

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED-213 095

EA 014 392

AUTHOR Stahl, Robert E.
 TITLE Implementation Perspectives on Follow Through and Other Innovations by a Teacher Organizer.
 SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
 PUB DATE 30 Dec 80
 NOTE 31p.; Purchase Order: NIE-P-80-0196.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Cooperative Planning; Cooperative Programs; Coordination; *Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership Responsibility; Meetings; Parent Participation; Professional Associations; *Program Implementation; Selection; Staff Development; *Teacher Recruitment; Volunteers

IDENTIFIERS Project Follow Through

ABSTRACT

From his experience as a teacher organizer, the author offers concrete and detailed advice about preparing for the successful implementation of an educational innovation, Project Follow Through. In an informal format, he discusses the selection of appropriate school sites, recruitment of volunteer teachers, presentation of the innovation, and suggested criteria for volunteer selection. He considers continuing staff development, offered during the school day, to be crucial to the accomplishment of program goals. In addition, he recommends that meetings and evaluation processes be planned with care and suggests that group planning can help facilitate the teacher's transition from autonomous educator to participating member of a group. Successful implementation, according to the author, also requires a thorough appreciation of the principal's role, parent participation, and skills coordination.

(WD)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED213095

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION,
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert E.
Stahl

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

IMPLEMENTATION PERSPECTIVES ON
FOLLOW THROUGH AND OTHER INNOVATIONS BY A TEACHER
ORGANIZER

By

ROBERT E. STAHL

December 30, 1980

Order No. NIE-P-80-0196

EA 014 392

Why a Paper from a Teacher organizer on Follow Through Models?
What contribution can an organizer give to Sponsors, Academics,
Researchers, on Follow Through and other education innovations?

In brief, what I give to this writing task is my observation of
and connection with organized and unorganized teachers and how I per-
ceive them in the public education system operating with imposed
innovations. The Paper is practical in the sense of I would do this
. . . if I wanted to succeed with teachers who have the responsibility
of implementing a Model.. I see the implementation of Follow Through
Models or other innovations as representing an organizational challenge.

Most of this short paper deals with the practical, with some
license to comment about the educational system.

Personnel Relations

Let's begin. If you want to achieve innovative success, find
out in advance about personnel relations in school districts before
you implement Follow Through models. It may be unorthodox, but
check with the local Teachers' Association and discover from them
which buildings appear to have good personnel relations and which
schools have poor personnel relations. The conversation with local
officers of the Teachers' Association can be revealing. I would
repeat this exercise with downtown administrators and selected build-
ing administrators. The discrepancies between views of local asso-
ciation officers and school administration on personnel matters is
important to know. If you don't, you could place your project on
a powder keg of hostility insuring non-success.

Get into the Building

After you discover the personnel discrepancies, do you believe them? It's a good idea to visit buildings and check out the discrepancies. Find schools where the seeds of a Follow-Through model can be nourished to full growth. You are looking for kindred spirits; teachers who are attracted to the sponsor's model.

How do you conduct yourself in a building? First, I'd get permission to be there from the administration and secondly, I'd be straight forward and announce the purpose. What's that? You are seeking volunteers for Follow Through and you are enthusiastic. Aren't you? Advance notice to the local Teachers' Association wouldn't hurt either. Courtesy will get you a gourmet school lunch.

The time of the visit? Don't do it after school. Be there in the morning. At lunch you can announce that interested volunteers, after school, may seek extended conversation with Follow Through sponsors. This intent should be posted by written notice and announced in advance of the sponsor's visit.

If you have some extra dollars, invite the volunteers to a nearby hotel for refreshments and a more relaxed surrounding. This is the time to present your slide show or an equivalent formal presentation. This is called selling the project. There is no guarantee the faculty, on the day of your visit, will be enticed. At least you will know where not to plant the Follow Through model. And, you have the opportunity to put your knowledge of change to use in recruiting. Your job is to spot individuals who seek change. Identifying individuals who feel comfortable with change is related to the

success of your model. Do not fully depend on a single administrator or teacher observation about personnel in particular schools. See for yourself.

