DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 527   UD 030 337

AUTHOR   Nash, John B.; Calderon, Margarita
TITLE   Principals' Perceptions of Community in Low
              Performing Campuses in Minority Settings.
PUB DATE   Oct 94
NOTE   25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
              University Council for Educational Administration
              (Philadelphia, PA, October 1994).
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research/Technical (143) --
              Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Administrator Attitudes; *Community; Decision Making;
              Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Change; Educational
              Planning; Educational Policy; Elementary Education;
              *Hispanic Americans; *Low Achievement; *Minority
              Groups; *Principals; School Based Management; Staff
              Development
IDENTIFIERS   *High Stakes Tests; Reform Efforts; *Texas

ABSTRACT
              Using its Academic Excellence Indicator System, Texas
has labeled some schools as low performers, giving them a "Priority
One" rating for improvement. Principals of low-performing campuses
were interviewed to assess the condition of these campuses as
communities of learners working to remove the Priority One label. All
of the 6 subject schools have 93 to 97 percent Hispanic American
enrollment, and all are under heavy state and public scrutiny.
Interviews with principals suggest that these schools have succumbed
to ineffective staff development plans, and that, although lip
service is given to site-based decision making, decision making
usually does not seem linked to a coherent and focused plan. Overall,
principals know what they would like to do to improve the schools,
but are restricted by a crisis mentality typical of situations where
high-stakes testing has an impact on local educational policy.
Ultimately, responsibility for school change rests with the school
community. Pedagogically based community, rather than crisis
mentality, will result in successful implementation of change. Two
tables summarize findings. (Contains 10 references.) (SLD)

Principals' Perceptions of Community

in Low Performing Campuses in Minority Settings

John B. Nash

The University of Texas at El Paso

Margarita Calderón

Johns Hopkins University

RUNNING HEAD: PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY

2

Introduction

It is fashionable now among many states to differentiate treatment of school districts based on student performance. How state agencies go about this varies (Fry, Fuhrman, & Elmore, 1992). Since 1990, Texas has utilized the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) to report campus and district status. The cornerstone of the AEIS is student performance measured by the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS). Schools that fail to meet certain minimum performance standards are subject to remediation plans. In extreme cases schools may be labeled "low performing" or "Priority One" schools. In May of 1993 the state released a list of 326 "low performing" schools from 78 districts. A campus was designated low performing when less than 20% of any one segment of its population (i.e.: all students, African American, Hispanic, White, or economically disadvantaged) passed all three segments of the TAAS. These campuses are subject to takeover or closure if improvement does not occur within two years.

In this study we interview principals of low performing campuses to assess the condition of these campuses as a "community of learners" (Barth, 1990) striving to remove the Priority 1 state label. All of the schools in our study were labeled low performing in May, 1993. All of the subject schools have 93%-97% Hispanic enrollment and are under heavy state, public, and media scrutiny as they try to improve.

Many schools with high percentage of Hispanic students in Texas have been found to be "low performing" schools. The teachers and

administrators in these schools may or may not have been
adequately prepared to deal effectively with schooling needs of
this diverse population. It is doubtful, however, that the
educators who need updating the most will want to return to
universities to seek additional degrees. Yet, profound faculty
and staff learning needs must be met if positive change is to
occur in the schools—the type of change that will ensure success
for Hispanic students.

Schools with large minority populations are also typically
Chapter 1 schools. These schools, such as the ones in our study,
are typically the most underfunded, understaffed, and ineffective
in our nation (Slavin, 1994). They have been dormant for many
years, supporting a level of mediocrity and isolation that is
difficult to break. They have created a culture that rejects
change. In most schools there is little opportunity or
encouragement for teachers to work together, learn from each
other, and improve their expertise as a community (Fullan &
Hargreaves, 1991). These problems are exacerbated where the
majority of students possess language barriers and lack an
educational heritage. However, where principals can foster a
sense of community through continuous, sustained learning among
teachers, campus improvement is more likely. Fullan and Miles
(1992) outlined propositions for success in restructuring schools,
e.g., (1) change is learning; (2) change requires the power to
manage it; and (3) systemic change should be implemented locally.

