ED 347 929   HE 025 692

AUTHOR   Glickman, Carl D.; And Others
TITLE   Facilitation of Internal Change: The League of
                Professional Schools.
SPONS AGENCY   BellSouth Foundation, Inc. Atlanta, GA.; Department
                of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE   Apr 92
CONTRACT   DOE-84-073A
NOTE   21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
                American Educational Research Association (San
                Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE   Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information
                Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Colleges; Educational Change; Elementary Schools;
                Elementary Secondary Education; *Governance; Helping
                Relationship; Higher Education; *Institutional
                Administration; *Institutional Cooperation;
                *Instructional Development; *Interschool
                Communication; *Organizational Change; Organizational
                Communication; Research Methodology; Secondary
                Schools; Universities
IDENTIFIERS   *League of Professional Schools GA

ABSTRACT
                This paper reports on a study of the sources and
characteristics of facilitation of internal change in schools
successful in the implementation of the League of Professional
School's core premises of shared governance, schoolwide
educational/instructional focus, and action research. First, an
assessment is presented of an analysis of all League schools'
governance processes, implementation of instructional initiation, and
action research that is done every year by League associates. Next,
an additional analysis is provided that determines what have been the
schools' sources and types of facilitation and compares these
differences with the degree of implementation of these three
premises. Results are examined within seven themes: (1) non-political
climate (at meetings in schools, with other schools) to explore
ideas; (2) exchange with other schools and people about research,
ideas, and actions about educational renewal; (3) tendency to be
inclusive and involve all faculty in governance and participation;
(4) tendency to be inclusive as defined by including new and
additional faculty in League conferences and meetings; (5) ability to
work with or around the district in making school based decisions;
(6) use of time (for schoolwide planning, deciding, and revising) as
validation of important work; and (7) ability to ask for help and
assistance (to call others, to ask help of each other, to visit
others, and to ask others to come to the school). (GLR)

ED347929

Facilitation of Internal Change: The League
of Professional Schools

by Carl D. Glickman
Lew Allen
Barbara Lunsford

The University of Georgia, Athens

A paper presented to the Annual Meeting of
the American Educational Research Association

San Francisco, April, 1992

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Overview

The League of Professional Schools, organized by the University of Georgia's Program for School Improvement, promotes a nationally validated school renewal process (the U.S. Department of Education, 1991) that creates opportunities for all members of a school's professional staff to be involved in a planning, decision-making, and assessment cycle that guides schoolwide, instructional improvements. In League schools, teaching actions are driven by internal decisions and the school's own criteria of success. The belief is that if teachers and principals are willing to take on the choice and responsibility of collaborative decision making and they are provided with an ongoing, formal support system for their own internal changes, then better education for students will result (Glickman, 1990). Schools interested in joining the League send a team comprised of teachers, administrators, and central office representatives to a two-day orientation and planning workshop where they are exposed to the theories and premises of shared governance and issues surrounding schoolwide instructional improvement. If team members feel the League may have potential for their school, they share the information they received with the staff of their school. If, after gaining an understanding of the League premises and practices, 80% of the staff members indicate (by secret ballot) that they want the school to join the League, and they have support of the appropriate school district officials, then they become members (Glickman & Allen, 1992).

League schools receive a variety of services as a result of their membership in the League of Professional Schools. Each year, League schools send a team of 2-7 persons to a two-day fall conference, a one-day winter meeting, and may choose whether to send

a team to a one-day optional meeting in the spring. Optional institutes are also available during the school year and summer on team building, action research, and specific instructional innovations. Schools receive a bi-annual newsletter, a variety of professional materials on shared governance and action research, unlimited access to an Information Retrieval System that searches information about topics of instructional change being considered by individual schools, unlimited telephone consultation on issues of school renewal and evaluation, a one-day on-site visit, and, if so desired, additional on-site consultations (at an additional cost). Representatives from the schools govern the League, set membership fees, establish services, and develop policies.

The Program for School Improvement (PSI) of the University of Georgia is the operational center of the League. Since its inception, the work of PSI has been to assist schools through implementation of three core premises of a "professional" school:

1) Shared Governance - a democratic process that ensures teachers have an equal vote on site-based changes;

2) Schoolwide Educational/Instructional focus - the governance process makes decisions over professional school matters, i.e., teaching and learning;

3) Action Research - the school establishes priorities based on data and collects, analyses, and studies the effects of their educational decisions on students.

