ABSTRACT
               National restructuring organizations are described in
this paper, with a focus on those that work across districts to
support multiple aspects of school restructuring, rather than
within-district or state organizations. Data were derived from
interviews with individuals in each program and from program
descriptions and secondary sources. Section 1 describes the
educational visions of 11 national organizations, and concludes that
much variation exists in terms of formality of guidelines and
governance flexibility. Processes for linking the national
organizations with schools are examined in the second section. Two
themes of linkages are identified: those in which groups select the
level at which they work with the school system; and the diverse ways
of working with schools, such as the use of networking, training
models, onsite consultation visits, and intensive training. The next
two sections conclude that the spread of restructuring organizations
and the depth of their impact varies greatly. A combination of
support at various levels is needed. Key components of a successful
program that serves all children include teacher involvement, a focus
on all students' outcomes, professional development at the school
level, and implementing a systemic, long-term approach. Appendices
provide descriptions of the 11 restructuring organizations and data
collection information. (21 references) (LMI)

SUPPORT FOR SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING: THE WORK OF NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Kent D. Peterson and Janet S. Bixby

Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools
University of Wisconsin-Madison

May 6, 1992

Final Deliverable to OERI

Introduction

Many new approaches to organizational change and improvement in United States school systems are being proposed by businesses, states, and federal agencies. Leaders of national and regional educational organizations are discussing these approaches, disseminating information and technical support, and encouraging systemic changes in a major movement to restructure schools and their systems. Practitioners and policymakers may wonder what these organizations do, what they stand for, and how they serve the goals of restructuring. This paper describes a number of these national organizations and how they might serve school, district, or state policymakers in reshaping schools. These organizations, unlike many of the programs or projects of past reforms, approach transforming schools through broader notions of restructuring and more varied ways of shaping change.

One of the major trends in the early 1990s has been the spread and expansion of national organizations and projects designed to support substantial restructuring of school systems. As the Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools has noted, restructuring at the school level may involve major changes in student experiences in classrooms, teachers' worklives, school leadership and governance, and the school's relations to external communities and agencies.

Significant transformations in these four arenas have been identified by scholars, policymakers, and practitioners as key features of restructuring. This framework suggests that restructuring can affect all aspects of schools (Newmann, 1991). Few approaches, however, undertake to integrate significant change in all four areas. Approaches such as outcomes based education, site based management and specific curricular initiatives such as mastery learning, cooperative learning, and new mathematics standards (see the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics report, 1989) can be seen as efforts to change conventional practice in one or more of these areas.

In this paper we describe organizations which work across districts to support multiple aspects of school restructuring rather than organizations that work primarily *within* districts or states. In contrast to specific or specialized approaches, these organizations take a broader view of reform and seek more fundamental changes. National organizations influence the way educators, policymakers, and foundations view school reform. Local educators and policymakers are asking: What can these organizations do to help start restructuring the school or district?

We will describe the educational visions of these organizations, the ways that they work with schools and policymakers, and their scope and spread. Finally, we will note the ways organizations might have some long-term influence on the ways schools are structured and what students experience.

1

In order to provide practitioners, policymakers, and interested citizens with a sense of the kinds of programs that are being used to spread the ideas of restructuring across the country, we will note some key ideas guiding many of the most visible organizations and illustrations of their work. There are dozens of organizations that foster school improvement and change. Since it was not possible to consider all organizations working across districts, we have selected a few representing different types of sponsorship, focus and national visibility.

<u>Some are located in national teacher and educator associations:</u>

- Mastery in Learning, National Education Association (NEA)

- Center on Restructuring, American Federation of Teachers (AFT)

- Network on Restructured Schools, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

<u>Some are located in universities:</u>

- National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching (NCREST), Center for School Reform, Teachers College, Columbia University

- The Coalition of Essential Schools, Brown University

- School Development Program (The Comer Model), Child Study Center, Yale University

- The Program for School Improvement and The League of Professional Schools, University of Georgia

- Success for All, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, Johns Hopkins University

- The Accelerated Schools Program, Stanford University

<u>Some are part of other policy oriented or other organizations:</u>

National Governors Association

- Re:Learning, Education Commission of the States (ECS)

- National Alliance for Restructuring Education (of the) National Center on Education and The Economy

2

4

- Center for Leadership in School Reform, Kentucky

These are not all the organizations that support restructuring, but they were mentioned frequently by people working and doing research on school restructuring. They also represent a useful cross-section of organizations that serve restructuring efforts around the country.

Perspectives on Restructuring

What do we mean by restructuring? Numerous authors have written on this issue in great detail [for longer treatises see Elmore & Associates, 1990; Murphy, 1991; and publications from the National Governors' Association such as (1991) *From Rhetoric to Action*]. For our purposes, restructuring of schools means the substantial and systematic change of basic underlying orientations, attitudes, behaviors, and properties of schools. This involves developing different views of learning and social experiences of students, transforming the professional work life of teachers, changing the nature of leadership and governance in schools, and reshaping the relationships between schools and their external communities and social service agencies (four areas being studied by the Center). These changes, in turn, create equally dramatic changes in the mission and roles of central office as well as local and state policy.

This definition of restructuring encompasses many of the other definitions of key s:holars in the field. For example, it incorporates Corbett's (1990) view that restructuring requires substantive changes in the roles, rules, relationships, and results of schools and those who work in them. And, it incorporates many of the elements noted by Fullan (1991) who points to the need to radically transform the core properties of schools if major improvements in student outcomes are to be obtained.

The organizations we describe in this paper (see appendix A for a complete list), attempt to effect change in schools in varying ways. They attempt to help schools change classroom processes, invigorate teachers' worklives, redefine leadership and governance of schools, reshape how the school interacts and links to its external environment, and foster major changes in policy. Some attempt to influence district level restructuring, while others attempt to influence state educational policy. Each organization approaches this process differently. Each one takes a different set of pieces of the educational system as their primary focus. Few organizations attempt to focus on all levels of the educational system simultaneously.

The descriptions and analyses that follow should be useful to practitioners interested in these broad based approaches to school restructuring. They should inform policymakers at many levels concerned with understanding the variety of organizational resources that can and will shape their schools and school systems. Finally, they should help heighten the

3

dialogue about how national and regional organizations influence school restructuring by identifying similarities and differences in approach.

A Framework for Describing Restructuring Organizations

The restructuring movement is different from previous reform movements in several fundamental ways. Advocates of restructuring do not anticipate that all schools will go from one common identifiable organizational structure to a new common structure, or that they will move through a linear, predictable process. Leaders of these organizations seem to agree that many new forms of school structure are needed and that the paths to these new structures are varied. If the emerging patterns of restructuring take hold, then schools will look less alike, in the future, than they do now. This movement envisions a system in which school professionals and district personnel, and even the state government, will develop an attitude toward change which will allow for continuous growth and change. That is, change and adaptation will become the "status quo" in the school culture.

The organizations we describe, then, do not have a required model of change for schools to implement or a specified model of what a restructured school must look like. Each school's restructuring effort, like each school population and staff, is, according to this thinking, viewed as unique and changeable depending on local needs and preferences within a set of agreed upon goals and standards for student performance. The effective restructured school is seen as evolving, but never completely evolved.

