DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 394 972 SP 036 688

TITLE	Assessing the Impact of High School Restructuring in Kentucky.
INSTITUTION	Louisville Univ., Ky. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Kentucky Inst. for Education Research, Frankfort.
PUB DATE	Sep 95
NOTE	80p.; For related documents, see SP 036 685-694.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Role; Demonstration Programs; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Change; *Educational Innovation; Graduation Requirements; High Schools; Parent Participation; Performance Based Assessment; Program Evaluation; Research and Development; *School Restructuring; State Departments of Education; Student Role; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	*Kentucky; *Kentucky Education Reform Act 1990

ABSTRACT

Kentucky high schools are attempting to address requirements of the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990 (KERA). This study was conducted to collect and interpret data related to the implementation of high school restructuring and make recommendations. Thirty-three schools were invited to participate based on categories of restructuring, geographic region, size, and type. Data were collected through the Configuration Map for High School Restructuring (developed by the Kentucky Institute for Education Research) and interviews with administrators, counselors, teachers at various grade levels, departmental chairs from English mathematics, science, and social studies or two team leaders and two department chairs, a minimum of two parents, a student focus group, and a support staff member, community member, or business partner. The study found broad and genuine support for the education reform. Some specific findings were: (1) high school restructuring was mostly in the planning and development stage; (2) the most critical factors for the advancement of high school restructuring were the principal's leadership, teacher involvement, school counselors providing leadership and support, active involvement of students, reallocation of funding to support instruction, standards for new graduation requirements, parent and community support, and new ways to use teaching and planning time; and (3) in the next few years, the need for development training and technical assistance will be focused on specific high school restructuring initiatives, such as shared decision making, increased use of teams for instruction, flexible scheduling, and performance-oriented graduation requirements and many forms of assessment. Twelve recommendations were made based on these findings. Appendices include the configuration map and the mean scores and correlation coefficients for the 33 high schools. (NAV)

THE KENTUCKY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATION RESEARCH

Assessing the Impact of High School Restructuring in Kentucky

A Report of Research
conducted by the
School of Education
University of Louisville

for the
Kentucky Institute for Education Research
146 Consumer Lane, Frankfo , KY 40601

September 1995

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

THE KENTUCKY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATION RESEARCH

146 Consumer Lane • Frankfort, Kentucky 40601 • 502-227-9014 • Fax 502-227-8976

Assessing the Impact of High School Restructuring in Kentucky

A report of research
conducted by:

John Fischetti, University of Louisville, Project Director
Marjorie Artzer, Northern Kentucky University
Marietta Daulton, Morehead State University
Allan Dittmer, University of Louisville
Nancy Loposer, Western Kentucky University
Mitzi Lowe, University of Kentucky
Rosetta Sandidge, University of Kentucky
Kawanna Simpson, University of Kentucky
Beth Stroble, University of Louisville
Sue Strong, Eastern Kentucky University
Russell Wall, Murray State University

for the
Kentucky Institute for Education Research

September 1995

PREFACE

This research project is one of six studies conducted in the spring of 1995 to determine the extent schools and educators across Kentucky had implemented Educational Technology, High School Restructuring, the Primary Program, Professional Development, Performance Assessment and School-Based Decision Making.

The studies were sponsored by the Kentucky Institute for Education Research, supported by funding from The Annie E. Casey Foundation. Each research project was contracted to a Kentucky university that managed the research and employed the services of a team of researchers/field observers, mostly from higher education institutions across the state.

Each study was designed to collect data from a random set of schools across the eight state educational regions. All studies used a research tool developed especially for studying the progress of program implementation called an Innovation Component Configuration Map. The Configuration Map enables researchers to judge the level of implementation of different program components based on a common set of standards and guidelines.

Collectively, through these six studies, more than fifty trained researchers visited 189 schools across the Commonwealth conducting interviews, observing classrooms, training sessions and school council meetings, and reviewing documents and collecting artifacts. To date this research represents the single most comprehensive effort to gage the level of implementation of programs initiated through the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990 (KERA).

The Kentucky Institute for Education Research is proud to be able to sponsor these projects and highly commends the members of the research teams and the universities for the excellent work of data collection and analysis they conducted under difficult conditions and a limited budget. On behalf of the Institute, I want to personally express my sincere appreciation to each of the principal investigators for their professional commitment to this statewide effort, their many hours of work beyond those budgeted in the contract and their perseverance to produce a high quality research report.

This report not only describes what schools and educators across the state are doing to implement school reform, it also provides research-based, thoughtful suggestions about how implementation of programs can be enhanced and the benefits of reform increased for the youth of Kentucky.

I sincerely hope you will find the contents of this report both informative and helpful.

Roger Pankratz, Executive Director
Kentucky Institute for Education Research

Acknowledgments

We are very fortunate to live and work in Kentucky. In the process of completing this study, we had the opportunity to visit with students, parents, teachers, administrators, counselors, support staff, central office personnel, community representatives, the Kentucky Department of Education, and other service providers. We are impressed by what we saw and thank everyone who so graciously gave of their time.

