study utilizing information from the Florida Department of Education are their website. Therefore, the researcher analyzed external data from the agency to draw conclusions, trends and patterns. These external documents were




Figure 1. Conceptual framework analysis model.

indicators of the agency's fiscal support of Safe School programs, as well as their monitoring mechanisms. The current project utilizes an analysis of district on-campus violent and criminal behavior rates and Safe School Program funding, comparing an urban and a rural district. It examined the district's violent and criminal behavioral rates as they relate to financial resources.

Random sampling

The theoretical framework of random sampling as a precursor to statistical analysis is as follows. The population is the group of interest to the researcher and is the group to which the results of the study intend to be generalized. It is from this target population that the sample is drawn. The aim of random sampling is to create a sample, which represents the population from which it is drawn. In this study the population is defined as the 67 counties that comprise the State of Florida. The desired sample is two counties. The 67 counties were divided into urban and rural counties as per the definitions provided by the US Census Bureau. Following the stratification into urban and rural counties, Miami-Dade County (urban) and Glades County (rural) were randomly selected for analysis.

Statistical analysis

This study employed descriptive statistics to compare and contrast the difference in funding and violent behaviors between two county school districts, Miami-Dade County (urban) and Glades County (rural). In addition, series of paired samples *t*-tests were utilized to compare groups for significant difference in Hypothesis₂. In this instance, county funding is paired by year, county paired percent change in offenses and county as well as year paired offences in each year of analysis. Furthermore, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to identify if a significant relationship existed between variables. For this study, this correlation coefficient examined offenses committed in (a) 2001 to 2002 and (b) 2003 to 2004 as compared across counties. A *z* test for difference in proportion is used to address HO₃. The data were collected from external documents created by the Florida Department of Education.

The information derived from the data is useful in understanding FLDOE's Safe Schools Programs in the districts under investigation, as well as the agency's perspective of the programs' overall effectiveness in Miami-Dade and Glades counties. Since the information derived from were already classified and summarized by FLDOE, it is evaluated by the researcher to discover trends and patterns between the disbursement of monies and the decrease or increase in violent behaviors in the districts under consideration to draw conclusions about the program's overall effectiveness. Of critical importance were the trends in funding allocation and violent behaviors from the 2001 to 2002 academic year to the 2003 to 2004 academic year. In order to mitigate the large discrepancy in populations between the two districts, changes were reported in terms of percent increase or decrease from the first year in question to the third.

Reliability and validity

Reliability refers to whether a particular technique applied repeatedly to the same object will yield the same or similar outcomes each time (Salkind, 2001). Researchers generally would prefer a measurement instrument to have a reliability of .80% or above, which would give some assurance of acceptable stability. Validity refers to whether an empirical measurement reflects what it is intended to measure. In reviewing the self-survey evaluation, there is no mention of how reliable and valid the instrument is in gathering information. This research uses surveys and reports as the foundational data of this research. Surveys can be useful in understanding the broad picture under study, efficient in the collection of data, and in some instances reveal accurate results (Salkind, 2001). However, to extrapolate or interpret information from a self-survey evaluation report without factoring in the effect of interviewer bias would lessen the meaning of the information gathered.

FINDINGS

The analysis of the data is presented in this section. The

first part of this section is a presentation of research hypotheses.

The second part presents the statistical analysis as well as the description of the overall status of safety programs in the form of self-assessment reports. The final part examines the self-assessment reports for Miami-Dade and Glades County under the *School Safety and Security Best Practices with Their Associated Indicators* for 2003 to 2004.

Hypothesis results

The research question explored in this study was what is the impact of the allocation of additional revenues from the Safe School Programs on violent and criminal behaviors in schools? The findings concerning each hypothesis are:

HO₁: There is a positive relationship between the implementation of strategies and the incidences of violent behaviors in a rural and urban school district.

