DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 326 EA 020 033

AUTHOR Harvey, Glen; Crandall, David P.
TITLE A Beginning Look at the What and How of Restructuring.
INSTITUTION Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast & Islands, Andover, MA.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 88
CONTRACT 400-86-0005
NOTE 37p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publication Sales, The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands, 290 South Main St., Andover, MA 01810 ($3.00 plus $2.50 postage and handling).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; *Educational Change; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; Expectation; School Demography; *School Effectiveness; *School Organization
IDENTIFIERS *Maine

ABSTRACT

A second wave of educational reform is closely scrutinizing fundamental issues (structure, organization, management, curriculum, and instruction) and calling for at least partial restructuring of the public school system. After presenting a scenario of an ideally restructured elementary school, this paper explores the "why," "what," and "how" of restructuring for Maine faculty and administrators involved in the state's Restructuring Schools Project. Although some states have made significant progress and can point to steady standardized test scores, the dropout rate remains excessive, students still possess inadequate writing skills, and educators continue to deplore students' inability to use higher order thinking processes. Other challenges include new technological advances, growing numbers of nonfamily households, an aging population, a growing demand for skilled workers in a rapidly changing labor force, and increasing numbers of poor and minority students. Attempts to define restructuring as a solution are discussed, along with definitions of what it is not (tinkering around the edges or improving existing structures). Next, eight critical restructuring components are outlined, including the need to focus at the buiding level, educate all students, clarify and raise expectations, personalize teaching and learning, rethink administrative roles and responsibilities, apply research and development knowledge, humanize the organizational climate, and involve parents and the community. Finally, a model restructuring plan is described. Appendices detail five examples of innovative restructuring programs and list relevant resources. Also included are 36 references. (MLH)

A Beginning Look at the What and How of Restructuring

Glen Harvey and David P. Crandall

1988

The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands

for the

Maine Department of Educational and Cultural Services' Restructuring Schools Project

The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands, 290 South Main Street, Andover, Massachusetts 01810

The work on which this publication is based was sponsored in part by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, under contract number 400-86-0005. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views of the department or any other agency of the U.S. Government.

A Beginning Look at the What and How of Restructuring*

Glen Harvey and David P. Crandall

Within fifteen minutes of walking through the door, you realize that something exciting and exhilarating is going on. The atmosphere is charged with electricity. You can't put your finger on it immediately, but this is no ordinary school. What is it that makes it so different? Why does it stand out so clearly from other schools you've visited?

Slowly you begin to notice subtle differences. The morning announcements are celebrations -- of student birthdays, of teachers' contributions to school programs and activities, of successful community events, of a variety of student achievements. The school-community newsletter is displayed prominently as you enter the school, next to a brightly decorated bulletin board to greet the many new faces that you notice -- volunteers from the local community, area businesses, and nearby universities and colleges. Members of the community are always welcome to visit and learn more about what the school is doing to meet its goals. Partnerships with local businesses and colleges are a large part of the collaborative support system that assists the school in making the progress to which everyone so eagerly points with pride.

The hallways are covered with student art work and bulletin boards created by teams of teachers, suggesting still another, more substantial difference in the school. Teachers are collaborating with one another, across grades and classrooms. Together with their principal, they are jointly deciding the new directions of the school, in close collaboration with parents, community members, and participating businesses and colleges. Shared decision making is a critical ingredient of the school's success, as is recognizing and rewarding excellence -- in both teaching and learning.

Down the hall, a team of teachers is meeting to discuss a new set of research materials they have just received. They have invited the principal and an outside consultant to work with them in planning how to apply the new materials and information in order to develop a strategy for working with a particularly difficult student.

* *Special thanks to Richard Card, Deputy Commissioner, Maine Department of Educational and Cultural Services, and C.L. Hutchins, Executive Director, Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory, for sharing their insights and wisdom as we developed this paper.*

A Beginning Look at the What and How of Restructuring
The Regional Laboratory

As you enter a classroom, you realize you haven't heard the usual sound of the bell announcing the beginning and end of class. Inside, the room exudes the change you have been sensing. The classroom reverberates with energy and excitement. You find students of different ages busily working together, alongside their teachers and volunteers. Teams of students, each reflecting the range of student abilities and backgrounds typical in the community, are working collectively on a joint project of the class. There is a feeling of caring in the classroom, with every student being treated as special and important. It is obvious that expectations are high and that all students know that they are expected to learn -- and are confident in their own abilities.

The dominant teaching mode is coaching rather than lecturing; the general style is supportive, personal, trusting, and purposive. Even the curriculum is different. Subject matter is not divided into the traditional disciplines. In this case, students are participating in a rather unique combination of calculus and literature. In other classrooms, science permeates almost every lesson. Regardless of the classroom, students are mastering basics and then moving beyond them to more abstract problem solving, pushing the boundaries of typical subject matter to better understand the challenges confronting them.

The outer shell of the building may be the same as always, but inside you have just experienced what is currently being labeled a "restructured" school. But what does it mean to restructure a school, how do you go about it, and is it really necessary anyway?

The purpose of this paper is to begin to answer these questions for faculty and administrators in Maine who are considering restructuring their schools as part of the Restructuring Schools Project. In so doing, our intentions are twofold. First, since restructuring is an innovative concept with few boundaries, we hope to stimulate ideas and visions that go beyond the traditional models of schooling, drawing on examples of schools that are actually engaged in the process of restructuring. In part, the paper is intended to create a mosaic of miniature portraits of the "what" of restructuring. There is, after all, no one best way to restructure schools. Each school must be designed to fit the context of which it is such an integral part.

Our second purpose is somewhat more concrete; it is to provide an overview of how a school could -- or should -- go about restructuring. Although restructuring is a relatively new phenomenon, a considerable body of knowledge exists about the ways in which schools can successfully manage change to achieve desired goals and visions. Our intention is to begin to adapt and apply this knowledge in ways that assist school staff tackling the enormous challenge of restructuring their schools. Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that faculty who are embarking on this quest are, in

fact, breaking new ground. We know very little about the concrete "how" of restructuring, in large measure because so few schools have fully accepted the challenge.

The paper is organized into three sections. We begin with the "why" of restructuring, reviewing the reasons and rationales behind and beneath the restructuring movement that is emerging across the country. We then proceed to describe the "what" of restructuring, portraying images of a restructured school. We conclude with the "how" of restructuring, providing a discussion of the process for achieving a new image of schools and translating that image into practice.

It is important to note that we see this paper as only a beginning draft. We plan to modify it as the reality of restructuring becomes more informed by those of you actually engaged in the challenge to redesign our schools. We ask that you join with us in this effort, informing the what and how of restructuring through your own experience and learnings. In accepting the challenge to restructure, you are assuming a leadership role in one of the most exciting and potentially rewarding cutting edge reform efforts throughout the country. We hope that you will continue to work collaboratively with the Restructuring Schools Project and will share with others what you are experiencing and learning to pave the way for those who follow in your footsteps, striving for excellence in education.

Why Restructure Schools

As the old saying goes, "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." If this advice is to be heeded, the question to be seriously addressed is whether or not our schools are truly broken, requiring the massive overhaul the label "restructuring" suggests, or instead whether some more minor, well-informed tinkering might solve the problems that persist.

