DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 098 SP 035 420

AUTHOR Darling-Hammond, Linda; And Others
TITLE Professional Development and Restructuring.
INSTITUTION Columbia Univ., New York, NY. Teachers Coll. National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY DeWitt Wallace / Reader's Digest Fund, Pleasantville, N.Y.
PUB DATE Dec 92
NOTE 59p.
AVAILABLE FROM NCREST, Box 110, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027 ($3).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - General (020) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Beginning Teacher Induction; *College School Cooperation; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Information Networks; *Inservice Teacher Education; Models; Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Development Schools; *School Restructuring

ABSTRACT

This compilation brings together three previously published papers on the role of professional development in school restructuring. The three papers articulate a new paradigm for professional development in teaching which sees opportunities for teacher development residing in collegial work settings, team teaching environments, school improvement networks, and school-university collaboratives. "Teacher Development in Professional Practice Schools" by Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller provides a framework for developing a culture of inquiry in a school, considers professional growth activities that are appropriate to that culture, and discusses problems and dilemmas that must be recognized and worked through to maintain and support teacher development in professional practice schools. "Accountability for Professional Practice" by Linda Darling-Hammond explores the contributions of professionalism to school accountability in the context of the professional development school. "Networks for Educational Change: Powerful and Problematic" by Ann Lieberman and Milbrey McLaughlin examines the power of networks, the problems of networks, and implications for policy. (References accompany each paper.) (JDD)

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

ED 374 098

Professional Development and Restructuring

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. Harrington
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Linda Darling-Hammond

Ann Lieberman

Milbrey McLaughlin

Lynne Miller

National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching

Teachers College, Columbia University

35420

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

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. NCREST's work builds concrete, detailed knowledge about the intense and difficult efforts undertaken in restructuring schools. This knowledge is used to help others in their attempts at change, to begin to build future education programs for school practitioners, and to promote the policy changes that will nurture and encourage needed structural reforms. The Center brings together the voices of practitioners and researchers, parents and students, policy makers and teacher educators.

NCREST is supported by a major grant from the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund. NCREST's work in New York City, through its Center for School Reform, is supported by the Leon Lowenstein Foundation and the Aaron Diamond Foundation. Other funders have included the Center for Collaborative Education, the Danforth Foundation, the Fund for New York City Public Education, the National Center for Research on Vocational Education, the New York Community Trust, and the Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands.

Additional copies of this publication may be ordered for $3 each. All orders must be prepaid by check or money order payable to NCREST. Contact:

NCREST
Box 110, Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, NY 10027
Fax: (212) 678-4170

ERIC

Professional Development and Restructuring

ERIC

Professional Development and Restructuring

Teacher Development in Professional Practice Schools

Ann Lieberman
Lynne Miller

Accountability for Professional Practice

Linda Darling-Hammond

Networks for Educational Change: Powerful and Problematic

Ann Lieberman
Milbrey McLaughlin

December 1992

ERIC

Contents

Foreword vii
Linda Darling-Hammond

Teacher Development in Professional Practice Schools 1
Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller

Accountability for Professional Practice 19
Linda Darling-Hammond

Networks for Educational Change: Powerful and Problematic 43
Ann Lieberman and Milbrey McLaughlin

ERIC

Foreword

The foundation of school restructuring initiatives is professional development for teachers. Educators and policy makers are increasingly aware that efforts to rethink schooling so that it becomes centered more on the needs of students than on the demands of bureaucracies require that we rethink opportunities for teacher learning as well. If teachers are to be responsive to students' development, prior knowledge, approaches to learning, cultural and community experiences, strengths, and talents, they must have opportunities to understand how these factors influence learning. They must also have opportunities to develop practices that can connect valued learning with learners' experiences and world views. If teachers are to develop new approaches to curriculum and new strategies for assessment, work closely and effectively with parents, and participate in shaping school structures and practices, they must be prepared to take on these responsibilities from a deeper base of knowledge and experience than teacher preparation programs -- and in-service staff development programs -- can provide.

This volume pulls together three articles that begin to articulate a new paradigm for professional development in teaching -- one that acknowledges teachers, like their students, as active learners who make meaning of their experiences in light of intentions and understandings. This new paradigm sees the opportunities for teacher development as residing in collegial work settings, team teaching environments, school improvement networks, and school-university collaboratives like professional development schools rather than in simple formulas for classroom behavior, teacher-proof curriculum packages, and mandated in-service days. It sees the work of teaching as deeply and reciprocally related to the needs and interests of learners rather than as driven by the demands of curriculum "coverage." It sees the development of a shared knowledge base for teaching as integrally related to the development of school structures that support teachers in sharing their own knowledge with their colleagues -- structures that respect and nurture the wisdom of practice as well as the contributions of research.

The first two articles in this volume examine issues of teacher development in the newly emerging professional practice schools (also called professional development schools) being created by teacher education programs in conjunction with schools. Both papers were originally written to inform an American Federation of Teachers project to launch professional practice schools, several of which are now in operation. Hundreds of other such schools have also begun under the auspices of organizations like the Holmes Group, the National Education Association, and the Network for Educational Renewal, along with states like Minnesota, Massachusetts, and Michigan.

Intended to support the simultaneous restructuring of schools and schools of education

while providing state-of-the-art settings for the preparation of beginning teachers, these schools provide opportunities for teacher learning that build upon collegial forms of practice. The prospects for developing teaching as knowledge co-construction and as facilitative leadership are described in this volume's first article on ***Teacher Development in Professional Practice Schools***. The second article on ***Accountability for Professional Practice*** discusses how such schools can provide the foundations for professional accountability grounded in collegiality, community, and collective inquiry.

The development of professional practice schools is an acknowledgement of the fact that, in the long run, if "break the mold" schools are to survive and prosper, they must be able to rely on "break the mold" programs for the initial preparation of teachers and administrators. In the short and long run, school restructuring initiatives will also depend heavily upon efforts to help teachers and other staff develop and connect with new ideas, experiences, and examinations of practice. Such efforts will always be needed to stimulate continued learning. The third article in this volume, ***Networks for Educational Change: Powerful and Problematic***, describes the power of teacher and school networks to promote these kinds of opportunities for teacher development. By fostering shared work and ownership of the learning process, networks provide vehicles for building professional community -- an intersecting set of collegial structures within which teacher leadership can grow.

Professional practice schools, teacher networks, and other collaborative enterprises for teacher learning can provide foundations for building a teaching profession that is learner-centered and knowledge-based, while supporting school reforms grounded in these values. The power of such enterprises is that they enable teachers to reach beyond their individual struggles in isolated classrooms to the empowerment that is made possible through shared knowledge and collective problem solving. We hope that this volume contributes to efforts to develop the elements of community, collegiality, and collective inquiry that are the cornerstones of the new paradigm for professional development, creating engines for change that enrich the work of individuals, school communities, and the profession of teaching as a whole.

Linda Darling-Hammond

ERIC

Teacher Development in Professional Practice Schools

Ann Lieberman
Lynne Miller

This article first appeared in *Teachers College Record 92*, (1): 105-122.
It is reprinted here with the permission
of the authors and *Teachers College Record*.

It was originally commissioned by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT),
Education Issues Department, as part of a grant from the Exxon Foundation
on the conceptualization of professional practice schools.

ERIC

In the current period of educational reform, the movement to restructure schools has been linked with initiatives to improve the preparation and ongoing development of teachers. Professional practice schools, also known as professional development schools, have emerged as a promising model for connecting school renewal and the reform of teacher education. Unlike laboratory schools sponsored by universities and operating independently of public education, professional practice schools exist as part of public school systems, are governed by lay boards of education, and serve public school populations. These schools are best characterized as having three complementary agendas: (1) to rethink and reinvent themselves for the purpose of building and sustaining best educational practices; (2) to contribute to the preservice education of teachers and induct them into the teaching profession; and (3) to provide for continuing development and professional growth of experienced inservice teachers. This third agenda, teacher development, is the focus of this article.

We approach the topic of teacher development in professional practice schools with both optimism and caution. We are optimistic because we think the time is ripe for the creation of professional practice schools and because we know from our own experience and the experience of others that teacher development activities can enhance efforts to improve teaching and to improve schools. We are cautious because we also know that in the name of professional development, educators have committed a multitude of sins. Too often structured activities and programs have served to reinforce the status quo rather than change it, perpetuating the "paternalistic system that reinforces 'schooling as usual'" (Lambert 1988, p. 666). We think it is important, then, to define what we mean by teacher development and to distinguish our construction of the concept from the competing notions of inservice education and staff development.

To our way of thinking, the term in-service education has come to be synonymous with training and implies a deficit model of education. Before the 1950s and the growth of teachers' colleges, there was a focus on certification and licensure of teachers. Perhaps because of this, there was little concentrated effort on thinking about teacher development for inservice teachers. Authoritarian management practices and talking about teaching practices, rather than talking with teachers about their practices, was seen as legitimate inservice education. In the first National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE) Yearbook that focused primarily on inservice (1957), there was a major shift, in discussion if not in practice, to democratic practices, cooperative research, and collaborative work between teachers, principals, and researchers. The teacher came to be seen not as an object but rather as an engaged subject, capable of continuous development. These two models, a deficit approach, assuming that teachers need information from people in authority, vs. a collaborative approach, based on notions of teachers as colleagues engaged in inquiry about practice, became deeply ingrained in the profession.

After the launching of Sputnik, coincidentally in the same year that the NSSE yearbook was published (Edelfelt and Lawrence, 1975), inservice took hold once again as subject matter specialists from the arts and science faculties in universities were enlisted to write teacher-proof curricula. Teacher institutes, funded under the National Defense and Education Act (NDEA), proliferated. These institutes were designed either to train teachers to use new, externally developed instructional materials or to update teachers in current academic thinking in the content areas. The failures of

ERIC

this approach to professional development are legion and have been carefully documented (Sarason, 1982). One might suppose that the notion of inservice education as training died a quiet death some time ago. Sadly, this is not the case. In many districts and schools, professional development still implies a deficit training model. Assemblies filled with an entire school staff still dot the landscape of allocated "staff development days." Outside experts still transmit "the word," be it assertive discipline, mastery teaching, or the elements of effective schools, to the unanointed. Teachers are viewed as "the passive recipients of someone else's knowledge" (Miller, in press) rather than as sources of knowledge themselves or active participants in their own growth and development.

The term staff development, on the other hand, implies a broader notion of professional development -- one with which we are more, but not totally, comfortable. In the mid-seventies, there was a major shift in the research on and writing about staff development, exemplified by the findings of the Rand Change Agent study (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1979), John Goodlad's analysis of the League of Cooperating Schools (Goodlad, 1975), and Gene Hall and Susan Loucks' work on teacher concerns (Hall and Loucks, 1979). This shift was most notable for its emphasis on the school as an organization and the connection that it made between the development of teachers as individuals and the development of the school as a whole. In 1979, we defined staff development as "working with at least a portion of a staff over a period of time with the necessary supportive conditions" (Lieberman and Miller, 1979). While this approach to teacher development was more broadly construed than inservice training, it oftentimes, though not always, assumed that the role of development was to assist teachers in either adopting an externally designed program, making adaptations to some technological innovation, or implementing a federal or state mandate.

We choose here to use the term teacher development when we write and talk about professional growth activities in a professional practice school. By teacher development, we mean continuous inquiry into practice. In this construction of professional development, we see the teacher as a "reflective practitioner" (Schon, 1983; Schon, 1987), someone who has a "tacit knowledge base" and who then builds on that knowledge base through ongoing inquiry and analysis, continually rethinking and reevaluating her own values and practices. Teacher development is not only the renewal of teaching, but it is also the renewal of schools. Teacher development is, in effect, culture building. In the following pages, we first provide a framework for developing a culture of inquiry in a school, then consider professional growth activities that are appropriate to that culture, and finally discuss some of the problems and dilemmas that must be recognized and worked through to maintain and support teacher development in professional practice schools.

Building a Culture of Support for Teacher Inquiry

Having made the case for teacher development as continuous inquiry into practice, we are well aware of the complexity of this notion, the difficulty of transforming it into reality, and the necessity of having, or creating, a culture in the school that supports teachers as they become active

inquirers into the process of teaching and learning. Fortunately, in the last few years, research and practice have provided some important insights about how such a culture may be constituted. Five elements have emerged as essential; they are: (1) norms of colleagueship, openness, and trust; (2) opportunities and time for disciplined inquiry; (3) teacher learning of content in context; (4) reconstruction of leadership roles; and (5) networks, collaborations, and coalitions. Below, we discuss each of these elements and how they combine to create a culture of support for teachers engaged in continuous inquiry.

Colleagueship, Openness, and Trust

Judith Warren Little (Little, 1981; Little, 1986) in what has become a benchmark study of staff development, followed six urban schools as they became involved in district-sponsored staff development. Her findings indicated that norms of collegiality and experimentation were most responsible for the successful implementation of new programs. In schools where the principal was actively engaged with teachers and announced expectations for and modeled behaviors of colleagueship, there was increased support for self-examination, risk-taking, and collective reflection on practice. When teachers and principals observed each other in classrooms, had time to talk about what they were doing, and worked to find solutions for commonly defined problems, the life of the teachers in the school was transformed. Traditions of privacy, practicality, and isolation (Lieberman and Miller, 1984) were replaced by shared ownership of issues, a willingness to consider alternative explanations for practices and behaviors, and a desire to work together as colleagues. In effect, in developing successful staff development in support of a new program, the staff was building a new culture for the school and defining new ways of being for themselves as teachers.

