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Aims to demonstrate how conceptual frameworks can guide managerial training in education. Such purpose should apply to various countries because the concepts, by their nature, have universal characteristics. Uses three managerial functions: the rationale for their selection; the methods of teaching them; and the results of teaching as benchmarks of the use of the guidelines. Also provides an argument that other managerial functions can be taught in the same way. This work, which focuses on communication, style and problem solving, is considered experimental in nature. More research is needed to understand better the relationships between conceptual frameworks and administrative training.

Conceptual frameworks may be defined as basic structures or arrangements which hold together general notions or ideas of a class of objects. Thus, in education, for example, various system inputs such as student aptitudes, system processes such as teaching and learning, and system outputs such as student achievement combine together into an input-output conceptual framework of schools. Most conceptual frameworks in education are constructed on the basis of data which describe practice. At times the data are incomplete but the framework is constructed anyway. At other times the basis for the framework constitutes values more than facts but, here too, the framework is constructed anyway.

Very little is reported on the use of conceptual frameworks in managerial training in education (e.g. Boyan, 1988; Murphy, 1996). The reason is not so much that university trainers fail to report their work (e.g. Milstein, 1993; Murphy, 1993). Rather, much of the training is not anchored in conceptual framework (e.g. Glasman, 1997). The problem-based framework is a noted exception (Bridges, 1997).

The purpose of this paper is two-fold. One objective is to describe three cases of using conceptual frameworks in managerial training in education. The first case took place at the University of Judaism in Los Angeles where, as part of the MA degree requirements, students receive 120 hours of classroom instruction and a year-long, ten weekly hours of internship experience. The other two cases took place at the University of California, Santa Barbara. One case involved a leadership seminar as part of preliminary administrative credential requirements. The other involved an evaluation seminar as part of requirements for the advanced administrative credential. The second purpose of the paper is to highlight selected learning results in each of the three cases to be described.

The paper begins with an outline of the conceptual frameworks and their associated central managerial functions. Rationale is provided for the choice of the three functions – communication, style, and problem solving – as well as their corresponding conceptual frameworks. The second section covers the teaching methods used in all three cases, including the assigned reading, introduction of the material in class, class discussion, field-based assignments, and the sharing of results in class. Section three offers examples of what trainees learned. This section attempts to tie learning results to both the conceptual frameworks and the methodology of teaching them. A brief final section offers concluding remarks.

Organizational functions and their conceptual frameworks

This section includes three subsections, each describing a different case of using a conceptual framework to teach a specific managerial function. First the functions will be defined, their importance in management noted, and the selected conceptual frameworks outlined.

Communication

Communication in organizations is typically defined as transmitting or exchanging information or opinions. Hoy and Miskel (1987) suggested that communication processes are diffused throughout the entire organization, a fact which makes it extremely difficult to examine these processes as separate entities. Nonetheless, several studies (e.g. Hoy and Miskel, 1987; Murphy and Peck, 1980; Sigband and Bell, 1989) demonstrate the centrality of communication as a function in the organization and its status in determining the nature of other functions (e.g. instructional leadership).

Several conceptual frameworks for organizational communication exist. The one chosen here (offered by Gorton and Snowden, 1993) is comprehensive, sufficiently in depth and applicable to school management. The concepts chosen for this function were associated with four roles of the school manager as follows: communication sender, receiver, monitor and information seeker.

Heavy emphasis in the framework is on the role of communication sender. The following six sets of concepts were chosen:

1. the purpose of the message (e.g. to inform, to convince);
2 effective characteristics of the content of the message (e.g. arousing desire, desirable communication first, acknowledging opposing arguments, recognizing that fact alone will not change people's opinion);
3 recipients' perception of message sender (e.g. honest, tactful, accepting, positive, dependable);
4 recipients' characteristics (e.g. their interest, knowledge, bias, social barriers);
5 communication channels (e.g. writing, oral face-to-face, oral-electronic/visual); and
6 criteria for choosing communication channel (e.g. objectives, content, audience, strength of communicator, other specific situations).

Concepts pertinent to the role of communication receiver included perceived reasons for message, perceived key facts in the message, and the perception about the extent to which the message is typical and indicative of its sender. Kinds of listening and reading in receiving communication are outlined in the framework. Some recommended listening behaviours are discussed such as showing attention, seeking additional information, seeking clarification, paraphrasing, reflecting emotion and summarizing.