The Efficiency and Effectiveness and Safety Programs and Curricula sections of the self-assessment of the *School Safety and Security Best Practices with Their Assorted Indicators* revealed that Miami-Dade County School district met the criteria for successful implementation and operation of programs aimed at promoting safe school environments through substance abuse, anti-violence and social programs. Furthermore, the results from the Miami-Dade County school districts suggested an overall increase in total incidents; however, there were no supporting documents, which described these programs or their strategies or interventions. According to the Efficiency and Effectiveness and Safety Programs and Curricula sections of the self assessment of the *School Safety and Security Best Practices With Their Assorted Indicators* for the Glades County school district, there were no procedures in place to assess performance of programs in terms of efficiency and cost, nor did the school district promote preventative educational programs important in improving school culture and climate. In addition, the school district did not have the educational components in place to teach each grade level violence prevention, conflict resolution, and decision-making skills. The results from the Glades County school district revealed that many of the incident categories experienced a significant increase in percentage changes when funding is decreased.

HO₂: There is a significant difference between incidences of violent behaviors in a rural area and urban school district.

A series of paired samples *t*-tests were utilized to

compare groups for significant differences. In this instance, county funding is paired by year, county paired percent change in offenses and county as well as year paired offences in each year of analysis.

Furthermore, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to identify if a significant relationship existed between variables. For this study, this correlation coefficient examined offenses committed in (a) 2001 to 2002, and (b) 2003 to 2004, as compared across counties. Paired samples *t*-tests resulted in no significant difference being found. The following relationships were examined:

- (a) Annual funding in Miami-Dade county and Glades county paired by academic year,
- (b) Percent change in offences paired by county,
- (c) Offences in the 2001 to 2002 academic year paired by county,
- (d) Offences in the 2003 to 2004 academic year paired by county,
- (e) Offense in Glades county paired by academic year, and
- (f) Offenses in Miami-Dade county paired by academic year.

The Pearson correlation coefficient calculations yielded two statistically significant results. When the offences committed in the 2001 to 2002 academic year were correlated at the county level, a .818 correlation is found to exist between Miami-Dade and Glades counties ($p = .013$). This is statistically significant at the .05 level. Furthermore, when the offences committed in the 2003 to 2004 academic year were correlated at the county level, a .883 correlation is found to exist between Miami-Dade and Glades counties ($p = .004$). This is statistically significant at the .01 level.

HO₃: The allocation (decreases and increases) of monies to a rural and urban school district results in different effects on the school environment.

A *z* test for difference in proportion is used to address *HO₃*. The *z* test formula is the following where p_2 is the proportion of behaviors after the resource reduction and p_1 is the proportion before the change. The student population, before and after the resource reduction is denoted by n_1 and n_2 , respectively:

$$p_2 - p_1 Z = \sqrt{P(1-P)(1/n_1 + 1/n_2)}.$$

The results of the analysis of data illustrated that four out of the nine categories (property, harassment, other non-violent incidents and disorderly) conduct were significant. Total incidents decrease; however, it is not significant. A significant decrease in property crimes is observed after the resource reduction ($p = .05$). Harassment decreased

Table 3. Changes in funding from 2001 to 2002 to 2003 to 2004.

County	2001-2002	2003-2004	Percent (%) Change
Glades	\$ 61,602.00	\$ 57,411.00	-7%
Miami-Dade	\$13,802,205.00	\$12,693,067.00	-8%

and is significant at $p < .001$. Other non-violent incidents increased and are significant at $p < .001$. Reported disorderly conduct is significantly less after the resource reduction ($p = .05$). The results from Glades County revealed that total incidents increased and are significant at $p < .01$. Harassment incidents increased and are significant at $p < .02$. There is a significant decrease in fighting incidents ($p = .04$). Weapons crimes increased and is significant at $p = .02$. Total incidents and resources decreased in Miami-Dade County, while total incidents in Glades County increased and resources decreased. A possible explanation may be found in the analysis of HO₁, which indicated that programmatic strategies in the Miami-Dade County school district could have mitigated the kind of increases in the incidences of violent behaviors that were seen in Glades County. The troubled areas for Miami-Dade County school district appeared to be property, harassment, other nonviolent and disorderly conduct. Glades County district troubled areas appear to be harassment, fighting and weapons