Many people in education and in the corporate world as well believe that restructuring must allow for continuous, self sustaining renewal and change (Fullan, 1991; Waterman, 1987). Achieving this culture of renewal takes considerable time and energy. Because of this, leaders fear that already hardworking teachers and administrators will burn-out when they realize that restructuring requires much more than a year or two or three of intensive reflection and action. Many restructuring advocates are concerned that teachers may resist restructuring efforts when they realize that the intense programmatic scrutiny, flexibility, continual professional development, and a culture supportive of risk taking may need to become a continuous part of the school. Furthermore, restructuring cannot happen in schools unless it happens in districts. And both require change in state law and policy.

Another way in which the restructuring movement is different from previous reform movements is that educators and the public at large seem to have lost faith in trying to engineer specific school changes through externally mandated prescriptions from distant, centralized bureaucracies. Instead there is an increased focus on locally determined change processes to achieve valued student outcomes. Since many of the factors in any school are constantly changing -- the make-up of the student body, the school personnel, the availability of new types of curriculum materials -- educators, the thinking goes, must have the power

and autonomy to constantly adapt the school structure to meet these valued student outcomes.

Advocates of restructuring generally believe that the external regulation of schools should be decreased allowing for greater school autonomy over pedagogical questions. Despite this autonomy though, schools will be expected to produce high student performance. The National Center on Education and the Economy's Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce believes that:

> . . . to meet global competition . . . the United States must create an education performance standard -- bench-marked to the highest in the world -- to be met by all American students at age 16 . . . Students who meet the standard would qualify to enroll in a college-preparatory program . . . those who did not meet the standard would be required to continue their education toward the performance standard as a condition for being allowed to work part-time before age 18. (Brock & Marshall, Washington Post, 9/3/90)

This trade off and pressure for better results, noted by the National Governors Association, may change the accountability of professionals. It means teachers should have the power and thus the responsibility to create the changes in the school organization that they think necessary to student success. This movement views accountability (sometimes through external assessment of student outcomes and sometimes through increased internal professional accountability) as key to allowing the school the flexibility to experiment with school organization and curricular approaches.

Finally, another critical factor in the restructuring movement, which sets it apart from many past educational reform movements, involves changing the authority over educational, pedagogical knowledge. Educational reform movements in the past often had fairly set models of classrooms or schools which reformers, from federally funded regional labs and research universities, advocated. The goals of the reformers have often been to train and shape the professionals in the schools to change the schools to fit the new, "reform vision." "Knowledge" of what schools should look like often came from outside, while the practitioners within the schools have been held responsible for implementing reforms over which they had little power to define, select, or develop.

In practice, of course, top down models of reform have always been shaped, transformed, or amended by schools people who implement them. But that process has been seen by educational theorists as an inevitable reality of implementation rather than as the inherent power of any given reform movement, perhaps until now.

One model of change, then, was based on externally imposed theories of education or models of schooling imposed on schools and backed up by regulation. In contrast to this approach, current leaders of restructuring organizations advocate conceptions of change

5

which rely on school level practitioners not only to implement reform ideas, but, in many cases, to participate in the creation of them.

Numerous organizations have formal means by which they gather and utilize the knowledge of teachers and administrators in the work of the organization. The Center for Leadership in School Reform, for example, hires outstanding teachers and administrators as fellows. These fellows then work with the Center on developing training materials and models and on doing some training of other practitioners. The League of Professional Schools in Georgia has a congress of representatives from member schools. This congress has significant governing power over how the League functions. Some restructuring organizations develop on-going networking opportunities for their constituent schools and districts as an important element of their work. The NEA Center for Innovation, for example, has a computer network on which teachers, administrators, parents, students, and university professors from around the country communicate concerns and share new ideas about restructuring. Their hope is that this constant, daily interplay of theory and practice provides a rich mix of educational knowledge which is helpful to schools people and university people alike.

Given these basic points about restructuring, we will, in this paper, look at the scope and impact of these organizations as follows. First, we will characterize the vision and beliefs about education that these organizations promulgate and disseminate. We will ask such questions as: What sorts of student learning experiences do these organizations think are valuable? What are the conceptions of restructuring that are promoted? What, according to these organizations, are the professional roles of principals and others in schools?

Second, we will describe the processes that these national and regional groups employ to link with schools, districts, and policymakers. For example we will ask: How do they get their ideas out? With whom do they communicate primarily? In what ways do these organizations provide support to the schools and districts going through a change process?

Third, we will describe the scope and breadth of these programs across different settings, regions of the country, and types of schools based on their literature and descriptions. Questions addressed include: How many schools or districts do these organizations serve? In how many states or different regions do these programs work?

Section I
Educational Vision of the Program

What are the educational visions, values, beliefs, and goals of the major restructuring efforts of these organizations? What are the outcomes that some of the new structures are designed to achieve? Clearly every organization which we studied has some guiding

6

philosophy or vision of education. Furthermore, these organizations appear to share a number of educational orientations and values. Many share: (1) a focus on improving the learning environment for students; (2) a concern for student academic performance; (3) a focus on increasing higher order thinking activities for students; (4) a belief that teaching should extend beyond simple lecture and recitation and be more authentic; and (5) a strong belief that teachers and others should be involved in key educational decisions at the school level (National Governors' Association, 1991).

While there are common themes of restructuring supported by many of these organizations, these visions are emerging and flexible. They are not static. These restructuring organizations typically hold to certain basic educational goals and visions which they have developed. At the same time they express support for the work of the school staffs who use these philosophies as guides to restructure their schools. Henry M. Levin, Director of the Accelerated Schools Program at Stanford University, says in their first newsletter that:

> Accelerated Schools are a young and developing movement rather than a finished product or formula. Implementation is at least as important in terms of educational success or failure as are the ideas that spawn educational change. But implementation must be informed by the considerable wisdom of practice. We need to learn from each others' experiences as well as to share the latest research results and implementation strategies. It is my hope that the Accelerated Schools newsletter will serve as a vital forum for the exchange of information by those dedicated to accelerating the education of at-risk students. (Levin, 1991)

Similarly, the Coalition of Essential Schools gives examples of how schools are implementing the notion of "Less is More" by publishing case histories of schools and classrooms that are using projects, demonstrations, exhibitions, authentic performance experiences or other activities to increase depth and cut down on the urge to cover curricular topics. These illustrate underlying beliefs about schooling.

While these organizations may express their educational philosophies, there is great variation as to how thoroughly these reformers want to describe what a restructured school must look like. Some reformers have organized models of schooling which suggest the inclusion of certain components, new roles for educators and parents, and regularly stated approaches or themes that they consider important to quality schooling. In contrast to this, other reformers advocate a more process oriented model of change which emphasizes the school's role in determining what it wants to look like and how it is going to be structured. This tension then, between an organization aiding schools in a somewhat more specified school improvement effort on the one hand versus a broader, more thematic vision of restructuring on the other hand, forms the crux of a critical debate in many of these organizations.