In this study we look at six schools through the lens of
community learning, examining their ability to successfully grasp

the propositions listed above. We hypothesize that these schools
find it difficult for several reasons; reasons cited in the
literature on change and school improvement:

• The problems these schools face are complex, and not easily
amenable to solutions given the resources at hand;

• Time lines are unrealistic because policy-makers may want
immediate results in the form of raised test scores;

• There are tendencies toward faddism and quick-fix solutions in
panic situations;

• Structural solutions (e.g.. redefining the curriculum,
increasing assessment and testing) are often preferred, but they
do not get at underlying issues of instruction and teacher
development;

• Follow through support systems for implementing policy
initiatives may not be provided; and

• Many strategies fail to motivate teachers to implement
improvements and also alienate them further from participating in
reform (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991).

Conceptual Framework

To define community we draw upon Barth's notion of a community
of learners. The responses of the principals in this study are
examined in light of this framework. A community of learners
works from the following assumptions:

• Schools have the capacity to improve themselves, if the
   conditions are right;

• Adults and students alike learn and each energizes and
   contributes to the learning of each other;

- What needs to be improved about schools is their culture, the quality of interpersonal relationships, and the nature and quality of learning experiences;

- School improvement is an effort to determine and provide, from without and within, conditions under which the adults and youngsters who inhabit schools will promote and sustain learning among themselves (Barth, 1990).

Barth contends whereas many attempts to improve schools dwell on monitoring adult behavior, on controlling students, on the assurance of student achievement, and on the visible attainment of prescribed skills, the central question for a community of learners is not, What should students, teachers, and principals know and do, and how do we get them to know it and do it? Instead the underlying question is, Under what conditions will principal and student and teacher become serious, committed, sustained, lifelong, cooperative learners (Barth, 1990)

Thus, a community of learners is a place where students and adults alike are engaged as active learners in matters of special importance to them and where everyone is thereby encouraging everyone else's learning. There is a high level of collegiality, it is a place teeming with frequent, helpful, personal and professional interactions.

One of the current authors has previously examined the role of teachers learning communities (Calderón, 1994) and their use in improving schools. Principals can have learning communities too. Among other things, a principals learning community ideally serves to:

- Provide helpful assistance to principals and other school
  leaders that will enable them to become more successful in
  fulfilling their goals and providing leadership to their school;
- Help principals cope with the changing realities of school
  administration, including increased time demands, declining
  resources, new state and federal guidelines;
- To explore new conceptions of school leadership;
- To identify and study promising practices.

When principals are not given the opportunity to design and
conduct their professional development, they learn to react
instead of reflect on the real needs of their schools.

Research Questions

In the face of high stakes accountability, how do principals of
"low performing" campuses in language minority regions describe
the state of their campus as a community of learners? To what
extent are the activities these schools engage in an outgrowth of
a community of learners?

Methodology

To address the major research questions, the investigators used
a multiple in-depth interview design. Principal's perceptions of
their campuses as communities of learners and its role in removing
a "low performing" label are the phenomena of interest described
in this paper. Each case was examined within its own context and
comparisons were made across cases.

<u>Setting</u>

Since the purpose of the investigation was to examine principal
perceptions of community in low performing campuses, the

investigators obtained the names of principals in six urban El
Paso schools that were deemed "low performing" by the State of
Texas.   Table 1 shows the percentage of all students passing the
1993 and 1994 TAAS.

Table 1.   Percent of all students passing

Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS)

	Percent passing Reading (69.8)		Percent Passing Math (53.6)		Percent Passing Writing (79.8)	
	1993	1994	1993	1994	1993	1994
Canyon View Middle	57.6	64.8+	24.3	34.7+	55.4	59.3+
Farmland Hills Middle	58.9	66.5+	21.4	42.9+	58.8	53.8-
Hillview Middle	60.8	63.2+	15.4	35.2+	61.2	59.6-
Eastside Elementary	14.8	37.9+	14.0	33.0+	43.2	48.7+
Mission Elementary	26.9	60.6+	20.8	50.7+	49.1	70.3+
San Juan Elementary	24.2	72.8+	16.5	56.8+	39.8	78.6+

*Valence after 1994 score indicates positive or negative change since 1993.
State average percentage passing is shown in each heading.