Ask for Volunteers

Mandated innovative projects are not popular with teaching staff; especially, if they are practicing a successful style of teaching. Why should anyone be mandated to do a job better when better, from the perspective of the teacher, is happening. Volunteers should be sold. Why should a volunteer be enthusiastic about the Follow Through Project? The answer is they usually aren't. Unless enthusiastic explanation of what the project can do for a teacher is given, expect reluctance in implementing Follow Through or any other innovation.

A volunteer should be courted; treated with respect. The sponsor should explain what kind of personnel is needed and lay out the criteria. This is a Truth in Selection process. You tell the truth about the kind of professional you need . . . ; they tell you the truth about whether they want to sign on for this innovation or change.

Special interview days should be scheduled. Write the personnel criteria on paper. Select a perceptive interviewer of teachers and lay your criteria on the table and let the parties judge. As a sponsor, I would be convinced I had an excellent model. Convince the volunteer teacher.

When seeking volunteers, ask the local Teachers' Association if they will cooperate with you and the school administration. If they won't, I would suggest trying another district unless you are interested in bad odds and a failure.

Spotting Leaders

As a sponsor your knowledge about discrepancies regarding personnel, association and administration views about climate, is growing. By this time you should be ready to spot the leader teachers . . . , leaders relative to implementing a Follow Through model. Write their names, addresses and phone numbers in a notebook and sometime soon have an individual conversation with each of them about the Follow Through project. You will be able to tell the interested teachers from those with the "why bother me" countenance. Conduct a conversation with leader teachers about how you would like to implement the model and ask them how they would like to implement. The insight will be helpful and may be suggestive of changes that will happen to your model with or without your permission. The teacher leaders thus recruited will begin to organize your project in advance of the start date. Keep in contact with them and exchange information for communication to the building faculty.

Conversations must be scheduled as a matter of protocol with appropriate school administration and regularly with the local Association President. The Superintendent should be judged for his/her tendency to vertical or horizontal organizational style with staff. Which style do you need for the model? Is the principal flexible? What about respect for the staff? Does the staff respect the principal? The answers to the questions will become apparent and, despite lack of documentation and statistical analysis, some sound judgments can be made about placing the Follow Through model with screened leaders.

The object of conversations with leaders is to get their approval if not an endorsement. When probed about the model, will this leader, association or district give supportive words about Follow Through? The answer must be yes.

State the condition of employment in the model

The sponsor has gone through important preliminaries looking for fertile ground. Next, tell volunteers or candidates what employment in the project will be compared to their present employment. By answering the following questions on anticipated conditions of employment in the project, other constraints will emerge and can be planned for and solved.

1. Who is the boss of the project?
2. What kind of hierarchy is the sponsor following - vertical, horizontal, loose coupling or some combination?
3. What skills other than interaction with students must teachers master?
4. What staff training will be given to master unlearned skills?
5. Who is allowed to intervene in the project after it is operating?
6. How much paperwork will be required?
7. What secretarial assistance will be provided to process paperwork for staff?
8. What new skills will a project teacher learn that will serve the person after the project is over? This is an incentive.

9. What old skills will be reinforced or learned better to serve the person after the project is over?
10. Will the teacher be required to work autonomously in a self contained classroom, or will the teacher be required to work as an equal or subordinate member of a team?
11. Are the salary, fringe benefits and hours of employment the same for project and non-project teachers? Association-District contract provisions should be checked in advance by the sponsor to anticipate and plan for constraints.
12. What happens to the teacher, future assignment, after the project is over?
13. What happens to the Follow Through model with respect to District institutional implementation after the project is over?
14. Does the school district encourage all or some teachers to volunteer for assignment in the model?
15. If the school district doesn't get volunteers, will they mandate volunteers?
16. What is the location(s) of the project?
17. What regular or additional resources will be provided?
18. Which students will be involved?
19. What is the difference between the sponsor's model and the self-contained classroom model?

Given this knowledge, volunteers can make sound personal decisions, and given this knowledge, districts can make sound decisions.