In particular, I would like to thank those schools that participated in this study and worked us into their already crowded agendas. Your assistance has helped us compile important data that will influence decisions for many years.

There are a few people whose contributions to this project deserve a special note of appreciation. I would like to thank the ten other members of our research team who completed their work within the tightly imposed deadlines and provided great insight into the process of restructuring. I am excited about this emerging network of university colleagues from around the state. It was very rewarding to work with such fine educators. And particular thanks to the team that drafted the original Configuration Map used in this study.

Many thanks to the staff at the Kentucky Institute for Education Research, particularly Dr. Roger Pankratz who provided superb leadership and great advice during the research. Lori Henderson also supported our every request.

Tim Moore and Don King at the Kentucky Department of Education assisted the project with timely information and invaluable expertise regarding high school restructuring.

Dr. Gene Hall from the University of Northern Colorado and Dr. Archie George from the University of Idaho gave us technical support and advice in addition to providing data analysis.

Thanks also to Chris Metzger, a U of L graduate student, who assisted in the content analysis of the researchers' field notes during June 1995.

There are so many people to recognize in a project of this size, but we especially wish to thank the students of Kentucky's high schools. Their insights and suggestions are the lasting memories of this project, and will help to shape the future of education in our Commonwealth.

John C. Fischetti
Associate Professor
University of Louisville

Project Researchers

John Fischetti, University of Louisville, Project Director

Marjorie Artzer, Northern Kentucky University

Marietta Daulton, Morehead State University

Allan Dittmer, University of Louisville

Nancy Loposer, Western Kentucky University

Mitzi Lowe, University of Kentucky

Rosetta Sandidge, University of Kentucky

Kawanna Simpson, University of Kentucky

Beth Stroble, University of Louisville

Sue Strong, Eastern Kentucky University

Russell Wall, Murray State University

Table of Contents

Table of Figures

ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF HIGH SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING IN KENTUCKY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990 (KERA) did not require high schools to make changes in organizational and program structures other than in School-Based Decision Making. However, many Kentucky educators believe that significant restructuring is essential to fulfill the vision that "all students can learn and most at a high level." Furthermore, the higher standards of performance established by Kentucky's Learning Goals and Academic Expectations and the demands of Kentucky's new school assessment and accountability system require high schools to become more efficient in assisting all students to learn and achieve to their highest potential.

The context for restructuring Kentucky high schools is both informal and formal. Informally, every high school is attempting to address the new KERA requirements of performance assessment, an integrated curriculum, expanded uses of educational technology, and School-Based Decision Making. Formally, some high schools have elected to be part of a statewide effort to pilot new graduation requirements recommended by the 1993 Kentucky Task Force on High School Restructuring. Other high schools have joined special state and national efforts designed to "re-vision schools."

In July 1992 the State Board for Elementary and Secondary Education asked the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) to appoint and manage a High School Restructuring Task Force composed of citizens and stakeholders. In June 1993 the Task Force presented its final report to the State Board, proposing the establishment of pilot sites. In November 1993 the State Board approved the Commissioner's recommendation and the application procedures for funding a network of 24 "Developmental Sites" and 40 "Mini-Grants for Restructuring." After a two-year process of piloting these new requirements, KDE will present recommendations to the State Board for Elementary and Secondary Education regarding formal changes in high school gradation requirements.

Trying to learn from both the informal and formal efforts in Kentucky high schools to restructure organizations, programs and processes, the KDE requested the Kentucky Institute for Education Research (KIER) to study the implementation of High School Restructuring in selected schools across the state.

Purpose of the Study

1. To develop a system to collect statewide data related to the implementation of high school restructuring

2. To determine the extent of implementation of high school restructuring across selected schools

3. To assess the support provided by the KDE related to high school restructuring

4. To make recommendations related to the continuation of the high school restructuring initiative

5. To create a statewide collaboration among higher education faculties related to high school restructuring

6. To make recommendations for further research

The Study Sample

Thirty-three high schools were invited to participate in this study based on categories of restructuring (developmental, mini-grant or other), geographic region, size of school, and type of school (rural, urban or suburban). Twelve schools were invited from the network of 24 demonstration sites funded by the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) for the implementation of new graduation requirements. Eleven high schools were invited from a group of 40 that were recipients of mini-grants supported by KDE to develop one or more specific restructuring components. Ten study sites were selected from the remaining Kentucky high schools in consultation with KDE and KIER, based on the other state or national innovative efforts, such as Tech-Prep, Effective Schools, Education Technology, etc.

Protocol Development and Data Collection

The primary research instrument used to identify each high school's implementation level of restructuring components was the Configuration Map for High School Restructuring developed earlier by KIER. In addition, research protocols for interviews, observations and the recording of structured field notes were developed to ensure a consistent data collection process. Ten researchers from seven of Kentucky's state universities were selected and trained to collect data using the research protocols.