> The successful program rested on long-term habits of shared work and shared problem solving among teachers. Such patterns of mutual assistance, together with mechanisms by which teachers can emerge as leaders on matters of curriculum and instruction are also typical (Little, 1986, p. 42).

These notions of shared work, shared problem solving, mutual assistance, and teacher leadership in curriculum and instruction are -- to our mind -- the cornerstones of building a school culture that supports continuous inquiry into practice.

Susan Rosenholtz, in her study of the school as a workplace (1989), added to our understanding of the effects of the norms that Little describes. Rosenholtz categorized schools as being either "learning enriched" or "learning impoverished" (Rosenholtz, 1989, pp. 80, 81). Learning enriched schools had collaborative goals at the building level, minimum uncertainty, positive teacher attitudes, principal support of teachers to the point of removing barriers, and support for collaboration rather than completion. On the other hand, learning impoverished schools had no clear or shared values, were places where teachers rarely talked to each other, where work was perceived as routine, and where both self-reliance and isolation flourished. In the learning impoverished schools, teachers, with no vehicle for discussion and reflection, retreated to their individual classrooms, kept quiet about their successes and failures, and assumed a public stance of being expert teachers for fear of being found out to be less than adequate. In the learning enriched

ERIC

schools, the opposite was true. Teachers who shared their successes and failures were more willing to identify and explore common problems and seek common solutions. The myth of expertise was replaced by the reality of collective struggle and discovery. As did Little, Rosenholtz provided evidence that norms of colleagueship and collaboration were among the necessary conditions for teachers to reconceptualize their work, to engage in active investigations about their practices, and to expect that professional learning and growth were part of their worklife in schools.

Opportunities and Time for Disciplined Inquiry

In a school where teachers assume leadership in curriculum and instruction and where reflective action replaces routinized practice, the need for providing opportunities and time for disciplined inquiry into teaching and learning become crucial. Unlike traditional school settings, professional practice schools are places where teachers, sometimes working with university scholars and sometimes working alone, do research on, by, and for themselves. It is necessary that professional practice schools provide the conditions so that teachers can develop the skills, perspective, and confidence to do their own systematic investigation.

The notion of teacher-as-researcher is not new. Writing over 20 years ago, Robert Schaeffer, then dean at Teachers College, Columbia University, urged that schools should organize as "centers of inquiry" (Schaeffer, 1967). More recently, Miles Myers, president of the California Federation of Teachers, argued that "school site teacher research projects are a basic requirement of the current second wave of school reform" (Myers, 1989, p. 1). The case, then, has been made for teacher research, but the question remains: how do schools organize themselves and create the necessary conditions so that teacher research is encouraged, supported, and used? The answer, we suspect, is not to have externally-driven workshops on research methods and then ask school staffs to apply their learning to practice. Rather, the research sensibility must be infused into the dailiness of the school. Such an infusion takes time and commitment. It begins with an acknowledgement of the importance of norms of collegiality and experimentation; it builds on shared problem identification and a mutual search for solutions; it depends on taking a risk in the classroom; it requires the support of colleagues. Let us present a case in point.

Mary George[1] is a first grade teacher in a school that is trying to organize around Schaeffer's notion of the school as the center of inquiry. For over a year, she and her colleagues have been meeting in grade-level teams and in schoolwide forums. The question the faculty has been grappling with over the year is, "How do we understand more about how children learn?" Mary has had no formal training in research; what she does have is a very specific problem that has been troubling her and her colleagues: how do children approach new words they encounter in their reading? Like her colleagues, Mary has been torn between phonics and whole language approaches, but has been wary about accepting one to the exclusion of the other. She took her problem with her into her class one day and when she generated a list of words that students missed in an initial

---

[1] This case study is taken from field notes by Lynne Miller in Gorham, Maine, as part of a long-range study of school restructuring (1989).

reading of a big book, she began a spontaneous inquiry into how children learn new words. She asked the children, "How many of you could figure out the word *left*?" One little boy raised his hand and explained how he sounded out the word, beginning with the initial consonant and moving on to the vowel and the final consonant sounds. A little girl raised her hand and began to explain how she knew the story was about hands, and she knows that people have a left and a right hand, and she knew that the word in question began with *l*; so she figured out that the word must be *left*. A third child, another girl, raised her hand, and told the class that she knew the word because she saw it in another book. She proudly found the other book in the classroom library and showed it to the class.

This simple experiment that Mary George conducted in her classroom was, to our minds, the beginnings of teacher research. Mary acknowledged later, in discussing what she did with her grade-level colleagues, that she considered her initial question an enormous risk. She had never approached her teaching as research before, but she also acknowledged that the ethos of inquiry that dominated the school and the support she knew she would get from her colleagues gave her the courage to try her experiment. Needless to say, she was delighted with the results, as were the rest of the first grade teachers who each took Mary's question to her next class. Together, the first grade teachers began putting together the pieces of the puzzle of word recognition in a way that made sense to them and had value to their classroom practices.

Teacher research, of course, can be more complex and more sophisticated than Mary George's spontaneous inquiry. But we should not let sophistication and complexity become the criteria by which we judge disciplined inquiry into practice. Rather, the importance of the question, the legitimacy of the sources of data, and the usefulness of the results should guide our practice. What is important is that authentic teacher research develops in an environment where culture building and professional colleagueship are also being nurtured and sustained.

Teacher Learning of Content in Context

One may argue that all of this talk about teacher development as continuous inquiry into practice is long on process and short on content, that it places too much value on reflection and sharing and not enough value on just what is being reflected upon and shared. As Myrna Cooper reminds us, "In professional settings, when teachers are moved to share, it is usually because they are proud of something they have done with children" (Cooper, 1988, p. 51).

We are fortunate that at the present moment in education we can point to several practices, developing separately and simultaneously, which challenge conventional assumptions about instruction. These approaches share a common belief that the learner is at the center of the educational enterprise. For lack of a better term, we call these approaches *content-in-context learning*. Unlike the call for cultural literacy and core learnings, content-in-context approaches acknowledge the complexity of teaching and learning, provide room for flexibility and diversity, and -- at the same time -- manage to maintain the legitimacy of the content areas and the teacher's responsibility to teach children something of value. Central to this school of thought is the notion that students come to school with prior knowledge and ongoing access to valuable experience, both

ERIC

of which can be tapped to motivate and ground school learning.

David Elkind (1989) in a recent article distinguished this approach, which he views as developmental in orientation, from more conventional school practices, which he identifies as having a psychometric orientation. From the developmentalist point of view, all learners have developing abilities; the task of the schools is to match the curriculum to the student. From the psychometric perspective, on the other hand, intelligence is fixed and measurable; the task of the school is to match like students to each other and to match students to the curriculum. The developmentalist sees learning as a creative, active, and constructive process that engages the learner, continuously and reciprocally, with the content area; content and skills are connected and interdependent. The psychometrician sees learning quite differently. Learning is viewed as a series of acquired behaviors that are mastered through the application of general principles such as intermittent reinforcement; skills and content are independent, and, once mastered, skills are transferable to other knowledge domains. The aim of education for the developmentalist is to create people who, in the words of Piaget, "...are capable of doing new things...who are creative, inventive, and discoverers. The second goal of education is to form minds which can be critical, can verify, and not accept everything that is offered" (Elkind, 1979, p. 115). In contrast, the psychometric aim of education is less general and more technical; that is, to maximize skills acquisition in a way that is quantifiable and meets demands for accountability.

Recent developments in research on cognition further support the developmentalist, or content-in-context, position. This line of research recognizes the complexity of school learning, the necessity of constructing ill-defined problems, the importance of mastering metacognitive strategies as well as knowledge acquisition, the connection of cognition to specific content knowledge domains, the centrality of prior knowledge, and the need for a mix of cognitive and social skills in defining and solving problems. Under this framework for learning, the basic unit of instruction is the task, not the lesson or the textbook (Devaney and Sykes, 1988).

The implications of research on cognition and of the developmental approach are nothing short of revolutionary. They direct us to reconceptualize teaching, to see it as being woven of the same cloth as learning. Teaching and learning are interdependent, not separate functions. Under this view, teachers are primarily learners. They are problem posers and problem solvers; they are researchers; and they are intellectuals engaged in unraveling the learning process both for themselves and for the young people in their charge. Learning is not consumption; it is knowledge production. Teaching is not performance; it is facilitative leadership (Schlechty and Joslin, 1986). Curriculum is not given; it is constructed empirically, based on the emergent needs and interests of learners. Assessment is not judgment; it documents programs over time. Instruction is not technocratic; it is inventive, craft-like, and, above all, an imperfect human enterprise.

Teachers using content-in-context approaches eed to add to their teaching repertoires. Lectures, seat work, worksheets, and unit tests must be deemphasized as dialogue, discussion, and production take their place. Whole language, learning math through the use of manipulatives, hands-on science classes, and the process approach to writing all represent content-in-context approaches to learning. The Foxfire Project, which has gained so much national attention, is

ERIC

another example of what we mean. Foxfire is much more than a publication; it is what founder Eliot Wigginton calls a "style of education" (Wigginton, 1989, p. 26) and is best understood through its ten principles:

1. All work teachers and students do together must flow from student desire.
2. Connections of the work to the surrounding community and the real world outside the classroom are clear.
3. The work is characterized by student action rather than passive reception of processed information.
4. A constant feature of the process is its emphasis on peer teaching, small group work, and teamwork.
5. The role of the teacher is that of collaborator and team leader and guide, rather than boss or the repository of all knowledge.
6. There must be an audience beyond the teacher for student work.
7. The academic integrity of the work must be absolutely clear.
8. The work must include honest, ongoing evaluation for skills, content, and change in student attitude.
9. As the year progresses, new activities should grow out of the old.
10. As the students become more thoughtful participants in their own education, our goal must be to help them become increasingly able and willing to guide their own learning, fearlessly, for the rest of their lives (Wigginton, 1989, 26-28).

We think that these ten principles incorporate many of the principles of curriculum and instruction that are implied in contemporary research on cognition. We also believe that this style of education can happen best in an environment where openness and collaboration are valued and where disciplined inquiry is encouraged. If professional practice schools are, in fact, centers of inquiry where continuous teacher development is normative, then the content-in-context style of education provides most of the substance around which inquiry may be focused But as we cautioned at the beginning, these process approaches to student learning and teacher facilitation must also be continuously examined. Students' products must grow in complexity and thought. Process does not automatically move to better products. It too must be scrutinized by both teacher and student for its importance, depth, and enhanced understanding. We are talking, not about panaceas, but about the development of habits of mind that make it legitimate to continually ask questions of practice.

Reconstruction of Leadership Roles

In traditional school settings, leadership is defined by one's position in the organization. Principals have leadership; teachers do not. In professional practice schools, the whole concept of leadership is in the process of being reconstructed. Thomas Sergiovanni makes what we think is a useful distinction between technical and managerial conceptions of leadership and cultural leadership.

ERIC

In human enterprises such as the profession of teaching and schooling, technical and managerial conceptions should always be subordinate to human needs and actions and should always be practiced in service of human ends. Cultural leadership -- by accepting the realities of the human spirit, by emphasizing the importance of meaning and significance, and by acknowledging the concept of professional freedom linked to values and norms that make up a moral order -- comes closer to the point of leadership (Sergiovanni, 1987, p. 127).

What Sergiovanni is proposing is that principals learn to think and act as leaders in ways that are different from custom and tradition. According to Sergiovanni, leaders lead by purpose and empowerment. They have power, but of a different sort than usually practiced. Their power is viewed as "power to accomplish" rather than "power over people and events." They practice the concept of "leadership density...the extent to which leadership roles are shared and the extent to which leadership is broadly exercised" (Sergiovanni, 1987, p. 122). When construed in these ways, leadership becomes something that both administrators and teachers have and use; and leadership becomes an essential ingredient in transforming schools into centers of inquiry.

For principals, life in such a setting requires a radical shift in attitudes and behaviors. In a compelling study of two high school principals, Mary Lynne Derrington brought home the difficulty building administrators have in making the transition from technical and managerial leadership to cultural leadership. She identified three steps in the transition (Derrington, 1989, p. 180):

Tradition	Transition	Transformation
The boss	The lone ranger	Parallel leadership
Branch manager	Hero	Hero maker
Adversarial	Competitive	Collegial
Views teachers as objectives for improvement	Views teachers as vehicles for improvement	Views teachers as partners for improvement
Works through directive	Works through small groups	Works through collaboration and power equalization
Rewards and punishes	Builds coalitions	Solves problems

For teachers, it is equally difficult to assume new roles. Patricia Wasley (1989) uncovered many of the tensions and dilemmas that teacher leaders faced as they assumed new roles in schools. She noted that all the teacher leaders she studied felt constrained by time -- time to both teach and lead effectively and time to work collaboratively with their colleagues. Teacher leaders were often confused about the primary purpose of their positions; were they to support teachers or were they to

support administrators? In addition, they had a tough time dealing with their colleagues in their new leadership roles. An egalitarian ethic dominates teaching, and many teachers had difficulty in recognizing one of their own as a leader. To paraphrase Orwell, the notion that all teachers are equal but some teachers are more equal than others went against the grain. Most importantly, the success of teacher leadership depended on the ability of the principal to make the transition from traditional to transformative or cultural leadership.