Whatever the level of specificity, these organizations do not believe that their approach should be imposed upon the schools. Such externally created, top down reform, educators agree, seldom works (Fullan, 1991). Schools and districts often have a common set of beliefs and understandings about educational purpose and structure that will shape any effort at reform. Externally or hierarchically imposed reforms that do not match with these sets of beliefs and understandings are difficult, if not impossible, to implement. However, recognizing the need for change in the schools and school systems' traditional resistance to change, reformers are utilizing various approaches in order to promote restructuring that fosters reflection and analysis without dictating everything schools should do. How do these approaches vary?

Some organizations have developed organized, not rigid, models for school improvement that support restructuring. For example, the School Development Program (SDP) was established by the Yale Child Study Center staff and the New Haven school system in 1968 to foster school improvement. This model of school improvement is commonly known as the Comer model after James P. Comer, the child psychiatrist, who is a driving force behind and founder of the program. Comer and his colleagues have a somewhat more delineated conception of how schools should be structured and governed than do leaders of many other restructuring organizations. This model focuses more on organizational themes than on the nature of the curriculum. The Comer model or SDP is made up of nine components (3 mechanisms, 3 operations, and 3 guidelines) including:

(1) a governance and management team representative of the parents, teacher, administrators and support staff; (2) a mental health or support staff team; and (3) a parents program. The governance and management team carries out three critical operations -- the development of (4) a Comprehensive School Plan with specific goals in the social climate and academic areas; (5) staff development activities based on building level goals in these areas; (6) periodic assessment which allows the staff to adjust to the program to meet identified needs and opportunities.

Several important guidelines and agreements are needed. Participants on the governance and management team (7) cannot paralyze the leader. On the other hand, the leader cannot use the group as a "rubber stamp." While the principal usually provides leadership to the governance and management group, (8) decisions are made by consensus to avoid "winner-loser" feelings and behavior. (9) A "no-fault," problem solving approach is used by all of the working groups in the school, and eventually these attitudes permeate the thinking of most individuals. (Comer, 1991)

This model suggests some of the components that they believe need to be in place to help ensure a healthy environment in which urban children can learn. The SDP literature explains that:

8

A support or mental health staff person serving on the governance and management team helps them apply child development and relationship knowledge to all of their activities. The mental health team, meeting separately, addresses individual student behavior problems, but focuses equally on preventing problems. This is done by recommending and facilitating changes of school procedures and practices found to be harmful to students, staff, and parents. (Comer, 1991, p. 5)

Success for All, supported by the Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students at Johns Hopkins University, delineates organizational components as well as curriculum that the organization argues will help urban students succeed. Designed specifically for urban schools, Success for All seeks "to ensure that all students will be performing at grade level in reading, writing, and mathematics at the end of third grade" (Hollifield, 1989). This approach includes specified curricula, instructional activities, and daily schedules of many classroom activities. Success for All staff provide extensive training to an in-school facilitator who in turn provides on-going training to the rest of the school staff. The facilitator is also in charge of resource coordination for the program in the school or district. In addition to training locally based facilitators, the staff at Success for All conducts research and works to develop effective teaching strategies and curriculum materials for the program based on what they find successful in the schools.

While both of these approaches, utilized by the SDP and Success for All, are somewhat more structured than a general school improvement or thematic restructuring effort, they are not externally imposed, top down programs. They require a formal vote of majority support from practitioners before implementation of activities. Seventy-five percent of the school staff must vote acceptance of the program before Success for All will agree to work with the school. This check is built into the program to ensure that the majority of the staff at a school will be actively and positively involved in the decision to implement the program.

Though some people would argue that the Comer Model and Success for All are more properly thought of as structured programs than as organizations which support more flexible approaches to restructuring, they have many of the elements of other restructuring efforts. While they certainly require the support of the school staff and are aware of the complexity of the change process in schools, they do have some components that they expect to be in place for change to occur.

Some organizations take a more thematic approach to restructuring schools, thus supporting more flexibility in which structures, components, or roles should be established or changed. These reformers generally believe that the schools or districts should determine their own goals for change and control their own processes of restructuring. They recommend a school improvement process as their basic approach to shaping schools often by providing support to the school, district, or state level of the educational system. They incorporate current thinking on substantive directions for restructuring into the school, district or state level discussions about improvement. In many of these cases.

9

11

schools, districts, or state leaders come to their own conclusions about how they need to restructure the educational system in order to achieve their educational goals.

The Coalition of Essential Schools is an example of a restructuring organization that is less explicit regarding schoolwide components, and places more attention on classroom themes and "principles." It describes some aspects of an educational vision and a general school level change process. On the one hand the Coalition promotes thematic conceptions of how schools should be organized for optimum student learning detailed in its Common Principles. The Principles are (in part):

1.   The school should focus on helping adolescents learn to use their minds well.

2.   The school's goals should be simple: that each student master a limited number of essential skills and areas of knowledge.

3.   The school's goals should apply to all students, while the means to these goals will vary as those students themselves vary.

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 80 students.

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.

6.   Students entering secondary school studies are those who can show competence in language and elementary mathematics . . . . The diploma should be awarded upon a successful final demonstration of mastery for graduation -- an "Exhibition."

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).

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).

9.   Ultimate administrative and budget targets should include, in addition to total student loads per teacher of 80 or fewer pupils, substantial time for collective planning by teachers, competitive salaries for staff and an ultimate

10

per pupil cost not to exceed that at traditional schools by more than 10 percent.

The Coalition promotes a change process which they hope compels the schools to establish their own context specific structures and operating procedures based on these Nine Principles. The specific curricular and instructional approaches, then, are not determined by the Coalition.

The Center for Leadership in School Reform provides another example of how organizations promoting restructuring attempt to facilitate change in the schools. The staff of this organization have a powerful commitment to utilizing the current knowledge and research in education. They also recognize that practitioners must have a strong say in developing this knowledge and implementing it into their own schools if significant restructuring is to be successful.

Eight years ago when Philip Schlechty started the Gheens Academy for professional development in the Louisville middle schools, he worked closely with the local superintendents to gather, develop, and disseminate useful knowledge about successful school management practices. He recognized the need to incorporate practitioner knowledge into the development of reform programs. By doing this he tried to avoid the mistake that other school reform movements have made by imposing research upon practitioners from the top down or outside in.

Another less directive approach is taken by the National Education Association's Center for Innovation. They advocate what they call research-based risk-taking at the school level. They describe in detail what such a collaborative effort looks like:

Through the breadth of experience and scholarship of its professional staff the Center has a strong grasp of the educational research literature, as well as of the anecdotal history of practical applications of a wide range of school renewal program ideas. Each of its program initiatives is therefore based firmly in premises for which there is strong and convincing evidence in the literature, or in the field.

However, since much of what the Center supports is program activity that has few precise precedents or is comprised of unusual partnerships, projects frequently begin where the research leaves off. This affords the staff at both the national and the site levels the chance to engage in action research, so that the programs not only serve an immediate set of program goals, but also yield data and analysis which can further the national understanding of the very specific issues and challenges in a wide range of school renewal work. (NEA National Center for Innovation, 1991)

11

13

In short, some organizations seeking to help schools restructure have formalized programs that provide some local flexibility. Other organizations provide considerable flexibility with only broad principles to guide local educators.