Researchers spent a minimum of two full days at each high school in the study. At the conclusion of these visits, each researcher compiled his or her multiple maps into one composite Configuration Map and prepared an interview summary. At the school site, each researcher arranged to interview the following persons:

- the principal
- another administrator or counselor

- a minimum of four teachers from different teams/levels/grades, including those involved in extra- or co-curricular activities
- the four department chairs from English, mathematics, science, and social studies, or two team leaders and two department chairs
- a minimum of two parents
- a student focus group with students who have been affected by the restructuring efforts
- a support staff member, a community member or a business partner

The study data were collected during February, March, and April 1995. All Configuration Maps and a summary of the field notes were submitted to the Project Director. Configuration Map data were analyzed by Dr. Archie George at the University of Idaho. Interview data were compiled by the Project Director who reviewed the data with each researcher.

Major Findings

Findings of Critical Factors for High Implementation based on Configuration Map Data

The analysis of the data from the Configuration Maps for High School Restructuring reveals a number of factors that are critical to a higher level of implementation. These factors are related to the three major areas that were the primary focus of the study: new graduation requirements, new roles and new school structures.

1. Critical factors related to *New Graduation Requirements* include:

    - Standards and processes are developed for required school sponsored or approved activities
    - Standards and processes are developed to verify new graduation requirements (exit review)

2. Critical factors related to *New Roles for Individuals and Groups* include:

    - The school principal brings vision and facilitates shared decision-making
    - Student input is sought and used in decision-making
    - Teachers have transformed roles from "lecturers" to facilitators, guides, or academic coaches
    - The community is an integral part of learning environment
    - Parents are included in all aspects of school program planning

3. Critical factors related to *New School Structures* include:

    - School budgets are reallocated to support student-centered curricula--teachers have access to hands-on materials and alternative curriculum resources; they make decisions based upon what works for them

- Curricula are planned to link across the disciplines and are focused on knowledge and the application of that knowledge
- Instructional time has been reallocated to allow for more opportunities for hands-on activities and applications of curriculum in real-world contexts

Findings Based on Structured Interviews and the Review of Artifacts Collected

1. Four clusters of schools were identified at different levels by their overall progress toward restructuring:

   - Six high schools were identified as "trailblazers" because they had principals and faculties who were highly supportive of rethinking school structures
   - Thirteen high schools were identified as "engaged" because they were generally involved in planning for restructuring and have changed their school schedules
   - Seven high schools were identified as "cautious" because they had at least one strong component in place described by the Configuration Map
   - Seven high schools were identified as "not restructuring" because any initiatives toward restructuring were fragmented and not linked together in a school-wide restructuring plan

2. There is broad and genuine support for Kentucky's education reform in high schools. No one interviewed wanted to return schools to what they were before 1990.

3. The school principal and his/her leadership appeared to be the most important factor related to the progress of high school restructuring.

4. The support of assistant principals, counselors and other school staff appeared to have a significant impact on the restructuring process.

5. High schools where the entire faculty worked together to plan and solve problems had a higher level of support for restructuring and less resistance to change.

6. Students provided the most complete and comprehensive descriptions of innovations in their high schools; however, very few schools have involved students in the planning process.

7. Most high schools have not included school support staff, parents, community members and business partners in the restructuring process.

8. Parents on School Councils and parents not on Councils were generally supportive of high school restructuring efforts; however, few were knowledgeable about the specifics of the changes being planned and implemented.

9. The most frequent restructuring initiatives have been alternatives to the six-period school day (20 of 33 high schools). Examples of other restructuring initiatives developed but used less frequently are interdisciplinary teaming, Tech-Prep, service learning, individual graduation plans and senior exhibitions.

10. No high school visited has developed a plan to assess whether or not student performance will improve as a result of the overall restructuring efforts or specific changes; however, KDE is currently working on a program to evaluate the success of demonstration site and mini-grant initiatives and gather statewide data.

11. High schools that were designated developmental or mini-grant sites appeared to have a more well-developed planning process and specific rationale for their efforts than high schools that were not receiving financial assistance from the Kentucky Department of Education. However, there was no observed difference in the level of implementation associated with the type of assistance or the amount of support received.

12. Both positive and negative effects of the Kentucky Instructional Results Information System (KIRIS) were observed. In some high schools the KIRIS tests have been an impetus to think differently about teaching and learning. In other schools short-term strategies to score well on the assessments inhibited efforts toward long-term goals for restructuring.

13. Teachers were generally critical about professional development they received; however, when they were given choices, time to plan among themselves and when facilitators modeled strategies and techniques that were the focus of the training, teachers' evaluation of professional development was much more positive. The specific types of training and technical assistance needed were reported often as not available.

14. A majority of teachers interviewed reported that as a result of KERA they have increased their use of hands-on materials, cooperative learning, writing assignments and performance-oriented assessments; however, reports from students indicated that only about half of their teachers were implementing these new instructional strategies.