Statistical analysis

Table 3 is a comparison of percent change in funding and incidents. Table 3 indicates the change in funding in both school districts. The results of the calculation reveal that percentage change in funding from 2001 to 2004 for both districts decreased. Table 4, represents a comparison of percent change in funding and incidents between 2001 to 2002 and 2003 to 2004 for Miami-Dade and Glades School Districts. However, between 2001 to 2002 and 2003 to 2004 is the base for Miami-Dade, and Glades School Districts base year is 2001 to 2002. The data indicated that two categories in Glades County have zero incidents. Consequently, it is impossible to calculate a percent change. For the sake of comparison with Miami-Dade County, the data used for percent change in these two categories is taken from the 2002 to 2003 academic year. These categories are marked with an (*). This adjustment in base year for these two categories is not reflected in the total incidents calculation. The analysis in this study consisted of the safe school funding for the years 2001 to 2004. For 2001 to 2002, the funding is \$13,802,205.00, for 2002-2003 the funding is \$13,026,380.00, and for 2003 to 2004 the funding is \$12,693,067.00. The safe school funding is generated by the fourth and final calculation of the Florida Education Finance Program

(FEFP). The school district population numbers and incidences were produced from the Student Environmental Safety Incident Reporting System (SESIR). The task is to analyze the changes in incidents for each of the SESIR categories.

Miami-Dade County total incidents and funding

The total number of incidents for 2001 to 2002 is 24,445 and 23,834 for 2003-2004. This change represented a 2.5% decrease in total incidents. A breakout of the incidents by category is elucidated in the accompanying charts and graphs. Total revenue decreased 8% from 2001 to 2002 to 2003 to 2004 (\$13,802,205.00 to \$12,693,067.00).

Glades County total criminal incidents and Reported Acts Against Persons (VAAP)

Total incidents for 2001 to 2002 were 57, 47 for 2002 to 2003, and 90 for 2003 to 2004. The incident rate is 45.67% for the 2001 to 2002, 38.40% for 2002 to 2003, and 72.99 percent for 2003 to 2004. The total revenue decreased 6.5% in 2002 to 2003 from the previous year; however, there appears a major increase of 90.1% in total incidents for the 2003 to 2004 school year. VAAP incidences for 2001 to 2002 are 13, 5 for 2002 to 2003, and 11 for 2003 to 2004. The incident rate is 10.42% for the 2001 to 2002, 4.08% for 2002 to 2003, and 8.92% for 2003 to 2004. Total revenue decreased to 6.5% in 2002 to 2003 from the previous year; however, there appears to be a major increase of 118.4% in VAAP incidents for the 2003 to 2004 school year.

ANALYSIS

Miami-Dade County

As previously mentioned, Miami-Dade County has the largest population of students out of the 67 school districts. Therefore, one would assume that there would be more overall incidences in the Miami-Dade County system than in Glades. However, it is worth noting a few of the most glaring illustrations. First, total incidences were 2.5% for Miami-Dade County, which appears to be

Table 4. A Comparison of percent change in funding and incidents.