The League, beginning its third year of operation, currently consists of 42 schools: 10 high schools, 5 middle schools, and 27 elementary schools. The schools are from urban, rural, and suburban environments throughout the state of Georgia. The schools

have a wide range of socioeconomic conditions, racial and ethnic composition, and size of student population.

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to determine the sources and characteristics of facilitation of internal change in schools successful in the implementation of the League's core premises. The League currently consists of two generations of schools: 22 schools that joined in 1990, 20 schools that joined in 1991. The original 22 that joined in 1990 were the focus of the study. The findings will be used by the League in determining further facilitation needed to sustain successful change.

Data Analysis - Stage 1

Descriptive Findings on Implementation of Core Premises

by First and Second Generation Schools

Prior to analyzing the data on facilitation, it was necessary to develop a comprehensive overview of the progress of all League schools. A thorough analysis of each school's governance process, implementation of instructional initiatives, and action research is done every year by League associates. Data for this analysis are collected by the PSI associates that conduct on-site visits. On-site visits include (1) structure , open-ended interviews with teachers, administrators, and students; (2) review of the school's renewal plan; (3) observations and collection of artifacts, notes from meetings, etc.; (4) participation in school governance meetings and informal group discussions. A report

summarizing the associate's observations on the three premises areas is sent to the school.

The report and notes are placed in a school's individual folder housed at the University. The folder also contains data on previous visits, school plans made at previous conferences and meetings, action research plans and outcomes, and initial survey information about the school prior to joining the League. Some schools have written their own case studies which also are included in the file. The data bank grows across the years and leaves a trail of information for studying the changes in each school since its membership in the League.

As of March 15, 1992 on-site reports were available from 10 of 18 second-generation schools and 16 of 22 first-generation schools. Only schools whose on-site reports were available are included in the study.

Shared Governance:

As defined by the League, the purpose of shared governance is to provide democratic procedures that will provide all staff members in the school access to the decision-making process over instructional renewal. A three-part continuum, as shown in Figure 1, was created to describe the varying effects that schools' governance processes had on their staff members (Allen & Glickman, 1992). Processes that provided access to a low number of staff members and/or were unclear or advisory in nature were placed as a one on the continuum. Processes that provided access to and were understood by a moderate number of staff members, provided staff members with a moderate number of opportunities for assuming decision- making roles, and were generally clearly written as

to the specific workings of the process, were placed as a two on the continuum.

Processes that were highly democratic, well understood, clearly written, and

institutionalized were placed as a three on the continuum.

FIGURE 1

Conditions of Governance: Process

Non-League		League
Low (1)	Moderate (2)	High (3)
• Unclear	•Democratic Procedures Clear *Process is New*	• Democratic Procedures Understood by All and Institutionalized
• Advisory	• Groups Make Decisions for Everyone Else	• Elected Body or Volunteers at Large Set Priorities, Make Decisions, and Assess Results Through Schoolwide Process
• Policy in Place - Not Operational	•Elected Representatives or Volunteers at Large	
• Representatives Appointed		

A majority (13) of the first-generation schools had a clear, institutionalized governance process in place. Two first-generation schools had a moderate level of shared governance wi .. teachers involved in some decision-making. Only one of the original schools had a low level of shared governance. The second-generation of schools were still developing a final process for governance. Three of the second-generation schools were using an advisory approach and were still working to clarify the process. Seven second-generation schools had implemented a process that involved teachers in some opportunities with final decision-making authority. (see Table 1)

Table 1

Governance Process

	1 Low, unclear advisory	2 Moderate, clear some decision-making	3 Clear Institutionalized
First-generation schools (1990)	1	2	13
Second-generation schools (1991)	3	7	0

Instructional Focus:

The second premise is that the governance process has a schoolwide educational/instructional focus. A continuum was developed to chart the progress of all member schools. Four stages were identified and include: 0=no educational focus, 1=minimal focus, 2=core (instructional/curricular) focus, and 3=comprehensive (budget, hiring and or deployment of personnel) focus.

Fourteen of the 16 first-generation schools had identified an instructional focus. Four were identified as having a minimal focus, seven had a focus in the core area, and three were found to have a comprehensive instructional focus. Two of the first-generation schools were working on issues that had no educational focus. Again, a developmental process was seen in looking at the second generation schools. Three of these schools had no educational focus, four had minimal focus, and three had issues in the core area. No second-generation schools had a comprehensive focus.

Table 2

Instructional Focus

	0 No educational Focus	1 Minimal Focus	2 Core Focus	3 Comprehensive Focus
First-Generation Schools (1990)	2	4	7	3
Second-Generation Schools (1991)	3	4	3	0

Action Research

Studying the effects of the instructional focus is the third premise of the League. The stages of the action research continuum were 0=no data collected, 1=data collected

and organized, 2=data analyzed/interpreted, and 3=data driven schoolwide actions taken.