15. Teachers and principals interviewed reported that most central office staffs have been supportive of high school restructuring; however, there is little evidence that central offices have restructured their roles and processes to support restructured high schools.

16. School personnel often perceive the existing statewide regulations on teacher certification and program studies in high schools to prevent and discourage restructuring. While some high schools have sought and obtained waivers from regulations, others report they are confused by multiple communications they

receive and are not sure how to approach the Department of Education to obtain the flexibility they need for change.

17. High school teachers and administrators often expressed concern about level of performance of incoming ninth graders; however, very few high schools had formal connections with feeder middle schools.

18. The impact of other KERA initiatives showed wide variations depending on the program and the local situation:

    - There did not appear to be a relationship between the extent of restructuring and whether or not a high school had a School-Based Council
    - Extended School Services were highly praised in some high schools and harshly criticized in others
    - Youth Service Centers in general were positively received and often cited as removing barriers to success for students

Conclusions

1. High school restructuring in Kentucky was mostly in the planning and development stage for the 33 study schools visited.

2. The most critical factors that appeared to advance implementation of high school restructuring were:

    - A visionary and supportive principal
    - A majority of teachers involved in decision making and the change process
    - School counselors providing a leadership or supportive role
    - High school students actively involved in the change process
    - A reallocation of funding to support instruction
    - Standards established for new graduation requirements
    - Parents and community supportive of change
    - Time for teaching, learning and planning used in new ways

3. In the next few years the need for development training and technical assistance will be focused on specific high school restructuring initiatives:

    - Shared decision making that involves a broad range of constituents
    - Increased use of teams for instruction
    - Greater use of flexible scheduling
    - Performance-oriented graduation requirements and students assessed by multiple measures

- More linking of the high school curriculum to the requirements of the workplace and other post-high school environments
- Year-round high school schedules
- The introduction and use of multiple measures to determine school success

Recommendations

1. All high schools should design and implement formal plans to evaluate the progress of restructuring and the impact on students (including special populations), educators, the school and the community.

2. The recruitment, preparation and support of the next generation of school leaders should become a high priority of the Education Professional Standards Board, the Kentucky Department of Education and Kentucky institutions of higher education.

3. The Department of Education should modify the state's school assessment and accountability system to minimize incentives for short-term strategies to achieve high KIRIS scores at the expense of effort to achieve long-term restructuring goals.

4. High schools should develop specific strategies to gather and use students' input and ideas in the planning, development, implementation and assessment of restructuring initiatives.

5. High schools should work more directly with KDE staff to explore waiver options for programs of study available to them that facilitate their restructuring goals.

6. Local schools, the Department of Education, institutions of higher education and the media should facilitate public dialogue and discussion about the role, purpose and organization of high schools of the future.

7. The KDE should create a division or administrative unit to directly address and manage multiple issues affecting middle and high schools.

8. High schools with exemplary restructuring components should be identified, and descriptions of the successful innovations widely disseminated to high schools throughout the Commonwealth.

9. Successful strategies for involving parents, business partners and community patrons need to be developed and/or disseminated to high schools involved in restructuring.

10. The KDE and higher education institutions need to develop a greater capacity for providing professional development with respect to the specific high school restructuring initiatives that have been identified as high priorities.

11. District offices should explore and develop supportive roles for central office staff relative to high school restructuring.

12. All high schools should develop formal linkages with feeder middle schools to facilitate a continuous and supportive curriculum, middle school through high school, for all students.

Suggestions for Further Research

1. Follow-up, longitudinal studies should be conducted on all high schools engaged in restructuring efforts to (a) track the progress of the high school restructuring initiative statewide and (b) determine the impact of high school restructuring on student performance.

2. Processes and products of schools ranking in the top half of the implementation continuum of the Configuration Maps should be studied to determine their contribution to the school's restructuring goals and the long-term impact of these processes and products on student performance.

3. In-depth longitudinal case studies should be conducted of significant high school restructuring efforts to determine the interrelationship of high school restructuring initiatives and other KERA initiatives.

Assessing the Impact of High School Restructuring in Kentucky

Background for the Study

The rules for high schools in Kentucky have changed since 1990, and with this new era has come the direct and implied pressure to organize the structures of schools differently. The basic tenet of Kentucky education reform is to work toward designing schools so that all students have the opportunity to learn and achieve at the highest possible level. In the past, we have allowed school success to be measured by evaluating the accomplishments of a small percent of graduates who were high achievers in school or achieved success after graduation.

Because of this change of "paradigms," high school restructuring is a complex, dynamic, and evolving process. The Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) mandates that high schools show ongoing success in the assessment/accountability system and create School-Based Decision Making (SBDM) Councils by 1996. Other components of KERA are being employed by high schools to serve students more effectively, including Extended School Services and Youth Services Centers.

While high schools are not under a specific mandate to change structures other than creating SBDM Councils, many educators believe that the rules, roles and relationships of all schools need to be reconsidered in order for Kentucky's schools to do well on the KIRIS assessments and to move forward with the vision to assist all students to learn and achieve at the highest possible level. There are those who are skeptical that changes made to serve all students might jeopardize those who currently are doing well in the structures in place. This is a valid concern and one to which any advocate for change must be sensitive.