Few would deny that the nineteen eighties has earned the distinction of being one of the most active decades of educational reform in recent memory. Fueled by the National Commission on Excellence in Education's (1983) charge that the "educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity" (p. 5), 1983 witnessed a groundswell of public and political energy and enthusiasm for improving education that has yet to subside. At all levels -- local, state, and federal -- the amount of sustained activity and commitment to improving education has been almost unprecedented. No state in the union can be charged with not seriously accepting the challenge to initiate improvement efforts in the quest for educational excellence. Additional funds have been allocated in support of education; new policies and regulations have been developed and instituted; school improvement initiatives have been designed and implemented; curricula have been

reviewed and revised; standards for students and faculty have been raised.

But have all the energy, enthusiasm, and resources been effective in achieving educational excellence? The answer is both yes and no. At the building level, many schools have made remarkable progress, providing showcases of educational excellence at its best. Similarly, some states can also boast of significant headway at the state level. In addition to many schools, districts, and states being able to point to their individual measures of success, SAT and ACT scores are remaining steady. On the negative side, however, dropout rates are at a staggering high; the 1985 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) writing assessment indicates that students possess inadequate writing skills; and educators continue to be alarmed by the inability of students to use higher order thinking processes -- to name just a few examples.

In what might be considered a second wave of reform reports, new concerns began to be voiced more loudly about the health of the educational enterprise during 1986 and 1987. The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, the National Governors' Association, the Holmes Group, and the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, among others, have been in the forefront of this latest call for excellence in education. There is a difference in this second wave of reform efforts and recommendations, however. As Mark Danner, senior editor of Harper's, pointed out in his assessment of the recommendations of the National Commission on Excellence in Education during a forum on "How Not to Fix the Schools," many of the proposals of the more prominent commissions and task forces of the first wave of reform represented little more than a recommendation for more of the same -- take schools as they are, for better or worse, and treat their problems by adding more, e.g., more time on task, more course requirements ("How Not to Fix the Schools," 1986). Fundamental issues regarding structure, organization, management, curriculum, instruction, and so forth were seldom addressed through straightforward, hardnosed analysis that permitted the possibility that there might be another way. In this second wave of reports and recommendations, not only is such an examination of other possibilities permissible, it is what is being called for loudly, forcefully, and with passion.

Some argue that the system truly is broken and to fix it requires more than applying a few patches and a new coat of paint. A reexamination of the entire system is required, with the ultimate result being at least a partial -- if not total -- restructuring of the system. Others would argue that schools have been fairly successful in their efforts to educate America's youth but that, nevertheless, the massive changes currently being experienced by society require that schools must make significant changes in their basic structures in order to appropriately adapt. According to McCune (1987),

> *The challenge for all of us is to keep one foot secured in the richness of our past experience and build on that experience in the improvement of schools. At the same time we must move out and begin the restructuring of schools that will match the needs of the larger society. Effective change does not call for denying or diminishing the learnings of the past, but it does call on us to move ahead and to meet the new challenges of our time (pp. 7-8).*

Similarly, in a recent presentation at "School Year 2000: An International Seminar on Creating Effective Schools of the Future," C.L. Hutchins, Executive Director of the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory, stated that although "American education is better today than it was five, ten, twenty-five, fifty years ago" and that public schools "reach more students, provide more services and produce a higher level than schools of the past," the current structure of American schools is nevertheless "not sufficiently powerful to meet the needs of students who will live and work in the 21st century."

Dr. Hutchins and others make such claims in large part in response to a variety of demographic, social, and economic changes that are occurring (and are predicted to occur in the years to come) within our society and across the globe. As Cohen (1987) points out,

> *the need for education reform continues and the work of the recent past must be extended into the future . . . . because American society is undergoing profound changes, largely as a result of the combined effects of demographic changes affecting families, the workforce, and the schools, as well as changes in America's competitive position in the world economy (p. 2).*

Consider, for example, the following items and the potential consequences and demands they hold for effective schools of the future:

- Advances in technology have significantly changed the way we live, work, and communicate. According to the Commission on Reading (1985), "the world is moving into a technological-information age in which full participation in education, science, business, industry, and the professions requires increasing levels of literacy. What was a satisfactory level of literacy in 1950 probably will be marginal by the year 2000" (p. 3).

- The dropout rate in the United States is estimated to be over 29 percent. As Rist (1987) points out, "leaving school early damages a young person's chances of future success: Dropouts have more difficulty finding and holding jobs, they make up a large portion of the long-term unemployed, and the jobs they manage to land pay

> less. . . dropouts swell the ranks of welfare recipients, represent lost tax revenues, and are disproportionately represented in crime statistics" (pp. A9-A10).

- Although the country is currently experiencing a baby boomlet, 73 percent of families do not have children in schools, in contrast to the 1950's when one out of every two families had children attending school. Non-family households (unmarried with no children) are the fastest growing segment of our society.

- The population of the United States is aging. Twelve percent of the population is over 65 years of age; by the year 2080, it is estimated that 23.5 percent will be in this age category.

- There is a growing demand for skilled workers who can adapt to a labor force that is witnessing major shifts in its needs and is likely to continue to do so. As new jobs emerge in the service sector of the economy and disappear in manufacturing and production, labor market demands change dramatically, requiring that workers either be adaptable in their skills or that massive retraining occur. The labor force is also increasingly female and minority. In addition, in over fifty percent of the households with two parents with children, both parents are in the work force.

- The world is increasingly shrinking as communication mechanisms become more sophisticated. The concept of a world community is now a reality rather than a futuristic concept, as is the global, interdependent nature of the world's economy.

In a discussion of how appropriate today's curriculum will be in the year 2000, Harold Hodgkinson (1987) aptly observes that

> *demography has an enormous amount of predictive power, because of the simple fact that kids grow up and become the next generation of adults (p. 6).*

He then proceeds to sketch a picture of today's 5-year-olds -- many of whom will graduate in 2000. He highlights the following provocative features of the class of 2000, all of which must be dealt with by the teachers and administrators of today if these students are to be productive, educated citizens of tomorrow:

- 24 percent of these students are below the federal poverty line;

- over one third are minorities;

- while the immigration rate is about the same as it was in 1920 --

approximately 14 million -- 83 percent of today's immigrants arrive from South America and Asia (rather than from Europe, as in the 1920s), bringing with them radically different cultures, mores, languages, and so forth;

- fewer of these students are white, middle class, suburban students than in the past, given declining birthrates in the northeast and midwest and increasing rates in the more minority-dominated southeast and southwest;

- 18 percent were born outside of marriage;

- approximately 50 percent live with only one parent; the "traditional" American family of a working father, housewife mother, and two or more school age children constituted only 4 percent of American households in 1986;

- approximately 11 percent of these students have emotional or physical handicaps;

- an estimated 20 percent of the females will become pregnant as teenagers; and

- two-thirds of their mothers will be in the labor force (most of them full-time) by the time today's 5-year-olds enter high school.

These then are some of the challenges confronting today's educators. Of course, the foregoing statements are generalizations about our nation as a whole. The particulars for Maine, and for each of its communities, might differ. (Indeed, getting a handle on such information for your situation may give you valuable information.) It is in large measure a growing need to respond to these realities (many of them newly confronting educators) that underlies much of the reasoning beneath and behind calls to truly rethink our educational system and begin the very difficult task of restructuring our schools -- and the entire educational enterprise -- in ways that assure success in the future.

