Shared Mission and Responsible Decision Making in Schools

Dr. Héctor Navedo

Abstract

This essay asks whether a shared school mission guides an organizational decision or merely justifies it afterward. It distinguishes a defensible choice, documentary indications of mission influence, and evidence about educational outcomes. A hypothetical reading-support decision shows how commitments to reading and a broad curriculum shape alternatives without determining a single correct answer. A dated decision record makes the proposed criteria available for later scrutiny. Professional disagreement, curricular sacrifices, unequal burdens, and insufficient resources require explicit judgments. The case identifies a provisional choice and conditions for changing it while maintaining responsibility for unmet reading needs. The discussion connects school decisions with learning and accountability at intermediate and system levels. Empirical studies, conceptual and management resources, and professional standards play distinct argumentative roles. A companion inventory documents source use and reading limits. The contribution is a structured approach to professional judgment, not a validated instrument or evidence of improved student outcomes.

Keywords: educational leadership, mission and vision, core values, organizational coherence, educational governance, equity.

Resumen

Este ensayo pregunta si una misión escolar compartida orienta una decisión organizativa o solo la justifica después. Distingue una elección defendible, indicios documentales de influencia de la misión y evidencia sobre resultados educativos. Una decisión hipotética de apoyo lector muestra cómo los compromisos con la lectura y un currículo amplio orientan alternativas sin determinar una única respuesta correcta. Un registro fechado permite examinar posteriormente los criterios propuestos. El desacuerdo profesional, los sacrificios curriculares, las cargas desiguales y los recursos insuficientes requieren juicios explícitos. El caso identifica una elección provisional y condiciones para cambiarla, manteniendo la responsabilidad ante necesidades lectoras no atendidas. La discusión conecta las decisiones escolares con aprendizaje y responsabilidad en niveles intermedios y del sistema. Estudios empíricos, recursos conceptuales y de gestión, y estándares profesionales cumplen funciones argumentativas distintas. Un inventario complementario documenta usos y límites de lectura. La contribución es una forma estructurada de juicio profesional, no un instrumento validado ni evidencia de mejores resultados estudiantiles.

Palabras clave: liderazgo educativo, misión y visión, valores fundamentales, coherencia organizacional, gobernanza educativa, equidad.

A school's mission should be recognizable in the way it is organized. Schedules, access to the curriculum, and the allocation of teachers and support provide clues. Budgets and decisions made in meetings matter too. That relationship warrants examination. A mission statement can coexist with practices shaped by other priorities, external constraints, or habits that have never been reconsidered.

This essay uses a concrete organizational decision to examine whether a shared mission guides action or merely justifies it after the fact. The question is how competing commitments shape the choice among feasible alternatives. It also concerns whose opportunities are protected or displaced and who must respond when the arrangement proves inadequate. A mission should influence the reasons for choosing, not simply the language used to defend a choice. Rights, consequences, and the opportunity to challenge the decision remain independent tests of its legitimacy.

What it means

For this discussion, I propose three working definitions. Mission expresses the school's educational purpose: whom it serves and what responsibility it assumes. Vision describes the future the community seeks to build. Core values guide judgments about decisions and the means used to carry them out: what is protected, what is considered acceptable, and how tensions among priorities are resolved.

The Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) devote their first standard to these commitments. They call for developing them collaboratively and putting them into practice. The aim is the academic success and well-being of each student. The standard includes collaboration, relevant information, action, and review. It provides normative professional

guidance, not evidence that a particular practice causes better outcomes (National Policy Board for Educational Administration [NPBEA], 2015).

Alignment and coherence should be distinguished. As a working distinction, alignment examines how a decision relates to a purpose; coherence examines how several decisions support or contradict one another. Neither is equivalent to uniformity. A common purpose may require differentiated support and room for teacher judgment. The resource by Kaufman et al. (2023) explicitly distinguishes coherence from uniformity in instruction.