Suggested criteria for selection of volunteers to work in the Follow Through Innovative Project

The teacher volunteers should:

1. Be interested in the sponsor's model for practical and intellectual reasons.
2. Understand newness frequently means problems and probably more work because the model is not automatically debugged.
3. Gain occupational skills from the project enhancing the saleability of the volunteer teacher to the same or another employer.
4. Be qualified by way of educational background.
5. Be qualified by way of experience (not necessarily the same experience sought by the sponsor to implement the model).
6. Be qualified by way of attitude (defined by the sponsor).
7. Be qualified by way of desiring to work with others (defined by the sponsor).
8. Have a desire to approach the instruction of students from a different point of view foreign to current teaching behavior.
9. Offer constructive opinions for the improvement of the model. (If the sponsor doesn't want any change in the model, then tell the teacher.)
10. Be challenged by a desire to work with students who are not responding to school. This doesn't necessarily mean interest in difficult and non-responding students is exclusively about student discipline. Some teachers are more fascinated by discipline and control, and others about the mind and

learning. Others about planning activities, content and materials; some about evaluation and testing, while others prefer psychological aspects. Teachers may have preferences about their contributions towards helping students who are more difficult than the average.

And the Model Starts

The sponsor is now located in the district and building. The staff is picked. Employment conditions have been stated in advance. Does the sponsor stop cultivating the staff? The answer is no. After the model is operative, especially of concern is the continuing education of teachers relative to the model.

Staff Development

To break the norm regarding staff development is a challenge to the Follow Through sponsor. Project teachers should be ~~be~~ ~~led~~ for staff development that is operational during the instructional day. This is a better way to do training. Why make the same mistake most traditional schools offer. They offer training after school and Saturday. Offer the same mistake and the credibility of the project begins to slide downhill. Yes, teacher's perception, this is still another add-on project with add-on teaching conditions. What's the incentive? None. Don't do it. But, if you are strangled by local conditions, don't delude yourself about the unimportance of this business. The agenda for Follow Through is change, relatively rapid change. If the sponsor can't deliver appropriate resources and meet requirements for rapid change and acquisition of skills,

then a major constraint has been added to implementation problems. The level of success with teachers and the model is reduced.

Meetings

There are all kinds of informal and formal meetings happening daily in the project: between teachers, teacher and project administrator, teachers and non-project teachers, teachers and parents, teachers and experts, teachers and evaluators, etc. The kinds of meetings ought to be noted and analyzed for payoff. Payoff relates to implementing the model and sharing success and failure. House-keeping can be communicated in minutes, face-to-face, or by memos.

Meetings should always have an important written agenda for those asked to meet. Most meetings run their course in two hours unless it is a spectacular guaranteed to attract the implementing group.

Playing with the Curriculum - A Solid Meeting

Meetings should be arranged with the staff to play with the familiar curriculum and make it strange a la Synectics. Seeing the curriculum in new, exciting and strange ways will have an innovative side effect and a further impact on organization. What the predictable outcome of playing with the curriculum will be is unknown. But, viewing stable curriculum in a new way should spirit revisions in methodology, testing, evaluation and better perceptions how the student is receiving the curriculum. This game of seeing the familiar curriculum as strange can be applied to learning theory, child development and other educational matters now accepted at face value. Playing is a good energizer and mind stretcher

for the staff, the original innovator and should lead to further insights on the kind of organization, flexible or rigid, needed to do a job within the model. This activity may lead to changes in the model, which may present interesting challenges to the Sponsor, especially those who want exclusive control and change privileges.

Experts - Evaluators

Experts, especially evaluators, should make an appointment with the operating staff to meet at the convenience of the staff. Deliberations about evaluation is extremely important. The design of the evaluation should be critiqued by the Follow Through staff. Their suggestions about evaluations, programs, personnel, students, systems, if valid, should be converted into concrete changes in the design and implementation of the evaluation instruments. This will enhance analysis of the model. Why? Because it's important that the evaluators and the faculty agree upon what they are observing, analyzing and ultimately judging.