It is clear, then, that one of the tasks a professional practice school faces is to make the transition from bureaucratic and hierarchical modes of leadership to alternative forms. That this is difficult and fraught with tension must be acknowledged. What also must be acknowledged is that in schools where principals and teachers together make the transition, there exists the real possibility for colleagueship and the development of a new professional culture. In schools where teachers are making responsible and grounded decisions about instruction in their classrooms and where principals are supportive of the decisions that teachers make, the possibility for continuous learning takes root. One example shows what this could look like. Suzanne Soo Hoo (1989) described a collaborative project in which she, in collaboration with another principal and a university faculty member, engaged teachers in a discussion of the misuses of standardized tests. Teachers generated questions of their concern such as:

- How do we know students are learning?
- How do we capture the data that is available in our classrooms?
- What are some new ways of displaying student achievement?

Teachers kept journals, while the university researcher did observations and helped with additional data collection techniques. Through monthly meetings and discussion around both the information teachers used and collected, and alternate sources of data, the principal facilitated the growth of a culture of inquiry. In this case the principal, in partnership with teachers and a university researcher, provided the impetus to look at the frustration of testing and unlocked a variety of understandings about assessment, which in turn led to other subjects for inquiry. Again, description and practice begin to show us how to think about and engage teachers as lifelong learners.

Networks, Collaborations, and Coalitions

While it is important to concentrate energies on the specific school site, it is also important to develop support outside of the school. Too often schools in the process of radical transformation suffer from the "funny farm syndrome." They stand out in their district as different and, oftentimes, threatening. Teachers involved in professional practice schools may find they have a difficult time explaining just what they're about to colleagues within their own district. They may find that the support they need from the immediate environment is lacking. The formation of networks, collaborations, and coalitions is helpful in combating the "funny farm syndrome," in providing the support and encouragement for teachers to continue to experiment, to question, and to work to change common practices in an effort to improve education for children.

ERIC

Networks, collaborations, and coalitions take many forms. They may be informal collections of people or they may be more formalized partnerships among institutions. In any case, such groupings share some common characteristics. They are alternative in nature, share a common purpose, exchange information and psychological support, are voluntary, and are based on equal participation of all members (Parker, 1979). For examples of how networks function, we draw on our own experience and on the experience of others involved in school improvement efforts.

The Puget Sound Educational Consortium and the Southern Maine Partnership are both members of the National Network for Educational Renewal, a national coalition of school-university partnerships. In both Washington and Maine, the partnerships serve more to connect people across schools and districts than to connect schools to the university. In both settings, groups of teachers come together regularly to discuss and act on matters of common concern. In the past two years, teacher groups have dealt with issues of equity, teacher leadership, restructuring schools, grouping practices, early childhood education, and at-risk students. The power of the groups is that they are self-directed, define their own agendas, and provide the opportunity for teachers of like mind and like disposition to exchange experiences and ideas in an atmosphere of support and common understanding. People who have been involved claim that participation in the groups provides the extra support they need to return to their schools with renewed energy and commitment.

The Coalition of Essential Schools is an example of collaboration at the national level, where schools are drawn together by a common purpose and a clearly defined mission. The Coalition grew out of the work of Ted Sizer and is comprised of over 40 high schools who ascribe to a set of principles that involve different roles for teachers as generalists and for students as workers and a different conception of the high school curriculum; "less is more" has become the credo of the group.[2] Though the Coalition does not provide much opportunity for face-to-face interaction among teachers at member schools, it does serve as a source of support for schools, many of whom are isolated in their districts and who look to a national movement to help legitimate their local efforts.

So, too, the Mastery In Learning Project (MIL) of the National Education Association seeks to link schools together in a national network where common purposes are shared and a common vision is upheld. School faculties join the MIL after they complete a comprehensive profile of their schools and commit themselves to a plan for rethinking and redoing education. Unlike the Coalition, there is no one model for the transformation of schools. Rather, there is a process of analysis, action, and reflection to which members agree. The MIL is linked by a computer network whereby all member schools can conference with each other and have access to an education database to assist in their individual efforts. Like the Coalition, MIL helps legitimize local reform and renewal efforts. In addition, it provides the opportunity for teachers to communicate with their peers from other parts of the country, to form professional alliances, and to support each other in their work.

Networks, collaborations, and coalitions need not be so formal as those we've discussed

[2] See Theodore Sizer (1984). *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

here. The Philadelphia Teachers' Learning Cooperative is a fine example of teachers coming together on an informal basis once a month to discuss a preassigned reading. In other cities and towns, teachers have formed small resource centers where they can meet to discuss issues, exchange ideas, learn about effective practices, and develop learning materials.

The point we want to make is that schools, like teachers, can become isolated and feel estranged from the mainstream. Schools, like teachers, must learn to reach out beyond their traditional borders and create sources of support, challenge, and legitimacy for themselves. Teachers who see themselves as part of a school in the process of change must also see themselves as part of a profession in the process of change. In that way, the norms and values of the school become part of a larger social system, one that sustains improvement and encourages it.

Teacher Development in Professional Practice Schools

The five elements that combine to create a culture of support for teacher inquiry do not take root quickly. It takes time for change to happen, even in a school that defines itself as different. Teacher development activities must occur alongside the development of the new school culture. In fact, teacher development and culture building are part of the same process in a professional development school. This means that teacher development activities are designed around notions of colleagueship, openness, and trust; they provide time and space for disciplined inquiry; they focus on teacher learning of content-in-context; they provide opportunities for new leadership roles; and they become engaged in networking activities and coalition building beyond the boundaries of the school. Below, we present a few examples of teacher development activities that seem to combine these elements and that hold particular promise for professional practice schools.

Teacher study groups meet regularly to discuss an agreed-upon topic or theme. Teachers rotate leadership of the group. The role of the designated teacher-leader is to select a common reading and to make it available to all group members before the meeting, to structure discussion by preparing a question or problem to answer, to facilitate discussion, to ensure that minutes of the meeting are taken and distributed, and finally to guide the group in making a decision about the direction the next meeting should take. In general, teacher study groups take place outside of the school in an informal setting around a potluck meal or similar occasion.

Curriculum writing involves groups of teachers working together over time with the intention of developing a product for use in the classroom as part of the instructional program. The product varies as the task varies and may take the form of a guide for teaching, an inventory of classroom practices, a statement of expectations of learners and teachers, a program evaluation, a set of recommendations for program design, anything that meets the needs, interests, and inventiveness of the teachers involved (Miller, 1992). Curriculum writing groups are teacher-initiated and teacher-led. They last as long as it takes to complete a task, allowing teachers the opportunity to

ERIC

move in and out of groups as time and interest permits.

Teacher research projects may be individually or group initiated. The project begins with the identification of a problem that matters to people. Even though one person's problem may seem trivial to someone else, it is important to assume that each individual or group engaged in research has a legitimate concern that needs to be understood. The goal of the research is both to understand practice and to improve it. The major activity of teacher research is the collection and analysis of data. Data collection need not be cumbersome or overly technical. Data can be collected through observation, informal interviewing, journal entries, and brief surveys. Researchers do not have to worry about doing complex statistical analysis or proving the generalizability of findings, since the problem under consideration is idiosyncratic to the people involved or to the specific school. Oftentimes, teacher research is published informally for the information and use of other faculty.

Peer observation involves teachers, usually in pairs, making informal contracts to visit each other's classrooms and to observe each other teaching. Sometimes, the visiting teacher will concentrate on the behaviors and practices of the teacher. At other times, the visiting teacher will focus on the actions of the students or of one or two students in particular. In any event, the object of the observation is mutually determined before the visit takes place. The visiting teacher and the teacher being observed then take time to discuss the observation. It is the role of the visiting teacher to provide descriptive feedback to the observed teacher, and it is the role of the teacher observed to make sense of the feedback, either on her own or in consultation with the visiting teacher. The contract is renegotiated after each visit and may be altered or terminated at any mutually agreed-upon point.

Case conferences engage teachers in a method of problem solving usually reserved for the medical and social work professions. In the case conference, a group of teachers agree to meet to discuss cases of individual students. The person presenting the case is responsible for developing a history of the child in school and a description of problematic behaviors, attitudes, or academic concerns. The task of the other group members is to pose questions that help clarify the issues at hand and to offer suggestions for solving the problem. Each meeting focuses exclusively on one case. Participants rotate in presenting cases to the group.

Program evaluation and documentation assumes that teachers want to evaluate current practices as part of an ongoing investigation of what works and what doesn't work for children. As new programs are put in place, new textbooks adopted, new practices of grouping students initiated, new approaches to instruction implemented, and alternative modes of assessment designed, teachers can collect information that will be useful in decision making in the future. Using the techniques of teacher research, an evaluation team collects data on a program or approach that the faculty as a whole has decided is worth evaluating. The evaluation team analyzes the data and presents its findings to the faculty for consideration and action. The role of the evaluation team is not to judge effectiveness, but rather to collect data for decision making by the larger faculty.

Trying out new practices with systematic support from colleagues is one way to make it easier for teachers to try and fail and try again, without beating a hasty retreat to routine and safe

ERIC

ways of doing things. As teachers become interested in content-in-context learning approaches, they may want to experiment with process writing, begin a Foxfire project, or incorporate experiential learning activities into their teaching. We have found that the closer change gets to the individual classroom, the riskier it gets. When a cadre of teachers decides to try out something together, it is easier to experiment and take risks (Little, 1986). This is the way such a cadre works: teachers commit to implement a new approach; they agree to meet regularly to discuss what is happening to them personally in their classrooms; they contract to observe each other and to provide feedback on the new practice; they agree to suspend all judgment and evaluation of themselves and others; they work together to become comfortable with what they are doing and to support each other in doing it better; they give themselves ample time to try and fail and try and succeed. In the end, they become confident of new practices and make decisions about whether to incorporate them into their existing repertoires, to modify them to suit their own needs, or to reject them as not helpful in the improvement of their own teaching.

Teacher resource centers can be easily structured within a school. A small room off the library or media center, a converted stockroom, a renovated space hidden somewhere in the building -- all will suffice. We have seen teacher resource rooms in the basements of buildings and in old rest rooms. The place doesn't matter; what matters is that there is a place for teachers to come together in the school to read professional journals, view educational videos, peruse books and catalogues, or simply engage in informal, but professional, conversation. We suspect that even in a professional practice school, there will still be the need for a traditional teachers' lounge, where people can engage in light banter and some griping as an antidote to the tensions that come with teaching. The teacher resource room, then, serves as an alternative to the lounge, with alternative norms and expectations and alternative ways for people to interact with their colleagues during the school day.

Participation in outside events and organizations is a way for teachers to make connections outside of the boundaries of the school where they work every day. Provision for teachers to visit other schools that are engaged in reform and restructuring efforts are a valuable way for people to broaden their perspectives, become infused with new energy, and consider new ideas. When teachers are actually practicing new efforts and have already accomplished success, opportunities for teaching others about how they have learned their new practice becomes another powerful means for professional development. Attendance at regional conferences is another way that teachers can reach out and connect with kindred spirits in kindred schools. Participation in partnerships with universities and businesses, involvement in coalitions with other agencies, membership in formal networks of teachers or schools are yet other avenues for growth and development.

We have presented a partial listing of the kinds of teacher development activities that can take place as part of the general organization of a professional practice school. We want to make it clear that none of the approaches we suggest is an "add on"; none is initiated outside of the worklife concerns of teachers; none is designed for people by someone else. Each, we think, contributes to the development of a new school culture; each acknowledges that the major goal of teacher development is continuous inquiry into practice.

Teacher Development -- Changing Student and Adult Working Conditions

Our view of teacher development ends where it began, recognizing that the engagement of teachers in the creation of professional practice schools cannot be isolated from the larger vision of creating schools that work for all students. This means that the entire school is involved in discussion and action around the issues of teaching and learning, such as the new knowledge about how students learn, understanding the diverse and multicultural populations of students, as well as developing sensitivities to their changing cultural contexts -- all of which call for new ways of thinking about and organizing teaching so that students are enabled to participate in their own learning.

Teachers, long engaged in private struggles -- successful and unsuccessful -- with their students, need to create and work in collective and collaborative structures. The isolated classroom must give way to a genuine colleagueship as the insulated school must expand to include the whole community. This means that the workplace for both students and adults must change, for they are intimately connected with each other. We know that teacher development involves teachers in learning about how to work together, how to make collective decisions, and how to structure continuous opportunities for their own growth. But at the same time, teachers must be involved in continuous new learnings about students -- their motivation, engagement, connection, and experience -- through practicing new ways of teaching and providing for new ways of student learning. These two strands represent two distinct parts of teacher development, each part taking time, energy, and new knowledge.

We are cautious about saying that if changes are made in the adult workplace environment there will be positive changes in the student learning environment -- or vice versa.

The two environments are connected only if connections are explicitly made. It is possible for teachers to participate on school site committees, be involved in greater decision making, learn how to deal with conflict and negotiate contracts for greater teacher participation in the running of a school, without changing what goes on in classrooms or teams. And conversely, it is possible for several teachers to have classrooms characterized by cooperative learning teams, student-centered learning, and a major focus on problem-solving activities *without* addressing the need for schoolwide structures that promote collegiality and continuous inquiry, which in turn support efforts to improve learning for students.