Between 2001-2002 and 2003-2004 for Miami-Dade and Glades School Districts		
	Miami-Dade	Glades
Funding	- 8%	- 7%
Total Incidents	- 2.5%	+ 58%
Violent Acts Against Persons	- 3%	- 15%
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	+ 5%	+ 14%
Property	- 6%	+400%
Harassment	- 34%	+183%
Other Non-Violent Incidents	+ 18%	- 67%
Fighting	- 2%	+ 40%
Disorderly Conduct	- 15%	0% *
Weapons Possession	+ 11%	+500% *

relatively low for a district with the largest number of students in the state. Yet, when separating out violent behaviors into categories, there appears to be an issue in the areas of disorderly conduct (15.1 %), non-violent incidences (26% increase), and weapons possession (41.5% increase). If funding is the only factors affecting the increasing or decreasing, then policymakers would suggest that school funding in these areas should increase in order to bring the increased percentage rates into a more acceptable range within the goals and objectives of the school district and the state mandate. Although, the revenue change for all the categories is the same, some incidences experienced a relatively small or no change. For example, violent behaviors against persons experienced a 0.0% or no change. Similarly, there is a relatively small increase in harassment incidences (1.1%), in fighting (1.4%), and in alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs (7.7%). From 2001 to 2004, the number of harassment and fighting separately decreased by 200, which demonstrates that some strategy or intervention has occurred over that three-year period to effect this change. If a Miami-Dade County School administrator uncovered the same outcome with regard to these categories, it would be considered good news. There is only one instance where funding decreased and the incidences decreased and that is in property crime (-8.5%). Do these results mean that property crime is not a problem? Again, more in depth inquiry has to be employed to understand the issue more fully.

Self-evaluation

When the 2003 to 2004 self-assessment form and the statistical analysis outcomes of this study are compared, it appears that the Miami-Dade County school district has met practically all the criteria for the School Safety and Security Best Practices (Chapter 2004-268, Laws of

Florida). With regard to the overall efficiency and effectiveness of district, the district's assessment procedures contained the following:

- (a) District goals are clearly stated for safe and security programs.
- (b) Benchmarks are set for programs.
- (c) Performance assessment are regularly conducted.
- (d) Data is collected and process for the SESIR, and
- (e) The district has ensured the reliability of the SESIR through an Automated Reporting Case Management System.

With regard to safe programs and curricula, the district described the following goals:

1. Safe and security curriculum includes pro social skills, character education, conflict resolution and peer mediation;
2. Students are exposed to surveys consistent with the SESIR categories;
3. The school board and each school adopt violence and drug prevention, safety and health curricula, and programs designed to reduce violence, increase safety, and reduce the number of violence risk factors;
4. The district regularly reviews the performance of its intervention programs and revises, eliminates, or adds programs accordingly; and the self assessment for the 2003 to 2004 Miami-Dade County school district reported that the successful implementation of these initiatives depended upon the following curriculum: a Life Skills curricula, Peer Counseling/Mediation, Substance Education curricula (Grades PreK-5), Parenting for Drug Prevention curricula, Alternative to Indoor Suspension curricula, PIN (Proudly Infusing Nonviolence) curricula (Grades K, 2, 4, 6, 9), Peace Education Foundation curricula (Grades K-12), Elementary and secondary school support groups, Substance Education Program

(TRUST—To Reach Ultimate Success Together), Youth Crime Watch Programs, D.A.R.E. program, D-FY-IT (Drug Free Youth In Town) (Grades 6 to 12), S.W.A.T. (Students Working Against Tobacco), S.A.D.D. (Students Against Destructive Decisions) (Grades 9 to 12).

Glades County

The apparent large changes in incidences given the SESIR categories must be viewed with extreme caution because the percent change is based on small absolute numbers of crime. For example, the increased percentage change for total incidents (90%), violent acts against persons (118.4%), weapons possession (495.6%), and harassment (237.5%) did not reflect an accurate representation of these acts occurring in the Glades County school district. In the case of disorderly conduct, weapons possession, and property crimes there were incidents that went from 0 to 1 or 1 to 3. Therefore, the analysis is compromised as it relates interpreting given the very small numbers of incidents data. Statistical data indicates that there were increases in five of the nine chart areas while at the same time funding decreased. Property crime incidents were the only category that revealed a substantial decrease in percent change (205% to 65%).