What Restructuring Is and Is Not

In Search of a Definition

What does it mean to restructure schools? What would it look like to restructure the entire educational enterprise? What distinguishes Theodore Sizer's Coalition of Essential Schools, which provides an excellent illustration of one approach to restructuring, from the recommendations of the Commission on Excellence in Education in A Nation At Risk, which do not

represent an effort to redesign and restructure?

These are not easy questions to respond to, and there are no simple answers. Restructuring represents a new, emerging concept. There is no one, concise, agreed upon definition of restructuring nor is there a definitive model that can be applied. There are, in fact, many conceptions of a restructured school; the concept itself is one that suggests and supports the notion of multiple alternatives.

There is some agreement, however, both on what counts as restructuring and what does not count. As David H. Lynn, editor of Basic Education notes, "schools must truly be re-formed, not simply greased to do the same old thing with less friction" (1987, p. 1).

Restructuring is not adding more of the same, tinkering around the edges, even making significant improvements to the current structure. Typical school improvement initiatives, however important, and efforts to apply the school effectiveness research to schools in search of excellence do not, by themselves, constitute restructuring -- which is not to say that they are not well intentioned efforts likely to improve the quality of education our children receive.

Lynn goes on to state what he considers restructuring to b...

> *First and foremost it means that schools should be organized according to the needs of children and the ways in which they actually learn, not on rigid models half-military and half-industrial. Educators and policymakers must begin to concentrate less on so-called "inputs" -- the size of classes, teachers salaries, and graduation requirements, valid as each may be on its own -- and look more to "outcomes" -- what children, all children, can be expected to know and be able to do at various stages of their education (1987, p. 2).*

This is but one definition; obviously there are alternative ways of defining the concept. Underlying any definition of and/or approach to restructuring schools, however, is the shared belief that the current system must be rethought and redesigned in order to be more effective in meeting the demands of our changing society and in achieving commonly held goals. As Duttweiler and Hord (1987) point out,

> *in order to guide educational reform, policy makers must visualize and articulate the outcomes their system should strive to achieve, then see that those systems are designed to enable people to choose actions that have the best chance of accomplishing the goals and achieving the outcomes (p. 11).*

A Beginning Look at the What and How of Restructuring
The Regional Laboratory

To achieve real excellence in education for all students is likely to require significant alterations in what we currently recognize as our educational system -- at the local, district, and state levels. According to Cohen (1987), the necessary changes "will affect virtually every aspect of the structure and operations of the education system, from the schoolhouse to the state house" (p. 3). Efforts to restructure begin with the premise that the current boundaries and visions of education and schooling are malleable; rather than limiting images of what could be, they provide a jumping off point for considering alternative means of achieving a shared end of educational excellence.

To restructure means to preserve and build upon what has been successful in educating our children and to rethink and redesign those aspects of the enterprise that have failed. This ultimately requires taking a critical look at all aspects of schooling including:

- mission and goals of education and schooling;
- organization and management at the local, district, state, and federal levels;
- curriculum and structure of knowledge;
- instruction;
- the roles and responsibilities of educational personnel;
- the roles, responsibilities, and involvement of parents and the community;
- school finance; and
- educational regulation and control.

The sheer magnitude of this list of categories to reconsider and perhaps redesign gives a general sense of the meaning of restructuring, as well as some understanding of the level of effort and length of time required to take on a restructuring endeavor. Unfortunately, the prospect of rethinking the educational enterprise in its entirety is more likely to be experienced as overwhelming than enticing and stimulating, particularly when it is presented in abstract concepts and categories rather than concrete portraits of alternatives. We have therefore provided descriptions of actual ongoing restructuring efforts in Appendix A, including contact information for schools in Maine that are participating in these initiatives. As you embark on your restructuring adventure, we hope that you will agree to be added to this list.

Included in Appendix A are descriptions of the following efforts:

- Coalition of Essential Schools;
- National Network for Educational Renewal;
- NEA Mastery in Learning Project Schools;
- The Holmes Group; and
- the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession.

It is important to note that these initiatives and their respective sets of recommendations are provided only as examples -- as jumping off places to stimulate the reader's own creative imagination. To restructure means to first identify the mission and goals that are desired and then to design a system that will allow the successful achievement of the goals and enactment of the mission. To simply adopt one of the alternatives described in Appendix A may result in traveling down a path leading to an unwanted destination.

Critical Components of Restructuring

The five examples discussed in Appendix A graphically illustrate the view that there is no one right way to structure (or restructure) schools. Each school must be designed to achieve its individual mission within the community in which it finds itself. As Fullan (1982a) aptly reminds, change is bound by its context. "The history, personalities, and socio-political climate within each setting constitutes major determinants of change outcomes" (p. 4). As a result, restructured schools may look quite different from one another, reflecting different community realities, needs, beliefs, and values.

Nevertheless, looking across the various efforts to restructure schools, significant similarities begin to emerge. Taken together, the following core components of restructuring can be identified as critical, the majority of which are overlapping and interactive with one another.

- Focus at the Building Level. If significant changes in the educational system are to occur, restructuring efforts must be focused on and driven by the local level. Obviously changes of the magnitude of those discussed above cannot be achieved without involvement at the district and state (if not federal) levels -- but the message is clear and consistent: if restructuring is to be successful, it must be building-based. In the view of the Committee for Economic

Development, for example, "reform is most needed where learning takes place -- in the individual schools, in the classroom, and in the interaction between teacher and student" (1985, p. 17). On a similar note, Timar and Kirp (1987) point out the limitations of a top-down approach.

> *A school must set a tone that will be apparent to the students. That tone, an organizational ethos, determines the character of the school. It sets the expectation for excellence or failure. But it is created by individuals working in schools, not by bureaucratic mandates that emanate from distant places (p. 328).*

- Educate ALL Students. Underlying approaches to restructuring is the belief that all students are important and that all can and must learn. It is noteworthy that discussions of restructuring spend considerable time discussing the ways in which schools must be redesigned in order to better meet the needs of students who traditionally have been failed by the current structure.

- Clarify and Raise Expectations. Just as restructuring efforts maintain that all students must receive a quality education, they expect that all students will achieve mastery of widely agreed upon skills and curricular areas. Similar to the effective schools research, an emphasis is placed on clarifying and sharing high expectations for student performance and behavior. The emphasis on expectations is not limited to students, however. Teachers, administrators, parents, and other members of the community are also expected to meet certain standards and responsibilities and play particular roles. The mission and goals of the school must also be clear -- and they must be shared and endorsed by students, teachers, administrators, parents, and the community alike.

- Personalize Teaching and Learning. The concept of "personalizing" teaching and learning can hold many different meanings for different people. However, common to restructuring efforts is the notion of a child-centered approach to instruction. Coaching, tailoring, and individualizing are all frequently referenced approaches. More traditional approaches to both curriculum and instruction are rethought and generally redesigned in restructuring efforts.