Section II
Processes for Linking with Schools

Organizations that support restructuring use a variety of means to link with schools or districts. The ways they work and communicate with schools and the linking mechanisms they use vary considerably across the restructuring organizations we contacted. From publications to computer networks to direct technical assistance to school, district, or state educators and policymakers, organizations that support restructuring find different ways to connect to their clients.

These different linkages, like the schools and districts themselves, are constantly changing. The organizations are continually adapting their services to keep pace with the changing needs of the educational systems with which they work. Just as there is no model of a restructured school, there is no model of an organization which promotes restructuring. Across different programs, the ways that the programs link with schools and districts varies. However there is great variation even within each organization over time. Trying to describe these organizations now is like trying to hit a moving target. The ways in which these organizations work to promote restructuring is often fluid and adaptable to changing circumstances and local needs. The staffs of these organizations try to provide a wide range of services to the schools, districts, and states with which they work through direct contact, print materials, regular and electronic mail and the telephone.

While the fluidity of the linkages between the organizations and the schools, districts, or states resists rigid categorization, there are some themes and patterns emerging. First, these groups pick the level at which they work. They tend to form primary linkages at different levels -- school, district, or state. Secondly, all of the organizations work with schools in a myriad of different ways.

These restructuring organizations differ from each other in the level at which they work with the school system. Some organizations work primarily with individual schools, others work with districts, and others work at the state level. The Coalition of Essential Schools is an excellent example of an organization which links with the school system primarily at the school level in order to promote change. The name of the organization makes it clear that the focus is on the school. The Nine Principles which guide the Coalition repeatedly refer to the school's role in creating positive learning environments. Common principle number 4 in the Coalition literature says in part:

12

. . . 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.

The Coalition, in addition to linking with the school system at the school level, promotes local site decision-making and holds conferences which are attended by and designed for teachers and administrat s.

Another example of an organization which links primarily at the school level is the League of Professional Schools based in Georgia and headed by Carl Glickman. Like Success for All, for a school to work with the League, the school's faculty must vote to participate. The majority of the work that goes on subsequently between the program and the school happens through building level teams. While the staff at the League is exploring working with district level administrators as well, the core of their work involves working with the staffs at individual schools.

Other organizations choose to focus their efforts on linking primarily to school districts rather than individual schools. Schlecty's Center for Leadership in School Reform (CLSR) works mainly with school districts. When Philip Schlechty started the Gheens Academy for professional development eight years ago, he worked closely with district administrators. Currently, CLSR staff work with school level practitioners and local business leaders as well. The Center operates on the belief that fundamental change will not come exclusively either from the bottom up or from the top down. As they note:

> The Center believes that fundamental school reform requires local effort. Reform cannot be imposed from the outside; nor will it be sustained unless the local system develops the talents and skills that are needed to sustain the effort. Thus, the Center is committed to building capacity in local school systems rather than doing something to local school leaders. (The Center for Leadership in School Reform, 1991)

Some organizations work primarily at the state level to influence policy to promote restructuring. For about five years the National Governors Association (NGA) staff has done research and written policy analysis reports about the relationship between state policy and local change and the state's role in promoting restructuring. The recent report, *From Rhetoric to Action: State Progress in Restructuring the Education System*, is a thorough review of state level initiatives to promote restructuring across the country. The NGA also provides technical assistance to state level policy makers wishing to promote restructuring in their own states.

Another organization, the Education Commission of the States (ECS), also believes that the entire educational system needs to be changed, "from the schoolhouse to the statehouse." They have recently developed a working relationship with the Coalition of Essential Schools to create Re:Learning. The staff at Re:Learning and ECS want to help state level leaders promote policies which will help make room for schools to restructure.

13

They bring state, district, and school level people together into working groups in order shape educational policy. While the Coalition of Essential Schools works primarily with individual schools and the Education Commission of the States works primarily at the state level, these two organizations have been working across the different levels within the state systems of schooling in order to promote restructuring at the school level.

Restructuring often requires breaking new ground and demands new forms of rapi linked communication about current ideas that can foster quick learning. In order to better understand these new communication linkages between the restructuring organizations and school systems, we must look at the myriad of <u>ways in which the organizations work with the school systems</u>. Here again the specific ways in which the organization's staff connect with the school systems is rarely rigidly defined. Rather, they tend to help their clients focus on the process of change and upon the end goals. In this way the organizations are free to be highly adaptive to the needs of the people and organizational structures with which they work. They provide different services depending in large part on the level upon which they focus.

Through <u>networking</u>, many organizations help people and organizations at different levels of the educational system to develop new ideas and find useful resources. The Program for School Improvement has a major focus on networking. Each year at least one of their conferences is dedicated primarily to networking. This annual event includes very few formal presentations. Instead, educators use the bulk of the time to gather information from each other, share experiences, and make connections with people facing similar challenges. Other networks supporting restructuring include one sponsored by the Association for Curriculum and Development and the National Education Association's School Renewal Network. These are both computer networks.

The National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching, (NCREST) based at Teachers College, Columbia University, has set up a network for networks. In their proposal they describe this linking process:

> Our aim is to support the integrity of the individual networks, each having its own values and principles and particular contributions to make, while we encourage networking across sites. For example, Foxfire is building a sizeable knowledge base for how to teach and support teachers in their efforts to create student centered learning. The Coalition of Essential Schools is doing groundbreaking work on alternative means of assessing student learning and documentation of how teachers change. Informally these two networks have spoken of getting together. The networking of networks effort would facilitate the kind of cross-site sharing that could strengthen both of these networks by sharing the staff development efforts of both groups, by deepening the assessment procedures of the Sizer Network and the powerful teacher-led networks that have expanded Foxfire's work nationally, and by learning from one another the importance of individual and organizational change.

14

Some organizations help create stronger links between different groups interested in restructuring. For example, the Center for Leadership in School Reform helps schools build stronger ties with their local business communities. The NEA helps districts get what they need from state departments of education by working with state legislators. Often the prestige of a national organization can lend credence to a school or district's efforts to transform itself. Thus the organizations can also help transform the schools into safe places for professionals to take risks to reach their goals. The head of one organization said that she is continually impressed with the creativity of educators once they are given the freedom and encouragement to experiment with all aspects of their school structure. She said the most exciting thing about her organization's work is that she and her staff get to nurture school practitioners in their efforts to create change. She sees this nurturing as a powerful, positive alternative to the regulatory role that many external agencies have traditionally played.

Some organizations develop <u>training models and materials</u> to help schools move through a restructuring process. Success for All and the Gheens Academy provide extensive staff development opportunities for participating schools. Others are developing these models and materials as well, seeing the need to facilitate change at the school level.

Many organizations have staff who provide <u>on-site consultative visits</u> to schools in order to provide school specific training to the administration and staff. The number and duration of the visits varies tremendously among the organizations.

The organizations struggle with a continual tension between reaching out to more and more schools on the one hand, and providing on-going training and support to their member schools on the other. Because of their comprehensiveness, national role, and the evolving nature of the restructuring process, most organizations are constantly facing the difficulty of intensively serving individual schools or expanding their influence nationally. Many of these organizations are reluctant to "graduate" one school from the organization's rolls to make room for another school. Most of the organization leaders we spoke to were still in the beginning stages of deciding how they would balance this tension between expanding their networks and continuing to serve their existing schools.