Self-evaluation

The 2003 to 2004 Glades self-assessment report differed from the Miami-Dade County assessment in a couple areas. First, in the Efficiency and Effectiveness section of the report, it revealed that the district did not regularly conduct an assessment of performance and cost of safety program (Florida Department of Education, 2007). Second, the assessment report revealed that Glades County schools did not have a curriculum and/or programs for improving the school culture and crime such as pro-social skills, character education, conflict resolution and peer mediation. The Glades County School Board have not adopted or implemented violence and drug prevention curriculum and programs to reduce incidence of violence (Florida Department of Education, 2007).

Third, students in Glades County schools did not participate in the planning and implementation of violence and drug prevention programs (Florida Department of Education, 2007). Finally, Glades County students were not exposed to issues of violence prevention, conflict resolution, and communication/ decision making skills (Florida Department of Education, 2007). Although, it appears that some of the outcome responses from the self-assessment maybe consistent with some parts of the analysis more research is needed to confirm any links.

CONCLUSION

As mentioned earlier in the Literature Review, the issue of safety schools has come to the forefront of America's consciousness since the Columbine shootings. The nation's reaction and response reverberated throughout schools in this country. This study is just one in a multitude of studies attempting to understand school violence. The results from the Miami-Dade County school district suggested an overall decrease in total incidents and funding. A review of non-violent incidents and weapons possession revealed increases in incident percentage rates with a simultaneous decrease in funding. Analysis of the data indicated that there is a substantial decrease in percentage change in violent acts against persons and property while funding decreased.

However to the infusion of Safe School Funding, the Miami-Dade School District has already implemented interventions and strategies to control its school population. Since 1966, Miami-Dade County Public Schools have its own police department that has a stated responsibility to develop a partnership with members of the school community to improve relationships, reduce tensions, and increase trust. Miami-Dade also has more Student Arrests Referrals to the Juvenile-Justice System than the two counties that board it, Broward and Palm Beach. In 2004 to 2005, there were 130,030 suspensions (both in- and out-of-school), an average of one for every 2.8 students in the District. The results from the Glades County school district revealed an overall decrease in funding; however, there is a substantial increase in incidents. Five incidents categories experienced a significant increase in percentage changes when funding is decreased. Again, the statistical analysis demonstrated that large changes in crime categories occurred given the fact the percentage change is based on small absolute numbers of crimes.

The statistical analysis of Miami-Dade and Glades County mirrored the national statistics. A *t*-test is administered to determine significance in Hypothesis₂. There is a significant increase in weapon possession in both counties. The possession of weapons on school campuses poses a tremendous risk to the health and well being of student populations and this problem is highlighted in several of the court challenges to *Zero Tolerance* procedures. The increased presence of weapons on school campuses undermines the ability of school districts to adequately address incidences of school violence and its fatalities. Therefore, the data indicates that with the increase of weapons possession in both districts *Zero Tolerance* policies are not being effectively implemented to decrease the level of weapons in these individual school settings. The results of Hypothesis₃ indicate that four out of the nine categories were significant. Total incidents decreased however and were not significant. A significant decrease in property crimes

is observed after the resource reduction ($p = .05$). Harassment decreased and is significant at $p < .001$. Other non violent incidents increased and are significant at $p < .001$. Reported disorderly conduct is significantly less after the resource reduction ($p = .05$). Total incidents and resources decreased in Miami-Dade while total incidents in Glades County increased and resources decreased. From the data studied, there appears to be a relationship between a decrease in safe school funding in each of the years analyzed and an increase in school violent behaviors. Given these increases, each district has to ask two questions:

1. What is an acceptable amount of monies to address the educational needs of their students?
2. What type of program would be most effective to curb violent behaviors in their respective districts?