The last two communication roles presented were monitoring and information seeking. The former is characterized by staying informed about key communications and key communicators. The latter involves feedback from multiple sources about process and effect.

Style
Managerial style in organizations is typically defined as the characteristic manner in which the manager interacts with subordinates. The interaction is a function of the way in which the manager and subordinates perceive each others' actions and behaviours (e.g. Hall, 1990). Thus, managerial style is determined by perceptions of members of the organization. The style, in turn, affects subordinates' formal and informal behaviours. Managerial style has been viewed as very central to the description, understanding and operation of an organization (e.g. Ouchi, 1981).

Only in recent years have students of educational administration begun to attribute high significance to the study of leadership style in management training programmes (e.g. Glasman, 1997). The change occurred as a result of increased belief that style is crucial to effectiveness and that it may be learned. The conceptual framework chosen here (offered by Bolman and Deal, 1984) was one of the first ones to be offered in the field. It has strong theoretical grounding (begins with a solid set of assumptions), and it is highly comprehensive (offers specific behaviours for four styles in association with nine different administrative functions each). Thus, one could examine behaviours belonging to a structural style, a human resource style, a political style and a symbolic style in terms of each of the following nine functions:
1 planning;
2 decision making;
3 reorganizing;
4 evaluating;
5 approaching conflict;
6 goal setting;
7 communicating;
8 meeting; and
9 motivating.

Some of the assumptions underlying the use of the structural style include:
1 emphasis on goals and corresponding appropriate structures;
2 deployment in a turbulent environment of norms of rationality as well as control and impersonal rules;
3 deployment of specialization for increased performance; and
4 deployment of structural solutions to problems which are perceived as structural in nature.

Selected assumptions underlying the human relations style are as follows:
1 need for a fit between needs of the organization and needs of the individuals; and
2 when fit is poor, both suffer; when fit is good, both benefit.

The assumptions underlying the use of the political style include:
1 allocation of scarce resources is a central decision;
2 coalitions of interest groups form; they differ in values and beliefs and they strive to advance their cause; and
3 coalitions negotiate but scarce resources and differences remain; conflict is a central feature of organizational life.

Some of the assumptions underlying the use of the symbolic style are:
1 perceptions and meaning of events are central;
2 there is much ambiguity in the organization; and
3 the creation of symbols reduces ambiguity.

Problem solving
Most generally, problem solving is defined as giving consideration and providing an answer to a question which is raised. Several writers (e.g. Tallman and Gray, 1990) suggest
that in organizational life the process of problem solving is considered the making of a series of related decisions. In most of the literature which deals with problem solving and decision making in educational organizations, the making of decisions is considered central to the work of the manager. The solving of problems, though, is considered an important context within which the decisions are made (e.g. Carroll and Johnson, 1990).

Problem-solving-based conceptual frameworks have been used in management training probably more than any other framework (e.g. Bridges, 1997). The frameworks vary by the problem situation to which the framework is applied. One variation is a function of the length of time it is estimated to solve a problem. Short-term problematic solutions (less than an hour) are typically not reported because of brevity and the difficulty of recording behaviours and thoughts. Medium-term problematic situations (up to two days) involve several decisions which can be detected and recorded (e.g. Glasman, 1994). Long-term problematic situations (a year or more) involve the following typical stages which occur because of the availability of time: diagnosis, alternative solutions, selection and implementation and evaluation (e.g. Kersey and Blanchard, 1988).

The conceptual framework offered here (Glasman, 1994) involved not only decisions made by managers, but also evaluations conducted by them. The central assumption was that managers spend quite a bit of time evaluating, that is, gathering information and judging its worth – and that evaluation results serve as inputs to their decisions. The framework includes a problem-solving process made up of four decisions and 22 evaluation actions spread among the four decisions. The Appendix depicts a conceptual framework for the problem-solving module.

Teaching the functions
This section also includes three subsections. Each subsection describes the methods used to teach each of the three functions, respectively. In each case the teaching guide was the respective conceptual framework identified in the previous section. The teaching of the three functions had the following in common:

1. Some material about the function was read by trainees prior to the first class meeting dealing with the subject.
2. The conceptual framework was introduced in the first meeting and discussed in terms of the relationship of specific concepts to their counterpart behaviours, attitudes and perceptions in managerial practice (in the problem-solving unit a second meeting was needed in order to complete this discussion).
3. An assignment was given (in the communication and style units, two assignments were given) wherein the trainees were asked to gather data about the function and to analyze it in terms of possible generalities.
4. In another class meeting, gathered data were shared, discussed, and broader generalities were sought.