- Rethink and Alter the Roles and Responsibilities of Educational Personnel. Many of the recent restructuring efforts have focused on reexamining the roles and responsibilities of teachers and professionalizing the field of teaching, as evidenced by the work of The Holmes Group and the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession as well as by efforts such as the one occurring in Rochester, New York

(see Appendix A). Although there are a variety of aspects to consider within this component, one of the most prominent among restructuring efforts is the notion of shared decision making and shared leadership. As the President of the Rochester Teachers Association pointed out, "If accountability means assuming responsibility for the decisions and choices that one makes, then teachers, to be held accountable, must not be locked out of the decisionmaking process" (Urbanski, 1987, p. 25). Similarly, in his report (1987) on educational leadership, Governor Bill Clinton draws on the observations and insights of Rosabeth Moss Kanter:

> *The model of the single leader may be declining in favor of a coalition of leaders ... who act together and divide various leadership functions among themselves. In fact, it may also be important to ensure that a much larger number of members of the organization are capable of taking on pieces of the leadership role. What will be important is that the functions are served -- not that any single person has total responsibility for performing them (p. 12).*

- Apply Research and Development Knowledge. If restructuring efforts are to be successful and are to avoid costly trial-and-error experiments and often counter-productive duplication of effort, it is critical that faculties turn to available research and development (R&D) for insight and guidance as they embark on their restructuring efforts. It is equally important that they continue to draw upon R&D as their restructuring initiative progresses.

- Humanize the Organizational Climate. The overlap of this component with many of those cited above is obvious. The notion here is that the school, as well as the classroom, must be a pleasant environment conducive to learning and working. Again, the emphasis is on looking across all members of the educational community to ensure that the school provides a place that nurtures and supports them in their collective efforts to grow.

- Involve Parents and the Community. Consistent across restructuring efforts is the emphasis on increasing the active (as opposed to superficial) involvement of parents in the education of their children. As evidenced by the examples above, additional emphasis has also been placed on moving beyond parents to raise the level of involvement and commitment of other community members as well. Partnerships -- with area businesses and local colleges and universities -- are playing an increasingly important role in efforts to redesign the country's schools. Community support and commitment are important factors to success.

It is critical that each of these eight components be examined and addressed in any restructuring effort. While it is not necessary to respond to and reflect every component in the short-term and on the same timeline, we would argue that to constitute a "restructured school" ultimately requires incorporating each of the components into the overall design.

How to Begin Restructuring

Just as there is no one right image of a restructured school, there is also no one right way to go about restructuring. As Michael Fullan (1982b) points out:

> *there can be no one recipe for change, because unlike ingredients for a cake, people are not standard to begin with, and the damned thing is that they change as you work with them in response to their experiences and perceptions (p. 129).*

Nevertheless, there is a considerable body of research and experience that has arisen through recent school improvement efforts that provides an impressive point of departure in efforts to restructure.

In many respects, restructuring can be approached in a fashion similar to implementing multiple, intertwined school improvement efforts, with the understanding that they are incredibly more massive and complex. As evidenced by the discussion above and the examples contained in Appendix A, to restructure requires much more than making a minor -- or even major -- change in one aspect of the school. It requires rethinking and redesigning the entire system. Clearly you need to begin somewhere -- and that somewhere may be with changing one aspect of the school -- but the vision must encompass the overall system as must the plan for eventually restructuring it.

Getting Started: Establishing a Team and Creating a Vision

We recommend that you begin by establishing a multiconstituent building-level restructuring team to provide leadership and guidance to the effort. Leadership is critical to the success -- or failure -- of any restructuring effort. To take a lesson from school improvement efforts, Fleming and Buckles (1987) warn that

> *an increasing number of leaders report that the success of their efforts depends on the composition, influence, and skill of the staff assigned to steer complex projects. For leaders who will be working with school improvement teams for the first time, the selection and guidance of team members and the establishment of*

> *ground rules for discussion, decisionmaking, and workscope, are essential (p. 3).*

Harvey and Hergert (1986) emphasize a number of relevant points in their discussion of the fundamental role people play in change efforts, i.e.:

> *First, particularly in major change efforts, everyone has some type of role, e.g., teachers, trainers, administrators, policy makers, parents. The use of multiple strategies can involve many people doing many things . . . .*
>
> *Second, forceful leadership, usually by district-level administrator or building principal, is "the factor that contributes most directly . . . to major, effective changes in classroom practice that become firmly incorporated into everyday routines" (Crandall and Loucks, 1983, p. 10) . . . .*
>
> *Third, sticking with the effort rather than transferring responsibilities entirely to users can make a difference (pp. 294-295).*

One of the first and most crucial tasks of the restructuring team is to create a vision of the "restructured school." It is absolutely critical to develop a shared vision of the restructured school at the outset. The vision must be one that both the school community and the community at large can endorse and support. Given the radical departure from the norm that restructuring efforts represent, the more concrete the vision, the better.

The examples described in Appendix A are provided as one stimulus to developing such a vision. We strongly recommend that the team actually visit schools that are involved in restructuring both to assist in developing their own unique vision as well as to begin to identify strategies for enacting that vision. There is a definite benefit to seeing alternatives in action and in learning from those who have been involved in the restructuring process. Contact information for schools in Maine has been provided throughout Appendix A in order to facilitate the process of identifying possible sites to visit.

It is important to realize, however, that simply observing will be insufficient to create any meaning out of what the team has witnessed. Preparation for such visits is vital if the team is to benefit. The team must come away from the visit with more than a positive feeling about the school and its accomplishments. It is necessary to have a clear understanding of what changes were made, how and why they were made, what problems and obstacles were encountered, how and when success was defined, and so forth.

A galvanizing theme, motto, or slogan may be quite helpful both in articulating the vision more concretely as well as in developing the necessary school and community support that will be needed if the restructuring effort is to succeed.

Moving from Vision to Reality: Developing and Implementing a Plan to Restructure

Loucks-Horsley and Cox (1984) identify three distinct phases of the change process that must be addressed in improvement efforts -- phases that equally apply to restructuring efforts. These include initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. Below we briefly review each of these phases within the context of setting forth to restructure a school. Because of the limited nature of our discussion, we encourage readers to explore additional sources of information upon which we have based our guidelines. A listing of selected resources is included as Appendix B.

The Initiation Phase. The initiation phase (also referred to as mobilization) involves:

- identifying the problems to be addressed;
- establishing goals and priorities;
- identifying strategies, approaches, resources, etc.;
- developing an overall plan; and
- preparing for implementation.

This is a particularly critical time for restructuring efforts. It is at this point that the image or vision of the entire restructuring effort is translated into a workable plan, which will then be implemented in the subsequent implementation phase.

As was apparent in many of the restructuring examples described in Appendix A, a key activity during the initiation phase is to identify the problems you are trying to address through your restructuring effort. In school improvement efforts, Loucks-Horsley and Hergert (1985) suggest the following data sources for defining the problem: classroom and school observations; test scores; surveys of parents, teachers, and students; interviews of parents, students, and teachers; and documentation of activities. They caution, however, that the team should not spend too much time on assessment. This is a warning even more critical in restructuring

efforts. It is not difficult to imagine a scenario where so much time, energy, and even resources are spent identifying the problems the team intends to solve that there is nothing left for the solution.

Understandable, supportable goals that paint a colorful picture of success will also be invaluable in providing continuous guidance to the team while simultaneously serving as a mainstay of the ongoing public relations work any restructuring effort requires. As Fleming and Buckles (1987) point out in their discussion of implementing school improvement initiatives:

> *good planning will assure that there are short-, mid-, and long-term goals; goals that affect policy as well as programs or practices; and goals that have implications for all levels of the school community (p. 3).*

This is doubly true for restructuring efforts, given their long-term, complex nature and the fact that they must ultimately have impact upon all levels of the educational enterprise.

In school improvement efforts, the next step in the initiation phase is to identify strategies and solutions, which are then developed into an overall school improvement plan. Loucks-Horsley and Hergert identify six sub-steps within this solution facet:

- identify local resources and constraints;
- develop criteria for the solution;
- locate outside resources;
- apply criteria for solutions;
- make a decision; and
- transform a solution into a definable practice.