We are optimistic because professional practice schools can indeed value, promote, organize, and practice teacher development by explicitly connecting to student development. Professional practice schools can provide a variety of learning environments for students as active learners and a workplace environment for the adults, rich in continuous inquiry, peer discussion, and increased opportunities for adult learning.

References

Buchanan, J., Edelsky, C., Kanevsky, R., Klausner, E., Lieberman, G., Mintier, J., Mantoya, B., Morris, E., Strieb, L., and Wice, B. (1984). "On Becoming Teacher Experts: Buying Time," *Language Arts 61* (7): 731-36.

Cooper, M. (1988). "Whose Culture Is It, Anyway?" In A. Lieberman (ed.), *Building a Professional Culture in Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Derrington, L. (1989). *The Role of The Principal: Tradition, Transition, and Transformation*. (unpublished dissertation). Seattle: University of Washington.

Devaney, K. and Sykes, G. (1988). "Making the Case for Professionalism," In A. Lieberman (ed.), *Building a Professional Culture in Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Edelfelt, R.A. and Lawrence, G. (1975). "In-service Education: The State of the Art," In R.A. Edelfelt and M. Johnson (eds.), *Rethinking In-service Education*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Elkind, D. (1989). "Developmentally Appropriate Practice: Philosophical and Practical Applications," *Phi Delta Kappan 71* (2): 113-17.

Goodlad, J. (1975). *The Dynamics of Educational Change*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hall, G. and Loucks, S. (1979). "Teacher Concerns a Basis for Facilitating and Personalizing Staff Development," In A. Lieberman and L. Miller (eds.), *Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lambert, L. (1988). "Staff Development Redesigned," *Phi Delta Kappan 69* (9): 665-8.

Lieberman, A. and Miller, L. (1979). "The Social Realities of Teaching," In A. Lieberman and L. Miller (eds.), *Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A. and Miller, L. (1984). *Teachers, Their World and Their Work: Implications For School Improvement*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Little, J.W. (1981). *School Success and Staff Development in Urban Desegregated Schools*. Boulder, CO: Center For Action Research.

Little, J.W. (1986). "Seductive Images and Organizational Realities in Professional Development," In A. Lieberman (ed.), *Rethinking School Improvement: Research, Craft and Practice*. New

ERIC

York: Teachers College Press.

McLaughlin, M. and Marsh, D. (1979). "Staff Development and School Change," In A. Lieberman and L. Miller (eds.), *Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Miller, L. (1992). "Curriculum Work as Staff Development," In W. Pink and A. Hyde (eds.), *Effective Staff Development for a Change*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Myers, M. (1989). *Teacher Research: A Policy Perspective*. San Francisco: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association.

Parker, L.A. (1979). *Networks for Innovation and Problem Solving and Their Use For Improving Education: A Comparative View*. Washington, DC: Dissemination Process Seminar, IV.

Rosenholtz, S. (1989). *Teachers' Workplace*. New York: Longman.

Sarason, S. (1982). *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*, 2nd edition. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Schaeffer, R.J. (1967). *The School as a Center of Inquiry*. New York: Harper and Row.

Schlechty, P. and Joslin, A. (1986). "Images of Schools," In A. Lieberman (ed.), *Rethinking School Improvement: Research, Craft and Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Schon, D. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Schon, D. (1987). *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. (1987). "The Theoretical Basis for Cultural Leadership," In L. Sheive and M. Schoenhert (eds.), *Leadership: Examining the Elusive*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Soo Hoo, S. (1989). *Teacher Researcher: Emerging Change Agent*. San Francisco: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Wasley, P. (1989). *The Reform Rhetoric and Real Practice: A Study of Lead Teachers*. (unpublished dissertation). Seattle: University of Washington.

Wigginton, E. (1989). "Foxfire Grows Up," *Harvard Education Review 59* (1): 24-29.

ERIC

Accountability for Professional Practice

Linda Darling-Hammond

This article first appeared in *Teachers College Record 91*, (1): 59-80.
It is reprinted here with the permission
of the author and *Teachers College Record*.

It was originally commissioned by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), Education Issues Department, as part of a grant from the Exxon Foundation on the conceptualization of professional practice schools.

ERIC

Introduction

The issue of educational accountability is probably the most pressing and most problematic of any facing the public schools today. Gone are the days when a local town council hired the village schoolmaster and fired him at will for any cause. Gone, too, are the days when schoolteachers were so respected in their office that anything within the schoolroom walls was accepted as the rightful and unquestioned prerogative of school officials. A more highly educated populace has greater expectations of schools, and a more knowledge-oriented economy raises both the costs and benefits of school success or failure. Today, schools are being held accountable by politicians, the general public, and parents for results they should be expected to produce and, often, for results over which they have little or no control.

In recent debates about improving American schools and increasing accountability, the professionalization of teaching has surfaced as a prominent strategy now being pursued in a variety of ways by policy makers and practitioners across the country. Though many changes in the areas of teacher preparation, certification, and compensation have accompanied the reform discussions, many questions remain regarding how schools should operate to sustain and nourish effective teaching based on professional norms and understandings.

At the same time, concerns for school accountability are as pronounced as they have ever been in our nation's history. Policy makers want to find ways to ensure that students learn, and they struggle to find a lever that will penetrate a giant, fragmented system engaged in a difficult and complex undertaking. If the promises of professionalism are to bear fruit, the contributions of professional accountability to improved education must be activated in concrete ways in schools.

In this article, I explore the contributions of professionalism to school accountability in the context of a new phenomenon in American education: the professional development school. Such schools, in their infancy in more than a dozen cities around the country, are intended -- like teaching hospitals -- to model state-of-the-art practice while simultaneously refining and spreading it. They are to be places where experts train and socialize novices, where research and theory are translated into practice, and where practical knowledge is translated into research and theory. Such schools are, in short, the harbingers of an accountable profession as they assume the mission of testing, transmitting, and further advancing the ethical norms and knowledge-based standards of professional practice. As models of professional practice, these schools should become models of professional accountability as well.

The Goals of Accountability

In the current debates about accountability, cacophony rules. There is little agreement, and perhaps even less clear thinking, about what accountability means, to whom it is owed, and how it can be operationalized. Many policy makers seem to equate accountability with something like the monitoring of student test scores, averaged for classrooms, schools, or school districts. Some believe that accountability can be enacted by statutes prescribing management procedures, tests, or curricula. Unfortunately, these approaches to accountability leave the student, the parent, the teacher, and the educational process entirely out of the equation. The production of a test score or a management scheme does not touch the issue of whether a student's educational interests are being well served.

We need to begin to articulate what we mean by accountability, and in particular, what we mean by professional accountability. I suggest here that a meaningful system of accountability for public education should do three things: It should (1) *set educationally meaningful and defensible standards* for what parents and members of the general public rightfully can expect of a school system, school, or teacher; (2) *establish reasonable and feasible means* by which these standards can be implemented and upheld; and (3) *provide avenues for redress or corrections in practice* when these standards are not met, so that ultimately students are well served.

Within this framework, I will explore how current systems of accountability are structured and how they would need to be changed to provide honest and useful vehicles for accountability in the context of schools intended to promote professional practice in teaching.

Models of Accountability

Social transactions in our society are managed in a variety of ways, ultimately subject to democratic control. Through legislative bodies, the populace can decide whether an activity should be a subject of government regulation and where that regulation should begin and end. When legislative government involvement has been eschewed or limited, control of an activity may revert, in whole or in part, to professional bodies, courts, or private individuals in their roles as clients, consumers, or citizens.

In any of these instances, accountability mechanisms are chosen to safeguard the public interest. These include at least the following:

Political accountability. Elected officials must stand for reelection at regular

intervals so that citizens can judge the representatives of their views and the responsiveness of their decisions.

Legal accountability. Courts must entertain complaints about violations of laws enacted by representatives of the public and of citizens' constitutionally granted rights, which may be threatened either by private or legislative action.

Bureaucratic accountability. Agencies of government promulgate rules and regulations intended to assure citizens that public functions will be carried out in pursuit of public goals voiced through democratic or legal processes.

Professional accountability. Governments may create professional bodies and structures to ensure competence and appropriate practice in occupations that serve the public and may delegate certain decisions about occupational membership, standards, and practices to these bodies.

Market accountability. Governments may choose to allow clients or consumers to choose what services best met their needs; to preserve the utility of this form of accountability, monopolies are prevented, freedom of choice is protected, and truthful information is required of service providers.

All of these accountability mechanisms have their strengths and weaknesses, and each is more or less appropriate to certain types of activities. Political mechanisms can support the public establishment of general policy directions in areas subject to direct government control. Legal mechanisms are most useful when rights or proscriptions are clearly definable and when establishing the facts is all that is needed to trigger a remedy. Bureaucratic mechanisms are most appropriate when a standard set of practices or procedures can be easily linked to behavioral rules that will produce the desired outcomes. Market mechanisms are helpful when consumer preferences vary widely, when the state does not have a direct interest in controlling choice, and when government control would be counterproductive to innovation. Professional mechanisms are most important when safeguards for consumer choice are necessary to serve the public interest, but the technology of the work is uniquely determined by individual client needs and a complex and changing base of knowledge.

There are, of course, incentives in any of these systems for individuals to shirk their missions or for functional inadequacies to impair performance. (Public servants may use their positions for private gain; courts may become overloaded; bureaucrats may fail to follow regulations; professionals may overlook incompetence; markets may break down due to regulatory or economic failures.) These problems can, presumably, be addressed by efforts to make the systems work more perfectly, often by overlaying another accountability mechanism against the first as a check and balance, for example, enacting an ethics in government law that adds legal accountability vehicles to the electoral process for governing the actions of public officials.

Even when such mechanisms function perfectly, however, any given mode of

accountability has intrinsic limits that must be weighed in the choice of which to use under varying circumstances. Electoral accountability does not allow citizens to judge each specific action of officials; nor does it necessarily secure the constitutional rights or preferences of citizens whose views and interests are in the minority. Legal accountability cannot be used in all cases: The reach of courts is limited to that which can be legislated; not all citizens have access to courts, and they are buffered from public opinion. Bureaucratic accountability does not guarantee results, it concerns itself with procedures; it is effective only when procedures are known to produce the desired outcomes, and when compliance is easily measured and secured. Professional accountability does not take public preferences into account; it responds to an authority outside the direct reach of citizens and may satisfy its purposes while ignoring competing public goals. Market accountability does not ensure citizens' access to services and relies on the spontaneous emergence of a variety of services to allow choice to operate as a safety valve for poor service provision.

Because of these intrinsic limits, no single form of accountability operates alone in any major area of public life. Hybrid forms are developed to provide checks and balances and to more carefully target vehicles for safeguarding the public interest toward the particular matters they can best address. The choices of accountability tools -- and the balance among different forms of accountability -- are constantly shifting as problems emerge, as social goals change, and as new circumstances arise.

Accountability in Education

In education, it is easy to see that legal and bureaucratic forms of accountability have expanded their reach over the past twenty years, while electoral accountability has waxed and waned (with local and state boards operating with reduced authority in some instances, and the purviews of elected and appointed officials shifting in many states). Market accountability is more often discussed as a possibly useful vehicle, but still rarely used, except in a few districts that offer magnet schools or other schools of choice. Professional accountability is gaining in prominence as an idea of strengthening teaching quality, but it is as yet poorly defined and partially at odds with other forms of accountability currently in use.

Bureaucratic Accountability

Bureaucratic organization and management of schools has increased since the early part of this century, when "scientific management" principles were first introduced into urban schools in an effort to standardize and rationalize the process of schooling. The view underlying this approach to managing schools is as follows: Schools are agents of government that can be administered by hierarchical decision making and controls. Policies are made at the top of the system and handed down to administrators, who translate them

into rules and procedures. Teachers follow the rules and procedures (such as class schedules, curricula, textbooks, and rules for promotion and assignment of students), and students are processed according to them.

This approach is intended to foster equal and uniform treatment of clients and standardization of products or services and to prevent arbitrary or capricious decision making. It works reasonably well when goals are agreed on and clearly definable, when procedures are straightforward and feasible to implement, and when following these procedures is known to produce the desired outcomes in all cases. Bureaucratic accountability ensures that rules will be promulgated and compliance with these rules will be monitored. The promise that bureaucratic accountability mechanisms make is that violators of the rules will be apprehended, and consequences will be administered for noncompliance.

When bureaucratic forms are applied to the management of teaching, they rely on a number of assumptions:

- That students are sufficiently standardized so that they will respond in identical and predictable ways to the "treatments" devised by policy makers and their principal agents.
- That sufficient knowledge of which treatments should be prescribed is both available and generalizable to all educational circumstances.
- That this knowledge can be translated into standardized rules for practice, which can be operationalized through regulations and reporting and inspection systems.
- That administrators and teachers can and will faithfully implement prescriptions for practice thus devised and transmitted to schools.

The circular, bottom-line assumption is that this process, if efficiently administered, will produce the outcomes the system desires. If the outcomes are not satisfactory, the final assumption is that the prescriptions are not yet sufficiently detailed or the process of implementation is not sufficiently exact. Thus, the solutions to educational problems always lie in more precise specification of educational or management processes.