Recognizing the limitations of their resources, some organizations choose to provide <u>intensive training</u> to people at the school site. Those persons, ideally funded in a permanent position by their own district, then become the vital link between the school or district and the national organization. They are responsible for carrying on the training of the school staff for the organization. For example, Success for All trains school level facilitators who work at the local sites.

In sum, while there is great variation, as outlined above, one of the most significant aspects of the nature of the linkages between these organizations and the schools is that they are flexible, fluid, multi-level with strong ties to schools. Some of these organizations initiate contact at the school building level and then were pulled into work with the district, and

15

then, sometimes, state level involvement. These organizations have played numerous roles even at the state level, from advocates for individual schools, to consultants for state level policy formation. Thus, when we ask the leaders of these organizations what types of linkages they have with schools, districts, and states, they give us a variety of answers. Change must come from many directions and include actors from the various positions within and outside of the schools. Linkages that include more levels may, in the long run, provide the support needed for restructuring.

These organizations also seek to assist change through dissemination of ideas and knowledge. One of the most common strategies is the publication of newsletters, materials and position papers and through the development of training materials print and non-print. The first type of materials are useful for spreading ideas and making people aware of the perspectives and views of the organization. The second type of materials are especially important if implementation is to be coordinated consistently and cost-effectively replicated across different sites.

National restructuring organizations varied in the types of publications and materials they developed for educators. Some produced informal occasional reports, announcements, and papers about the program. For example, the Coalition and Accelerated Schools Program regularly sends out a newsletter and descriptions of what schools are doing to restructure around the country, with a tone and content often practical and applied. Others had regular newsletters and informational brochures and papers on the program. Still others had extensively developed publications distributed on a regular basis, extensive position papers, and detailed brochures. Some produce implementation or training literature that details ways of approaching the process of restructuring, provides training ideas, and in some instances gives case studies of schools or sites working under their direction.

Another way regular dialogue is established, is through computer bulletin boards where schools people can communicate with each other and the organization via inexpensive and quick electronic mail networks. For example, the ASCD network shares ideas and information electronically, but also publishes a newsletter that is distributed to the membership for those who do not have access to telecommunications equipment. Often these materials gave attention to useful and applicable knowledge written with a minimum of jargon and considerable examples for successful practice

National restructuring organizations vary in how they link with schools. This variation may serve to provide differential support, knowledge and information as the schools require them. Which approaches prove most beneficial for which schools will only be known as these efforts are closely studied over time.

16

Section III
Spread of Restructuring

As the NGA in its new report *From Rhetoric to Action* states, all levels of education and government are coming to the conclusion that tinkering with the system of education through fragmented, single focus, programs will not transform schools into effective organizations. As we have seen in the ways that restructuring organizations link with schools and policymakers, and the elements of educational vision that these organizations promulgate, these enterprises seek to influence educational change in a variety of ways. Many organizations share concerns and values.

The actual spread and depth of implementation is difficult to determine. How many schools are working with these organizations? Is their involvement primarily through increasing educators' awareness of their ideas, concepts, and approaches? Or are the districts, schools, and states actually implementing changes in the basic structures of schools and classrooms? Are these organizations the only influence on the schools with which they work, or are schools attached to several restructuring efforts at once?

While we do not have systematic, statistical data to answer these questions, we can illustrate and provide a tentative portrait of the breadth of influence of these organizations based upon reports from the organizations themselves and data from schools that have contacted the Center.

Restructuring organizations have touched schools in every region of the country, at all levels, and in every type of district. The organizations that focus on networking and developing an awareness of ideas related to restructuring have the widest audience. For example, the NEA School Renewal Network is a program that:

> . . . enables educator colleagues across the country to share research and practicum data, develop special areas of expertise and study, and interact collegially in a manner rarely encouraged or practiced in the average public school. Also active in the computer network are education researchers, scholars and theoreticians, whose participation adds a profound richness to the collegial community that teachers can join.

The breadth of these programs is quite varied. This network connects nationally with about 580 schools. The ASCD network links hundreds of schools on its computer network to share ideas, problems, and solutions. Organizations with more specific programs and activities to share with schools tend to work with fewer schools, but more intensively. The National Governors' Association reports working intensively with five to ten states and less intensively with others through their materials and contacts. The Coalition is reported to be working with some 200 public and non-public schools across the nation. In addition, there are seven states that have Re:Learning programs to help schools and another five states that are

in the network. Success for All reports working intensively with 26 schools in 11 states. The Center for Leadership in School Reform reports working with 36 school districts.

Another illustration of the spread of these ideas comes from the numerous schools that sent in information to the Center in response to a request for potential research sites. We contacted all the major organizations and associations that promote restructuring or have large educational memberships in our search for nominations. In the 1991 nominations list, over 200 schools from all over the country reported themselves to be restructured schools with a desire to be researched by the Center.

There is increasing awareness of many of the ideas and approaches being taken to school restructuring. For example, *Educational Leadership*, one of the most widely read publications for school practitioners, devoted entire issues in 1990 and 1991 to restructuring. *Education Week* regularly reports on restructuring efforts. In addition, Jane David co-authored several monographs for the NGA in 1990 describing restructuring in districts and schools. The most recent of these, *From Rhetoric to Action*, provides concrete examples of state level restructuring efforts in an attempt to spread these ideas to state policymakers and districts. For more direct impact, national conferences by restructuring organizations and others such as the National Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, the National Center for Effective Schools Research and Development, and the Upper Great Lakes Multifunctional Resource Center, are connecting notions of restructuring with school improvement based, in part, on effective schools ideas and on serving special populations better. These conferences attempt to link the ideas in other educational forums to those of the restructured school.

While the idea of what "restructuring" is all about has spread through a number of media, most educators probably have only piecemeal understandings of the term and of what a restructured school might look like. Actual school or district wide restructuring is spreading much more slowly than the rhetoric. Given the complexity of the ideas, this is not surprising.

Depth of Impact

While the ideas of restructuring organizations are spreading to policymakers and schools, how, and in what ways, are schools affected? The depth of impact seems to vary. Organizations such as Success for All work intensively with schools and have substantial influence over changing how these schools function. But Success for All works now with only about 26 schools. The Coalition is working intensively with a small group of schools as well and the ten principal "Fellows" are working to restructure their schools. It is difficult to say how many of the schools connected to the other organizations have dramatically restructured.

One indication of how deeply these restructuring ideas have permeated the schools comes from a description of the schools who initially nominated themselves to participate in

an integrated study through the Center (Berends, 1992). The descriptions of these schools provide some indication of the potential depth of impact. By Spring of 1991, approximately 214 schools returned completed nominations and questionnaires that described the kinds of restructuring in which they were enga'   We asked them to report whether they were engaging in restructuring in the four key areas (student experiences, teacher professional work life, leadership and governance, and coordination with external agencies and groups). Though not a random sample, it still provides a large set of schools who are trying new approaches.