One way to understand restructuring is to compare it to traditional reform. Typically, change in schools has taken place one fad at a time and has usually lasted for a relatively short time before joining its predecessors on the ash heap of failed reform initiatives. Schools might add a computer lab, remodel the physical plant, begin a freshman team, or implement a new discipline policy, etc., and each change would happen in isolation from everything else going on in the school. Restructuring involves managing all aspects of change simultaneously because every aspect of the school is dependent on every other aspect.

A school cannot change its schedule without looking at staffing. It cannot change staffing without impacting the curriculum. It cannot look at the curriculum without affecting parents and students. Likewise, it cannot affect parents and students without having an impact on the community as a whole, and on and on.

The current context for high school restructuring is both informal and formal. Informally, every school is trying its best to understand and implement local and state requirements. Formally, some schools have been part of the statewide effort to pilot new graduation requirements recommended by the Kentucky Task Force on High School Restructuring in its 1993 report. Other schools are part of formal statewide or national efforts designed to "re-vision" schools.

What Does KERA Mandate?

KERA stipulates that schools will be measured, in part, on their graduation rates and on the proportion of students who make a successful transition to work, post-secondary education and the military. In addition, KERA mandates in Kentucky Revised Statute 156.160 that "prior to the beginning of the 1994-1995 school year, the State Board for Elementary and Secondary Education would review graduation requirements in light of the expected outcomes for students and schools set forth in Kentucky Revised Statute 158.6451 (originally named Valued Outcomes or Learner Outcomes and more recently called Academic Expectations)."

The Kentucky High School Restructuring Initiative

In July 1992, the State Board for Elementary and Secondary Education asked the KDE to appoint and manage a High School Restructuring Task Force composed of citizens and stakeholders. In June 1993, the Task Force presented its final report to the State Board, proposing the establishment of pilot sites. In November 1993, the State Board approved the Commissioner of Education's recommendation and the application procedures for funding a network of 24 "Developmental Sites" and 40 "Mini-Grants for Restructuring." After a two-year process of piloting these new requirements, KDE will present recommendations to the State Board regarding formal changes in high school graduation requirements.

Performance-Based Graduation Requirements

In order to develop performance-based graduation requirements that honor the six KERA Learning Goals and 57 Academic Expectations, the Task Force proposed a locally determined, phased-in process. The development of new performance-based graduation requirements necessitates a reevaluation of all current curricula, including precollege and vocational/technical curricula. It was the belief of the Task Force that schools would continue to use Carnegie Units (i.e., the unit used to define one year of study in a high school subject--which must be at least 120 sixty-minute hours). However, schools may expand evidence of student learning by piloting new performance-based credits over an extended period. The Task Force proposed a time line for the development and implementation of the new requirements (see Task Force on High School Restructuring, 1993, p. 21).

Proposed Core Components for High School Graduation

Following is a brief summary of the proposed required core components for high school graduation taken from the Task Force report (see Task Force on High School

Restructuring, 1993, pp. 22-24 for complete descriptions). These core components are being piloted by the 24 Developmental Sites.

1. Individual Graduation Plan

Prior to entering high school, with the guidance of parents and educators, each student will develop an Individual Graduation Plan that documents an academic program of study for achieving the six KERA Learning Goals and demonstration of the Academic Expectations. As part of the plan, students will indicate a program of study that enables them to complete high school and be eligible for each of the following: college, vocational/technical school, the workforce (or home as a workplace), and the military or community service. The plan will include specific academic courses and projected school-sponsored or approved activities.

2. Integrated Academic Portfolio

The student will maintain a required Integrated Academic Portfolio for the years he/she is enrolled in high school. The student would assemble a single portfolio from all courses and experiences throughout high school. The Academic Portfolio includes a transcript; a resume; appropriate test data (such as ACT, SAT, etc.); statewide assessment results; recommendations from educators and employers; certificates and awards; print and non-print examples of performance, demonstrations and/or exhibitions; documentation of satisfactory participation in school sponsored and approved activities; and a Culminating Project.

3. Student-Initiated Culminating Project and Panel Presentation

During the review process of the Individual Graduation Plan, prior to the anticipated final year of high school, the student will design a significant Culminating Project. The Culminating Project will include a major written component supported by appropriate documentation, references, and research and an oral or visual performance, demonstration, exhibition, or presentation to be presented to a panel.

4. Required School Sponsored and Approved Activities

The student will actively participate in at least one school sponsored or approved activity during each year he/she is enrolled in high school. In addition, during the years he/she is enrolled in high school, the student will actively participate in any two of the following activities: (a) service learning, meaningful activity that benefits

the community; (b) school service, a meaningful activity that benefits the school, school personnel, or other learners; (c) work-based learning, a work program, internship, or simulation with predetermined learning goals, and (d) student-initiated enrichment--personally enriching activity or experience that complements the student's graduation plan.