Action research is the third of the three League premises to be implemented in the schools. Five of the first-generation schools had not collected any data and five had collected and organized data. Four first-generation schools had collected, organized, analyzed, and interpreted data, while only two schools had completed the cycle and taken action based on data collected. The second-generation schools reveal a similar profile. Four of the second-generation schools had not collected any data, four had collected and organized data, one school had analyzed and interpreted the data collected, and one school had completed the cycle and taken action based on the data.

Table 3

Action Research

	0 No data collected	1 Data collected and organized	2 Data analyzed and interpreted	3 Data driven action taken
First-Generation Schools (1990)	5	5	4	2
Second-Generation Schools (1991)	4	4	1	1

Summary

As the previous tables indicate, there are differences in the degree of implementation between first-generation schools and second-generation schools. The governance process reflects the greatest difference between the two generations of

schools. Eighty-one percent of the first-generation schools had processes that were extremely clear and institutionalized, while none of the second-generation schools were placed in this category. While not as dramatic as the governance process, comparing the two generation's instructional focuses does indicate marked differences. Sixty-three percent of the first-generation schools had an instructional focus on core or comprehensive issues as compared to thirty percent for second-generation schools. Action research shows the least amount of differentiation between schools, but a discernable contrast is apparent. Thirty-seven percent of the first-generation schools had analyzed data or had taken data driven actions while twenty percent of the second-generation schools had taken similar actions.

First-generation schools overwhelmingly had shared governance processes that were highly democratic. The focus of the governance process for most first-generation schools was on schoolwide educational/instructional changes; action research was an activity at least begun by most. Nearly all first-generation schools were in full implementation of at least two of the three premises. The fact that first-generation schools are, as a whole, further along than second-generation schools was encouraging and expected.

Data Analysis - Stage 2

Data Collection and Method of Analysis:

After having studied all League schools' degree of implementation of the premises of the League and comparing first-generation schools with second-generation schools, the next step of the analysis was to draw from a new data source and focus only on first-

generation schools. The purpose here was to determine what have been the schools' sources and types of facilitation and compare these differences with the degree of implementation of the three premises.

Sources of Facilitation

During the months of January and February of 1992, a person unknown to League school faculty and administrators was hired to conduct telephone interviews with the contact persons from first-generation League schools. In most cases the contact person was the school principal, but in a few cases, it was a teacher or assistant (each school designates its own contact person to receive ongoing League communications).

The interview format was piloted by one of the co-investigators with three schools and the questions were reshaped to derive the intended information (Patton, 1980). The final interview questions can be found in Appendix A. The questions focused on the facilitation that had an affect on the internal changes of the school. The interviews lasted from thirty minutes to an hour and a half. The interviewer kept notes on the responses and submitted the set of responses to the three investigators.

The analysis of the interviews was done in a five-step process of (1) independent analysis for themes by each of the investigators, (2) discussion among investigators of tentative findings and clarification of new themes, (3) independent analysis to support or refute the new themes, (4) discussion among investigators of themes that were or were not supported, and (5) overall conclusions were drawn. The methodology was ethnographic (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) using a comparative analysis of 22, first-generation schools as a single case. After deriving themes, distinctions were looked for

that differentiated those schools with a high degree of implementation from those schools having a low degree of implementation of the three League premises.

Step One and T ᵐᵉ **.dependent Analysis and Emergent Themes**

Each investigator read eac. interview and recorded notes on a 3 by 4 grid (see Appendix B). Notes were taken on the (a) facilitation mentioned, (b) its influence, and (c) general comments in regard to four sources of facilitation: (1) the League, (2) internal to the school, (3) district, and (4) outside consultants After completing the independent analysis, the three investigators reviewed notes on each school and discussed if there were similar expressions, weights, and sources of facilitation being mentioned.

Step Three: Verification and Re-Conceptualizing

A new grid was established that listed what appeared to be the practitioners' perspectives in seven categories and each school was listed across a seven by twenty-two grid (see Appendix C). The investigators went back to the original interviews and to supplemental data including the school folders for on-site letters and records of school team attendance at various League activities. Using this data, schools were divided into high implementation schools (implementation of two premises and at least beginning operations on the third) and low implementation (one or no premises implemented). These distinctions were fairly confidently made based on the on-site visit reports (when available) and from personal discussions with PSI associates who had first-hand experiences at the schools. Eighteen schools were in high implementation and four were in low implementation.