In order to receive the mark of Low Performing School, a campus
must have, in May of 1993, shown

- 20% or less of its students passing all tests taken (a student
  "passes" a test when they answer approximately 70% of the items
  correctly), and not showing required improvement (defined as
  annual improvement in either percent passing all tests taken for
  TAAS to reach the state standard in 5 years).

- All non-special education test takers are considered in the
  analysis; and

• Grade 4, 8, and 10 results were summed as appropriate to the
grade configuration of the campus.

To remove the "low performing" label, a school must have at least
25% of all students pass the writing portion, 25% of all students
pass the reading portion, and 25% of all students pass the math
portion of the TAAS. Table 1 shows the results of the Spring,
1994 TAAS administration for the six campuses we examined
alongside 1993 figures. All of the campuses are now above the
minimum criteria to remove the "low performing" label. At the
time of the interviews none of the principals knew the outcome of
the 1994 TAAS administration

Data Collection

Structured interviews, lasting from forty-five minutes to one
hour and a half, were conducted with each building principal. All
responses were recorded on to cassette tape. The recordings were
then transcribed verbatim into a text file. These text files
formed one data set which was amenable to various analytical
strategies including cross checking for consistency of responses
within respondent sets, pattern making, and theme identification.

Data Analysis

Patterns, then themes from interview data were developed. Using
a constant comparative method, common particulars from each case
were clustered into more general classes.

Presentation of the Findings

The research questions were: in the face of high stakes
accountability, how do principals of "low performing" campuses in
language minority regions describe the state of their campus as a

community of learners? To what extent are the activities these schools engage in an outgrowth of a community of learners? It appears that little that is done in the schools we examined fits Barth's notion of a community of learners. To the extent that there is community, it manifests itself in the form of staff development and site based management activities. First we will summarize the principal perceptions of their schools. Then we examine issues of community as described by the principals.

Principal Description of their School

Five of the six principals have been at these schools less than one year, each brought in as a hired gun. The other principal has been in place only five years. It is noteworthy that they were all raised and educated primarily in El Paso. Five have been working for the same school district between 20 and 28 years. The sixth one had teaching and administrative experiences in another state but kept coming back to work in El Paso from time to time. Except for the principal who is planning to retire in two years, all others were in the same age bracket between 45-50. They all attended local schools and the local university. The principals were comprised of two Hispanic females, two Hispanic males, and two Anglo males.

Three elementary schools and three middle schools comprise the units of analysis. The schools in this study are San Juan Elementary, Mission Elementary, Eastside Elementary, Hillview Middle, Farmland Hills Middle, and Canyon View Middle (all pseudonyms).

10

In describing their campuses, most of the principals noted that they were a low performing campus, but that wasn't the first item mentioned by every principal. Some didn't mention it at all. When asked how she would describe her school, the principal from Farmland Middle School said, "My school is a small middle school with,...multiple opportunities not only for our students but for our staff to change and grow." The principal from San Juan Elementary said they were

> "Basically a K through 6th school, 850 students, 98% of our students are on the free lunch program but 60% of our students are LEP (limited English proficient). LEP students and of course we are a target school, a low performing campus. Almost 50% of our children come from the Johnson Apartments which are the low rent housing, HUD projects..."

The principal from Hillview Middle School said of his campus:

> ...I don't think the reputation (of this school) is very successful. I think it's a reputation of having a large yearly turn over rate among the faculty and staff. It has a reputation of a school who has some gangs. Gang related activities, gang related problems, student discipline problems. I've even heard the school being labeled as Hellview other than Hillview. I need to go on record saying that all of this is changing. I think maybe some of the parents at one time thought this school was not safe for their children. This is also changing. The number one priority that we have on campus is our students. The student's safety, the student's well being as well as the students academic success.