Communication
Several practice-based examples were introduced and discussed in connection with each of the following four communication roles of the school manager – message sender, message receiver, monitor and information seeker. I had the opportunity to repeat this procedure eight times (1988-1996) at the University of Judaism in Los Angeles. I found that as more and more examples are heard, the trainees begin to feel that the four communication roles are also four communication forms.

More specifically, most of the examples of communication heard are viewed as ways of exchanging opinions and information. The major problem associated with these exchanges is typically identified as miscommunication. Trainees express different perceptions about a given oral or written communication. Some class time is devoted to identifying ways of learning how to avoid such differences. The use of the concepts is helpful in performing this activity.

In addition to being exposed to examples in practice of concepts associated with school managers’ engagement in communication, the trainees engaged in a pertinent exercise which took place in the first class session of the unit. Each of the trainees was given the task of preparing a three-minute oral message from a school principal to his/her teachers. The purpose of the message, the characteristics of the receivers, and the content of the message were to be each trainee’s choice. After ten minutes of preparation time, trainees were asked to deliver the messages one at a time. While a given trainee delivered the message, the rest of the trainees prepared themselves to share their perceptions about four items pertinent to the message:

1. the reason(s) for the message;
2. the key facts included in the message;
3. information which may be relevant to the message but was not included; and
4. the extent to which the message is typical and indicative of the sender.

The messages covered a variety of contents, all typical of communications which principals would send to their faculty (e.g. student discipline policy issues; information...
about a forthcoming assembly; inquiry about staff development activities; announcements about contacts with outside agencies. Following the delivery of the messages, listeners shared their perceptions regarding the four items mentioned.

Following the discussion of the results of the exercise, the assignment was given: Trainees were asked to log and record themselves in their work as administrative interns in schools for 30 minutes or more until they had detected five instances of self-engagement in communication. They were also asked to evaluate their communication skills in terms of effectiveness criteria derived from the concepts. Trainees presented their work orally and in writing in the following class session. A discussion followed which searched for generalities.

Style
Here too, the session in which the conceptual framework is introduced includes ample examples that are practice-based. Actually this task is relatively easy because the chosen framework encompasses 36 possible managerial behaviours (nine functions \times four styles). It so happens that some “cells” cannot be easily filled with examples from the field, primarily because school principals do not exhibit all styles in all functions.

While I have had the privilege of working with trainees on the function of style for six years at the University of California, Santa Barbara (1991-1997), I was able to make the first assignment only in the last three years since the publication of Gardner’s (1995) book (to be discussed below). In this assignment, trainees were asked to identify managerial behaviours in a series of written descriptions of lives of 11 exceptional leaders. Such a collection of descriptions exists in Howard Gardner’s Leading Minds (1995). It includes works on Robert Oppenheimer, Robert Hutchins, George Marshall, Pope John XXIII, Eleanor Roosevelt, Martin Luther King and others. Typical descriptions include: “...Marshall showed that he cared about the human dimension of soldiering...” (p. 158) (could easily be labelled “human relation style”); “...King was evolving from a reformer into a radical...” (p. 217) (could easily be labelled “political style”). I found it useful to make this assignment in pairs so that trainees had a chance of bouncing ideas back and forth off each other.

The next class meeting was devoted to sharing the data and discussing the value of the conceptual framework.

The second assignment in this area was to observe (shadow) a school principal for one day (or two half-days), to record his/her observed behaviours and to classify these behaviours according to one or more of the four styles. The purpose was to learn first hand about the use of style. In the final class meeting, results were shared and generalizations sought.

Problem solving
The pertinent conceptual framework was used in the past three years (1994-1997) at the University of California, Santa Barbara. It was discussed at great length in the first class meeting. At issue was not so much the merit of the four decisions or the significance of the 22 evaluations considerations. They had all been considered in one form or another in the management or evaluation literatures, respectively. The concern, rather, was about the order of the concepts in the framework. Examples were typically brought from practice and options were suggested as to the specific location of some evaluation considerations.

The assignment in this unit consisted of interviewing a school principal about a problematic situation (medium range) he/she has had in recent weeks. The trainee was to use the conceptual framework as a guide for the six questions. The principal’s answers were to be recorded in the appropriate “cells”. Finally, the entire case was to be analysed in terms of the completeness of the problem-solving process. Data were shared in the next class session and generalizations were sought about problem-solving behaviours of principals using the previously-mentioned conceptual framework.