It would be wise to address the Follow Through staff's insufficient skills in evaluation by staff development. If the knowledge base of the operating staff in evaluation is increased, then the professional evaluators will do better work because the critiques by the operating staff on the proposed evaluation will enhance the work done by evaluators and represent more accurately what's happening in the model. For example, if student outcome is the most important part to evaluate, then how do you effectively connect the score to your functional organization for work? Is the score the purpose of your evaluation or does the Follow Through sponsor choose to stress other

kinds of outcomes? The evaluator tells the story and should be provided with help from the working staff. Other evaluators, foreign to the staff, may make their reports independently, but the staff must know from their evaluator what they tried to produce and how well the parts they were implementing worked. This procedure places the teachers in a better position to compare their own perception of success or failure with the mutually agreed upon design of evaluation in advance of judgment day.

Documentarians and evaluators working with implementing personnel must discover the best form of organization for the delivery of a particular Follow Through model. No doubt, some models are best served by vertical; others by horizontal relationships, and some by loose coupling. The major point is that implementation efforts in any innovation is the product of governance times organization. The authority flowing from governance by law is divided into local, state and federal parts and together, or independently, they cause resources to flow towards a school organization. The school organization usually allocates its given resources in a vertical way to programs and teachers. Often the administration and the Board of Education receive the resources vertically from the State and Federal Governments. Decisions are made in advance for operating personnel by virtue of the way the system is organized.

The phenomena of Follow Through being dropped into the bureaucracy is worthy of study. Does Follow Through organization function well in the context of a vertical organization? Does

the district, state and federal system allow the sponsor to construct an organization and implementing procedure in such a way that what is learned will be used to modify the organizational behavior of the district, state and federal governance group? Government should be responsible to flexible implementing procedures within the public system or it runs the risk of its public abandoning the system.

What is proposed is difficult and there are many constraints, human, economic and technical. The Follow Through model or any innovation is analogous to a heart transplant. Sometimes the body rejects the transplant and the reasons for rejection should be studied for full understanding. This knowledge will greatly assist in improving professional competence and student outcomes. Teachers, students and the system should be studied simultaneously.

Focus on the Social Engine - Governance and all that

The sponsor's model represents a mini-model of governance, authority, organization and operations. The Follow Through model of governance has a strong relation to the governance of the district, state and federal governments. A documentarian of this broadly conceived governance is needed to describe how all this relates or doesn't. Governance is defined here to mean virtually all implementation efforts of Follow Through, such as, functional decision making, materials and equipment use, staff development and all resources related to the task. Governance and operations can be analyzed independently, but they are closely related. It is important to track how resource allocations flow through the district,

state and federal organizations as the resources move towards implementation by teachers. The sponsor and the district proclaim how they operate on paper. But, does the paper description match the real and required operating structure for doing the job?

Teacher Autonomy is Reduced and Planning is Increased

Teachers who work in self-contained classrooms, and then by sudden participation in a Follow Through model, must conceptually move from classroom planning to small system model planning are going to experience implementation difficulties. The difficulties can be overcome by group planning which leads to compromise, conflict and, ultimately, resolution. It's difficult to learn how to work together. The autonomous teacher is not currently in daily need of the peer group for classroom instruction and, as a matter of preference, would rather be left alone except where there is an occasional or personal call for teaching assistance. What a difference to persuade yourself about a lesson plan compared to persuading peers about adopting your lesson plan. The transition from autonomous teacher to an equal or unequal participating member of a group is highly underrated. Individual classroom autonomy is a powerful norm and is in conflict with innovations requiring team cooperation. The planning and facilitation skills for group planning by teachers are often assumed by institutions. Planning skills should not be assumed because the norm in most schools and classrooms is individual planning, implementation and evaluation. Of course, if the innovation depends on strong individual autonomy, then the model will have a good chance for success. In the self contained classroom,



the major function of the teacher is interaction with students. Group planning and preparation is not wasted effort, but it is effort that subtracts from personal contact with students. Or, it is effort that subtracts from one's personal and after school life. It is an add-on and not valued because it is not teaching. If there is a planning/preparation time period in the daily school schedule, it often, of necessity, turns out to be simply a needed rest period between classes.