In the bureaucratic model, teachers are viewed as functionaries rather than as well-trained and highly skilled professionals. Little investment is made in teacher preparation, induction, or professional development. Little time is afforded for joint planning or collegial consultation about problems of practice. Because practices are prescribed outside the school setting, there is no need and little use for professional knowledge and judgment. Thus, novice teachers assume the same responsibilities as thirty-year veterans. Separated into egg-crate classrooms and isolated by packed teaching schedules, teachers rarely work or talk together about teaching practices. A rationale for these activities is absent from the bureaucratic perspective on teaching work.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In the bureaucratic conception of teaching, teachers do not need to be highly knowledgeable about learning theory and pedagogy, cognitive science and child development, curriculum and assessment; they do not need to be highly skilled, because they do not, presumably, make the major decisions about these matters. Curriculum planning is done by administrators and specialists; teachers are to implement a curriculum planned for them. Inspection of teachers' work is conducted by hierarchical superiors, whose job it is to make sure that the teacher is implementing the curriculum and procedures of the district. Teachers do not plan or evaluate their own work; they merely perform it.

Accountability is achieved by inspections and reporting systems intended to ensure that the rules and procedures are being followed. Teachers are held accountable for implementing curricular and testing policies, grading policies, assignment and promotion rules, and myriad other educational prescriptions, whether or not these treatments are appropriate in particular instances for particular students. As a consequence, teachers cannot be held accountable for meeting the needs of their students; they can only be held accountable for following standard operating procedures. The standard for accountability is compliance rather than effectiveness.

The problem with the bureaucratic solution to the accountability dilemma in education is that effective teaching is not routine, students are not passive, and questions of practice are not simple, predictable, or standardized. By its very nature, bureaucratic management is incapable of providing appropriate education for students who do not fit the mold on which all of the prescriptions for practice are based.

Public Versus Client Accountability

At present, I think it is fair to say that the use of legal and bureaucratic accountability mechanisms in education far outweighs the use of other forms, and that these mechanisms have overextended their reach for actually promoting positive practices and responsiveness to public and client needs. This statement should not be glossed over too lightly, though, for public and client needs are not identical, and positive practices are defined in the eye of the beholder. Indeed, there is a special tension in public education between the goals held by governments for public schools and the goals held by the clients of schools, for which different forms of accountability are needed. Because the needs, interests, and preferences of individual students and parents do not always converge with the needs, interests, and preferences of state or local governments, the question of accountability in education must always be prefaced by the questions "to whom?" and "for what?"

Public schools have been created primarily to meet the state's need for an educated citizenry. Indeed, public education is not so much a right accorded to students as an obligation to which they are compelled by law. State goals include (1) socialization to a common culture (education to meet social needs); (2) inculcation of basic democratic values and preparation of students to responsibly exercise their democratic rights and responsibilities (education to meet political needs); (3) preparation of students for further education, training, and occupational life (education to meet economic needs). To meet these goals, the state

further defines what type of socialization is desired, what manner of democratic preparation is to be given, and what forms of preparation -- forms useful to the state's economic goals -- are to be offered (Wise and Darling-Hammond, 1984).

Furthermore, the state has an interest in providing educational services both equitably (sometimes, this state interest has had to be enforced by courts when it is ignored by legislators) and efficiently, so that taxpayers' burdens are not excessive or their tax monies wasted. Since equity and efficiency are difficult concepts to operationalize, they cause special accountability problems for bureaucrats and professionals to resolve. They also frequently stand in conflict with the needs and interests of individual students, as for example when "same" treatment does not produce appropriate treatment, or when "efficient" education does not produce quality education.

Individual consumers (parents and students) often hold social, economic, and political goals different from those of the state government, and they very often disagree about how to pursue even the commonly held goals. Furthermore, child-oriented definitions of student "needs" rarely match state definitions, since the former are unique to the individual child, and the latter are promulgated for all children in a state, or for specified groups of children.

These definitions continually confront a tension that Thomas Green refers to as the dialectic between the "best" principle and the "equal" principle (Green, 1980). The best principle is the proposition that each student is entitled to receive the education that is best for him or her; the equal principle is the proposition that each is entitled to receive an education at least as good as (equal to) that provided for others. In translation through legal or bureaucratic vehicles, "equal to" means "the same as," since these vehicles must operate by uniform standards. Efforts to individualize instruction through these vehicles invariably must create groups of children, all of whom are then to be treated alike (hence, the tendency to create identifiable subsets of children, by age, grade level, measured ability, curriculum track, and so on). This may solve the state's problem of specifying inputs and desired outcomes, but it does not solve the student's or teacher's problem that children will still, come what may, fit untidily into the containers designed for them.

Thus, accountability for accomplishing state goals is a very different concept from accountability for accomplishing clients' goals. Indeed, accountability for meeting the needs of individual students is often in conflict -- or at least in tension -- with accountability for securing the public's preferences for education. Teachers and public school officials are the arbiters of these tensions. They strive to achieve a balance between meeting the state's goals and the needs of individual students. This requires a great deal of skill, sensitivity, and judgment, since the dilemmas posed by these two sets of goals are complex, idiosyncratic, and ever-changing.

Increasingly, though, attempts to provide public accountability have sought to standardize school and classroom procedures in the hope of finding "one best system" by which all students may be educated. Codified by law, and specified more completely by regulation, these attempts have both "teacher-proofed" and "student-proofed" schooling,

ERIC

leaving little room for innovation or improvement of education. Indeed, this approach is criticized in recent reports as having created a situation in which "everyone has the brakes but no one has the motors" to make schools run well (Carnegie Forum..., 1986).

Ironically, prescriptive policies created in the name of public accountability have begun to reduce schools' responsiveness to the needs of students and the desires of parents. In the cause of uniform treatment and in the absence of schooling alternatives, large numbers of students "fall through the cracks" when rules, routines, and standardized procedures prevent teachers from meeting individual needs. Those who can afford to do so leave for private schools. Those who cannot are frequently alienated and ill served.

The theory underlying the press for teacher professionalism is that strengthening the structures and vehicles for creating and transmitting professional knowledge will prove a more effective means for meeting students' needs and improving the overall quality of education rather than trying to prescribe educational practices from afar. This theory is based on a conception of teaching as complex, knowledge-based work requiring judgment in nonroutine situations and on a conception of learning as an interactive and individually determined process. These conceptions limit the applicability of legal and bureaucratic remedies for ensuring learning, by asserting the differential nature of effective interactions between teacher and learners that is beyond the capacity of laws and regulations to predict or prescribe.

Professional Accountability

Professionalism depends on the affirmation of three principles in the conduct and governance of an occupation:

1. Knowledge is the basis for permission to practice and for decisions that are made with respect to the unique needs of clients.

2. The practitioner pledges his or her first concern to the welfare of the client.

3. The profession assumes collective responsibility for the definition, transmittal, and enforcement of professional standards of practice and ethics.

Professionals are obligated to do whatever is best for the client, not what is easiest, more expedient, or even what the client himself or herself might want. They are also obligated to base a decision about what is best for the client on available knowledge -- not just that knowledge acquired from personal experience, but also that clinical and research knowledge acquired by the occupation as a whole and represented in professional journals, certification standards, and specialty training. Finally, professionals are required to take into account the unique needs of individual clients in fashioning their judgments about what strategies or treatments are appropriate.

These are fine goals, but how are they operationalized to result in something that

ERIC

might be called professional accountability? In policy terms, these requirements suggest greater regulation of *teachers* -- ensuring their competence through more rigorous preparation, certification, selection, and evaluation -- in exchange for the deregulation of teaching -- fewer rules prescribing what is to be taught, when, and how. This is, in essence, the bargain that all professions make with society: For occupations that require discretion and judgment in meeting the unique needs of clients, the profession guarantees the competence of members in exchange for the privilege of professional control over the work structure and standards of practice.

The theory behind this equation is that professional control improves both the quality of individual services and the level of knowledge in the profession as a whole. This occurs because decision making by well-trained professionals allows individual clients' needs to be met more precisely, and it promotes continual refinement and improvement in overall practice as effectiveness, rather than compliance, becomes the standard for judging competence.

It is important to note, too, that professional authority does not mean legitimizing the idiosyncratic or whimsical preferences of individual classroom teachers. Indeed, in other public-service occupations, autonomy is the problem that professionalism is meant to address. It is precisely *because* practitioners operate autonomously that safeguards to protect the public interest are necessary. In occupations that have become professionalized, these safeguards have taken the form of screens to membership in the profession and ongoing peer review of practice. Collective autonomy from external regulation is achieved by the assumption of collective responsibility. Responsible self-governance requires, in turn, structures and vehicles by which the profession can define and transmit its knowledge base, control membership in the occupation, evaluate and refine its practices, and enforce norms of ethical practice.

In theory, then, teacher professionalism promises a more potent form of accountability for meeting students' needs than that which courts and bureaucracies can concoct. It promises competence, an expanding knowledge base, concern for client welfare, and vehicles for enforcing these claims. In many respects, such accountability also serves the needs of the state by promoting better practice; but, because professional accountability is explicitly *client-oriented*, it will not fully represent the preferences of the general public. Hence, in working through a concept of professional accountability, we must keep in mind its limits for achieving public accountability as well as its promise.

The Nature of Accountability in Professional Practice Schools

Professional practice schools have three missions with respect to accountability.

First, they should model a professional form of accountability as it might ultimately be seen in all schools. Second, as induction centers, they implement a key accountability function for the profession as a whole. Third, as knowledge-producing institutions, they support and help to build the foundation on which professional accountability ultimately rests. These missions, as suggested by the earlier stated criteria for accountability mechanisms, require that professional development schools devote considerable attention to defining educationally meaningful *standards* of practice, creating reasonable *means* for upholding these standards, and establishing vehicles for *redress or corrections* of problems that arise.

The goals of professional accountability are to protect the public by ensuring that (1) all individuals permitted to practice in certain capacities are adequately prepared to do so responsibly; (2) where knowledge about practice exists, it will be used, and where certainty does not exist, practitioners will individually and collectively continually seek to discover the most responsible course of action; and (3) practitioners will pledge their first and primary commitment to the welfare of the client.

Preparation for Responsible Practice

The first of the goals listed above -- that *all* individuals permitted to practice are adequately prepared -- is crucial to attaining the conditions for and benefits of professionalism. So long as anyone who is not fully prepared is admitted to an occupation where autonomous practice can jeopardize the safety of clients, the public's trust is violated. So long as no floor is enforced on the level of knowledge needed to teach, a professional culture in schools cannot long be maintained, for some practitioners will be granted control and autonomy who are not prepared to exercise it responsibly.

Professional practice schools serve a crucial function in the preparation of professional teachers. They are charged with completing the initial education of prospective teachers, by ensuring that they have the tools to apply theory in practice, and by socializing them to professional norms and ethics. This mission requires (1) a conception of the understanding and capabilities to be acquired by novice teachers before they are allowed to practice autonomously; (2) means by which these understandings, including ethical and normative commitments, can be acquired with a high probability of success; and (3) safeguards to ensure that those sent forth from such schools are adequately prepared. In addition, as models of responsible professionalism, these schools must offer assurances to parents who send their children to such schools that they will not be harmed by the (literal) practice of novices.

A Conception of Teaching. In highly developed professions, the knowledge expected to be acquired in an apprenticeship or internship is decided by the profession through accrediting bodies that sanction such programs and through certification examinations that are taken after the induction experience is completed. Until such time as these professional structures are available in education, though, professional practice schools will be at the forefront of defining what it is that a teacher needs to know to safely practice without intensive supervision.

In pragmatic terms, this is where the first knotty challenge facing such schools will arise. Although professionalism starts from the proposition that knowledge must inform practice, teacher education is often denounced and frequently avoided on the grounds that either it does not convey the knowledge necessary for real teaching (alternative certification plans argue that this can be acquired on the job), or that there is no knowledge base for teaching anyway. Even trained and licensed teachers will come to their first teaching experiences with variable levels and types of knowledge, given the diversity of preparation experiences and the disparate standards for licensure both within and across states.

In wrestling with a conception of teaching knowledge, then, professional practice schools will form an implicit conception of their curriculum that must be based on assumptions -- sure to be violated -- about what novice teachers might already be expected to know. Even before they have begun, such schools will have to decide whether they will assume the mission of preparing, sometimes from "scratch," the unprepared, or whether they will develop some type of admissions standard that approximates a level of knowledge upon which they feel they can successfully build. A possible middle ground is that the school will diagnose novices' knowledge at entry, requiring supplemental coursework in specific areas where a minimal understanding of rudiments of content or pedagogy has not yet been acquired.

This is more than an academic question, particularly for large city school systems, which have many new entrants admitted on emergency or alternative certificates without prior teacher education, and others who are hired to teach in fields for which they have not had complete subject matter preparation. The choices made in this regard will determine in many respects what methods of preparation and levels of responsibility will be suitable for novice teachers.

There are many possible statements about what kinds of understandings and capabilities professional development schools should seek to exemplify and impart. Shulman, for example, classifies the elements of teaching knowledge as follows:

- Content knowledge.

- General pedagogical knowledge, with special reference to those broad principles and strategies of classroom management and organization that appear to transcend subject matter.

- Curriculum knowledge, with particular grasp of the materials and programs that serve as "tools of the trade" for teachers.

- Pedagogical content knowledge, that special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding.

- Knowledge of learners and their characteristics.