This is a complicated, time-consuming process even in relatively straightforward, narrowly focused school improvement initiatives. In restructuring efforts, the task is likely to be enormous. However, clearly defined problems and goals with an overarching vision will provide strong guidance and definable parameters. Well-planned visits to schools that are undergoing restructuring are particularly helpful at this juncture of the process, as is a careful examination of the relevant research and available programs, practices, and policies that have proven effective in addressing similar problems within similar contexts.

The final aspect of the initiation phase is developing an overall plan and

preparing for its implementation. Loucks-Horsley and Hergert again identify a number of sub-steps that must occur in improvement efforts, i.e.:

- create awareness;
- select implementors;
- assess current practice;
- set expectations;
- assign support roles;
- make logistical arrangements (e.g., for training, facilities, personnel); and
- create a timeline of activities and events.

Obviously, for a restructuring effort, this portion of the process is crucial and can become overwhelming. There may be the tendency for team members who have been involved in school improvement initiatives to either underestimate the amount of time and effort this (and the entire initiation phase) will require because of confidence in their ability to plan OR to become overwhelmed with the magnitude of the planning task in contrast to prior improvement efforts in which they have been involved.

There may also be a tendency in approaching restructuring (a) to believe that everything must be done simultaneously and (b) to ignore ongoing improvement initiatives within the school. In developing the overall restructuring plan, every effort should be made to incorporate existing improvement activities, developing a coherent, coordinated, comprehensive strategy that builds on existing strengths, energies, and commitments. Similarly, if a long-range plan and vision exist as guiding beacons, restructuring can be made much more manageable if the plan is thought of as a developmental effort, with various aspects of the overall initiative being timed and implemented in stages. The key is balance -- balance between planning and action, short- and long-term efforts, ongoing and new initiatives, security and risk taking, and perhaps most importantly, realism and idealism.

Critical to the entire effort is the support of the community and all the key players. This in itself is an enormous (and ongoing) task. Because of the nature of restructuring -- redesigning the entire system -- the local school board, teachers union(s), faculty, district personnel, and others must all support the new vision. As Mary Futrell points out:

> *It's now time to listen to the teachers and parents, to the administrators and school board members who are willing to risk putting ideas into action. We need people on the front line of education with the courage and the foresight to reconstruct curricula, radically alter how schools are organized, and make a clean break with the assumptions that have long determined the nature of the learning experience.* (Futrell, 1987, p.5)

It is likely that at least some aspects of the restructuring plan will be inconsistent with either the union contract or district policies, if not both. This will require up-front agreements concerning the ways in which conflicts will be resolved. For example, in a recent column, Albert Shanker showcased the achievements of the School Improvement Process in Hammond, Indiana, citing an agreement between the Hammond Teachers Federation and the Board of School Trustees that allows such conflicts to be resolved without either the board or the union constraining the improvement effort. Similarly, Governor Bill Clinton (1987) cites as an example a Coalition of Essential Schools high school in Arkansas that successfully negotiated an agreement with the Arkansas Department of Education to pursue its restructuring effort without conflicting with state standards. A word of warning: begin early to identify potential problem areas and to initiate the development of such agreements and support compacts. Rules and regulations are slow to change, and skeptics are slowly won.

Implementation Phase. The implementation phase represents the period during which the changes specified in the restructuring plan are actually put into place -- when the abstract vision is translated into a concrete reality. As Harvey and Hergert (1986) point out, "this is the period when training and assistance are particularly critical in order that those individuals involved acquire additional skills and modify current behavior" (p. 293; emphasis added). Equally important and obviously related is staff development, which, according to Fleming and Buckles (1987), can be "critical to the life of the plan" (p. 4).

Ongoing support is also an essential component of the implementation phase. Loucks-Horsley and Hergert suggest that one useful approach to providing such support can be found in the Peters and Waterman (1982) concept of "management by wandering around" (MBWA). They recommend that as team members practice MBWA, they look for such things as:

- use or nonuse of new practices and materials
- successful implementors

- teachers having trouble, and what the trouble is
- complaints and negative remarks, informal or voiced as jokes
- logistical problems; for instance, paper shortages, storage problems, needs for new kinds of space or equipment
- classroom management problems
- teacher-developed techniques that work (p. 52).

While their list is targeted toward school improvement efforts, it can be adopted and expanded in fairly obvious ways to be applicable to more massive restructuring efforts.

This is also the phase during which evaluation occurs, as do appropriate adjustments and refinements -- and sometimes even major shifts -- in direction, in the case of restructuring. Constantly monitoring progress is vital to the effort. Unfortunately, evaluation and assessment are generally considered to be threatening, resulting in a tendency to overlook shortcomings rather than making necessary adjustments on an ongoing basis. If restructuring is to be successful, everyone involved must recognize that it is a long-term commitment and that remarkable progress and accomplishments -- significantly raised achievement scores, for example -- in the first few years can be hoped for but are extremely unlikely to occur.

Given the long-term nature of restructuring, be prepared for an extensive, intensive implementation phase, requiring constant attention and vigilance. Fleming and Buckles (1987) suggest a number of strategies for "keeping the flame burning" including continuous staff development opportunities for staff successfully implementing the effort; regular progress reports and/or meetings; an active communications campaign to publicize successes and reward participation; and frequent replanning sessions. Pairing and sharing with another school undergoing similar activities will help offset the inevitable feeling that "I'm all alone out there" and "nobody could be having this much trouble."

A well-planned communications and public relations campaign is crucial to maintain and foster community and political interest and support as well as to enhance faculty and student morale.

Institutionalization Phase. Institutionalization -- making sure improvements stick -- is particularly important in school improvement efforts because this is the period during which the new practice or program finds a more stable place in the daily routine of the school and security

as a line item in the budget. According to Miles (1983), institutionalization requires

> *strong attention of administrators to stabilizing and supporting the innovation, extending its use to a large group, and making provisions to protect the innovation against the threats of personnel turnover (p. 19).*

This is also the phase when the commitment of veteran staff is renewed, new staff are brought on board and trained, administrative support is ensured, community commitment is reinforced, etc. The focus is on **maintenance**, **renewal**, and **long-term survival**.

Restructuring requires a somewhat modified approach to institutionalization, differing from school improvement efforts substantially in the magnitude of what must ultimately find a stable and secure place in the redesigned school. It is likely that some staff will be involved in institutionalization-related activities and responsibilities while others on the restructuring team are busily engaged in implementing new aspects of the effort. That is, if the restructuring plan is developmental and incremental, innovations might be treated separately and in need of institutionalizing within differing appropriate timeframes.

If the restructuring effort is guided by a coherent vision but is implemented in stages and in an appropriate yet relatively rapid progression, both the implementation and the institutionalization phases can be made more manageable -- reinforcing the absolutely critical nature of beginning with a clear, shared vision and a well-defined, realistic restructuring plan simultaneously grounded in reality and idealism.

Conclusion

As we stated at the outset of this paper, our intention was to begin to answer some of the initial questions that faculty contemplating restructuring have asked. For us, this is only a beginning. We hope that we can work collaboratively with schools embarking on their own unique restructuring efforts and that together we can develop much more concrete answers to these questions, paving the way for later adventurers.