The principal of Eastside Elementary, however, cut right to the reason he was there:

> Eastside is a very low performing school. It has for last year it produced probably the lowest scores in the state of Texas...Only eight percent of the students passed all tests last year, which is totally unacceptable. The climate of the school when I arrived here last August was not good. And there was animosity between the parents and the teachers and the teachers and the parents. The neighborhood is a poverty neighborhood. There are two public housing projects that lead into East Side and then the home owners in this area, the people who own homes in this area, are probably of very low economic status. Interspersed with that there are few of

the middle class students. Ah, there are some old valley
families that live in the area and some have children who
attend. But the population here is probably 99 percent
Hispanic. We have a few black students and a sprinkle of
Anglo students. The teachers at East Side are probably for
the most part, many of the teachers here are good teachers
but they probably have not been given the opportunity to
learn new strategies and techniques and the latest research
in education. And, they have taught a traditional classroom.
That has been the climate for this school, the teacher
tradition is to teach basics and it's drill and skills, that
type of approach...discipline is very laxed...The climate
here was 'If you can't handle them send them to the office
and don't mess with it.' So my job has been to try to turn
some of these things around during this year.

Staff Development as "Community Learning"

The school district has provided, for about the last ten years,

a catalog of workshops to be offered each semester through central

office. Teachers get to select the one-day or after-school

workshops they want to attend, and they are typically rewarded in

one way or another for attending. Occasionally, one week

workshops are offered , particularly in the summer. The central

office facilities are outstanding and the staff development staff

is always efficient and well versed in the newest trends.

With the onslaught of site-based management and low performing

labels, these schools have had to learn to deal, for the first

time, with the orchestration of staff development. At this stage,

the still rely on the district menu or the selections offered

through regional institutions. Or, they copy each others' fads

without reflection, study, or deep understanding of how it serves

the students' needs. They take on an instructional approach

without finding out if it is research based or it meets the

standards espoused by the originators of that approach. For

instance, there are many instructional variations labeled as "whole language."

The types of staff development activities at the schools or central office or university have been one-day or half-day once a month inservices on a variety of topics: writing, reading, critical thinking, science, math manipulatives, thematic units, leadership team development, whole language, TAAS test taking skills, site based management restructuring, and campus action plan development. One week sessions have been provided by the district for two of the schools on curriculum alignment and a program called TESA (Teacher Expectation for Student Achievement). The other schools plan to send their teachers to these sessions also.

Some staff development programs are generated by teacher grant writing. At Farmland Middle the principal encouraged faculty participation through a district grant writing program. "I've given them the freedom to do, for example, the grants that we have...To me, that's an investment in the kids. If we can bring more moneys and if I can encourage the staff to try different ideas and I think we're heading in the right way." Approximately 15 grant applications were sent in by teachers and the principal at Farmland, some related to staff development. When asked if there was a particular focus to the campus submissions she replied "No, kind of across the board, just across the board."

In some instances the staff development menu is so huge one may have a hard time understanding the scope, sequence and purpose of the training. Take for instance the training teachers

participated in at Hillview Middle School.   The principal

described activities completed in the eight months prior to the

interview:

> "Now, remember I've given them every opportunity to
> attend the workshops that they wanted...and **I'd like to
> list a few of them that I can remember**...We've
> attended several of the Michael Eden work shops.   They
> were workshops that were targeting **math and writing
> and reading**.   We had TESA workshops, which is **Teacher
> Expectation Student Achievement.**   As a matter of
> fact, we had...seven people...that had been trained as
> test of trainers.   We've attended **reading workshops**.
> We've had **computer training workshops** in our campus
> for all the reading and ESL teachers...We had a school
> wide inservice...about **critical thinking skills**...I
> sent ten staff members into an **accelerated reading
> workshop**.   I sent some staff members to the Michael
> Eaton **New Writing Process**.   I sent a number of staff
> members to the **Mathematics Problem Solving
> Workshop**, once again by Michael Eaton.   We've ordered
> written materials such as **"THINK"** for critical
> thinking.   We've ordered the **writing teacher magazine**
> that is available for all faculty and staff to utilize
> as well as if any students would like to take it and
> read it.   We sent off three teachers to the border
> conference (with an) emphasis (on) educating students
> with **special needs**.   The **AIMS workshop**, which is
> the Region XIX (workshop) for science and math teachers,
> we have two representatives attending that workshop.   I
> personally went to Arizona to attend the National
> Conference for the **NOVA NET** computer system...I did
> send the Chapter One liaison to a conference in San
> Antonio, and that conference title was **Parents Sharing
> Books Family Literacy and Communication
> Conference**, and with having two thirds of our student
> body reading below grade level, you can see the
> importance of this conference and the information that
> has been brought back to us.   I sent six teachers to a
> workshop on count down of **TAAS material**.   There are
> five teachers that will be attending an all day hands on
> **reading workshop**, and these are programs for reading
> improvement or remediation.   Basically it is reading
> plus and failure free reading...Ah, we also had some
> workshops on various **teaching strategies** (emphasis
> added).

When asked what type of staff development they would like to

offer if there were no obstacles, they responded: classroom

management, student attitudes and positive self esteem, critical

14

thinking, curriculum, rah! rah! morale building sessions for the
faculty, instructional strategies, cooperative learning, English-
as-a-second language, whole language, and TAAS skills.

Summary

In spite of quality central office staff and a plethora of
opportunities for training, these schools have succumbed to staff
development patterns that are suggested to be ineffective (Fullan
& Miles, 1992; Pink, 1992). We know that teaching can make a big
difference to students. We also know that there are models of
teaching that have been researched and tested (Joyce & Showers,
1992). In order for teachers to develop extensive teaching
repertoires of tested models, they must have the benefit of
comprehensive staff development programs followed up by learning
communities where teachers conduct peer coaching and construct
meaning with their new knowledge (Joyce & Showers, 1988).

Principals also need to acquire new skills and become
reflective practitioners capable of learning as they lead.
However, their prior experiences as learners may have left them
unsatisfied and turned off to staff development. Principals find
themselves too busy to join teachers in learning endeavors.
Hence, they may concentrate on quick fixes and showy symbols to
demonstrate progress (Fullan & Miles, 1992). Table 2 summarizes
the common problems these schools have in implementing
comprehensive staff development.

Table 2. Summary of Campuses and Staff Development Criteria

REASONS WHY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FAIL	LIKELIHOOD OF OCCURRENCE AT SUBJECT SCHOOLS	COMMENTS
1. An inadequate theory of implementation, resulting in too little time for teachers and school leaders to plan for and learn new skills and practices.	High	Actions as a community of learners not always valued
2. District tendencies toward faddism and quick-fix solutions.	High	High at the local level - passive acceptance of behavior at district level
3. Lack of sustained central office support and follow-through.	Low	Lack of sustained support missing at local level
4. Underfunding the project, or trying to do too much with too little support.	Low	Funding at local level is high. Focus of resources may be blurred.
5. Attempting to manage the projects from the central office instead of developing school leadership and capacity.	Low	School leaders are encouraged to solve local issues.
6. Lack of technical assistance and other forms of intensive staff development.	Medium	Technical assistance is available and arranged locally.
7. Lack of awareness of the limitations of teacher and school administrator knowledge about how to implement the project.	High	Shotgun approach to staff development - see what floats or sinks after the fact.
8. The turnover of teachers in the school.	Medium	Turnover used in some sites to build cohesion - "My way or the highway."
9. Too many competing demands or overload.	High	Crisis mentality - many innovations occurring at once

10. Failure to address the incompatibility between project requirements and existing organizational policies and structure.	Medium	Little evidence of prior planning or community of learners deciding beforehand what should be done.
11. Failure to understand and take into account site-specific differences among schools.	High	Faddism and latching-on to other school's programs
12. Failure to clarify and negotiate the role relationships and partnerships involving the district and the local university (Pink, 1992)	Medium	Some confusion about the utility of existing school/district/ university collaboration