Coherence does not establish ethical legitimacy or effectiveness either. An organization can sustain inadequate or exclusionary educational aims. In their report, Newmann et al. (2001) warn of the risks of coherent but narrow or regimented programs. We must judge the aims and the opportunities they offer. Kaufman et al. (2023) caution that coherence alone does not guarantee high-quality instruction; outcomes must be examined.

School organization is the link we need to examine between these commitments and educational experiences. It distributes time, responsibilities, resources, and opportunities. I propose comparing stated commitments with schedules, student groupings, and actual access to the curriculum. The examination includes teacher allocation, support, budgets, meeting agendas, and evaluation criteria. Schedules as implemented, actual support, expenditures, and recorded agreements make the comparison concrete. A discrepancy guides inquiry; by itself, it does not demonstrate indifference or poor management.

Statements and shared interpretations must also be distinguished. Daniel et al. (2024) study values written into school vision statements, not their implementation in practice. Ayscue et al. (2025) found different understandings of diversity among educators in the same school. Both the institutional document and verbal agreement require examination.

Shared understanding allows for disagreement: acting together does not always require identical beliefs (Louws et al., 2025). A majority does not automatically justify exclusion, nor does dissent confer an unrestricted veto. It is important to explain who decides, why, and how a decision can be reconsidered.

Why it matters

Coherence is built across levels. Honig and Hatch (2004) frame it as ongoing negotiation between school goals and external demands, involving schools and district offices. The Public Education Leadership Project (PELP) connects instruction and strategy with culture, stakeholder relationships, structures, systems, resources, and the environment (Public Education Leadership Project, n.d.). Its relevance here extends beyond arranging resources. Existing routines and legitimate professional interests can resist a proposed change. The case below uses these conceptual connections to examine negotiation, rather than treating agreement as a technical consequence of better information.

To analyze a decision, I distinguish three functional levels. At the school level, the focus is on schedules, student groupings, support, coordination, and monitoring. The intermediate body may be a district or another administrative organization. At that level, the question is what resources, authorizations, and services the school needs. At the system level, the focus is on policies, funding, and requirements that enable or constrain options. Where each specific authority resides must be verified locally.

A gap between mission and practice may reflect local decisions, unequal conditions, or conflicting external demands. School leadership should document the constraint and work with the responsible body. When several schools report similar restrictions, the intermediate or system authority should compare their circumstances, allocation rules, and potentially incompatible

requirements. Similar reports do not establish a common cause. This comparison could identify what requires a local response and what warrants a change in system design. Responsibility includes examining recurring constraints, not merely processing requests separately.

The cases discussed by Amber-Montes et al. (2026) and Choppin et al. (2026) connect educational direction, coordination, and responsibilities. Choppin and colleagues also examine time, resources, and capacities. Parraguez Núñez et al. (2026) describe shared planning in the qualitative component of a mixed-methods study. These are context-specific experiences, not evidence of a universally effective organizational arrangement; they help us study mission alongside working conditions.

The studies also differ in context and what they measure. In Finnish early childhood centres, Heikka et al. (2025) associated shared awareness of vision and strategy with staff-rated aspects of pedagogical quality and child well-being. In Dutch secondary schools, Knies et al. (2025) found positive associations between goal communication and teachers' understanding of their contribution to those goals. Communication was also directly associated with perceived school-unit performance. The analysis did not support mediation by teachers' understanding in that communication–performance model. These cross-sectional findings concern perceptions; they do not establish causal effects on student outcomes.

Coherence must also be evaluated against standards of justice. The review by DeMatthews et al. (2026), focused on the inclusion of students with disabilities or special educational needs, connects vision, organization, and capacities. Gümüş et al. (2026) document inclusive goals linked to plans, data, and resources in three primary schools in Hong Kong. The relevant question is what opportunities each student receives, as well as what a school average shows.

What is left out also matters. In the Michigan districts studied by Irondi et al. (2025), equity visions addressed individual and socioeconomic needs more explicitly than systemic racism. Ó Gallchóir et al. (2026) document principals who promoted a reform while retaining reservations. Objections should be heard and tensions acknowledged.