5. **Exit Review**

The components required for high school graduation will be verified by the school official so designated.

6. **Exceptions**

The school council/district will develop policies and procedures to individualize the graduation requirements for students who have special needs or extenuating circumstances.

Fundamentals of High School Restructuring

In addition to the core components, the KDE team working on implementing restructuring after the Task Force, developed 11 "fundamentals" of high school restructuring. The process components are "pieces" of the restructuring puzzle that assist in clarifying for schools some smaller steps that might be taken on the complex road to systemic change. The "Mini-Grant" sites were each funded to pilot at least one of these components:

- core curriculum
- curriculum redesign
- student engagement
- performance standards and accountability
- professional development
- structure and organization of schools
- technology
- alternative uses of school time
- school-wide engagement
- successful transition
- community participation

To date there is little research on the level of engagement of schools in High School Restructuring. Also, there have been no studies to determine the impact of High School Restructuring efforts in Kentucky on students, schools, educators or the school community.

The Use of Configuration Maps to Monitor Implementation

From May 1994 through January 1995 KIER involved researchers, practitioners and KDE staff to design an instrument to assess the level of engagement in an innovation using Innovation Components Configuration Maps. Based on the work of Hall and Hord (1987), Configuration Maps are tools that describe specific program components of High School Restructuring and enable one to assess variations in practice and to measure change. Based on a continuum ranging from "ideal implementation," as defined by the developers or a leadership group, to "marginal implementation," a Configuration Map provides a method of determining the extent to which a change strategy has been put in place for each component based upon standards set by experts in the field. In this study Configuration Maps, interviews, artifacts, and researcher observations served as the primary research tools for measuring the degree of change and level of implementation of High School Restructuring in 33 selected Kentucky high schools.

Description of the Study of 33 High Schools

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was:

1. To develop a system to collect statewide data related to the implementation of high school restructuring

   To determine the extent of implementation of high school restructuring across selected schools

2. To assess the support provided by the Kentucky Department of Education related to high school restructuring

3. To assess the support provided by the KDE related to high school restructuring

4. To make recommendations related to the continuation of the high school restructuring initiative

5. To create a statewide collaboration among higher education faculties related to high school restructuring

6. To make recommendations for further research

The Study Sample

Using geographic regions, size of school, type of school (rural, urban or suburban) and categories of restructuring (developmental, mini-grant, or other), the Project Director invited 33 schools to participate in this study. Twelve of the schools were from the network of 24 demonstration sites identified by the KDE for their implementation of the new graduation requirements recommended by the Kentucky Task Force on High School Restructuring. Eleven other high schools were selected from the list of 40 mini-grant recipients as part of the KDE-supported restructuring effort. The final 10 schools were selected in consultation with KDE and the KIER from the approximately 250 other public high schools in the state participating in other state or national innovative efforts such as Tech-Prep, Effective Schools, Technology, etc. From the original list of 33 schools, eight schools declined to participate and eight alternate sites with similar characteristics were contacted to be part of the study sample.

Researcher Selection and Training

In addition to the project director, ten researchers were selected from Kentucky's public colleges and universities. The team was chosen in consultation with KIER and included higher education faculty members who have demonstrated expertise in high school restructuring who were willing to donate additional time to this project as part of the service requirement at their institutions. During February and March 1995 each member of the research team visited three schools.

Training of the researchers took place in January 1995 in a two-day retreat. The training included review of the Configuration Maps for High School Restructuring, discussion of the research protocol, and demonstrations of the use of the research instruments. A participating school principal and teacher joined the training to facilitate the conversation and to allow the researchers to practice with the Configuration Maps and interviews using real subjects from high schools in an authentic setting.

The Development of the Innovation Configuration Map

The development of the Innovation Configuration Map for High School Restructuring was coordinated by KIER during the summer of 1994. Teachers, administrators, KDE representatives, and university faculty familiar with High School Restructuring participated in the development of this research instrument. The Configuration Map was field tested during the summer of 1994 and revised based on the feedback from researchers and field practitioners. A copy of the Configuration Map is presented in Appendix A.

Research Protocol and Data Collection

Using the High School Restructuring Configuration Map developed by KIER, structured field notes and an interview guide were developed as the research protocols for the study. Each researcher gathered the data using the agreed-upon protocol package and provided the data to the project director.

Researchers spent a minimum of two full days at each high school in the study. At the conclusion of these visits, each researcher compiled the data collected into one composite Configuration Map and prepared an interview summary. At the school site, each researcher arranged to interview the following persons:

- the principal
- another administrator or counselor
- a minimum of four teachers from different teams/levels/grades, including those involved in extra- or co-curricular activities
- the four department chairs from English, mathematics, science, and social studies, or two team leaders and two department chairs
- a minimum of two parents (one freshman and one senior)
- a focus group with students who had been involved in the restructuring efforts of the high school, who were from different programs/grades/levels, and who were familiar with the changes that were occurring
- one of the individuals who was critical to the school's success such as a support staff member, a community member, or a business partner

In addition, the Project Director conducted interviews with the staff of KDE and appropriate others around the state to assess the support of KDE related to high school restructuring.