Innovations, categorical programs, Follow Through models and the practices related, in general, are frequently biased toward intense group planning. Planning to learn the model, writing sponsor reports, cogitating over special variables of concern to the evaluator; learning to use equipment; meeting with staff and government officials are all part of the umbrella of planning. Follow Through and other innovations increase planning time intra school and group, and links the teacher to others outside the classroom, school, district and into the world of the University, business, state and federal governments. Since the advent of ESEA in 1965, a flood of categorical programs, requiring accountability by test and evaluation by government, has knowingly changed the daily routine of the autonomous teacher by intervention, forcing a team norm in place of an individual norm. On a guess, it would not be outrageous to think in terms of a teacher spending 50% time on group planning and 50% time on teaching students. Before intervention, this ratio, guessing again, may have been 10% planning and 90% interaction or teaching. This added planning is probably not desired by autonomous teachers because it is an add-on. There has been little accommodation by

school districts, governments or universities to consider the full impact of intervention in the life of the teacher. The imbalance between planning and teaching leads to failure to implement properly. Without additional planning time provided or valued, as teaching is, it is difficult to accommodate changes in the system.

What are autonomous teachers most inclined towards? Interaction with students. What are they least inclined towards? Group planning after school and Saturday. What do innovations offer? The negative incentive of group planning after school and Saturday? What can you expect if a sponsor offers these negative incentives? Individual complaints and hostility in spite of the unique opportunity offered by the Innovator. Most important: Follow Through evaluators must document this change of teacher norm or, at least, bring attention to it in the routines indigenous to the model. And, recommendations must be made by the sponsor, the funding agency, the school district, the responsible party for the innovation, about changes imposed on the system such as the changed ratio between planning and teaching. A new planning norm must be established and accepted by teachers due to innovation. All other institutions responsible must consider the new planning norm and accommodate. Schools of education must teach the skills used in planning and prepare personnel to welcome the function of planning as they now welcome direct contact with students. District, state and federal authorities must provide the increased resources for increased planning.

Teacher autonomy is not dead, but it is changing. Autonomy is impacted by requirements from state and federal legislatures and by

the rules and regulations generated by Departments of Education, who have responsibility to implement programs affecting the autonomous teachers. Universities and research organizations are evaluating the impact of programs implemented by the autonomous teacher. The public is judging, through private lenses; their higher expectations for all students, hardly considering the systemic operations needed under individual autonomy and group autonomy norms. Indeed, inside education we do not articulate well the required resource differences between individual and group autonomy operating in the public school system. Questions related to autonomy have been given low priority. It is assumed that either the teacher or the principal will overcome no matter the degree of change. What about the principal? What about parents? Here are some impressions:

The Principal as Educational Leader

The principal is reported, by students of the role, to be the key to educational leadership. Why is the principal key? Because the principal is a gatekeeper of knowledge pipelining Central Administration. The principal is the prime conveyer and interpreter of the rules and regulations of the district and the school. The principal is in a position to gain a perspective on the strengths and weaknesses of the entire staff by observation and from information provided by parents, students and teachers. The principal in the elementary school can master knowledge in multiple curriculum areas presented at the elementary level. Since content mastery at this level takes less time than secondary or university, more study can be dedicated to child development, methods of instruction and

some aspects of measurement. The elementary principal has a chance of becoming a master elementary teacher while serving as administrator.

The principal as a facilitator of staff is crucial. Leading faculty meetings, curriculum planning, developing staff relationships and leaders requires skills in motivation, listening and planning.

There is no question about the strategic position of the principal in the school hierarchy. Add, to the principal's experiences with the school, the direct relationship with the community through public meetings, with parents and organizations, and it is understandable why the elementary principal is the Chief Shepherd of the Flock.

However, many elementary principals do not take advantage of those role opportunities for numerous reasons . . . , one being the strong sense the principal evidences to be the ardent spokesperson for Central Administration. It is natural for the principal to show deference, frequently when it is not justified, to those in charge of the vertical hierarchy. When an elementary principal takes cues from staff and has primary interest in a major support role with his staff, which means listening to many of the dictates and suggestions of staff, the principal is an important facilitator of the regular program and could be a major facilitator of Follow Through.