Site F   Management as "Community Learning"

The second facet related to community learning that occur at these campuses surrounds site based decision making. All of the principals indicated that they had given teachers greater latitude in decision making. Many of the decisions teachers made were related to selection of staff development topics and budgeting, especially if it was geared toward increasing test scores. One thing is certain from the interviews: all of the sites are going through the motions of site based decision making. The trappings existed. Teachers were placed as decision makers, serving on sub-committees and the Campus Education Improvement committee (CEIC). Nevertheless, we left in the end thinking of an old Texas cliché: "Big hat, big boots, no cattle." While the trappings were in place we didn't see or feel that the decision process at these schools was linked to a coherent, focused plan. Like the staff

development activities discussed above, the site based management
process seemed faddish.

We noticed two principal styles within the descriptions of site
based management: certain principals tended to exhibit more micro
managing behaviors as opposed to a macro, stand-offish appr᠎ᐟ᠎ch.
Micro managers. At Farmland, the role of the CEIC appeared more
advisory than binding. Definitions of committee consensus were
determined by a subsequent administrative committee. The
principal describes the process:

> (At the CEIC meeting) there is an agenda presented with input
> from me and the staff. These are things we'd like to.do, to
> change, or to try, or...entertain, you know and they take it
> to CEIC and discuss the merits of it. (CEIC members) come
> back they make recommendations and then it's up to me you
> know. And I have an administrative team including an
> assistant principal and a counselor and the school wide
> project (Chapter 1) coordinator (and we) sit down and look at
> it and say, 'Okay, these are the recommendations, this is
> what they're saying, and this is the consensus.'"

At Eastside Elementary, site based governance took a back seat
initially, especially when staffing decisions were made:
"Eastside is under the gun," the principal said. "We have an
emergency situation. So...we decided what we wanted from an
Eastside teacher and that is how we set about it. It wasn't a
decision that we involved the staff with just because this is an
emergency situation. This is something that has to be done, ah,
from a top-down order."

Macro managers. The principal at Hillview Middle noted that he
had "given each department free reign in ordering all materials,
TAAS materials. All materials that they need or they feel they
need to have for their departments (they can have)." Here the
importance of raising the scores alone is again stressed. He went

on to note: "I'm managing the building with them (the teachers) and what I had to do was work with the faculty and staff and let them be creative and do the things that they needed to do, to work for the success of these students."

At Canyon View Middle the role of the principal was less clear. He stated "the teachers make all the decisions. We have surveys for everything...The majority rules. I have a budget of 2.2 million dollars and had $200,000 of that to spend as I liked. The faculty made all the decisions on how to spend the money...I don't want to be a dictator, just co-ordinate things."

Summary

Site based management as a vehicle for community takes on different forms at each of these schools. Equitable participation is occurring, except in the case of one school where a management team "clique" may form. The membership of the teacher/leadership team at Hillview may actually restrict participation by all staff. Here, many of the same people serve on influential committees. "Many of the members in that Collaborative team are going to be department chairs, they also are going to be members of the CEIC, they're also going to be members of the school wide assessment committee for chapter one."

In sum, too much or too little leadership may undermine the effectiveness of the CEIC. Where second tier committees determine consensus for the CEIC, meaning can be blurred. On the other hand, a stand-back approach may foster consensus by CEIC's on approaches that do not jibe with the principal's or the school's

collaborative. The purpose of these meetings centered on the word "coordination." They also used these meetings to learn from presenters brought by the organizers of the university collaborative group. The principal and Canyon View stated: "I don't see it (the collaborative) as a constant help. What is its purpose? Don't see a reason behind some of the things I've done with them. It is rare if it does any good."

On the other hand the other principals were able to glean some learning out of the collaborative meetings: "It's done nothing but help nurture the school. And, help us to really stretch our minds and look collectively as a staff too improve our campus." Another noted: "That (the collaboration) has been very helpful in guiding us and giving us ideas on a campus action plan on a CIS on consensus building so that has been very helpful and we are looking forward to attending that this year again."