Selected learning
This section will focus on new data which trainees acquired as a result of their engagement in the three management functions, their three corresponding conceptual frameworks and the uses of these frameworks to teach the functions. While a search for generalizations about these data is always sought in this approach, it is often possible to come up only with conjectures which must be tested elsewhere. These conjectures constitute strong hints about managers’ behaviours, nonetheless.

Only some of the new data will be described in this section. The choices are illustrative of a rich reservoir of knowledge which may be derived from the use of conceptual frameworks in training managers in education.

Communication
1. The exercise
Based on experiences between 1988 and 1994, three major reasons were detected for the sender’s messages: informing, convincing...
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and testing for reaction. For purposes of this article, a close record was kept of data associated with the exercise which took place in the 1994-1995 academic year. Nine students were in the cohort group that year. In the exercise, each student delivered a message while the other eight did the analysis. An example of a message would be a statement to teachers to provide examples of special activities they conduct in their classrooms (to be included in school bulletin). In five of the eight cases there was complete agreement among listeners about the reason for each message (messages 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5). Three messages were viewed as informing and two were intended to convince. In the other three cases (messages 6, 7, and 8) there was no agreement about the reason. Table I summarizes the data pertinent to all messages. (In some cases a listener perceived more than one reason for a given message. Only the major perceived reason is recorded here.)

In discussing the differences found in the last three cases, it was felt that perhaps these three messages were less clear than the other five. Other possible reasons for the differences including the listeners' level of knowledge about the subject, the beliefs which they may have about the subject, and their interest in the subject. All of these reasons are part of the characteristics of recipients of messages which vary and must be taken into account by school managers when they communicate.

Trainees' reactions to the key facts in each of the messages did not differ from each other significantly. The mean number of facts per message which were detected by each listener was between two and three. This number makes sense given the short duration of each message. The numbers of key facts detected by each trainee were not found to be a function of the perceived reasons for the message.

In four of the cases, trainees identified possible kinds of information which may be relevant but not included in the message. The four were in message numbers 4, 5, 7 and 8 (as depicted in Table I). It seems that such perceptions prevail when the perceived intention of the message is to convince or to test for reaction. Discussion followed concerning the cost in credibility and trust to the message sender in such instances. The general feeling was that in some instances lack of inclusion of some information is advisable but that all possible consequences of doing so must be weighed by the school leader.

In most of the cases (58 of 8×8), listeners believed that the message was highly indicative and typical of the message sender. This fact contributed to the perception that listeners had of the message sender as consistent, predictable and trustworthy. Discussion followed as to why at times the message is perceived as not typical of the sender. Reasons identified included when a major crisis occurs, when unusual pressure is exerted, when there is a change of allegiance, and when confidentiality is required.

2. The assignment

Nine trainees each reported about five communication instances. Table II depicts the number of communication instances reported by type of communication. Over a third of the cases were “sending” instances. About a fourth were “actively seeking information” and another fourth were “receiving”.

Class discussion began with an attempt to explain the numbers. Three factors were highlighted: the situation, the authority allocated to the intern, and the personal characteristics of the intern. In particular, trainee numbers 1, 2, 7, 8 and 9 identified personal characteristics which they thought helped them explain their distribution of instances. Among the characteristics mentioned were “cautiousness” (9) coupled with actively seeking information (4), “going with the flow” (1) coupled with receiving information (2), and being an “extrovert” (8) coupled with sending information (2).

The notion of combinations was also brought up in discussing which sequences of communication instances occur. Two trainees logged their five communication instances in one and two sequences, respectively. They reported that their administrative work is made up of several such sequences. It so happened that these two trainees had also been delegated several significant administrative authorities. Both trainees felt that since principals experience many communication sequences, their own work might resemble those of their principals to a larger extent than that of other trainees who had been delegated less authority. The possibility of communication sequencing being a function of the scope of administrative authority was debated.
The written reports included self-evaluations of the effectiveness of the instances of communication. For the 17 instances in which information was “sent”, trainees judged their effectiveness by the criteria of honesty, tactfulness, acceptance, positiveness, and dependability. Their evaluations in terms of tactfulness and acceptance were weaker. “Receiving” information in 11 instances was evaluated a bit differently for “listening” to an oral message and “reading” a written message. In “listening”, the criteria used were attentiveness, concentration, and caring. All trainees evaluated themselves strongly on attentiveness and concentration and a bit less strongly on caring. In “reading”, the evaluative criteria included understanding, concentration and caring. Trainees evaluated themselves strongly in concentration and caring and a bit less strongly in understanding.