Each investigator coded for each school and in each box whether the theme was mentioned, contrary information was mentioned, or the theme was not mentioned. All three of the individual responses were put on a visual chart (appendix D), that indicated where all three, or two of the three, investigators were in agreement of themes being verified, rejected, or not mentioned, and the cluster of themes that emerged among high-implementation schools as contrasted with low-implementation schools.

A further discussion was held among all three investigators and the final verifications rejections, and interpretations were made about the cluster of facilitation themes that separated high implementation from low implementation schools.

The Results

All three investigators have major responsibilities and interests in the League of Professional Schools. As a result, we tried to be conscious of not finding what we wanted to find (confirming the importance of the League work). Therefore, we took pains to return to original and supplemental data, work independent of each other, and raise alternative and contradictory hypothesis to offset potential bias. Objectivity was defined as agreement from all three independent observers and verification from the data. From this process the following themes were identified:

1) **Non-political climate (at meetings in schools, with other schools) to explore ideas.** Of the 18 high-implementation schools, this was confirmed in eight cases and not mentioned in ten. In the low-implementation schools, this was confirmed by none, contrary information was found in three, and no information in one. This finding did appear to discriminate, but only in the contrary findings of low-implementation schools.

14

2) Exchange with other schools and people about research, ideas, and actions about educational renewal.

This was mentioned by 12 of the 18 high-implementation schools and no contrary information was found. With the low implementation schools, three of the four schools mentioned it and no contrary information was found. For at least 15 of 22 schools, with no contrary information from the other seven, these were important facilitation activities, but they did not discriminate between high-implementation and low-implementation schools.

3) Tendency to be inclusive and involve all faculty in governance and participation.

The internal faculty was mentioned as the prime source of facilitation by 16 of the 18 high-implementation schools and no contrary information was found in the other two schools. In the low-implementation schools, the tendency to be inclusive and view internal faculty as a source of facilitation was not found in any schools, and contrary information was found in three of the four schools. This finding did appear to discriminate.

4) Tendency to be inclusive as defined by including new and additional faculty in League conferences and meetings.

This was confirmed in 15 of the 18 high-implementation schools and confirmed in two of the four low-implementation schools, not mentioned in one, and contrary in the other. In one of the low implementation confirmations, it was only recently that the school started to bring additional members to meetings. This finding did appear to discriminate.

5) Ability to work with or around district in making school based decisions.

In high-implementation schools, this statement was confirmed in 17 of the 18 cases with one contrary case. With the low-implementation schools, this was confirmed in one of the four, found as contrary in two of the schools, and no information in the other. This finding did appear to discriminate.

6) Use of time (for schoolwide planning, deciding, and revising) as validation of important work.

This information was confirmed in ten of the 18 high-implementation schools, eight had no information, and there were no schools with contrary information. In the four low-implementation schools, all four had no information. This finding did appear to discriminate.

7) Ability to ask for help and assistance (to call others, to ask help of each other, to visit others, to ask others to come to the school).

This finding was confirmed for the high-implementation schools in 16 of the 18 cases, two had no information, and there were no contrary cases. In the four low-implementation schools, there was one confirmation, three cases of no information, and no contrary information. This finding did appear to discriminate.

Clustering the Finding Into Patterns

All three investigators, had thought that the non-political climate for exploring ideas was a significant theme derived from reading each case study. However, when we went back to each school case for confirmation, it was the one theme most unsubstantiated (only confirmed in eight of eighteen schools and not mentioned by ten)

but in the low-implementation schools contrary information was found in three of the four cases. Most of the contexts for exploring ideas in the low-implementation schools were seen as occurring in a political climate of structure and control.

We found that theme 2 (exchange with other schools and people) seemed to hold up as a valuable external facilitation activity for all schools (high-implementation and low-implementation). Theme 3 (tendency to be inclusive) was confirmed and did clearly differentiate between high-implementation and low-implementation schools (with the only contrary cases being found in the low-implementation schools). Theme 4 further substantiated the tendency to be inclusive via bringing more and new faculty to meetings and differentiated high-implementation from low-implementation schools. Theme 5 (ability to work with and around the district office) was substantiated and did differentiate high-implementation from low-implementation schools. Theme 6 (use of time and validation of work) showed confirmation with high-implementation schools and no mention with low-implementation schools. Finally, theme 7 (ability to ask for help and assistance) was confirmed with high-implementation schools and mostly unmentioned by low-implementation schools.