Legal challenges both in Federal and State supreme courts have tried over the years to arrive at a suitable and equitable remedy to funding schools regardless of their socio-economic status (Odden and Piccus, 2000). However, FEFP funds do not appear to be adequate to significantly decrease this social problem. The fact that no statistically significant difference is found with respect to funding indicated that the slight decline in funding between the first year of analysis and the second year of analysis is minor and should not have led to any crucial change in behavior. This conclusion is borne out by the fact that there is no significant change in offenses from the first year of analysis to the second. Additionally, the fact that there is no significant difference between counties as to offenses indicated that a main distinction between the counties with respect to offenses is not the type of illicit behavior, but rather the sheer volume. In essence the behavioral problems which plague the public schools of South Florida are the same; be it a rural or urban environment. This conclusion is supported by the fact that, when offenses in Miami-Dade County during 2001 to 2002 were compared to the offences in Glades County during 2001 to 2002, the results essentially mirrored each other, as the Pearson correlation coefficient is a robust .818. Moreover, for the 2003 to 2004 academic year, this relationship proved to be even stronger, with the associated correlation being computed to be .883.

In Florida's school finance program (FEFP), Safe Schools Funds are an essential part of the overall formula to bring safety and security in schools across the state, but how do you create safe schools? In this study, it is determined that there is a disconnection between the increase of school incidences of violent behavior and the appropriate amount of funding needed to decrease of these incidences. The Efficiency and Effectiveness and Safety Programs and Curricula sections of the self assessment of the School Safety and Security Best

Practices with their Assorted Indicators were used to ascertain a general idea as to the inner workings of both (the urban and rural school districts) safe school programs. However, the State allows each district to conduct its own self-evaluation. Upon evaluation, it appears that the Miami-Dade County School district met the criteria for successful implementation and program operation with program aimed at promoting safe school environments through substance abuse, anti-violence, and social programming. However, there is no clear indication of what these programs consisted of or any real description of their strategies or interventions. However, Glades County school district did not have a procedure to assess performance of their programs in terms of efficiency and cost, nor did the school district promote preventative educational programs important in improving school culture and climate. In addition, the school district did not have educational component to teach each grade level violence prevention, conflict resolution, and decision-making skills.

One of three problems in the Florida's school finance program assessment procedures appears to be the self-evaluation surveys. Self-evaluations are processes of collecting and analyzing relevant information about a particular subject. The evaluation of programs is an essential aspect of demonstrating the existence of school improvement (Carter, 2006). It underlines the need for accountability in a governmental system that increasingly emphasizes local control and autonomy. The objective of evaluation methods is to extrapolate useful information so that decision makers can develop and implement cost-effective programs but information contained from self-evaluation is often biased and colored by the experiences of the evaluator (Gay et al., 2006). Further, information extrapolated from a checklist is scarce at best, and does not describe the strategies or interventions taking place in the school. For the purpose of this study, it is difficult to ascertain if the self-evaluations are consistent with evaluation goals or objectives because little information is provided. For example, there is some mention of prevention programs; however, there is no mention of their strengths and weaknesses. The checklist attempts to place the information in an informational format, but the description, goal and objectives, as well as promised results, management of program staff, and common standards for service are lacking (Carter, 2006). Miami-Dade included the following programs:

1. Life Skills curriculum—encourages students to make positive decisions relating to drugs and alcohol.
2. Peer Counseling/Mediation—encourages students to find constructive ways to resolve conflicts.
3. Substance Education curricula (Grades Pre-K to 5) —teaches students the dangers of harmful substances.
4. Parenting for Drug Prevention curriculum—geared toward educating parents about drugs to discuss with

their youth.