Only two of five instances of “monitoring” were evaluated, primarily in terms of process considerations (is it working?) rather than outcome (what did it produce?). In the case of “actively seeking information”, only eight of 12 instances were evaluated, primarily in terms of number of sources checked (the more sources, the stronger the evaluation).

The description of the content in each instance of communication was, in most cases, informative and clearly stated. It covered a wide array of administrative responsibilities. In reading the descriptions it was possible to get a sense that most trainees engage in communication to a great extent. How far they progressed in this area, is exemplified in one instance which the intern labelled as a “monitoring” instance rather than a “message receiving” (listening) or an “information seeking”. The instance was described as follows:

...I monitored what the principal was doing... I observed a school tour for prospective parents. The principal shared information about the school by showing a promotional video... The principal verbally explained the school’s philosophy... The principal showed the facilities and classes in progress... The parents heard... observed... and asked questions...

When asked why this instance could not be viewed as a “message receiving” instance, the trainee said that the principal was not talking to him but to parents. When asked why it could not be viewed as “information seeking”, the trainee said that he was not seeking facts or ideas from anyone. When asked, finally, what was he doing there, the trainee said:

... I watched and observed in order to see for myself how good the principal is, and that is monitoring...

**Style**

1. **The first assignment**

   This assignment included the identification of behaviours described in Gardner’s (1995) volume about 11 eminent leaders (not necessarily educational managers) and to classify them according to Bolman and Deal’s (1984) four styles. In the three years in which this assignment was used (1995-1997), the central value of the conceptual framework and this assignment was identified by trainees as enhancing their awareness and understanding of differences among leaders. For example, a political leader uses power and immerses himself/herself in conflict almost as a matter of habit. This leader can be recognized by his/her political style with regard to nearly everything she or he does (e.g. Hutchins). So it is for the Pope with regard to symbolic style, Marshall with regard to the structuralist style, and Mrs Roosevelt with regard to the human resources style.

   The reasons such styles are exhibited relate to the assumptions which underlie the behaviours. For example, value differences exist in the political world, uncertainty in the symbolic world, the need to establish goals and corresponding structures in the structuralist world and the need to satisfy individuals’ and the organization’s needs in the human resource world.

   Other findings based on the three years of work include:

   • Style could be related to the leader’s background.
   • Dominant style is evident in almost all nine functions.
   • In cases where more than one style is dominant, a given style may be correlated with a specific situation.
   • A leader may change style with age and mission.

2. **The second assignment**

   In this assignment school principals were observed for a total of eight hours. Their behaviours were recorded by unit of activity and classified by one or more styles. The findings here differed considerably from those in the first assignment. (The method used permitted only eight hours of work)
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Problem solving

Using the conceptual framework which consists of five decision questions and 22 evaluation questions, each trainee interviewed a school principal about a medium range problematic situation the principal experienced in recent weeks. Trainees conducted the interviews with the explicit knowledge that the order of the concepts in the conceptual framework may have to be adjusted. That is, some principals may convey information not in the prearranged order of the questions. Three cohorts of students have done this assignment. Domains within which problematic situations occurred varied (e.g. curriculum, personnel, student personnel, finance).

As elsewhere (Glasman, 1994, pp. 87-90), the dominant methods of evaluating the different stages turned out to be discussions with one or more other people or consideration of the issue on one's own. This was true in the evaluation of possible solutions, their owners, the owners' priorities, the possible effects of the solutions, their costs, and their manageability. The reported evaluation findings were pertinent to most cases.

In sum, reports identified the following:

- A range of one to four possible solutions;
- A small range of one to several owners of the possible solutions;
- Of the total solution owners, about 75 per cent focused on desired outcomes (which decisions to make) and about 25 per cent focused on desired processes (how to decide);
- Of the total possible effects of the solutions, about 75 per cent focused on cognitive results (what people would know) and about 25 per cent focused on affective results (how people would feel);
- Three kinds of costs of possible solutions included dollars, personnel and time; and
- All reports mentioned that possible solutions were viewed as manageable by the principals.