These sources perform different argumentative roles. Analyses of statements do not establish how commitments operate in practice. Surveys of perceived relationships differ from contextual accounts of organizational change and from Newmann et al.'s (2001) study of instructional coherence. Honig and Hatch's (2004) conceptual account, the PELP framework, and RAND's toolkit help organize inquiry. PSEL supplies professional expectations. Together, they frame questions about interpretation, conditions, and responsibility. Their thematic relevance does not make their objects interchangeable or turn them into a joint test of this essay's sequence.

How to put it into practice

This article takes a concrete organizational decision as its unit of analysis. The proposed sequence links principle, decision, resources, evidence, and review. Three questions remain distinct. Is the choice educationally defensible? Is there documentary evidence that mission commitments entered the choice? Does the arrangement improve students' educational experiences? Reasons and alternatives address the first question. A record made before approval informs the second. Implementation and outcome evidence address the third. An answer to one does not settle the others.

Before approval, the team would date a brief record of the feasible alternatives, the commitment that favors, modifies, or excludes each, and the expected burdens. It would retain proposal revisions and significant objections. Comparing that record with the adopted decision

provides indications of mission influence, not proof of participants' motives or an isolated causal effect. The record should also identify the decision-maker, review date, and which contributions changed the proposal or were rejected, with reasons.

Review works in both directions. Mission and vision guide decisions. In turn, changing needs and opportunities may justify adjustments to both. PSEL 1e provides for such adjustment (NPBEA, 2015). It must be justified on educational grounds, not used to weaken commitments for convenience or portray a difficulty as a success. Review must preserve students' well-being and equitable opportunities.

Consider a single hypothetical case. An elementary school's shared mission commits it to strengthening reading and providing every student with a broad curriculum. Its team is reconsidering reading support. These commitments require effective attention to reading needs while protecting access to other educational experiences. They do not predetermine a timetable or settle every conflict. The case is illustrative, not an account of a particular school or the author's experience.

Before changing the schedule, the team would establish a baseline and observation period. It would state eligibility criteria and record who receives support. It would also check whether those criteria overlook students with relevant needs. Reading work, teacher referrals, and student and family accounts could identify possible exclusions for review. The baseline would record current support time, instructional conditions, and classes or activities each option would displace.

Consultation would offer accessible channels for students, families, and staff, in-person or written options, and language support when needed. There would be a private channel, confidentiality within applicable procedures, and a commitment to nonretaliation. School

leadership would explain which suggestions it incorporated, which it rejected, and why. Attendance would not automatically amount to influence.

Routine withdrawal from art could provide uninterrupted specialist time at low organizational cost. After-school provision could preserve the timetable but exclude students without transportation or family availability. A third option would use an existing flexible learning period, subject to checking staffing and the activities displaced. Judged only by uninterrupted specialist time and scheduling convenience, routine withdrawal might appear preferable. In this case, the team interprets its broad-curriculum commitment as ruling out routine loss of art as the price of reading support. Its commitment to every student also rules out after-school provision as the only route while transportation barriers remain.

The reading specialist would raise a legitimate objection: a flexible period with changing groups and staff could fragment instruction and provide insufficient support. Better access figures would not resolve that concern. The team would negotiate a stable group, a consistent specialist, and protected joint planning time, replacing a lower-priority meeting rather than adding unpaid work. The specialist could accept this provisional arrangement while remaining concerned about intensity. The review would therefore examine instructional continuity and unmet reading needs, not just attendance. Any loss of other flexible-period activities would also remain open to challenge.

The team would verify which adjustments it can decide on and which staffing appointments, transportation arrangements, or curricular and budget changes require authorization elsewhere. If the solution exceeds school authority, school leadership would present the problem and alternatives to the responsible body. It would not promise resources it does not control or treat a system constraint as exclusively a teacher’s or principal’s failure.