What do these schools look like? What are they doing? How many different aspects are th y restructuring? In the data analyzed by Berends (1992) we find some interesting patterns. First, schools with a larger proportion of minority students report more comprehensive restructuring and in more arenas. Second, of the schools reporting extensive restructuring, a higher proportion of elementary and middle schools describe multiple changes than did high schools. Third, the size of the school does not seem to be associated with the comprehensiveness of restructuring reported by schools.

These nominated schools report working primarily to transform two areas, the nature of student experiences and the professional life of teachers, more than either governance or coordination with community service agencies. For example, schools report that they are changing the ways class time, patterns of grouping students, and the integration of subjects are organized. These changes, they report, are more common than changing the nature of school governance. Similarly, they frequently report that they are diversifying staff roles and responsibilities. For example, staff members are becoming more engaged in collegial planning and the design of staff development. In short, these schools report that they seem to be restructuring the work life of teachers and the types of student experiences in the school first, and leaving governance changes to later.

Conclusions

What does this say about how these restructuring organizations might effect an individual school? To give some perspective on how these organizations function and overlap in influence, let us imagine a school system seeking to restructure and the types of support they might find through these organizations.

First, educators in this school system may find policymakers at the state level who are part of an ECS sponsored network that supplies information and materials detailing current thinking on restructuring. The NGA or ASCD might provide supplementary readings and position papers. They might get more ideas, information, and contacts from the AFT and NEA networks and associates. Thus state level educational policy makers will be surrounded with many ideas and materials designed to stimulate thoughtful discussions about the role of the state in promoting school or district based restructuring efforts.

19

21

Second, at the <u>district level</u>, central office personnel may attend conferences on restructuring and receive information from national organizations about various efforts. In thinking about starting a restructuring effort in their own districts, they might work with Re:Learning if they are in certain states, or the Center for Leadership in School Reform if they are in Kentucky. Their ties may be, on the other hand, to local school improvement initiatives or to national programs such as the National Alliance for Restructuring Education or the AFT's Center for Restructuring.

Third, at the <u>school level</u> of this imaginary system, different types of technical assistance are available. If the school is part of a programmatic approach, such as Success for All, the principal and staff may have extensive training, materials, and access to ongoing training and staff development. Additionally, the staff may be part of a computer or other form of network connecting them with others restructuring schools. They would be able to seek ideas and solutions through electronic mail. On the other hand, if the school is part of a more process oriented approach, such as the League of Professional Schools, or the Coalition, the staff and administration may be meeting, planning, and implementing a variety of different approaches with a more general access to ideas, materials, and training related to change and improvement processes. They may also be part of a network of educators where they share ideas in a somewhat regular way, but seldom face-to-face.

Local material or technical support may or may not be present. Our imaginary school system might have strong ties to a national organization without having district or state support. This will make the restructuring more difficult and will threaten institutionalization. Conversely, where the district and state have the interest and resources, but the school is resistant, implementation is unlikely. Resistance, passive or active, could follow mandated restructuring.

Where our imaginary school is embedded in a district that understands, values, and supports restructuring by providing resources and discretion, the reform could be more active. Where the district is also located in a state (or state program of restructuring) with state regulations being waived, the program may be more active.

As others have noted (Fullan, 1991; Louis & Miles, 1990), for reforms to reach into schools and classrooms with some level of institutionalization, schools need to have: district support, release from rules or procedures that are dysfunctional, support for risk-taking and experimentation, and access to ongoing, high quality staff development. No one organization at the national or state level can provide all of these for a substantial number of schools. Some mix or combination of national organizations might, as some schools are finding out, help promote systemic restructuring.

Final Observations and Comments

Throughout this paper a number of important themes and ideas have emerged in looking at national organizations that support restructuring. While these organizations may

20

emphasize different approaches or orientations to restructuring, there are common concerns about deepening the curric 'lum, transforming the decision making processes in schools and districts, supporting change and risk taking at the school level, rethinking the roles of school level educators, and attempting systemic reform by reshaping all levels at once (see *From Rhetoric to Action*, 1991; Lewis, 1989).

Different organizations provide different services. Schools or policymakers should seek those that provide services that will solve their problems or provide answers to their questions. Not all groups work with all levels of education or policy. Developing restructuring efforts and interests at the state, district and school levels are important to gain the support and resources necessary for change to occur.

Some organizations provide detail on program activities while others focus more on the process of restructuring. Policymakers and schools people should determine which degree of specificity and formalization will work best for their schools, for both seem to work in different settings.

For restructuring to serve all children, a major component of the program has to include teachers and focus on transforming classroom activities with attention to how all children are achieving. This concern for results permeates many approaches.

Training and professional development is also key to insuring successful restructuring at the school level. Some restructuring organizations provide on-site training as part of their activities. Others organize conferences or networks to foster and spread new knowledge and skills.

Finally, there is widespread agreement from these institutions that schools can substantially improve to serve all children. But, it is acknowledged that the work cannot be piecemeal or comprised of add-on projects or simple programs.

This will not be an easy process. Considerable support, technical assistance, and staff development will be necessary to achieve these ends. These organizations can provide some of this assistance, but it is clear that the districts may need to change the allocation of resources and their own structures to better serve such a demanding and long-term enterprise. States will also need to consider changing the rules and regulations that restrict change efforts, focusing more on outcomes than on bureaucratic rule following. In addition, schools will need to take a long range view of these efforts. Systemic changes at the district and state levels may be necessary to support changes at the school level.

These national organizations are helpful in educating policymakers about restructuring issues, networking those with shared interests and problems, and providing technical assistance for change. Eventually, to make restructuring a reality for the 100,000 school sites across the nation, many of the functions and approaches of these organizations will need to be part of the routines and normative worlds of local educators.

21

APPENDIX A:
Restructuring Organizations

Accelerated Schools Project
402 S. CERAS
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-3084

"Accelerated Schools set a goal of bringing ALL students into the educational mainstream by the end of elementary school so they can perform at levels appropriate to their age group. We use the term 'accelerated' because at-risk students must learn at a faster rate than more privileged students -- not at a slower rate that drags them farther and farther behind. Only an enrichment strategy, not a remedial one, can offer hope for reversing the present educational crisis of at-risk students.

First, school staff, parents, students, and the surrounding community institutions develop a *unity of purpose* around the educational acceleration of the students in which all available human and other resources are dedicated to bringing these children into the educational mainstream and making them academically able.

Second, primary *responsibility and accountability for educational decisions and results* are delegated to the staff at the school site in conjunction with parents and students. The central office of the district collaborates with the school in providing such necessary services as information, technical assistance, staff development, and evaluation.

Third, Accelerated Schools *build on the unique strengths of at-risk students and their cultures* in an approach similar to that usually reserved for gifted and talented students." (Levin, 1991)

AFT Center for Restructuring
555 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001

"The AFT's Center for Restructuring has three main goals:

* to serve as an information clearinghouse on school restructuring

* to develop a network among school districts and local unions engaged in restructuring

* to promote and conduct research and development linked to restructuring efforts."

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Network for Restructured Schools
1250 N. Pitt Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

The ASCD Network for Restructured Schools shares ideas and information electronically, but also publishes a newsletter that is distributed to the membership for those who do not have access to telecommunications equipment.