The secondary principal does not indulge in comprehensive leadership to the extent of elementary principals. The role of curriculum leader is deferred to specialized secondary departments. Child development often turns out to be student discipline. The esprit de corps of the school can be symbolized in the secondary principal by his power to motivate a positive feeling tone about

sports, music, art or academic programs. Sports rivalry, in the local tradition, is usually picked to unify the student body. The secondary principal may facilitate planning by the staff, but normally, he is not the chief content planner for the staff, except for plant budget and housekeeping. Again, the principal at this level is the chief conveyer of the rules and regulations of central administration and the board of education. The principal is usually pushed towards dealing with difficult student control problems and evidence of mastering those problems on an equitable basis to teachers and students is greatly respected. Leadership is more related to control and less to intellectualism.

The principal's leadership role in instruction, curriculum, testing, child development, and staff development is uneven. When it is strong and balanced the principal is a leader. The principal is a constraint or, at best, neutral as a force in moving the faculty towards higher performance and satisfaction when the authority role is emphasized over instruction, etc.

The leader principal:

1. Respects his staff.
2. Knows the skills possessed by individual staff. Utilizes such knowledge in teacher assignment.
3. Moves the staff in new directions required by changing conditions.
4. Articulates the needs of the staff to Central Administration and, if necessary, challenges his superiors on decisions and operating procedures.

5. Runs efficient and effective meetings.
6. Promotes staff development.
7. Listens to staff.
8. Organizes planning groups around the ideas of staff.
9. Deals realistically and honestly with staff about constraints in teaching.
10. Chooses to move occupational matters remote from instruction, curriculum, testing, child development and staff development, to a much lower priority.
11. Has depth of educational knowledge.

Rich experience and practice is possessed by an unknown number of principals. It is important to observe the principal in action and in relationship to the faculty. The principal's zest for education; respect for staff; excitement about solving student learning problems; connections to educational theory and practice; and ability to listen to staff, is an overpowering functional order for one person. Given accelerated change conditions in public schools, it is plausible to assume the principal is declining in importance because authority is diminished while skill and knowledge requirements are increasing. The role has been diminished to Administrative Assistant, but calls for extraordinary skills beyond routine administering.

Educational leadership will always be important. Whether the traditional role of principal in public school can capture and implement the demands for accelerated change is analogous to whether autonomous teachers can meet the new demands of accelerated change.

The principal's role may be split into the following specialized functional paths:

1. Planner
2. Facilitator of Staff
3. Housekeeping, Administration
4. Budget
5. Community Relations
6. Student learning - knowledge of theory and practice
7. Evaluation and testing
8. Curriculum Development
9. Educational Computer Technology (New to most Principals)
10. Inspiration and motivation

Many of those functional paths require more time, effort and training than resides in one person. Teachers need the support from each of the ten roles. Some of the expertise regarding theory and practice of student learning is shared with the teacher and is not exclusive with the principal. There is an overlap of shared expertness, which often defies the legal authority given to administration at the building or central administrative level. The question for Follow Through Sponsors is - What kind of Principal do you need for the model?

Parent Participation has changed

The role of the traditional parent was to support, encourage and to tutor their grade school children. Since the advent of compensatory and Early Childhood programs in 1965, an increased political-influence role has been given to parents by way of local

advisory councils, especially in program, evaluation and assessment of student needs. This political-influence role changes the operational procedures of the school by intervention, directly or indirectly, in matters related to personnel hiring, transfer and assignment as well as programs. This is not to say that intelligent parents can't evaluate schools/teachers/administration/board. They often can and do. It does indicate they have been more strongly placed in a quasi-management and policy making role paralleling administration, teaching and board of education functions. Indeed, the politicalization of the school community was intended to move the board of education towards the concern of parents serving on the advisory councils. Overlapping and strengthening the advisory-political role is the parent as employee of the district. Parent aides hired on a wage basis serve two functions easily, if so inclined. They can monitor the activities of the teacher in the classroom and report negative or positive judgments to the advisory council which can, in turn, influence action. The action may be justified or unjustified. The point is the combined role of the parent as employee and influential community advisor, tends to muddy the district's professional procedures.

Community and political action, through educational parent advisory councils, exists. Political influence may improve instruction, but compared to parents tutoring their children as reinforcement to school, it's different. The governance of school is, therefore, changed with spillover effects throughout the system. I am not certain these changes have led to profound improvement in the

implementation of instructional programs. I am certain it has led to improvements in rendering more swiftly community and parent complaints. It could be argued that such modified governance involving parents is good for the system, but it's more difficult to argue that parents are more effective with their children because of advisory councils.