For monitoring, a small set of illustrative indicators would be agreed upon:

- Access: students served relative to all eligible students in the same period, with changes in criteria or cohort documented. The team would also examine possible exclusions produced by the eligibility criteria themselves.
- Implementation: sessions delivered, support time and intensity received, and instructional conditions. Relevant differences among students and groups would be examined, not only the overall total.
- Learning: comparable reading tasks completed under similar conditions. Before scoring, teachers would apply the agreed rubric to a small set of sample work, discuss disagreements, and refine shared interpretations. They would periodically compare scoring to detect drift.
- Unintended effects: differences in displaced curricular experiences, workload, stigmatization, and difficulties reported by participants. Access, intensity, and opportunity costs would be considered together.

This sequence and its indicators are an unvalidated proposal for professional judgment. Learning changes require consideration of other explanations; mission alignment alone cannot explain them.

For this hypothetical decision, assume the team verifies that the flexible period, specialist time, and negotiated planning arrangement are available. It would provisionally choose stable support in that period for six weeks, an illustrative review interval rather than a research-based dosage. It would reject routine art withdrawal and after-school-only provision. The redesigned option responds to reading needs while avoiding those recurring curricular and transport barriers. Yet flexible-period activities also have educational value. Their displacement is not acceptable

simply because the timetable labels them flexible. The team should justify the need addressed, less harmful alternatives, duration and reversibility of the sacrifice, and whether burdens fall repeatedly on the same students. These are proposed professional criteria, not a universal legal test. The mission may permit more than one defensible choice.

The instructional coordinator would assemble the evidence, and school leadership would remain accountable. At six weeks, the team would review comparable work, access, intensity, and displaced opportunities. It would redesign or end the trial if stable support required repeated exclusion from protected curricular opportunities. Ending an inadequate arrangement does not end responsibility for persistent reading needs. The team would explain the replacement or interim response, what it can reasonably provide, and what remains unmet. Needs that exceed school authority require a specified request for resources or authorization, a responsible person, and continued follow-up.

Suppose the same school lacks the flexible period or access to a specialist. The team cannot simply reproduce the preferred arrangement. It must assess what interim support existing staff can responsibly provide, identify the need that remains unmet, and request the missing capacity from the appropriate authority. If an available alternative repeatedly displaces more curricular experiences for some students, that unequal burden requires reconsideration even when overall coverage appears adequate. Neither scarcity nor aggregate feasibility settles the educational judgment. The case offers no universal substitute for the unavailable option.

Students, families, and staff would participate through the agreed channels and receive a reasoned explanation of what is retained or changed. Community feedback would avoid identifying individual students; personal instructional records would remain confidential under applicable procedures. For unresolved objections referred to another authority, school leadership

would name a follow-up owner and date. It would communicate the response and reasons, or the pending status and outstanding issues. The follow-up date does not promise an external decision. These are proposed accountability practices, not a claim that a particular legal remedy exists.

Application in Puerto Rico, Connecticut, or another context requires checking population, languages, resources, governance, and applicable rules. The school would need to establish feasibility and defend the educational purposes locally.

Responsible judgment makes commitments explicit before choosing, explains the losses a choice still imposes, and responds when the arrangement proves inadequate. The mission supplies reasons to examine; it cannot substitute for evidence or settle every conflict. When available options leave educational needs unmet, leadership must justify an interim response and pursue the changes beyond its authority. The practical question is which decision to revisit, whose opportunities are at stake, and what each level must do next.

Documentary basis

The corpus comprises the 34 PSEL 1 entries in an earlier bibliography with verified free full-text access. The documentary snapshot is dated November 2, 2026. It includes 32 journal articles and two doctoral dissertations published between 2023 and 2026. It does not come from a new search conducted for this essay. The availability filter limits its scope and does not guarantee representativeness or quality.

Reading focused on relevant sections, not complete critical appraisal of every work. Twelve sources are cited in the body; the other 22 informed editorial context or contrast. Four foundations on coherence and the normative PSEL 2015 document are added separately. The accompanying Spanish-language PDF, Inventario y procedimiento documental del artículo Misión compartida y decisiones responsables en la escuela, identifies all 34 entries and the five

additions. Each entry records its role, sections examined, and limits. Its bilingual reading map groups the 22 uncited entries by their documented relevance to organizational conditions, interpretation and judgment, or limits on claims. Those groups summarize existing editorial records, not a new analysis or a claim of synthesis of all findings. This is not a systematic review or an evaluation of the proposal.