Center for Educational Renewal
College of Education, DQ-12
Institute for the Study of Educational Policy
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195

"In September 1985 Kenneth Sirotnik, Roger Soder, and I [John I. Goodlad] created the Center for Educational Renewal at the University of Washington and embarked on three closely related sets of activities: a comprehensive study of the education of educators in the United States, a probe into the education of professionals in a dozen other fields to determine whether lessons for teacher education might be derived, and a systematic effort to advance simultaneously the renewal of schools and the education of those who work in them through the development of school/university partnerships . . .

Our analysis of society's reasonable expectations for its schools and of the shortcomings of schools and teachers in the nation's dogged pursuit of universal schooling led us to propose a set of four expectations for teacher education programs: 1) that they will prepare teachers to enculturate the young into a political democracy, 2) that they will provide teachers with the necessary intellectual tools and subject-matter knowledge, 3) that they will insure that teachers have a solid initial grounding in pedagogy, and 4) that they will develop in teachers the beginning levels of the knowledge and skills required to run our schools. Embedded in all four expectations are moral imperatives that become apparent when we consider the expectation of schooling for all children. These moral imperatives must be teased out and addressed in preparation programs." (Goodlad, May, 1990)

Center for Leadership in School Reform
950 Breckenridge Lane - Suite 200
Louisville, KY 40207

"The Center believes that fundamental school reform requires local effort. Reform cannot be imposed from the outside; nor will it be sustained unless the local system develops the talents and skills that are needed to sustain the effort. Thus, the Center is committed to building capacity in local school systems rather than doing something to local school leaders." (Vowels, 1991)

25

Child Study Center
230 South Frontage Road, Box 3333
New Haven, CT 06510

"Many school improvement approaches have emerged in recent years. Most differ from our approach in at least three significant ways. First, most give specific attention to one major group within a school setting -- either the students, or the teachers, or the parents; or to one program area -- curriculum, or social skills, or artistic expression, etc. We use a comprehensive approach in which all groups work in a collaborative fashion and resources and programs are coordinated to establish and achieve school objectives and goals. Second, most programs are not driven by child development and relationship concepts at all, or at most utilize such concepts only in regard to the students. All aspects of our work are driven by relationship and child development imperatives, focusing most on institutional arrangements that hinder adequate functioning. Third, many programs focus exclusively on academic achievement. We attempt to first create a school climate that permits parents and staff to support the overall development of students in a way that makes academic achievement and desirable social behavior at an acceptable level possible and expected. We believe that such an approach has a much greater potential for improving students' chances to achieve school success, decreasing their likelihood of being involved in problem behaviors, in turn, increasing their chances for life success." (Comer, 1991, pp. 7-8)

Coalition of Essential Schools
Box 1938, Brown University
Providence, RI 02912

The Common Principles of the Coalition of Essential Schools are (in part):

"1. The school should focus on helping adolescents learn to use their minds well.

2. The school's goals should be simple: that each student master a limited number of essential skills and areas of knowledge.

3. The school's goals should apply to all students, while the means to these goals will vary as those students themselves vary.

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 80 students.

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.

6. Students entering secondary school studies are those who can show competence in language and elementary mathematics...The **diploma should be awarded upon a successful final demonstration of mastery** for graduation -- an 'Exhibition.'

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).

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).

9. Ultimate administrative and budget targets should include, in addition to **total student loads per teacher of 80 or fewer pupils, substantial time for collective planning by teachers, competitive salaries for staff and an ultimate per pupil cost not the exceed that at traditional schools by more than 10 percent."

Education Commission of the States (and)
Re:Learning
707 17th Street Suite 2700
Denver, CO 80202-3427

The Education Commission of the States is a nonprofit, nationwide interstate compact based in Denver, Colorado. Formed in 1965, the primary purpose of the commission is to help governors, state legislators, state education officials and others develop policies to improve education at all levels. Forty-nine states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are members.

Re:Learning is a collaborative effort among the Coalition of Essential Schools, the Education Commission of the States and participating states and schools to assist the whole spectrum of educators and policymakers as they rethink the assumptions and practices of the education system -- from the schoolhouse to the statehouse. The goal is to encourage thoughtful local redesign of classroom practices and the administrative policies that support their minds well. Nine states -- Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, New Mexico, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island -- have joined Re:Learning, pledging to support the efforts of Essential schools and compatible systemwide change in their state. Another eight states are actively considering membership.

National Alliance for Restructuring Education
(of the) National Center on Education and the Economy
1341 G. Street, N.W., Suite 1020
Washington, DC 20005

"America is headed toward an economic cliff. We will no longer be able to put a higher proportion of our people to work to generate economic growth. If basic changes are not made, real wages will continue to fall, especially for the majority who do not graduate from four-year colleges. The gap between economic "haves" and "have nots" will widen still further and social tensions will deepen.

Our recommendations provide an alternative for America. We do not pretend that this vision will be easily accepted or quickly implemented. But we also cannot pretend that the status quo is an option. It is no longer possible to be a high wage, low skill nation." (National Center on Education and the Economy, 1990, p. 9)

"The recommendations are:

A new educational performance standard should be set for all students, to be met by age 16. This standard should be established nationally and benchmarked tot he highest in the world.

The states should take responsibility for assuring that virtually all students achieve the Certificate of Initial Mastery. Through the new local Employment and Training Boards, states, with federal assistance, should create and fund alternative learning environments for those who cannot attain the Certificate of Initial Mastery in regular schools.

A comprehensive system of Technical and Professional Certificates and associate's degrees should be created for the majority of our students and adult workers who do not pursue a baccalaureate degree.

All employers should be given incentives and assistance to invest in the further education and training of their workers and to pursue high productivity forms of work organization.

A system of Employment and Training Boards should be established by Federal and state governments, together with local leadership, to organize and oversee the new school-to-work transition programs and training systems we propose." (National Center on Education and the Economy, 1990, pp. 5-8.)

National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching (NCREST)
Center for School Reform
Teachers College, Columbia University
525 West 120th Street, Box 86
New York, NY 10027

"The National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST) was created to document, support, connect, and make lasting the many restructuring efforts going on throughout the nation.

The Center's mission is to advance the understanding needed to create schools that are:

- **learner-centered,** by restructuring school organization and governance.

- **knowledge-based,** by restructuring teacher learning and professional development.

- **responsible and responsive,** by restructuring accountability and assessment practices.

This will require fundamental and comprehensive changes in school governance, teaching practices, curriculum, parent and community involvement, assessment, and policy. We believe that no one of these changes will succeed or last unless all are accomplished.

Therefore, the Center brings together many voices: those of practitioners and researchers, parents and teachers and students, policy makers and teacher educators." (NCREST, 1991)

NEA National Center for Innovation
1201 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

"Purposes:

- To design, establish, and support experimental school projects and pilot programs which lead in the development of learning communities.

- To promote a favorable societal interest in the reform of public education and the restructuring of public schools.

Program Components:

1. 'Excellence in Action' programs

    Develop and implement an effort to spotlight exemplar school programs that advance school restructuring and promote the achievement of the national education goals.