Toward this end, we welcome your comments on this draft paper and hope that you will agree to join with us and others in the Restructuring Schools Project to seek more fully developed answers and more colorful portraits of the schools of tomorrow.

REFERENCES

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, The Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Clinton, B. (1987). Speaking of leadership. Denver, CC: Education Commission of the States.

Coalition of Essential Schools. Prospectus 1984 to 1994. Providence, RI: Brown University.

Cohen, M. (1987). Restructuring the education system: Agenda for the '90's (Draft). Washington, DC: National Governors' Association Center for Policy Research.

Commission on Reading (1985). Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the commission on reading. Champaign, IL: The National Academy of Education, The National Institute of Education, and the Center for the Study of Reading.

Committee for Economic Development. Cited in: Investing in our children. Education Week, September 11, 1985.

Crandall, D.P., Eiseman, J.W., & Louis, K.S. (1986). Strategic planning issues that bear on the success of school improvement efforts. Educational Administration Quarterly, 22(3), 21-53.

Crandall, D.P., & Loucks, S.F. (1983). A roadmap for school improvement. Andover, MA: The NETWORK, Inc.

Duttweiler, P.C., & Hord, S.M. (1987). Dimensions of effective leadership. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Fleming, D., & Buckles, C. (1987). Implementing school improvement plans: A directory of research-based tools. Andover, MA: The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands.

Fullan, M. (1982a). Implementing educational change. Paper presented at a conference on The Implications of Research on Teaching for Practice, sponsored by the National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C.

Fullan, M. (1982b). The meaning of educational change. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Futrell, M.H. (1987, October). Address to the Illinois Association of School Boards Large District Council Meeting. (Available from: National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036-3290.

Goodlad, J. (1983). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Harvey, G., & Hergert, L.F. (1986). Strategies for achieving sex equity in education. Theory Into Practice, XXV(4), 290-299.

Hodgkinson, H. (1987). Today's curriculum -- how appropriate will it be in year 2000. NASSP Bulletin, 71(498), 2-7.

The Holmes Group (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group, Inc.

How not to fix the schools. (1986, February). Harper's.

Huberman, A.M. & Miles, M.B. (1984). Innovation up close. New York, NY: Plenum.

Hutchins, C.L. (1987). Restructuring as a third wave strategy for school reform. Presented at School Year 2000: An International Seminar on Creating Effective Schools of the Future. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory.

Hutchins, C.L. (1987). Redesign as a third wave strategy for school reform. Unpublished personal communication.

Loucks, S. (1983). Ensuring success: Good news from a study of school improvement. Collection of 8 reprinted articles from Educational Leadership.

Loucks-Horsley, S., & Cox, P. (1984). It's all in the doing: What recent research says about implementation. In G. Harvey, S. Loucks-Horsley, P. Cox, & D. Crandall, Implementing the recommendations of the National Commission and studies of education, or what they failed to mention. Symposium (3 papers) presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Loucks-Horsley, S. & Hergert, L.F. (1985). An action guide to school improvement. Andover, MA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and The NETWORK, Inc.

Lynn, D.H. (1987). The seductions of general agreement. Basic Education, 32(2), 1-2.

McCune, S.D. (1987). Should the American high school be restructured? Draft. Aurora, CO: Learning Trends.

Miles, M.B. (1983). Unraveling the mystery of institutionalization. Educational Leadership, 41(3), 14-19.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987). Leaders for America's schools. University Council for Educational Administration.

National Education Association. The mastery in learning project. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

National Governors' Association (1987). Results in education: 1987. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

Peters, T.J., & Waterman, R.H., Jr. (1982). In search of excellence. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Rist, M.C. (1987). Students at risk. The American School Board Journal, 174(10), A9-A13.

Southwest Educational and Development Laboratory (1986). Research-based tools for bringing about successful school improvement. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Timar, T.B., & Kirp, D.L. (1987). Educational reform and institutional competence. Harvard Educational Review, 57(3), 308-330.

Urbanski, A. (1987). Restructuring the teaching profession. Education Week, October 28, 1987, 25 & 32.

Appendix A

Below are included descriptions of ongoing restructuring efforts, including contact information for schools in Maine that are participating in these initiatives.

Coalition of Essential Schools

Between 1981 and 1984, the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Association of Independent Schools sponsored an extensive study of secondary education in the United States. Among the findings of this study are five imperatives for better schools:

- teachers and students must be given room to work and learn in their own, appropriate ways;
- students must clearly exhibit mastery of their school work;
- students and teachers must receive the right incentives;
- students' work must focus on the use of their minds; and
- the structure of schools must be kept simple and flexible.

The Coalition of Essential Schools was established in 1984 as an extension of the 1981-1984 study of high schools and is intended to address the consequences of responding to these imperatives for better schools. As such, the Coalition is "devoted to strengthening the learning of students by reforming each school's priorities and simplifying its structure" (Coalition of Essential Schools Prospectus 1984 to 1994, p. 2).

The Coalition rejects the strategy of applying one specific model in order to ensure that schools respond to these imperatives, maintaining that "top-down standardized solutions to school problems" simply do not work and that the "heart of fine education is the constructive confrontation of able teachers and willing pupils" (p. 2).

To guide their restructuring efforts, Coalition schools each develop their own specific plan, grounded in a common set of principles, i.e.:

1. The school should focus on helping adolescents to learn to use their minds well. Schools should not attempt to be "comprehensive" if such a claim is made at the expense of the school's central intellectual purpose.
2. The school's goals should be simple: that each student master a

limited number of essential skills and areas of knowledge. While these skills and areas will, to varying degrees, reflect the traditional academic disciplines, the program's design should be shaped by the intellectual and imaginative powers and competencies that students need, rather than necessarily by "subjects" as conventionally defined. The aphorism "Less Is More" should dominate: curricular decisions should be guided by the aim of thorough student mastery and achievement rather than by an effort merely to "cover content."

3. The school's goals should apply to all students, while the means to these goals will vary as those students themselves vary. School practice should be tailor-made to meet the needs of every group or class of adolescents.

4. Teaching and learning should be personalized to the maximum feasible extent. Efforts should be directed toward a goal that no teacher have direct responsibility for more than eighty students. To capitalize on this personalization, decisions about the details of the course of study, the use of students' and teachers' time and the choice of teaching materials and specific pedagogies must be unreservedly placed in the hands of the principal and staff.

5. The governing practical metaphor of the school should be student-as-worker, rather than the more familiar metaphor of teacher-as-deliverer-of-instructional-services. Accordingly, a prominent pedagogy will be coaching, to provoke students to learn how to learn and thus teach themselves.

6. Students entering secondary school studies are those who can show competence in language and elementary mathematics. Students of traditional high school age but not yet at appropriate levels of competence to enter secondary school studies will be provided intensive remedial work to assist them quickly to meet these standards. The diploma should be awarded upon a successful final demonstration of mastery for graduation -- an "Exhibition." This Exhibition by the student of his or her grasp of the central skills and knowledge of the school's program may be jointly administered by the faculty and by higher authorities. As the diploma is awarded when earned, the school's program proceeds with no strict age grading and with no system of "credits earned" by "time spent" in class. The emphasis is on the students' demonstration that they can do important things.

7. The tone of the school should explicitly and self-consciously stress values of unanxious expectation ("I won't threaten you but I expect much of you"), of trust (until abused) and of decency (the values of fairness, generosity, and tolerance). Incentives appropriate to the school's particular students and teachers should be emphasized, and

parents should be treated as essential collaborators.