It is well documented that contemporary parents are working parents. More mothers are in the work place. Single and working parents exist in large numbers and they press for public services which will provide extensive programs of custodial, nutritional, medical, psychological, educational and recreational services. Yet parents, because of work, are less accessible to the school. The paradox is parent participation is sanctioned by law and politically potent, but parents have less time, after work, to divide between the school and other pursuits, including their own children.

I would suggest, against the tide of contemporary events, that schools are weakened because too many non-instructional goals and services belonging to parents or other institutions are moved to schools. Those non-instructional dollars, spent in public schools, important as they may be, are not improving the implementation of direct instructional services. They may be improving custodial care, but is custodial care the prime goal of schools? If it is, then teachers are in the wrong business. Education is the business of mind and learning. Parenting and custodial service is the business of parents and more economic institutions dedicated to strong custodial care and weaker educational service.

Parents, children and teachers are natural allies. Parents, and school advisory councils may be a good model of adversarial politics and influence. It certainly is not a model for improved parenting or funding for direct instruction. Teachers and parents are natural allies when both are focused on the learning and development of the child. They may become adversaries when the focus moves from the child to constituent movements in the community through advisory councils. Follow Through sponsors, if they have the luxury, should decide the function of parent participation that best reinforces the direct instruction of the child.

A Maze: Skills Coordination and the System

The courts and legislatures substitute legal for educational methodology to solve educational problems. Actually, the courts and the legislatures deal with equity, but their methods dominate education. The authority of the courts and the legislatures often dampens delivery of educational methods. Indeed, all the educational problems to be solved by mandate of the courts reside for solution in a host of loosely coordinated agencies. For example, Follow Through funds come from the government and the Follow Through sponsors are a part of a University, not necessarily a part of a School of Education. The sponsor presents a model to a school district administration. The administration of a school district is pressured by its public and selects a model for high test results. The teachers are given the responsibility by the board and administration, often without the required resource base and involvement, to do the job. Experts from an evaluation community, related to the government or

agencies, judges whether the program change has succeeded in its high test purposes. Policy makers, remote from school implementation experience, and often insensitive to teaching conditions and the dramatic differences in children, threaten punishment by subtraction of funds from school finance because they are angered by negative test scores. Teachers, responsible for a positive solution, probably did not invent nor agree with the innovation, but they are negatively evaluated. Other academics introduce guiding principles for education and innovations, but do not struggle consistently with their colleagues in K-12 about systemic problems because they are funded to do research. Book companies strongly influence the curriculum because they have a work schedule permitting them major responsibility to organize and publish knowledge. Test companies reduce the whole complicated systemic process of education to a test score and report only the facts of student progress, especially academic progress.

It takes the skills of these many, but separate, private and public educational institutions; legislative and regulatory bodies, to deliver a program, but those skills and agencies exist in fractions difficult to manipulate and coordinate in terms of bringing timely resources and skills to the classroom.

It is unfair to think the autonomous teacher can deliver on innovations developed or judged by all those others. And, it is unfair to require a variety of personnel skills, deliverable for implementation of innovative programs in public schools, whose residence is in a host of institutions and professionals not located in the district or classroom.

The Follow Through model sponsors, and teachers, to impact the system, must have access to the whole of the system, constantly in order to coordinate skills and resources required for implementation. There are large and varied educational resources in the total system, but frequently they are not available to teachers on a timely basis; for example, finding and utilizing a better and proven test instrument for next week or month.

Change in education is a fact. The autonomous teacher in the system strains under the weight of accelerated educational demands and higher and different parent, student expectations. Required for solution is how we deliver services and skills and supporting resources to meet higher and different demands drawn from this loosely connected band of experts in K to University, and a host of other agencies.