Data for the study were collected during February, March, and April 1995. Each composite high school Configuration Map and a summary of the field notes were submitted to the Project Director. Configuration Map data were analyzed by Dr. Archie George at the University of Idaho. Interview data were compiled by the Project Director who reviewed the data with each researcher.

Results and Findings

This section presents the results and findings of the study based c the data from Configuration Maps, field interviews, review of artifacts, and researcher observations conducted at each site. The results and findings are organized into five categories:

- New graduation requirements
- New roles
- New school structures
- Other results and findings
- Overall findings

New Graduation Requirements

1. Analysis of Configuration Map Data

Following are the results and findings on the implementation of New Graduation Requirements for the 33 high schools in the study. The complete Configuration Map is presented in Appendix A. Appendix B shows the mean implementation ratings and Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients for each Configuration Map component.

Table 1 shows the percent of the 33 schools sampled judged to be implementing the "processes" for New Graduation Requirements at different levels. It should be noted that only the 12 developmental and the 11 mini-grant sites are obligated to pilot one or more of these specific recommendations or related restructuring components.

Table 1

Percent of 33 Schools Judged to be Implementing the "Processes" for New Graduation Requirements (Section I of Configuration Map)

Section I				
a process fully established involving all constituents 9%	b process established with limited constituent participation 12%	c planning for individual graduation plan occurring 49%	d no plans to develop individual graduation plan 30%	
a portfolio process established and involves all stakeholders 3%	b process established with limited involvement of stakeholders 24%	c planning underway for integrated portfolio 27%	d only KIRIS portfolios in place or contemplated 46%	
a culminating project established with all stakeholders involved; all students participate 4%	b culminating project established by committee; some students involved 12%	c culminating project established by 1-2 individuals and communicated to others 0%	d planning underway for culminating project 42%	e no plans underway to develop culminating project 42%
a Process established that involves all students and school community; formal assessment ongoing 12%	b Process established that involves student and advisor 6%	c Process being developed 33%	d No plans to develop process for School Sponsored and Approved Activities 49%	

Section II				
a Process for Exit Review formally established; SBDM formally involved 6%	b Process for Exit Review established with student - and advisor 9%	c Exit Review process being developed 30%	d No plans in place for Exit review process 55%	
[redacted]				
a formal evaluation process in place 6%	b evaluation process being developed 36%	c no evaluation process being developed 58%		

Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients were computed for each component of the Configuration Map and are presented in Appendix B. A high correlation indicates that the specific component is highly correlated with overall high implementation of all high school restructuring components. In other words, components that had high correlation coefficients were most indicative of higher engagement in restructuring. Thus, the most crucial components indicative of higher levels of engagement in restructuring were:

- Standards and processes developed for required school sponsored or approved activities
- Standards and processes developed to verify new graduation requirements (exit review)

From the data displayed in Table 1 and Appendix B, it is evident that the 33 schools in the study sample have made the most progress in establishing planning processes for the various new graduation requirements and have generally not implemented the new requirements. Few schools have developed an evaluation plan for their new requirements either as part of the early planning or early phases of implementation.

2. Findings and Discussion of Interview/Observation Data

Following are results from interviews and observations that supplement data provided by the Configuration Map for New High School Graduation Requirements.

The impact of being a developmental or mini-grant site. Because most developmental sites working with the KDE considered this a planning year before piloting new graduation requirements during 1995-1996, the size of the grant or the designation as a developmental or mini-grant site did not determine the extent of the implementation of the restructuring effort. Most developmental sites have significant plans in place for next year to use an integrated academic portfolio or profile, an individual graduation plan, increased student participation in co- or extra-curricular activities and service learning, and/or senior exhibitions. The

common characteristics of schools that are part of the KDE pilot effort are: a) they have principals who are supportive of change, and b) they have spent considerable time as faculties and communities planning the initiatives.

The impact of restructuring at other schools. Ten of the schools that participated in the study are involved in restructuring but are not part of the KDE-funded restructuring sites. Some are affiliated with national organizations that are advocating restructuring. Others are working with the state on related initiatives. Some have new or renovated buildings redesigned to support a performance-based curriculum and collaborative learning. These sites appeared to have less formal, long-term planning in place and, overall, were not operating with a specific rationale for restructuring efforts.

New Roles for Individuals and Groups

1. Analysis of Configuration Map Data

Following are the results and findings on the implementation of New Roles for Individuals and Groups for the 33 high schools in the study. The complete Innovation Component Configuration Map is presented in Appendix A. Appendix B shows the mean implementation ratings and Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients for each Configuration Map component. Table 3 shows the percent of the 33 schools judged to be implementing New Roles at different levels.