ERIC

- Knowledge of educational contexts, ranging from the workings of the group or classroom, the governance and financing of school districts, to the character of communities and cultures.

- Knowledge of educational ends, purposes, and values, and their philosophical and historical grounds (Shulman, 1987).

To this list, I would add a grounding in professional ethics, so that teachers can responsibly resolve dilemmas of teaching practice. The goal, as Shulman puts it, "is not to indoctrinate or train teachers to behave in prescribed ways, but to educate teachers to reason soundly about their teaching as well as to perform skillfully" (Shulman, 1987).

Whatever the precise definition of knowledge that is arrived at, the professional development school must have in mind what its expectations are for the understandings that undergird professional practice. It is on this basis that the school selects its staff, develops its program for induction, and assesses whether novices have been adequately prepared to practice autonomously.

Structuring Professional Practice. The basic task here is constructing an organization that will seek, transmit, and use knowledge as a basis for teaching decisions and that will support inquiry and consultation and maintain a primary concern for student welfare. Because knowledge is constantly expanding, problems of practice are complex, and ethical dilemmas result from conflict between legitimate goals, the establishment of professional norms cannot be satisfied by prescriptions for practice or unchanging rules of conduct. Instead, the transmission of these norms must be accomplished by socialization to a professional standard that incorporates continual learning, reflection, and concern with the multiple effects of one's actions on others as fundamental aspects of the professional role.

For a professional development school, the accountability dilemmas associated with structuring practice are at least twofold:

1. How can the school guarantee that novices are given adequate preparation?

2. How can the school encourage the use of appropriate practices for all children it serves?

The induction mission of the schools ought to warrant that those working with new teachers are themselves exemplars of good teaching; that the experiences of the new teachers will be structured to explicitly address the understandings they are expected to acquire; and that some means for assessing the progress of new teachers are used.

Faculty who are engaged in the induction of new teachers may or may not be all of the faculty employed in a professional development school. If the school is to be an exemplar of good practice, certainly all of the staff must be committed to the tenets of

ERIC

professionalism and the goals of the school. Those who are specifically charged with the preparation of new teachers must themselves meet the standards of teaching knowledge and disposition toward which new teachers strive. This suggests that these faculty will be carefully selected for their capacities to teach adults as well as children. Selection should be conducted by other teaching professionals according to the standards earlier defined. If the school is to model professional accountability, selection by peers according to professional standards is a fundamental feature of the professionalization process.

What distinguishes the form of professional preparation envisioned here from the usual approaches to teacher induction is that, because a standard of practice is envisioned and articulated, haphazard or idiosyncratic training and experiences will be insufficient to guarantee that the standard has been met. Consequently, pairing of a beginning teacher with a mentor in a single class setting is not adequate to the task. The school must structure the experiences of beginning teachers so that they encounter a range of teaching situations and acquire a set of teaching and decision-making abilities. This suggests that the school has an explicit curriculum for beginning teachers composed of (1) formal instructional experiences, such as seminars, clinical conferences, readings, and observations of other teachers; and (2) clinical experiences in which the beginning teacher, under supervision, systematically encounters and examines the major domains of teaching knowledge.

In order to safeguard the welfare of students and facilitate the learning of novice teachers, beginning teachers should not have sole responsibility for a standard teaching load; they need to be given an appropriate and graduated degree of responsibility for teaching students and the opportunity to review major teaching decisions with expert faculty. Indeed, important decisions about students should not be made in isolation. The requirement for consultation is both a protection for students and a means for transmitting knowledge; it is also a means for socializing new teachers to norms of inquiry and collaboration.

In addition, beginning teachers should acquire experience with a variety of students and types of classes. To develop generalizable teaching skills and the ability to exercise judgment in diverse teaching situations, new teachers should learn to work with students at different cognitive stages and performance levels, from differing family backgrounds, and in different subject areas within the disciplinary or grade-level domain.

Finally, accountability for performing the training mission must be secured by assessing new teachers' progress toward the acquisition of professional knowledge and norms of conduct. Such assessment should be the basis for decisions about according additional responsibility for students to developing teachers and about "certifying" that novices are sufficiently prepared at the close of their experience to practice autonomously. At minimum, this process should include frequent feedback to new teachers, establishment of opportunities to acquire those skills not yet adequately mastered, and consultation at regular intervals.

The conditions for responsible practice in a professional development school obviously must include structures that promote inquiry and consultation among the faculty as a whole, not just those immediately engaged in supervising novices. Teacher isolation

promotes idiosyncratic practice and works against the development and transmission of shared knowledge. Changing the egg-crate classroom structure and the groupings of students and teachers that maintain isolation will require major changes in teaching arrangements to promote team efforts and legitimize shared time. Many possibilities for reorganizing instruction, such as those pursued in the Coalition of Essential Schools and other similar initiatives,[1] can be considered. With respect to the accountability question, several features of school structure are particularly important:

- The extent to which the organization of instruction fosters responsibility for individual students, that is, client-oriented accountability.

- The extent to which the school structure fosters the use of professional knowledge beyond that represented in the experiences of individual teachers.

- The extent to which the school structure supports continual self-evaluation and review of practice.

Client-oriented accountability requires that teachers primarily teach *students* rather than teaching *courses*, that they attend more to learning than to covering a curriculum. If teachers are to be responsible for students and for learning, they must have sufficient opportunities to come to know students' minds, learning styles, and psychological dispositions, and they must be able to focus on student needs and progress as the benchmark for their activities. This seems obvious, but it is improbable, if not impossible, as schools are now structured. The current structure assures that specific courses and curricula will be offered and students will pass through them, usually encountering different teachers from grade to grade and course to course, succeeding or failing as they may. This system does not offer accountability for student learning, only for the processing of students.

Client accountability entails at least two implications for the organization of schooling: that teachers will stay with students for longer periods of time (hours in the day and even years in the course of a school career) so that they may come to know what students' needs are, and that school problem solving will be organized around the individual and collective needs of students rather than around program definitions, grades, tracks, and labels.

Use of professional knowledge poses other requirements: that decision making be conducted on the basis of available *professionwide* knowledge, not on the basis of individual proclivity or opinion, even collective opinion. When most schools do not even stock professional journals in their libraries, the challenge implied by this requirement is profound. In addition to shared time and expectations of consultation and collective decision making, vehicles must be found for teachers in professional development schools to have access to the knowledge bases relevant to their work and to particular, immediate problems of teaching

---

[1] See, for example, R. Brandt (1988). "On Changing Secondary Schools: A Conversation with Ted Sizer," ***Educational Leadership*** ***45***: 30—36.

ERIC

practice. Links to universities and access to professional development opportunities go part way toward solving this problem, but more is needed. Professional practice schools may need to create their own research teams to examine and augment available knowledge if practice is to be thus grounded.

Research in the professional development school setting serves an important function for the development of knowledge, but it poses dangers as well. Experimentation can harm students, if it is conducted without care and appropriate safeguards. Too much innovation for its own sake can result in faddism and a lack of a coherent philosophy over time and across classrooms in a school. Thus, research in the professional development school must also be subject to careful faculty deliberation as to its necessity, desirability, and probable effects on children; to monitoring while in progress; and to the informed consent of parents.

Finally, ongoing review of practice is central to the operation of professional organizations. This evaluative function serves the joint purposes of monitoring organizational activities and establishing a continuous dialogue about problems of practice among the practitioners themselves. The very distant analogue in school systems is program evaluation, an activity generally conducted by central office researchers who report findings to government sponsors and school board members. Teachers are neither the major producers nor consumers of such information. Hence, neither they nor their students are the major beneficiaries of such evaluation results.

Teachers must wrestle with and take responsibility for resolving immediate, concrete problems of teaching practice if teaching lore is ever to be transformed into meaningful professional standards. One could envision many methods for achieving this. Standing committees such as those used in hospitals could meet regularly to review practices in various subject areas or grade levels, or to examine other functional areas: academic progress; grading policies; student and teacher assignments to particular courses, programs or teams; development of student responsibility; organization of instruction; and so on. Or more flexible approaches might be tried. *Ad hoc* research committees might be formed to examine particular problems, both as they manifest in the school and as they have been addressed by research. Faculty meetings could be used to investigate curricular strategies and other matters within and across departments or grade levels. What is critical is that teachers have both time to pursue these evaluations as part of their role (rather than as "released" or extracurricular time) and authority to make changes based on their collective discoveries.

One other point is worth making here: These evaluative and decision-making functions should be engaged in by all of the teachers within the school, including the novices in training. Some proposals for "teacher leadership" envision a small cadre of lead teachers or master teachers who partake of administrative decision-making authority, while everyone else goes on about their work. The trickle-down theory of expertise does not presume a professional standard for all teachers; professional accountability does. Teachers will learn to weigh and balance considerations, to inquire, consult, and make collaborative decisions, and to use and develop teaching knowledge to the extent that they are expected to do so.

ERIC

Socialization into these norms of inquiry and collaboration must be part of the preparation of beginning teachers and part of the daily life of all teachers if they are to begin to permeate the profession.

Safeguards for Professional Practice. Even with all of the professional accountability mechanisms described above, there are dangers that the needs of some students will not be diagnosed or fully met, that the concerns or preferences of parents will be inadequately attended to, that through the continual juggling of multiple and competing goals some will be lost in the effort to secure others. Members of a profession, while setting their own standards, cannot seal themselves off too tightly from public scrutiny or from their clientele. When they do, they endanger their rights to self-governance, as other professions have discovered in recent years.

A number of means for providing safeguards and voice for clients and the public will have to be considered and shaped to fit the requirements for a professional development school:

- Hierarchical regulation, which expresses the contract made between a state or district and its populace.

- Personnel evaluation, which establishes avenues for ensuring faculty competence.

- Participation and review procedures for parents, which create clear and meaningful avenues for expression of parent views and concerns.

- Reporting vehicles, which transmit the accomplishments of students in the school to parents and the general public.

Standard practices in each of these areas are inadequate to provide genuine accountability. In many cases, standard practice also undermines professional practice. New contracts must be forged with states, districts, teacher associations, parents, and the public. A full exploration of the content of these new contracts is beyond the scope of this article, but the nature of the terrain is sketched briefly in what follows.

The problems associated with hierarchical regulation of teaching have been articulated earlier. In school bureaucracies, authority for decisions and responsibility for practice are widely separated, usually by many layers of hierarchy. Boards and central administrators make decisions while teachers, principals, and students are responsible for carrying them out. It is for this reason that accountability for results is hard to achieve. When the desired outcomes of hierarchically imposed policies are not realized, policy makers blame the schoolpeople responsible for implementation; practitioners blame their inability to devise or pursue better solutions on the constraints of policy. No one can be fully accountable for the results of practice when authority and responsibility are dispersed.

ERIC

Yet policy makers have a responsibility to ensure fairness in the delivery of educational services, and district officials are liable for the actions of schools residing within their jurisdictions. Not all regulations can be dispensed with in the cause of professional practice. A heuristic is needed for sorting those regulations that must be observed from those that must be renegotiated or waived. As a first step, it is useful to divide responsibilities into those that must be centrally administered and those that, by their nature, cannot be effectively administered in a hierarchical fashion.

Wise offers a useful distinction between *equity* and *productivity* concerns. The former generally must be resolved by higher units of governance, since they:

> arise out of the conflicting interests of majorities and minorities and of the powerful and powerless. Because local institutions are apparently the captives of majoritarian politics, they intentionally and unintentionally discriminate. Consequently, we must rely upon the policymaking system to solve problems of inequity in the operating education system (Wise, 1979).

On the other hand, productivity questions cannot be solved by regulation, since the appropriate use of teaching knowledge is highly individualized, while policies are necessarily uniform and standardized. Thus, policy decisions about methods of teaching and schooling processes cannot ever meet the demands of varying school and student circumstances. These require renegotiation for the accommodation of professional practice.

Personnel evaluation, by this rubric, falls in the domain of professional determination. This could lead to its substantial improvement or to its avoidance and demise. This is a critical function of a profession, as the first promise a profession makes is supervision of competence to practice. The shortcomings of traditional evaluation practices and the outlines of more productive professional practices are described in detail elsewhere (see Darling-Hammond, 1986). In brief, these entail increased peer involvement in design and implementation of evaluation, and separation of the processes for encouraging professional learning from those for making personnel decisions (by committee and with attention to objectivity and due process safeguards). All of this is more easily said than done, however, and the resolution of issues regarding collective bargaining relationships, appropriate roles for administrators and teachers, and political turf battles will require courage and leadership from teachers.

Parent voice is particularly important and problematic for a professional development school. In the first place, the unique qualities of the school will be uncomfortable for some parents. In addition, professional practice must be guided to the extent possible, by knowledge, even where that conflicts with client preferences. On the other hand, best practice is never absolute or fully informed by research; it is a matter of judgment and frequently unique to the individual child, about whom the parent has substantial knowledge. The multiple goals of schooling will often stand in tension with one another. Parents must have a voice in determining the balance among goals as they are compelled by the state to entrust their children to schools. Thus, parent voice must be secured in a fashion that few

ERIC

schools have yet managed.