5. Alternative to Indoor Suspension curriculum—alternative approaches to indoor suspension by education students through activities about disruptive behaviors.
6. Proudly Infusing Nonviolence (Grades K, 2, 4, 6, 9) —activities to promote the benefits of solving conflicts with nonviolence.
7. Peace Education Foundation curriculum (Grades K to 12) —foundation offerings deal with creative conflict solving and mediation for many different grades.
8. TRUST-To Reach Ultimate Success Together—school-based program to combat substance abuse.
9. Youth Crime Watch Program encourages the reporting of crimes.
10. D.A.R.E. Program—a highly acclaimed program that gives kids the skills they need to avoid involvement in drugs, gangs and violence.
11. D-FY-IT (Drug Free Youth In Town) (Grades 6 to 12). a nationally recognized, community-based substance abuse prevention program that focuses on recognizing and rewarding students who choose to live a healthy, drug-free lifestyle.
12. S.W.A.T. (Students Working Against Tobacco) —empowers and unite youths to resist and expose big tobacco's lies while changing current attitudes about tobacco.
13. S.A.D.D. (Students Against Destructive Decisions) (Grades 9 to 12)—a peer-to-peer youth education and substance abuse use prevention programs.

Glades County programs are the following:

1. Conflict resolution— teaches people new ways to work through and resolve disputes that do not involve violence.
2. Peer mediation—encourages students to find constructive ways to resolve conflicts.
3. Character education courses—classroom instructions that sometimes include religious lessons, relating to character development.

Prevention programs in Glades County were funded through a grant until 2003 to 2004 and the grant have expired and there is no funding available to continue programming. Therefore, the questions presented by these data sets are:

1. Did these interventions, strategies and/or programs meet the needs of Miami-Dade and Glades County?
2. Are strategies effectively implemented to curb violent behaviors in Miami-Dade and Glades County?

Research indicates that early intervention is important, however, there is no evidence of other early childhood violence prevention programs (Tolan and Guerra, 1994). According to the CDC, these programs must begin early and involve parents in order to be effective. Early

childhood interventions employing an ecological violence prevention approach may help reduce violence (Tolan and Guerra, 1994). This approach promotes social competence through providing hope for improving educational competencies in other developmental areas (Tolan and Guerra, 1994). Therefore, strategies and intervention must be directed to the major educational stages:

- (a) Early childhood (ages 2 to 5).
- (b) Middle childhood (ages 6 to 11),
- (c) Early adolescence (ages 12 to 14), and
- (d) Middle adolescence (ages 15 to 18).

In each educational stage of development, schools provide an important environment for overall developmental success. In early childhood development, aggressive violent behaviors can occur; therefore, it is important that children are assisted with developing self-regulation controls during the preschool years (Tolan and Guerra, 1994). In middle school settings, it is important for children to be introduced to tasks that promote a child's normative beliefs about aggression. School contextual factors that have influenced development at the middle childhood stage are:

- (a) Interpersonal relations with peers and classmates.
- (b) Teachers' perceptions of children's aggression, and
- (c) The probability of exposure to antisocial youth.

However, school-based violence prevention programs are not enough to show a significant decrease of violence in school environments. Changes in school policies and the way in which violent incidences are classified and resolved are also necessary. There is no evidence in the reports that these types of interventions are occurring in the two school districts analyzed. Money is not the only component in fighting school violence although vital for programming. Understanding and preventing youth violence requires attending to the interconnectedness between families, schools, and their neighborhoods. The interconnections between social contexts and their impact on schools environments also have major implications for prevention efforts or programs. A comprehensive strategy that underscores the multiple social contexts in which school-aged students live and function has much greater promise for successfully stopping or reducing youth violence. Therefore, schools, communities, governments, etc. must connect the social network available to students to assist them in solving their individual and communal problem.