When asked what type of community of principals they would like, their responses were:

- Aligning and coordinating with feeder schools;
- Sharing strategies, reading articles, and having stimulating conversations;
- Small group training;
- Reading research; and
- Collective study

These responses came closer to Barth's definition. Except for the principal who plans to retire in two years, the others seemed eager to participate and have their teachers participate in a

community of learners. They felt that the district would never provide the time for teachers to study together; they would have to do it after school hours.

Summary

The construction of teachers and principals meeting together as a collegial learning team may be a role for teacher and school leader preparation programs. The fact that teacher and principal learning communities do not exist in schools that could use them is not the fault of the professionals. As the principal at Mission Elementary put it: "We were never really trained to take a look together collectively at how to change schools and make schools better. And I'd like that kind of reading to be going on so that when we're making decisions we're open to those decisions."

Conclusion

Overall, the principals at these schools know what they want to do, but are restricted by a crisis mentality, typical in arenas where high stakes testing impacts local educational policy (Corbett and Wilson, 1990). As noted at the beginning, none of the schools we studied are considered low performing schools anymore. For their efforts, described in part above, they have all been deemed "acceptable" by the State of Texas. This paper has been critical of the implementation strategies utilized by the schools we studied. While there is little question in our minds that the removal of the low performing label is a result of a re-focusing of purpose by leadership and staff, our concern remains for the long term. Literature on failed reform (Fullan and Miles,

1992) points to school traits that are mirrored by some of the schools we studied. There is no lack of innovation in these schools, but there is an overload of fragmented, uncoordinated attempts at change . We saw symbols over substance, where massive staff development was undertaken, providing an appearance of cohesive improvement. We saw faddism. When these schools found themselves with the situation of "having to implement" new ways of teaching and learning, the were reactive instead of reflective. They borrowed fads from each other (the TESA program, the same whole language consultant, local math workshops) instead of using local community of learners to find research-based practices. They accepted these trends superficially and implemented them likewise. One school "implemented" two reading programs in one year because their TAAS reading scores were so low. These reading programs contradicted each other in philosophy and implementation processes, but no one stopped to study those details. Two aspects of faddism come into play: either superficial solutions are introduced, or quality solutions are hastily implemented. At this early point we suspect both could be occurring. It is for these reasons that, in spite of political improvement, long term improvement is a long way off. Astute leaders in these schools will realize the difference between the crisis mentality that removed them from the state's hit list, and the learning mentality that is needed to create real reform and sustained student achievement.

Ultimately, responsibility for creating, evaluating, and planning for change belongs to the school community, a community

made up of everyone who works in the school. Parents and students
should also be part of that community. Because schools are living
organizations, incremental change is bound to occur without any
intervention. At the schools in this investigation, planned
change is in its infancy. The type of change the school engages
in, crisis-based or pedagogically based, will determine the long
range success of the school.

24

Bibliography

Barth, R.S. (1990). Improving schools from within. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Calderón, M. (1994). Bilingual teacher development within school learning communities: A synthesis of the staff development model. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University

Corbett, H.C.; Wilson, B. (1990). Testing, reform, and rebellion. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Fry, P; Fuhrman, S. & Elmore, R. (1992). Kentucky's Program for Educationally Deficient School Districts: A Case Study. New Brunswick, NJ: Consortium for Policy Research in Education

Fullan, M.; Hargreaves, A.(1991). What's Worth Fighting For? Working Together for Your School. Andover, MD:Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast & Islands.

Fullan, M.; Miles, M. (1992). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. Phi Delta Kappan, 73(10), 745-752.

Joyce, B.; Showers, B. (1988). Student achievement through staff development. White Plains, NY: Longman, Inc.

Joyce, B.; Weil, M.; Showers, B. (1992). Models of teaching. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Pink, W. T. (1992). Effective staff development for school change Norwood, NJ:Ablex Pub. Corp.

Slavin, R. (1994). Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk - Technical applications. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.