References

Amber-Montes, D., Martínez-Valdivia, E., & Higueras-Rodríguez, L. (2026). Construcción de una comunidad profesional de aprendizaje para la mejora escolar [Building a professional learning community for school improvement]. *REICE. Revista Iberoamericana sobre Calidad, Eficacia y Cambio en Educación*, *24*(3), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.15366/reice2026.24.3.006

Ayscue, J. B., Mordechay, K., Matthews, G. F., & Whetzel, J. (2025). Getting it "right": Educators' experiences with school diversity in a gentrifying neighborhood. *AERA Open*, *11*, Article 23328584251332943. https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584251332943

Choppin, J., Nelms, S. C., & Marsh, V. L. (2026). Conceptualizing school leaders as organizers of systems and resources. *Education Sciences*, *16*(10), Article 1650. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci16101650

Daniel, E., Arieli, S., & Akerman, L. (2024). The values of schools: An analysis of vision statements. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *39*(4), 3661–3683. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-024-00886-7

DeMatthews, D. E., Conroy, K., & McKenzie, L. (2026). Inclusive principal leadership from 1995 to 2024: A systematic literature review. *Review of Educational Research*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543261446662

Gümüş, S., Xu, N., & Berkovich, I. (2026). Creating equity in learning experiences and outcomes: How do school leaders enact socially just instructional leadership in practice? *Educational Administration Quarterly*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X261476637

Heikka, J., Hirvonen, R., & Muteweri, E. (2025). Distributed pedagogical leadership and quality in early childhood education. *Research in Educational Administration and Leadership*, *10*(3), 723–769. https://doi.org/10.30828/real.1620071

Honig, M. I., & Hatch, T. C. (2004). Crafting coherence: How schools strategically manage multiple, external demands. *Educational Researcher*, *33*(8), 16–30. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033008016

Irondi, O. N., Weddle, H., & Hashim, A. K. (2025). Leading during crisis: State and local education leaders' equity focused approaches during the COVID-19 pandemic. *AERA Open*, *11*, Article 23328584251318993. https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584251318993

Kaufman, J. H., Wang, E. L., Kennedy, K., Schweig, J., & Giglio, K. (2023). *The improving instructional system coherence toolkit: A resource for K–12 districts and schools* (TL-A2168-1). RAND Corporation. https://doi.org/10.7249/TLA2168-1

Knies, E., Leisink, P., Penning de Vries, J., & Mulder, R. (2025). School unit leaders' people management: Impact on teachers' line of sight and school unit performance. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432251364641

Louws, M., Struyf, A., van Haeften, N., Middelbeek, L., Schenke, W., Walraven, A., de Vries, B., Brouwer, P., & Lockhorst, D. (2025). Actors' involvement during collective sensemaking of educational change: A review study from a systems lens. *Journal of Educational Change*, *26*(4), 599–629. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-025-09536-1

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2015). *Professional standards for educational leaders 2015*. https://www.npbea.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Professional-Standards-for-Educational-Leaders_2015.pdf

Newmann, F. M., Smith, B., Allensworth, E., & Bryk, A. S. (2001). *School instructional program coherence: Benefits and challenges*. Consortium on Chicago School Research. https://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/2018-10/p0d02.pdf

Ó Gallchóir, C., McGarr, O., & Lenihan, R. (2026). Mediating ambiguity: Principals' sense-making and instructional leadership in curriculum reform enactment. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432261457326

Parraguez Núñez, P., Jiménez Vivas, A., & Montero de Espinosa Ramos, L. (2026). Patrones empíricos de liderazgo pedagógico en escuelas latinoamericanas [Empirical patterns of instructional leadership in Latin American schools]. *REICE. Revista Iberoamericana sobre Calidad, Eficacia y Cambio en Educación*, *24*(3), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.15366/reice2026.24.3.007

Public Education Leadership Project. (n.d.). *Coherence framework*. https://pelp.fas.harvard.edu/coherence-framework