Zero Tolerance policies and procedures in school settings provide school administrators with a mechanism to address and penalize students who engage in harmful behavior (Skiba, 2000). Research suggests that school violence influences school policies regarding discipline, security, and dropping out, and by small group inter-

actions that develop within the school encourages youth to respond violently to routine provocations. However, for the most part, these problems begin in the community. Therefore, the conclusions of this study are that the

- (a) Florida's school finance program should include an holistic evaluation process which includes self-evaluation and state monitoring of the program.
- (b) Goals and objectives for school violence and drug prevention programs in school districts should be reported to the State in greater detail.
- (c) Prevention programs should be assessed and evaluated for their utility in decreasing school violence.
- (d) Level of safe school funding has to be consistent with varying levels in school incidences.
- (e) Violence and behavior interventions should include the school, the community and the parents.
- (f) Definitions of incidence categories should be standardized across the state; and
- (g) The State should adopt a public health approach to school violence approach to school violence.

Conflict of Interests

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

- Addonizio M (2003). School finance reform, educational adequacy, and urban public schools. *School Bus. Affairs* 6(5):11-18. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ666101>
- Berne R, Stiefel L (1999). Concepts of school finance equity: 1970 to the present. In: H. F. Ladd, R. Chalk, & J. S. Hanson (Eds.), *Equity and adequacy in education finance*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=6166&page=7
- CarterMcNamara (2006). Basic guide to program evaluation. http://www.managementhelp.org/evaluatn/fnl_eval.htm#anchor1665834.
- Florida Department of Education (2004). Safe schools appropriations expenditures report: 2003-2004 school years. Bureau of Student Assistance. <http://www.fldoe.org/safeschools/pdf/safeschoolsreport-03-04.pdf>
- Florida Department of Education (2007). Safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools profile of district programs - 2005-2006. <https://www.fldoe.org/safeschools/pdf/staterep0708.pdf>
- Florida State N.A.A.C.P. Conference. (2006). Arresting development: addressing the school discipline crisis in Florida. http://b.3cdn.net/advancement/e36d17097615e7c612_bbm6vub0w.pdf
- Odden AR, Piccus LO (2000). *School finance: A policy perspective*. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Russo V (1996). Chippewa Valley School District, 24 IDELR 331, 333 (E.D. Mich).
- Salkind NJ (2001). *Exploring Research*. News Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- SESIR (2004). Statewide report of school safety and discipline data 2003-2004. <http://www.fldoe.org/safeschools/sesir.asp>
- Skiba RJ (2000). An analysis of school disciplinary practice. Indiana Education Policy Center (Policy Research Report No. SRS2).
- Tolan P, Guerra N (1994). What works in reducing adolescent violence: an empirical review of the field. <http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/publications/papers/CSPV-001.pdf>
- Underwood JK, Verstegen D (1990). *The Impacts of Litigation and Legislation on Public School Finance: Adequacy, Equity and Excellence*. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishing Co. <http://www.abebooks.com/IMPACTS-LITIGATION-LEGISLATION-PUBLIC-SCHOOL-FINANCE/132360624/bd>
- U.S. v Lopez, 115 S.Ct. 1624 (1995). http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/archived_content/events/vaw/readings/lopez.html
- U.S. Department of Education. (2006). *The condition of education*. Department of Education: Washington, D.C. <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2006/2006071.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education and Justices. (2006). Indicators of school crime and safety: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2007/2007003.pdf>
- Wise AE, Gendler T (1989). Rich school poor schools. *The College Board Review*. 151:12-17.

Citations

- Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Pub.L. 89-10, 79 Stat. 77, 20 U.S.C. Ch. 70.
- Florida Department of Education (2001). 2001-2002 funding for Florida school districts (EIAS Series 2002-2003). Tallahassee, FL.
- Florida Department of Education. (2002). 2002-2003 funding for Florida school districts (EIAS Series 2003-06). Tallahassee, FL.
- Florida Department of Education. (2003). 2003-2004 funding for Florida school districts (EIAS Series 2004-2006).



International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies

Related Journals Published by Academic Journals

- African Journal of History and Culture
- Journal of Media and Communication Studies
- Journal of African Studies and Development
- Journal of Fine and Studio Art
- Journal of Languages and Culture
- Journal of Music and Dance

academicJournals