2. Mastery in Learning Consortium, school-based restructuring

    Develop, implement, and demonstrate school-based models of complete restructuring in six to eight selected schools using the research and findings from the NEA Mastery in Learning Project.

3. Learning Laboratories Initiative, district-based restructuring

    Implement the NEA Learning Labs initiative creating a network of school districts involved in research and development regarding district-based restructuring.

4. Teacher Education Initiative

    Develop and implement collaborative experimental projects with several universities to redesign teacher preparation and induction programs.

5. Networking Structures

    Integrate the National Center projects and provide networking support for teachers and other personnel through:

    - an electronic computer network
    - a newsletter

    - a national symposium on educational innovation
    - network meetings of the individual project components
    - a national conference on educational technology in 1991.

    Provide opportunities for outreach to media and other education stakeholders and support internal and external advisory committees." (NGA, National Center for Innovation, 1991)

Program for School Improvement
College of Education, Aderhold Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

"The Program for School Improvement is a non-profit operation focusing on the individual school as the center of improvement. PSI is dedicated to improving public education through promoting the school as a professional workplace -- a place where shared governance and collective decision-making are used to plan and implement instructional improvement initiatives."

Success for All
Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students
3505 N. Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21218

"The idea behind Success for All is to use everything we know about effective instruction for students at risk in order to direct all aspects of school and classroom organization toward the goal of preventing academic deficits from appearing in the first place, to recognize and intensively intervene with any deficits that do appear, and to provide students with a rich and full curriculum to enable them to build on their firm foundation of basic skills. The commitment of Success for All is to do whatever it takes to see that every child makes it through third grade at or near grade level in reading and other basic skills and then goes beyond this level in other grades."(Madden, Slavin, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1991, p. 594)

"Program elements include:

1. *Reading tutors.* Success for All tutors are certified teachers with experience teaching Chapter 1, special education, and/or primary reading. They work one-on-one with students who are having difficulties keeping up with their reading groups." (Madden et al., 1991, p. 594)

2. *Reading program.* During most of the day, students in grades 1 through 3 are assigned to heterogeneous, age-grouped classes of about 25 students each. But during a regular 90-minute reading period, they are regrouped into reading classes of 15 to 20 students, all at the same level of reading performance . . . . Reading teachers at every grade level begin the reading time by reading children's literature to students and engaging them in a discussion of the story to enhance their understanding of what has been read, their listening and speaking vocabulary, and their knowledge of story structure. (Madden et al., 1991, p. 595)

3. *Eight week reading assessments.* At eight week intervals, reading teachers assess students' progress in the reading program. (Madden et al., 1991, p. 596)

29

4. *Preschool and kindergarten.* Most of the schools using the Success for All model provide a half-day preschool and/or full-day kindergarten for eligible students. (Madden et al., 1991, p. 596)

5. *Family Support Team.* One of the basic tenets of the Success for All philosophy is that parents are an essential part of the formula for success. A family support team works in each school, helping to make families feel comfortable in the school as well as providing specific services. (Madden et al., 1991, p. 596)

6. *Program facilitator.* A program facilitator works at each school to oversee (with the principal) the operation of the Success for All model. (Madden et al., 1991, p. 596)

7. *Teachers and teacher training.* The teachers and tutors for the program are all certified teachers. They receive detailed teacher's manuals and two days of inservice training at the beginning of the school year. . . . Throughout the year, facilitators and other project staff members make additional inservice presentations on such topics as classroom management, the pace of instruction, and cooperative learning. (Madden et al., 1991, p. 596)

8. *Special education.* Every effort is made to deal with students' learning problems within the context of the regular classroom, with the additional support of tutors. (Madden et al., 1991, p. 596)

9. *Advisory committee.* An advisory committee composed of the building principal, the program facilitator, a teacher representative, and the family support staff meets regularly to review the progress of the program and to identify and solve any problems that arise." (Madden et al., 1991, p. 597)

APPENDIX B: Data Collection

To gather information for this paper Data Collection: we collected existing descriptions of the programs and conducted interviews with program officers and participants in addition to reviewing descriptions of restructuring collected in nominations of restructured schools for the Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools school restructuring study. First, the major restructuring programs were identified in the literature and with the help of scholars in the field. Individuals in each program were interviewed for approximately an hour about the nature of the program, the structure of program activities, the organizational educational perspective and beliefs, and the spread and scope of schools who worked with them. Additional information was gathered from secondary sources as well as descriptive iniormation and other printed materials from the organizations. It was not possible to include every program or every association, many of whom are doing important and major work to improve schools. For example, the Learning Environments Consortium (LEC) of the National Association of Secondary School Principals as well as other association and national improvement programs were not included, but offer schools many ideas about how to reshape schools as well as provide assistance for change. Information from individual schools who were nominated to be part of a study of restructuring provided one more source of information on some of these programs. Berend's (1992) analysis of the nominated schools also provided some further data on the ways restructured schools connected to national programs. These data are not randomly sampled and do not represent statistical analyses of the spread of these organizations or their programs. Rather, they are useful illustrative data on a wide number of programs that cross district and state lines to connect to schools interested in substantially changing.

31

References

Berends, M. (1992). *A description of restructuring in nationally nominated schools*. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

Brock, W. E., & Marshall, R. (1990, September, 3). Building a better work force. *The Washington Post*.

Vowels, M. (1991). *An introduction to the CLSR assessment system*. Louisville, KY: The Center for Leadership in School Reform.

Comer, J. (1991, January). *A brief history and summary of the school development program* (final draft). New Haven, CT: Yale Child Study Center.

Corbett, D. H. (1990). *On the meaning of restructuring*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

Elmore, R. F., & Associates (1990). *Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M.C. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990, May). Studying the education of educators: From conception to findings. *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 698-701.

Hollifield, J. H. (Ed.). (1989, February). Success for all. *CREMS Report*. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on Elementary & Middle Schools, The Johns Hopkins University.

Levin, H. M. (1991, Winter). Accelerated visions. *Accelerated Schools*, *1*(1), pp. 2, 6. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Accelerated Schools Project.

Lewis, A. (1989). *Restructuring American schools*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Louis, K. S., & Miles, M. B. (1990). *Improving the urban high school: What works and why*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B. A. (1991, April). Success for all. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *72*(8), 593-599.

32

Murphy, J. (1991). *Restructuring schools: Capturing and assessing the phenomena*. New York: Teachers College Press.

National Center on Education and the Economy. (1990, June). *America's choice: High skills or low wages* (Executive Summary). Rochester, NY: Author.

National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching. (1991). *NCREST mission statement*. New York: NCREST, Teachers College, Columbia University.

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (1989). *Curriculum and evaluations standards for school mathematics*. Reston, VA: Author.

National Governors' Association. (1991). *From rhetoric to action: State progress in restructuring the education system*. Washington, DC: Author.

NEA National Center for Innovation. (1991, June). *Executive summary*. Washington, DC: Author.

Newmann, F. M. (1991, Fall). What is a 'restructured' school? A framework to clarify means and ends. *Issue Report No. 1*. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

Waterman, Jr., R. H. (1987). *The renewal factor: how the best get and keep the competitive edge*. New York: Bantam Books.