The first requirement, I believe, is that professional development schools must, for their clientele as well as their faculties, be schools of choice. No child should be compelled by neighborhood residence or other criterion to attend the school, although attendance should be open for those in the community who desire it. This both safeguards the rights of parents and students to voice their preferences for a form of education with which they feel comfortable and protects the school from the task of satisfying a clientele that might otherwise have widely differing and even opposing points of view. It also provides the school with information, legitimacy, and a form of external review. If schools of choice are chosen, they are legitimized; if they are not, self-examination is required.

Beyond choice, which is the easy part of the answer, parent voice can be fostered by (1) school structures for shared governance; (2) accessible review and appeals processes; and (3) parent involvement in decision making about individual children. Structures for shared governance, such as school-community councils, can provide a vehicle for the shared interests of the parent community to find legitimized and regular expression in the school context. Perhaps the most proactive form of shared governance among parents, teachers, and administrators is seen in Salt Lake City, where decision-making turf that is the joint domain of parents and faculty (e.g., the school schedule, discipline policies, and curricular emphases) is delegated to councils for determination by consensus and parity vote (Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein, 1984).

Mechanisms for review and appeal of specific concerns and complaints by a neutral third party supplement the shared governance mechanism, by providing a clear avenue for the resolution of individual problems. These mechanisms also provide information and external review for the school as a whole. Finally, the expectation that parents will be included in discussions of important decisions concerning their children prevents the insulation of the professional decision-making process from exposure to the real-world circumstances and concerns of families and communities.

The issue that most ties knots in discussions of accountability is the question of how individual and school expectations and accomplishments can be transmitted in an educationally productive manner to parents, students, and the public at large. Because school goals are numerous, diffuse, and difficult to quantify, simple statements of objectives and results can never completely capture what schools do or what their students accomplish. The counterproductive outcomes for instruction of mindlessly adopting simple performance measures, such as averages of student achievement test scores, have been well documented (Haney and Madaus, 1986; Darling-Hammond and Wise, 1985). Though less discussed, even student grading mechanisms can work against student success. The assumption behind grading schemes that students are to be ranked against each other and that their accomplishments can be captured in a single letter or number can trivialize the educational strivings of individual students and undermine their motivation and self-esteem, activating the Pygmalion principle rather than supporting learning.

Yet reporting vehicles serve an important accountability function by giving information to parents and policy makers about school practices and student progress. The press for such information is increasing and cannot be avoided. Professional practice schools must be at the forefront of efforts to devise educationally productive means for reporting what they and their students do. Untangling this knotty problem is well beyond the scope of this article, but I can point to a few promising directions.

Recent emphasis in a few school restructuring efforts on "high-fidelity" representations of student accomplishments -- demonstrations, exhibitions, and projects, for example -- seeks more valid and less artificial tools for educational assessment. Narrative reports of student progress accompanied by cumulative portfolios can better represent what a student has learned than a letter grade. Such forms also better represent what the teacher and school have sought to accomplish by depicting the form of instruction as well. Much can be learned from the assessment systems of other countries, which stress these kinds of representations of learning as a means for both reporting outcomes and supporting meaningful and useful education.[2]

Ultimately, though, to satisfy the press for public accountability, entirely new means of reporting the aggregate accomplishments of students in a school will need to be developed. This puzzle is one that professional development schools will undoubtedly encounter before they, or the profession, have developed a complete answer to it.

Postscript

Professional accountability seeks to support practices that are client-oriented and knowledge-based. It starts from the premise that parents, when they are compelled to send their children to a public school, have a right to expect that they will be under the care of competent people who are committed to using the best knowledge available to meet the individual needs of those children. This is a different form of accountability than that promised by legal and bureaucratic mechanisms, which assure that when goals have been established, rules will be promulgated and enforced.

Professional accountability assumes that, since teaching work is too complex to be hierarchically prescribed and controlled, it must be structured so that practitioners can make

---

[2] See, for example, D. A. Archbald and F. M. Newmann (1988). *Beyond Standardized Testing: Assessing Achievement in the Secondary School.* Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals; Educational Testing Service (1988). *Assessment in the Service of Learning.* Princeton, NJ: author; B. Fong (1987). *The External Approach to Assessment.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education; and C. Burstall (Spring, 1986). "Innovative Forms of Assessment: A United Kingdom Perspective," *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, pp. 17-22.

responsible decisions, both individually and collectively. Accountability is provided by rigorous training and careful selection, serious and sustained internships for beginners, meaningful evaluation, opportunities for professional learning, and ongoing review of practice. By such means, professionals learn from each other, norms are established and transmitted, problems are exposed and tackled, parents' concerns are heard, and students' needs are better met.

In such a system, parents can expect that no teacher will be hired who has not had adequate training in how to teach; no teacher will be permitted to practice without supervision until he or she has mastered the professional knowledge base and its application; no teacher will be granted tenure who has not fully demonstrated his or her competence; and no decision about students will be made without adequate knowledge of good practice in light of students' needs. Establishing professional norms of operation, by the vehicles outlined above, creates as well a basis for parent input and standards and methods for redress of unsuitable practice that do not exist in a bureaucratic system of school administration.

This work is not easy, and will not be accomplished quickly. As Clark and Meloy have noted:

> We counsel patience in the development of and experimentation with new organizational forms. We have been patient and forgiving of our extant form. Remember that new forms will also be ideal forms. Do not press them immediately to their point of absurdity. Bureaucracy as an ideal form became tempered by adjectival distinctions -- bounded, contingent, situational. New forms need to be granted the same exceptions as they are proposed and tested. No one seriously imagines a utopian alternative to bureaucracy. But realistic alternatives can be formed that consistently trade off control for freedom, the organization for the individual. And they can be built upon the principle of the consent of the governed (Clark and Meloy, 1987).

This, in sum, is the challenge that faces professional development schools.

ERIC

References

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986). *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.* New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Clark, D.L. and Meloy, J.M. (1987). "Recanting Bureaucracy: A Democratic Structure for Leadership in Schools" (unpublished manuscript). Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1986). "A Proposal for Evaluation in the Teaching Profession," *The Elementary School Journal 86* (4): 1-21.

Darling-Hammond, L. and Wise, A.E. (1985). "Beyond Standardization: State Standards and School Improvement," *The Elementary School Journal 85* (3): 315-36.

Green, T.F. (1980). *Predicting the Behavior of the Educational System.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Haney, W. and Madaus, G. (1986). "Effects of Standardized Testing and the Future of the National Assessment of Educational Progress." Working paper for the NAEP Study Group, Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation, and Educational Policy. Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College.

Shulman, L. (1987). "Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform," *Harvard Educational Review 57* (1): 8.

Wise, A.E. (1979). *Legislated Learning.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wise, A.E. and Darling-Hammond, L. (1984). "Education by Voucher: Private Choice and the Public Interest," *Educational Theory 34* (1): 29-47.

Wise, A.E., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M.W., and Bernstein, H.T. (1984). *Teacher Education: A Study of Effective Practices.* Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.

ERIC

Networks for Educational Change: Powerful and Problematic

Ann Lieberman
Milbrey M. McLaughlin

This paper first appeared in *Phi Delta Kappan*, *73* (9): 673-677.
It is reprinted here with the permission
of the authors and ***Phi Delta Kappan***.

ERIC

Why would teachers elect to belong to yet another organization or volunteer to attend yet another meeting? What is it about networks that inspires teachers to put in extra hours and to struggle with educational change? Teachers' aversion to inservice education activities -- workshops, special skills sessions, generic staff development programs -- is legendary (Little, 1987; Lieberman and Miller, in press). Yet the popularity of networks suggests that teachers stay away from conventional staff development activities -- or attend only if required -- not because of a lack of interest in professional growth but because the inservice training formats fail to meet their needs.

Despite the significant claims that networks make on their time and energy, teachers are as vocally enthusiastic about networks as they are critical of conventional staff development ventures (Lichtenstein, McLaughlin, and Knudsen, 1992; Little and McLaughlin, 1991). Teachers choose to become active in collegial networks because they afford occasion for professional development and colleagueship and reward participants with a renewed sense of purpose and efficacy. Networks offer a way for teachers to experience growth in their careers through deepened and expanded classroom expertise and new leadership roles (Carter, 1991; Smith, 1991; Little and McLaughlin, 1991; Lichtenstein, McLaughlin and Knudsen, 1992; Lieberman, in press; Lord, 1991).

The Power of Networks

The concept of network embraces diverse activities and participants. For example, teachers in the Foxfire Teacher Outreach Network are introduced to the Foxfire philosophy in a one-week summer workshop. During this workshop teachers become active learners, participating the way students do: choosing a project, planning, doing the work, assessing the outcomes. These shared activities and experiences not only encourage teacher learning but also serve as organizing tools to keep teachers working together, sharing, and learning from one another over time. Teachers who identify with the Foxfire approach to learning try it out in their classrooms and then seek professional affiliation with the network. Thus teachers model the kinds of learning and involvement they hope to elicit from their students. During the periods between their formal regional meetings, Foxfire teachers keep in touch with one another and with the mission of their educational collaboration through publications, correspondence, and electronic communication.

The Puget Sound Educational Consortium, a school/university partnership between the University of Washington and 12 Seattle-area school districts, began with a group of teachers working on an action research project to investigate dimensions of teacher leadership (Puget Sound Educational Consortium, 1988, 1989). This undertaking eventually led to other teacher-directed activities, including a series of publications reporting the group's work and the submission of proposals for grants to support future initiatives. The consortium stimulated critical reflection on practice and made possible the collaborative construction of new roles for teachers.

Subject-matter collaboratives, such as the Urban Mathematics Collaboratives and the National

ERIC

Writing Project, were created to support teaching and learning in a particular domain. The math collaboratives focus on building a mathematics community by bringing together mathematicians from the schools, the universities, and the private sector. The National Writing Project enables teachers of writing from the K-12 and the post-secondary education systems to join in collaborative ventures.

Subject-area collaboratives focus specifically on the critical examination of practice in a particular discipline, evaluating and developing new pedagogies and deepening teachers' content knowledge. Participants find themselves involved in a professional community in which they help shape their own learning -- a privilege historically denied in staff development programs (Lieberman and Miller, in press). Teachers work with others who are struggling in similar ways to learn new material and to try out different approaches for reaching students. Many become more enthusiastic about their subject matter:

> Geometry was the thing that really turned me on to mathematics....It was so logical and so obvious, I thought God had given me the answer to the universe, in a sense....It's kind of like listening to a Beethoven symphony in a way -- this is the way it's supposed to be (Little and McLaughlin, 1991, p. 4).

Whether organized around subject matter, teaching methods, school improvement, or restructuring efforts, successful networks share common features.

Focus

Unlike the all-purpose teacher centers begun during the 1970s, effective teacher networks are not "generic." Networks select a clear focus of activity and so target a specific component of the professional community. Those who join the network establish a sense of identity through the pursuit of activities relating to their common interests and objectives.

Variety

Networks provide opportunities for colleagueship and professional growth by engaging members in varied activities, such as curriculum workshops, leadership institutes, internships, conferences, and work on reform policies. Network participants stay in touch informally through electronic bulletin boards or by telephone. This "Chinese menu" approach to professional development gives participating teachers an important measure of flexibility and self-determination. It departs radically from forums in which some outside "experts" offer a set of workshops on topics selected for their appeal to the broadest possible audience.

Networks that engage and sustain teachers' interest and commitment blend, rather than differentiate between, personal and professional, social and work-related activities. Most network functions include some social time in which teachers can relax and get to know one another outside the school setting. Indeed, some network functions are purely social, serving to reward participants for jobs well done, to mark special occasions, or to provide a ceremonial affirmation of the network

ERIC

and its purpose. This social aspect of networks is an important ingredient in establishing a climate of trust and support because it enables members to know and appreciate one another as people, not just as math teachers or science specialists.

Discourse Communities

Traditional staff development often exacerbates the already strong feeling on the part of many teachers that their own views and voices are not important -- those of the "experts" are. But networks, committed as they are to addressing the tough and enduring problems of teaching, deliberately create a discourse community that encourages exchange among the members. Being a part of the discourse community assures teachers that their knowledge of their students and of schooling is respected. Once they know this, they become committed to change, willing to take risks, and dedicated to self-improvement.

Participation in networks also gives teachers firsthand experience of the constructivist notion of teaching and learning that is central to conceptions of higher-order thinking and problem solving. When they construct ideas about practice with their colleagues, teachers act as both experts and apprentices, teachers and learners. Members of networks report an intellectual and emotional stimulation that gives them the courage to engage students differently in the classroom -- an opportunity especially valued by teachers working in urban schools.[1]

Leadership Opportunities

Networks have made a substantial contribution to the professional lives of all teachers by expanding the pool of teachers who are capable of providing leadership in diverse spheres. Those who participate in networks return to their schools with new ideas and practices and a willingness to experiment (Little and McLaughlin, 1991). They also display leadership by teaching other teachers or by becoming active in local, state, or national education reform efforts.[2] A Durham, North Carolina, teacher explains:

> The workshops and other Urban Mathematics Collaborative activities have helped me use active listening and negotiation with my students and colleagues. I am now more willing to take a leadership role when decisions have to be made, even though I do not have an official title (Madzimoyo, 1992).

If reformers can't mandate teacher commitment, motivation, and willingness to change, then

[1]See Lichtenstein, McLaughlin, and Knudsen (1992) and Little and McLaughlin (1991) for teachers' views of networks as a chance to learn how to work with students in today's classrooms, students who bring values, perspectives, and life circumstances that challenge the kinds of teaching methods and assumptions learned years ago or practiced successfully even five years ago.