8. The principal and teachers should perceive themselves as generalists first (teachers and scholars in general education) and specialists second (experts in but one particular discipline). Staff should expect multiple obligations (teacher-counselor-manager) and a sense of commitment to the entire school.

9. Ultimate administrative and budget targets should include, in addition to total student loads per teacher of eighty or fewer pupils, substantial time for collective planning by teachers, competitive salaries for staff, and an ultimate per pupil cost not to exceed that at traditional schools by more than ten percent. To accomplish this, administrative plans may have to show the phased reduction or elimination of some services now provided students in many traditional comprehensive secondary schools (Coalition of Effective Schools Prospectus 1984 to 1994, pp. 4-6).

While this set of principles does not paint a portrait of what the restructured school should look like, it clearly suggests substantial changes in what currently exists -- in curriculum, instruction, organization and management, staff responsibilities, and so forth.

The Coalition currently includes a variety of schools spread across the United States, each of which reflects its commitment to these principles in its own unique way. Portland High School provides one example of the way in which a Maine school has responded to the Coalition's principles and imperatives for better schooling. To learn more about the Portland restructuring effort, contact:

Barbara Anderson, Principal
Portland High School
284 Cumberland Avenue
Portland, Maine 04101
207-775-5631

National Network for Educational Renewal

The National Network for Educational Reform also grew out of one of the major studies of education that occurred during the first wave of education reforms of the 1980s -- John Goodlad's Study of Schooling. The study spanned eight years and involved 38 elementary, junior, and senior high schools and included data from 8,624 parents, 1,350 teachers, and 17,163 students; over 1,000 classrooms were observed. In the preface of his book, A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future (1983), Goodlad states his underlying assumption in conducting the study: that "significant educational improvement of schooling, not mere tinkering, requires that we focus on entire schools, not just teachers or principals

or curricula or organization or school-community relations but all of these and more."

It is this assumption that guided the study as well as the findings that it ultimately generated. It is also this belief in the need to look beyond what currently exists -- to restructure our schools -- that Goodlad reinforces with his readers at the conclusion of his book, i.e.:

> *Readers who left us in earlier chapters may have been discouraged over the gap between their conceptions of what education is and what many of the schools studied appeared to provide. I hope that those who continued began to see with me the possibilities for reconstructing schools . . . Whatever our individual experiences with a place called school, to think seriously about education conjures up intriguing possibilities both for schooling and a way of life as yet scarcely tried. And, indeed, education is as yet something more envisioned than practiced (p. 361).*

The National Network for Educational Renewal is an outgrowth of the Goodlad study and is a reflection of many of its findings and recommendations, including the contention that many aspects of our current approach to schooling must be redesigned. Network schools are supported by university-school partnerships, based on one of the Goodlad reform themes to use such partnerships in their improvement/restructuring efforts.

Building-based accountability is a common theme of the schools with an emphasis on providing a general education for all students. Many aspects of schooling are being rethought, including school size, entrance age of children, curriculum, school organization, instruction (e.g.,the use of teams of teachers to teach non-graded groups of students), and so forth.

Examples of Maine schools participating in the National Network for Educational Renewal include the Junior High of the Kennebunks, Narragansett School, and New Suncook Elementary. To learn more about the ways in which these schools are restructuring, contact:

Sandra Caldwell, Principal
Junior High of the Kennebunks
87 Fletcher Street
Kennebunk, Maine 04043
207-985-2912

Cynthia Oshea, Principal
Narragansett School
284 Main Street
Gorham, Maine 04038
207-839-5561

A Beginning Look at the What and How of Restructuring
The Regional Laboratory

Gary MacDonald, Principal
New Suncook Elementary School
Route 5, Box H
Lovell, Maine 04051
207-925-2735

NEA Mastery in Learning Project Schools

The National Education Association's Mastery in Learning Project involves twenty-seven elementary, junior, and senior high schools throughout the United States. The project is "based on research that helps faculty restructure schools so that students can master what is taught."

Similar to the other two above-discussed restructuring efforts, the NEA project is committed both to building-based change and to the notion that there is no one, right model of the ideal restructured school. Instead, the project maintains that schools must be structured differently to accommodate the students and community context.

Nevertheless, the Mastery in Learning schools are guided in their restructuring efforts by four essential assumptions about educational excellence, i.e.:

- A school's curriculum must have content integrity and social significance. Students currently encounter a range of curricula so broad that they often acquire only surface skills and understandings during their school experience. This needn't be the case. A wisely selected, properly organized, and effectively taught course of study can do far more than impart minimum, basic skills and understandings. An effective curriculum empowers learners now and for the rest of their lives.

- A school community must hold high expectations for its students. Achievement is closely related to how parents, teachers, and other adults perceive a student's abilities. New understandings about teaching and learning have emphasized the importance of high expectations to individual success in school.

- The central priorities of schools -- learning, teaching, curriculum -- must guide all other educational decisions. Determinations about instructional materials, faculty deployment, course organization, and student schedules should follow -- not determine -- basic decisions about learning.

- Every decision about learning and instruction that can be made by a local school faculty must be made by that faculty. Teachers know what individual students need to succeed better than any decision-makers who are far removed from the classroom. To make quality decisions

> about learning, teachers need access to the latest research findings, not mandates from above. And when a school community makes its own decisions, these decisions will be effectively and enthusiastically implemented because they are owned by the community (The Mastery in Learning Project, pp. 2-3).

Similar to the principles of the Coalition of Essential Schools, these assumptions do not dictate what a Mastery in Learning school will look like. Nevertheless, to enact them requires substantial changes in the organization and operation of the typical American school.

Each school must agree to progress through four specific steps if it is to participate in the project. First, a school profile must be developed, describing the school's academic program, student attitudes and aptitudes, instructional styles, and so forth. Second, the faculty establishes its priorities for teaching, school climate, curriculum, and overall learning. Third, the staff examine research-based approaches to the organization of curriculum, teaching, and learning within the context of the priorities they established, using the project's TRaK (Teaching Resources and Knowledge) data base. And finally, staff develop, evaluate, refine, and implement a plan focusing on "high, relevant standards for students," based on current knowledge about curriculum, teaching, and learning.

Wells Junior High represents Maine in the NEA Mastery in Learning Project. To learn more about the school's involvement in the project and the changes it is implementing, contact:

Robert Hasson, K-8 Principal
Wells Junior High
Route 1, Post Road
Wells, Maine 04090
207-646-5142

The Holmes Group and the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession

The three examples discussed above all focus on the entire school, recommending necessary structural changes in a variety of aspects of the educational enterprise. In contrast, The Holmes Group and the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession -- both of which have received considerable publicity during the last year -- have a narrower mission, concentrating on the profession of teaching and the changes that must occur if excellence in education is to become a reality.

The Holmes Group is a consortium of education deans from leading research universities throughout the country. The overarching goals of the consortium are to reform teacher education and to reform the teaching profession. More specifically, in its recent report, Tomorrow's Teachers (1986), the authors state their goals as:

- to make the education of teachers intellectually more solid;
- to recognize differences in teachers' knowledge, skill, and commitment, in their education, certification, and work;
- to create standards of entry to the profession -- examinations and educational requirements -- that are professionally relevant and intellectually defensible;
- to connect our own institutions to schools; and
- to make schools better places for teachers to work and learn.