When we clustered the findings of themes 2 through 7 according to high-implementation and low-implementation schools, we discovered why our first theme, non-political climate, was strongly felt but not found in the actual words in the majority of high-implementation schools--it turned out to be the overall interpretation of the six other substantiated themes.

High-implementation schools see sources of facilitation for internal change in this way. They view themselves, meaning all faculty, as important and potentially competent to figure out how they need to change. As a result, they involve more people, from the beginning, in brainstorming sessions, proposing new ideas, react'ng to recommendations, etc. and they show this involvement by seeing that many, rather than a few, attend League meetings and conferences (i.e., faculty consciously give up their place so that others can attend). In these schools, uninvolved faculty members are not dismissed as being uninterested. Instead, disinterest is seen as a sign of having to work harder at more ways of involving non-participants. Furthermore, the principals in these schools give up hierarchical control in quick and visible ways to show they are part of the faculty's decisions, not above it, and will abide by such decisions regardless of their personal opinions. The principals of these schools mention "no longer feeling alone," meaning that now teachers are their colleagues and that leadership is shared among many.

With this tendency to involve all staff members and see faculty as the source of decisions, these schools find the role of their districts to be supportive in that the district gives them the flexibility to operate. In a few cases, district personnel actually work to assist them to make their own decisions. More often, district support consists of a public acknowledgement that what the school is doing is good and worth tolerating. The picture of district support ranges from active assistance to non-interference, most often the latter.

Since these schools see themselves as a source of facilitation, they use time to validate that thinking collectively about one's school (rather than one's classroom, department, or grade level) is a legitimate faculty responsibility. Faculty meetings are used for talking with each other and making decisions, retreats are held, council and task force meetings are held before school and after school, during planning days and inservice days, and staff send representatives to League meetings on paid time to bring back information and plan further changes. These schools see facilitation as feeling free to ask other schools or people for help, to reveal to other schools and to outsiders what is not going well, and to publicly express feelings of uncertainty. They do more than merely exchange information; they use information to raise questions of themselves about new paths to consider. To ask is to admit ignorance and these schools (principals and teachers) are willing to ask both within the school and across schools. They don't want answers; they're capable of finding their own. They seek possibilities.

The pattern for low-implementation schools is quite different. They see facilitation as exchanging information with others, but there is no evidence that they ask for help and assistance from others. They don't tend to be inclusive, but instead see governance as the work of a select group of administrators and teachers trying to make others in the school change. They keep their group intact, go to meetings together, and do not include others or let others go in their stead. In some cases, at League meetings, administrators from these schools outnumber teachers, which is totally different from the high- implementation schools. When low-implementation schools gather information from other schools, they tend not to utilize the information for raising further questions

with their larger faculty, but instead use it to figure out what the school needs to do next. These schools work almost completely in accord with directions from a central figure (in one case the principal, in the other cases the district office). Centralized power and control is visible to school faculty. They dare not change their school until the central power(s) say that it is alright to do so and the central power(s) closely monitor the schools to make sure that they understand the central rules. Time for discussions about schoolwide educational change is an add-on to teachers' personal lives, not built into the professional life of the school. When groups of teachers are brought together, it is for the purpose of providing input rather than to be involved in decisions. There seems to be an invisible but conscious cloak of political consequences hanging above the head of the school-based people. Although they feel more involved, they still feel dependent on a higher power.

These contrasted profiles of high-implementation and low-implementation schools need to be interpreted in context. Some of the current high-implementation schools looked like the low-implementation schools in their first year (and occasionally still do at a stopped moment in time). So the term low-implementation is not considered to be fixed characteristic of these schools. At any moment in the future these schools may turn the corner with a greater understanding among themselves of the need to view governance as expanding participation and a loosening of control structures from central figures (Kirby, 1991). The intent of this study was not to criticize or label schools, rather to provide information that will drive the format and content of further workshops, meetings, and on-site facilitation of League schools.

At the conclusion of this study, it became apparent that what the investigators had originally thought of as facilitation was not the same as what school-based people identified. The investigators had thought in terms of people, activities, and events; the school people thought of exchanges, inclusiveness, control structures, time and validation, and ability to ask for help.

Our first impression that we erroneously believed to be confirmable from the text of school reports was really an overriding concept of all six themes. In any effort to sustain school-based educational renewal, a key seems to be to provide thorough, ongoing, non-political exchanges among school people. Indeed, this study leads us to the belief that core facilitation might be the providing of structure for ongoing, purposeful time for horizontal teams in schools to exchange, share, and ask each other for help within a non-political climate devoid of control structures and punitive consequences.