[2]This perspective on the multiple dimensions of teacher leadership and the ways in which networks can commission it is elaborated in Little and McLaughlin (1991) and in Lichtenstein, McLaughlin, and Knudsen (1992).

ERIC

they must find the means to engender these attitudes. Networks provide teachers with the motivation to challenge existing practices and to grow professionally.[3]

But while networks provide the support, knowledge, and encouragement necessary for teachers to implement innovative ideas, their greatest strengths may turn out to cause their biggest difficulties. Creating an essentially new structure for teacher involvement and learning outside of teachers' workplaces results in new norms of colleagueship, a broadened view of leadership, enhanced teacher perspectives on students' needs, opportunities for teachers to be both learners and partners in the construction of knowledge, and an authentic professional voice for teachers. But the new structure is also the source of problems.

The Problems of Networks

Creating a new network, unencumbered by bureaucratic restrictions and free of traditional forms of inspection, is exciting because there is no old political or social baggage to carry and because teachers play a leading role in the venture. Unfortunately, this autonomy is no guarantee against other nagging problems.

Quality

Networks inspire teachers to construct and try out new ideas, but how can the quality of these innovations be continuously evaluated and improved? Close monitoring has not been effective in traditional staff development offerings; in the case of these new arrangements, traditional forms of oversight or evaluation are destructive of the trust, the sense of safety, and the supportive professional colleagueship that are crucial to a strong network for teachers. Yet networks need to reflect on and modify their own practices and to obtain useful feedback. Without procedures for ongoing outside review, networks can fall prey to the myopia of familiar practices and the misdirection of unchallenged assumptions.

Application

The practices and perspectives created within a network must eventually make their way into the schools if meaningful change is to occur. Ironically, the existence of a strong, vibrant network can in some cases actually impede that transfer. Networks constitute professional communities that transcend particular workplaces and draw teachers from many sites. The danger is that these extra-

[3]For example, the top three sources of teaching knowledge skills identified in a National Education Association study are the kinds of learning opportunities provided by an educational network: direct experience, consultation with other teachers, and observation of other teachers (cited in Shedd and Bacharach, 1991, p. 86).

school involvements may also draw teachers' loyalty and interest away from the school to the network itself, especially when the workplace setting is a difficult one.

The corollary to this problem is the sometimes chilly reception that network teachers encounter in their schools or departments. Teachers who belong to or are sent to join a network, even if they have legitimate credentials within their school, still have the problem of gaining support for new ideas brought in from the outside. Past reform efforts have taught us that, in order to become part of the school culture, new practices must be seen as credible and legitimate by administrators and by a critical mass of teachers. How can networks both support teacher participants in their efforts to bring new ideas and practices into their schools and protect them from potential ostracism (Clark, in Sirotnik and Goodlad, 1988)?

The Los Angeles Urban Math Collaborative responded to this dilemma by requiring that whole departments elect to participate in the network, thereby ensuring that teacher participants would have at least a moderately receptive workplace in which to try out new ideas.[4] Yet this strategy is not always successful. If the entire department is not willing to participate, then even those teachers who want to learn and change will be deprived of support for their professional growth.

Stability

Maintaining the stability of networks is a daunting prospect. Networks provide resources for teachers, giving them access to researchers, reformers, and subject-matter specialists, and introducing them to new structures or projects that provide the basis for learning. But whatever their benefits, these resources eventually become the focus of new uncertainties. How can the resources be sustained? Who will pay for them? Whose priorities do they represent? If teachers learn new ways of working with students, how can their efforts continue to be supported? Given the slow pace of change in schools, there must be some assurance that the necessary resources will be available for an extended period of time.

Foundations that fund networks see their role as providing seed money or risk capital -- not indefinite maintenance. The eventual withdrawal of such support threatens a network's survival -- as has been the case even with some of the successful networks associated with the Urban Mathematics Collaboratives, whose funding from the Ford Foundation was phased out. The withdrawal of foundation support typically puts a network in the position of having to request assistance from the very entity from which it sought independence -- the district. And the district, pressed by its own budget demands, is at best an insecure source of support, especially if it had no previous role in constructing or defining the network. Yet requiring the district to buy in at the outset is not always a good strategy either, since it risks the independence of the collaborative (Little and McLaughlin, 1991).

[4]Not surprisingly, teachers reported significant variation in the enthusiasm with which their departments volunteered to participate in the collaborative, from enthusiastic support to grudging accommodation.

Overextension

Ideas that can be transformed into activities are attractive to teachers, as are the networks that generate them. But the success of such ideas and activities in itself creates problems: The more popular the network, collaborative, or coalition, the greater the demand on its limited resources and the lower the amount of time, money, and energy it has for understanding what is being learned and how to apply it. As more and more people join, the networks soon find themselves overextended. Like a business that is successful and expands too fast, a network can expand too rapidly and risk falling into a kind of intellectual bankruptcy. But to limit membership to a level commensurate with the available material and human resources risks creating or aggravating a "them/us" divisiveness among teachers. Managing success is a fundamental problem for networks and their sponsors.

Ownership

The independence of many networks from districts or other "official" structures has been a source of strength because it has fostered teachers' sense of ownership and professional safety -- perceptions that are essential to the difficult process of unlearning old practices and acquiring new ones. For most teachers, becoming a learner means giving up some appearances of professional authority -- admitting uncertainty, admitting incomplete knowledge. Not surprisingly, teachers are hesitant to assume this vulnerable role unless they feel secure in doing so.

Many networks that are initiated by foundations, by school/university partnerships, or by national or local reform efforts come with an agenda of their own, even though they do not have a prescribed strategy, form, or duration. The success of such networks is frequently the result of strong input from teachers in the shaping of programs and practices. But as these networks develop, a consistent problem surfaces: Who controls the agenda? This question is especially pertinent when a foundation or university is paying the bill and specific goals have been determined. Since the power of these networks lies in their flexibility, the agendas are in a constant state of refinement, rather than irrevocably fixed in time or place. Sometimes, the partners with the money and/or the status become uncomfortable as teachers are emboldened to take more control.

Expanding Objectives

Most networks, while conceived with specific goals in mind, such as changing the writing process or involving teachers in learning new teaching methods, call on teachers to play roles to which they are unaccustomed. Political strategies, negotiation, policy making, and conflict are all unavoidable elements of organizational change. Subject-matter specialists or others in leadership positions in networks are not usually knowledgeable about the processes of change. Yet without this knowledge, systemic changes may be difficult to achieve, and reform efforts will be derailed. How can this kind of knowledge be made accessible, and who will teach it? How can the process of creating, implementing, and sustaining change become part of the focus of networks?

Leadership

Network failures are usually linking failures. Effective networks require the clear assignment of responsibility for managing the network, orchestrating its activities, brokering resources from diverse segments of the community, and promoting and sustaining the involvement of teachers and possible partners from the private sector, from the university, and from the community. To remain effective, networks must tread a fine line between the explicit assignment of organizational responsibility and the temptation to create hierarchical structures to manage the network's growth or to respond to mandates or constraints imposed by outside funders or governmental bodies. In and of itself, hierarchical organization is not a problem. It becomes one when hierarchical structures reproduce the differences in status and authority that squelch teachers' willingness to engage seriously in educational change, when they are used to control members, or when they corrode the links between network leadership and membership.

What makes an effective network leader is also of extreme importance, and we know precious little about it. One does not normally associate bureaucrats with such qualities as being visionary, multicultural (comfortable in school and university, private sector, and general community settings), at ease with ambiguity and flexibility, knowledgeable about alternative forms of organization, action oriented, and able to nurture emergent talent. Yet this is the stuff of capable network leaders (Clark, 1988). Without leadership of this kind, networks soon become very much like the bureaucracies they are trying to change. If we do not learn more about the life histories of these leaders and the contexts within which they are learning to lead differently from managers in conventional bureaucracies, we will be unable to find and develop more of them.

Evaluation

Models of accountability or evaluation need to reflect and support the nature and power of networks. As teachers become more involved and their vision continues to grow and change as a result of learning more and doing more in real schools and classrooms, evaluation based solely on student outcomes and classroom-focused goals will fail to illuminate the total context within which teacher and student learning takes place. Traditional evaluation models that measure teachers' success by student outcomes make it more difficult for teachers to be learners as well as dispensers of knowledge. Classical measures, such as standardized tests, do not assess or take account of changes in adult and student behavior, attitudes, and learning. Funders or governmental bodies that insist on such measures inhibit the very kinds of problem solving and risk taking that impart power to teacher networks.

Goals

The success of networks turns to a significant extent on teachers' perceptions that the groups to which they belong serve their own goals -- not goals specified by some outside agent, even a friendly funding source. For example, while the Ford Foundation gave its support to local collaboratives of mathematics teachers, it did not detail specific objectives or strategies. As a result,

ERIC

each of the 15 Urban Mathematics Collaboratives has different priorities, different programmatic characteristics, and different relations with its district, with institutions of higher education, and with its community.

Funders or education policy makers must be aware that goals that are articulated outside of the network, worthy though they may be, could jeopardize the strength of the network. This observation doesn't mean that "teachers rule" or that outsiders should just write checks. But it does suggest that administrators and others outside the network must restrain the urge to use the network to further purposes other than those specified by its members.

Implications for Policy

A number of lessons can be learned from examining the conditions that generate the power of networks and from recognizing the problems that can arise in terms of policy and practice. A most important lesson is that, contrary to cynical generalizations about teachers' lack of enthusiasm for staff development efforts, teachers are willing and eager to be involved in activities that challenge them and that promote their professional growth. A related lesson is that, given this opportunity, teachers can and will make significant changes in their practices and perspectives on teaching and learning. And nowhere have these changes been more profound than in urban classrooms in which teachers are challenged by the demands of and differences among today's students (McLaughlin, Talbert, and Phelan, 1990).

The networks that promoted these changes in practice and in conceptions of professionalism illuminate a fundamental lesson for policy makers: *The context in which educational change is pursued is everything*. Many policies are based on assumptions about contexts for reform that do not take into account the alternative that networks offer. Instead of targeting individuals and attempting to provide them with new skills or perspectives, networks concentrate on building *communities of teacher/learners*. It is thus critical that policy makers and others approach teacher networks not from the standpoint of management and control, but from that of the norms and agreements of communal relations.

Furthermore, teacher networks should be viewed through an occupational rather than an organizational lens. Organizational perspectives focus on questions of administration, reporting, incentives, "delivery," and outcomes. Switching to an occupational lens moves the policy focus from a concentration on "what works" framed solely in terms of student outcomes, to an examination of the meaning of teaching for those who do it. What are the challenges of teaching? The rewards? The frustrations? The power of networks is that, by focusing on the meaning of work for teachers, networks can affect student learning -- the overarching goal of reform.

The experience of diverse networks suggests that policy can lever change more effectively if

it takes an indirect approach -- concentrating on the environments available to support and stimulate teachers' professional growth -- than if it directly tackles concerns about teachers' knowledge base and classroom competencies. In this period of intensive school reform, when traditional inservice training and staff development have been shown to be inadequate, networks can provide fresh ways of thinking about teacher learning.

ERIC

References

Bascia, N (1991). *The Trust Agreement Projects: Establishing Local Professional Cultures for Teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Carter, B. (1991). *The Stanford/Schools Collaborative: Building and Inquiring Community of Practitioners and Researchers*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago.

Clark, R. (1988). "School-university Relations: An Interpretive Review." In K. A. Sirotnik and J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fine, M. (1991). *On Charters: Creating Uncommon Communities for Urban Adolescents in Their Public High Schools*. Paper prepared for the Pew Charitable Trust.

Lichtenstein, G., McLaughlin, M. W., and Knudsen, J. (1992). "Teacher Empowerment and Professional Knowledge." In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lieberman, A. (in press). "School/University Collaboration: A View from the Inside." *Phi Delta Kappan*.

Lieberman, A., and Miller, L. (in press). "The Professional Development of Teachers." In *The Encyclopedia of Educational Research*. Chicago: Macmillan.

Little, J. W. (1987). *Staff Development in California: Public and Personal Investments, Programs, Patterns and Policy Choices*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory and Policy Analysis for California Education.

Little, J. W. and McLaughlin, M. W. (1991). *Urban Math Collaboratives: As Teachers Tell It*. Stanford, CA: Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching.

Lord, B. (1991). *Subject Area Collaboratives, Teacher Professionalism, and Staff Development*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago.

Madzimoyo. V. (1992). "Urban Mathematics Collaborative Promotes Teacher Professionalism." *EDC News*, *2*(1): .

McLaughlin, M. W., Talbert, J., and Phelan, P. (1990). *Report to Field Sites*. Stanford, CA: Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching.

ERIC

Puget Sound Educational Consortium of the University of Washington (1988). ***Teacher Leadership Commitment and Challenge***. Seattle, WA: Author.

Puget Sound Educational Consortium of the University of Washington (1989). ***Teacher Leadership: New Skills -- New Opportunities***. Seattle, WA: Author.

Shedd, J. and Bacharach, S. (1991). ***Tangled Hierarchies***. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, H. (1991). ***Foxfire Affiliated Teacher Networks***. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago.

Van Maanen, J., and Barley, S. (1984). "Occupational Communities Culture and Control in Organizations." ***Research in Organizational Behavior*, *6***: 295.