Fixed in professional minds, is the role of our employing institution and its part in change. Usually, it turns out some other part of the institution or some different institution is in need of being reorganized, retooled, rebehavioered, redone, rethought. In this game, the teacher, again, becomes the prime object of change directed by the government, universities, and others who have time for a variety of applications beyond real time teaching. Different skills should be quickly available to teachers, schools, Follow Through Innovators, and innovators in general, to enhance their sense of pulling together. If the skill of testing remains at a high level, primarily, with test companies, then an expert test voice is missing at the point of classroom instruction. The system at the level of.

the classroom requires a sound technical voice, if only to be respected by the test community in matters of design and construction. Why? Because the test community will not respect the word of other professionals who are not technically qualified. Ditto for other specialists. Conversely, what voice is not recognized in matters of instructional excellence by teachers? The test companies. Why? Because they are not always sensitive experts on matters of practical implementation.

Follow Through and most other innovators continue in the tradition of efforts to innovate without regard for implementation impact of the Model on Teachers in the system. The focus in Follow Through is not on the variables needed by the teacher to effectively implement, but rather on how they or their students perform with little regard to the new demands required of them by the model. This tradition of the autonomous teacher being responsible for conditions and expectations given to them by others goes beyond their autonomous power. In effect, they get hung with a bum rap and suffer the ridicule of other professionals and the public for acting sometimes reticent towards innovations. It is difficult to articulate the need for systemic change when you are part of the system. It is unfair to take the blame for unsuccessful innovative changes when resources and skills were not fully delivered to the system.

There is no magic plan for bringing together system wide skills and resources. Only a willingness to recognize the uncoordinated systemic problem and then to try to plan in future models the advantage of drawing a variety of resources, rapidly, from the whole of education. For example, suppose the following practical question was asked of a faculty responsible for innovation.

Question: What's the best way to organize the teaching of subtraction? (Substitute any partial curriculum area or any other concern in place of subtraction).

1. How should subtraction be taught? Many teachers can agree on this. If they can't, have a math expert work with teachers at their discretion and on a timely basis with planning allowed during the day.
2. How much time does an average student need to master subtraction?
Hypothetical: There may be research studies that indicate 10 hours of intense programmed instruction. The teachers need a research of the literature done by a professional charged with this responsibility. Other studies may indicate 15 hours of independent study for subtraction mastery. Whatever the case, the resources and skills needed to create the delivery condition of 10 programmed or 15 independent study hours of subtraction instruction are different. The design and implementation of each instructional mode requires planning time and access to knowledgeable practitioners and research. How do you unglue the resources so they all flow to the district implementing staff, unfettered by numerous rules and regulations? One can plan easily what is required and what it costs to deliver 10-15 hours of subtraction in two modes. The difficult part is the politics of making the district and others responsible in more flexible ways to the implementing staff. The implementing staff might request material resources for 10 hours of programmed instruction and additional equipment. They may also request a knowledgeable

professional capable of identifying better sequences of subtraction facts for maximum student gain with minimum drill and practice by the student. They may request diagnostic resources to discover more about particular student subtraction difficulties. Whether these skills and resources reside with current staff will be determined during planning. In the case of subtraction, the faculty will probably determine its own solution. Suppose you can't meet this simple planning demand on a timely basis from a faculty? What then? Look for subtraction help in other parts of the system and deliver it on a timely basis. We can't do that in public schools. Well, we must try.

One should go more deeply into what appears to be the simple task of planning and organizing to teach subtraction or some different part of the curriculum, but not in this paper. The major point is to invent a flexible organization able to bring delivery in a rapid and intensive way.

In Summary

Teachers should be courted, screened and given the opportunity to volunteer for Follow Through. Employment conditions should be specified by the sponsor. Conditions in the model must include incentives for teachers such as full time staff development.

The Follow Through model is a mini-model of governance implanted in the loosely coordinated local, state and federal educational governance structures, including higher education and business. Researchers and evaluators must study required organization and resources

for the implementation of Follow Through models and other innovations and make recommendations to local, state and federal authorities for revision of the larger system.

Teacher autonomy has been severely impacted by government programs since 1965. Principal and parent roles have also changed. A new group planning norm is emerging by virtue of accelerated, higher and different demands on teachers and other personnel. The new norm is moving towards team and group skill efforts in contrast to the individual efforts of autonomous teachers. The skills reside in a maze of agencies and people.