Follow-up questions were usually raised in regard to improving problem-solving and decision-making skills. These included:

- When options partly overlap (in comparison to situations where options are mutually exclusive), is it easier or more difficult to conduct evaluations which lead to a possible solution? Some trainees felt that it is easier because one needs to handle less data and that one's capacity to handle data is limited.
- When there is more than one owner of the possible solutions, what might enhance the recognition by the other co-owners that they are, in fact, co-owners of a problematic situation? Almost all trainees agreed that the assignment of duties to individuals might enhance such recognition. The timing of duty assignment is a function of the level of involvement the decision maker desires for him/herself and for others (Gorton and Snowden, 1993, pp. 20-21).
- What can be done to enhance the problem-solving process when outcome-related priorities of the solution co-owners vary substantially? Almost all trainees agreed that attempts should be made to identify and/or reaffirm agreement on process-related priorities of the solution co-owners.
- Is the significance of possible cognitive effects of solutions different from that of possible affective effects? Here, trainees split along two main lines of thinking. One group felt strongly that the significance of possible cognitive effects far outweighs that of possible affective effects. The other group felt that the two types of possible effects are interdependent.
- Should decision makers choose possible solutions to problematic situations where the manageability is extremely difficult? Almost all trainees agree that not only are they not inclined to choose them, but that they may even not include these possible solutions as options altogether.

The majority of trainees expressed the opinion that the six evaluations (of possible solutions, owners, their priorities, effects, costs and manageability) are not only valuable to, but also essential in, the problem-solving process. Some trainees added that to conduct
such evaluations is to reinforce what is done in practice anyway.

**Summary and concluding remarks**

The use of concepts and conceptual frameworks has been demonstrated in this paper in teaching three different managerial functions to managerial trainees in education. The reported functions were taught at three levels. More specifically, training in managerial communication was shown as it takes place in a small managerial training programme in a private university. Training in a managerial style was outlined as it appears in a preliminary administration credential programme in a public university. And finally, training in managerial problem solving was described as it is included in an advanced administration credential programme, also in a public university.

Each managerial function and its corresponding conceptual framework chosen for this paper was defined and the reason for the choice was explained. The teaching methods were described in detail in each case, as were selections of learning results.

The testing of the concepts with field-based data was an indispensable component of the teaching. A variety of methods of collecting field data were employed (e.g. observation, interview, self logging.) The value found in sharing field data among trainees was in generating new ideas and possible new conjectures about the managerial topics which were learned.

The major message of this paper is that the teaching of managerial concepts in principal preparation training may be improved by identifying central concepts, discussing them, assigning work to trainees which involves collecting data about themselves and other managers in relation to the concepts, and discussing the results and synthesizing them in class. Practice-based data collection and concepts complement each other. They may be the best combination in managerial training programmes.

This message is brought about on the basis of the work done in the USA. The choice of functions whose teaching was described here—communication, style and problem solving—have implications across the entire world. These are central managerial functions and teaching them is a requirement in every educational system. To ground the teaching of these functions in conceptual frameworks in combination with the collection of field data makes the training of educational managers everywhere employ generalizable concepts and local implications of these concepts. It is these local implications which should make the managerial training described here attractive to a variety of managerial training institutions regardless of country and culture.
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Appendix

A. Did you decide to observe and participate in the problematic situation? Yes __ No __
   If yes,
   What did you look for?  How did you look at it?  What did you find?
The problematic issues
The origins of the issues
The participants in the issues
Those responsible for the issues
Possible specific problems to work on
The owners of possible problems
The priorities of problem owners
The possible effects of the problems
The predicted manageability of the problems

B. Did you decide on a problem to work on? Yes __ No __ If so, what was the problem?
   ______________________________________________________________
   What did you look for?  How did you look at it?  What did you find out?
The possible solutions of the problem chosen to work on
The owners of the possible solutions
The priorities of solution owners
The possible effects of the solutions
The cost of the solutions
The manageability of the solutions

C. Did you decide on a solution and did you implement it? Yes __ No __ If so, what the solution and how did you implement it?
   ______________________________________________________________
   What did you look for?  How did you look at it?  What did you find out?
The solution implementation process
The possible effectiveness of the solution implementation process
The predicted manageability of the solution implementation process
The cost of the solution implementation process
The owners of the solution implementation process

D. Did you decide on a design for a monitoring solution implementation and did you implement it? Yes __ No __ If so, what was the design?
   ______________________________________________________________
   What did you look for?  How did you look at it?  What did you find out?
The cost of the design for a monitoring solution implementation
The possible effectiveness of the design for a monitoring solution implementation