Their recommendations involve a major restructuring of both teacher education at the university level and the teaching profession at the building level. For example, in their discussion of differences in teachers' knowledge, skill, and commitment, The Holmes Group members propose a radical shift in the teaching profession, i.e.:

> *The Holmes Group commits itself to the development of a differentiated structure at three levels: the Career Professional Teacher, who would be capable of assuming responsibility not only within the classroom but also at the school level; the Professional Teacher, who would be prepared as a fully autonomous professional in the classroom; and the Instructor, who would be prepared to deliver instruction under the supervision of a Career Professional Teacher (p. 65).*

Similar to the National Network for Educational Renewal, The Holmes Group also emphasizes the importance of university-school partnerships as a means toward improving education -- both university-based education and school-based education. They also propose a new concept -- Professional Development Schools. According to the report,

> *these Professional Development Schools, analogous to teaching hospitals in the medical profession, will bring practicing teachers and administrators together with university faculty in partnerships ... (and) will serve as settings for teaching professionals to test different instructional arrangements, for novice teachers and researchers to work under the guidance of gifted practitioners, for the exchange of professional knowledge between university faculty and practitioners, and for the development of new structures designed around the demand of a new profession (p. 67).*

While The Holmes Group did not focus on restructuring schools, the report concludes with a clear statement about the need to move forward in these efforts and its commitment to support them, i.e.:

> *The existing structure of schools, the current working conditions of teachers, and the current division of authority between administrators*

> *and teachers are seriously out of step with the requirements of the new profession. If the construction of a genuine profession of teaching is to succeed, schools will have to change (p. 67).*

The fourteen-member Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, funded by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, had a focus similar to The Holmes Group. In their report, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (1986), the Task Force called for major changes in education policy to:

- Create a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, organized with a regional and state membership structure, to establish high standards for what teachers need to know and be able to do, and to certify teachers who meet that standard.

- Restructure schools to provide a professional environment for teaching, freeing them to decide how best to meet state and local goals for children while holding them accountable for student progress.

- Restructure the teaching force, and introduce a new category of Lead Teachers with the proven ability to provide active leadership in the redesign of the schools and in helping their colleagues to uphold high standards of learning and teaching.

- Require a bachelors degree in the arts and sciences as a prerequisite for the professional study of teaching.

- Develop a new professional curriculum in graduate schools of education leading to a Master in Teaching degree, based on systematic knowledge of teaching and including internships and residencies in the schools.

- Mobilize the nation's resources to prepare minority youngsters for teaching careers.

- Relate incentives for teachers to school-wide student performance, and provide schools with the technology, services, and staff essential to teacher productivity.

- Make teachers' salaries and career opportunities competitive with those in other professions (pp. 2-3).

Also similar to The Holmes Group, the Task Force recommendations are being followed up with concrete efforts to implement them across the country. The Carnegie Corporation has awarded a grant to Stanford University to develop prototype assessments that might be used by the proposed National Board for Professional Teaching Standards to certify teachers. Carnegie has also indicated a willingness to fund the costs of planning and starting the actual Board. At the state level, Connecticut and California are

planning a joint venture that would allow them to develop new teacher assessment procedures in at least twenty-five subjects areas by 1990.

In addition to The Holmes Group and the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, there are a variety of other efforts across the country also designed to rethink and restructure the teaching profession. The Rochester, New York, public schools provide an excellent example of a system-wide approach to restructuring the profession. In a much publicized contract agreement, Rochester recently established significant pay increases for teachers, with "lead" teachers earning up to $70,000 in the third year of the contract. The concept of a "lead" teacher is but one aspect of a sweeping restructuring of teaching. The Peer Assistance and Review Program (PAR) plays an important role in this overall effort and "involves teachers in monitoring quality within their own ranks by providing mentors to inexperienced teachers and offering assistance to experienced teachers whose performance should be improved" (Urbanski, 1987, p. 32). Paralleling the PAR program is the Career in Teaching program that provides for four levels of teaching -- intern, resident, professional, and lead -- and enables teachers to "assume leadership in matters relating to instruction and to the profession" (p. 32). A school-based planning process is used to assure shared governance of each school.

Appendix B

As noted in the text, we have made use of a number of resources on school improvement to inform the development of this paper.

We suggest in particular:

1. An Action Guide to School Improvement by Susan Loucks-Horsley and Leslie F. Hergert (1985)

2. Implementing School Improvement Plans: A Directory of Research-Based Tools by Douglas Fleming and Cecilia Buckles (1987)

3. A Roadmap for School Improvement by David P. Crandall and Susan Loucks-Horsley (1983)

4. "Strategic Planning Issues that Bear on the Success of School Improvement Efforts" by David P. Crandall, Jeffrey Eiseman, and Karen Seashore Louis (1986)

5. Research-based Tools for Bringing about Successful School Improvement by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (1986)

6. "Unraveling the Mystery of Institutionalization" by Matthew Miles (1983). Reprinted in Ensuring Success: Good News from a Study of School Improvement, Susan Loucks (Ed.)

7. Dimensions of Effective Leadership by P.C. Duttweiler and S.M. Hord (1987)

8. The Meaning of Educational Change by Michael Fullan (1982)

9. Innovation Up Close by Michael Huberman and Matthew Miles (1984)

For additional information, see the reference list following the main body of the text, pages 21-23.

Items #1 - #6 may be purchased through The Regional Laboratory; items #7 - #9 are available from their publishers.

FEEDBACK FORM
FOR
A BEGINNING LOOK AT THE WHAT AND HOW OF RESTRUCTURING

1 January 1988

We are interested in receiving feedback on our paper, A Beginning Look at the What and How of Restructuring. As we indicated in the paper, we intend to continue to revise the current draft, based on the experiences and suggestions of readers such as yourself. Feedback from you is the best way to let us know whether this is the kind of information that serves your needs. But we need to hear from you, from initial reactions to later experiences. We'd really appreciate it if you could take a moment to complete this form and return it to:

Glen Harvey, Director of Planning and Communication
The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement
of the Northeast and Islands
290 South Main Street
Andover, Massachusetts 01810

1. We divided the paper into three sections -- the why, what, and how of restructuring -- and two appendices. Which were more useful or less useful and why?

2. How was the information in the paper useful to you?

3. What would you like us to include in the next iteration of the paper?

4. In what other ways (in addition to your response to #3) would you alter the paper to make it more useful to you?

5. We've tried to eliminate jargon and communicate clearly. Have we succeeded? Was the paper's terminology straightforward. confusing, or unnecessarily complicated?

_____ Straightforward _____ Confusing _____ Unnecessarily complicated

Please identify any jargon that you think we should eliminate.

6. Was the paper's organization clear and obvious or poor and confusing?

_____ Clear/Obvious _____ Poor/Confusing

7. Did the paper balance theory and practice? _____ Yes _____ No

If no: Was the paper overly abstract? _____ Yes _____ No
Was the paper overly concrete? _____ Yes _____ No

8. We assume that you may share some or all of the paper with other administrators, teachers, Board members, etc. Have you/will you share the paper with colleagues? If yes, approximately how many?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Number of colleagues

9. What have you done or do you plan to do with the information contained in the paper? Please try to be specific about actions and activities that you attribute to reading/discussing the paper.

Thank you for your feedback and suggestions. Please feel free to attach additional comments and to continue to send us feedback.

Name and Title/Role _____

Address _____

_____

Telephone _____

Date _____

The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands, 290 South Main Street, Andover, MA 01810
(617) 470-0098