Table 2
Percent of 33 Schools Judged to be Implementing
New Roles for Individuals and Groups (Section II of Configuration Map)

Section II	New Roles			
Students				
a New student role defined; curriculum aligned with new role; student fully involved 12%	b New student role defined; some curriculum is aligned with new role 58%	c New student role under discussion 27%	d Students play traditionally passive role; no discussion underway 3%	
Principal				
a New principal role in place; shared decision-making fully operating 46%	b New principal role is defined; some evidence of sharing decisions 30%	c discussion underway regarding role of principal 15%	d Principal maintains "top-down" management style 9%	
Teachers				

	Section II		New Roles	
a New teacher role is defined as facilitator; curriculum aligned with role 21%	b New teacher role is defined; some curriculum re-aligned 52%	c New teacher role is being discussed 24%	d Teachers maintain role as presenters of information a majority of the time; little evidence of change 3%	
Parents and Adults				
a new role defined and parents/adults fully involved 9%	b new role defined partial involvement 43%	c new role under discussion 48%	d no attempt to increase involvement of parents and adults 0%	
Central Office				
a new role defined and evidence of activities congruent with new support role 48%	b new role defined, little evidence of change 21%	c new role under discussion 15%	d no discussion underway related to roles 16%	
Community				
a new role defined and evidence of increase in support 18%	b new role defined, efforts underway to increase support 52%	c new role being discussed 24%	d little or no effort being made to increase role of community 6%	

From the data displayed in Table 2 and Appendix B, it is evident that the implementation of new roles for principals, students, teachers, community, and parents are the most critical to implementing high school restructuring. Based on the Spearman Rank Order Correlation analysis displayed in Appendix B, the most crucial components indicative of schools with a higher level of engagement in high school restructuring are:

- The principal brings vision and facilitates shared decision-making
- Student input is sought and used in decision-making
- Teachers have transformed roles from "lecturers" to facilitators, guides, or academic coaches
- Community is integral part of learning environment
- Parents are included in all aspects of the school

2. Findings and Discussion of Interview/Observation Data

Following are the results from interviews and observations that supplement the data provided by the Configuration Map for New Roles of Individuals and Groups.

The role of the principal in facilitating restructuring. The critical element in schools that are moving forward significantly in their restructuring efforts is the building principal. The principal's vision and ability to achieve consensus are the most important motivators that keep people feeling positive about the change

agenda. While this is not a surprising result, since the differences found among schools' attitudes regarding specific changes were considerable, the one constant was the principal in creating more positive climates for change.

The roles of other administrators. Assistant principals in particular are typically working to implement restructuring while also working to enforce current rules and roles. As social problems and community issues continue to spill over into the schools, assistant principals and others in administrative roles are left with the unenviable task of working toward restructuring while being hampered by increasing workloads and crisis management duty.

The "leadership teams" in schools report a high degree of stress and on the brink of "burn out" from performing their regular day-to-day duties while also taking on the consuming roles of change agents.

The role of counselors. School counselors play a pivotal role in facilitating the process of change in high schools and in expanding success for all students. Since so many restructuring changes involve new or different ways to account for learning, schools that have moved forward in restructuring have done so only when counselors are directly involved in the change process.

The role of teachers. Most high school faculties have a critical mass who support the changes being implemented. However, at most sites there are some teachers who are frustrated and negative about change. The personality of the principal has an influence on reactions of the teachers to the specific restructuring changes. Many changes implemented in high schools are intended to encourage teachers to teach differently. For many, these changes are an affirmation of the way they have been teaching for years, but for others they are a threat to the security they have found in teaching a certain way. Where faculties have thoughtfully worked together to develop plans and to work out concerns, there is less resistance to and strong support for what is happening.

The role of students. Students provided the best insight into the level of success of innovations at their schools, yet few schools have actively sought their ideas, responses, or reactions. The two schools where student input is valued in the change process are also the two schools in the sample which are rated the most engaged in restructuring. One of the schools has over 1,000 students and one has under 1,000. Students were generally positive about specific changes in their schools, but reported that in only about one-half of their classes were curriculum activities redesigned to fit the new structures. For example, students supported the block schedule but only when teachers varied their teaching style and got them involved. Longer blocks of time can backfire for all students when teachers talk the entire time or when there is too much space left at the end of lessons. Students were also positive about portfolios, but are not convinced they contain their best work.

Most were unaware of any use of portfolios beyond the imposed class requirement to complete them. Freshmen and sophomores, who have participated in the process during the eighth grade and are now in high school, felt less "put upon" by the alternative assessments than seniors who had the system change on them from middle to high school or during high school.

The role of parents. Lack of parent involvement is an ongoing dilemma faced by all schools. Increasing parent involvement is not a new topic, but it is made more relevant by the urgency to work with all students successfully, which requires schools to involve the community in many new ways. Parents are supportive of the changes taking place, but, with the exception of parent members of SBDM Councils, are not "up to speed" on the specifics. They trust the teachers to make the decisions that are best for their children. Many parents reported that parent involvement is directly proportionate to their level of confidence in the school. If they did not feel the school was doing a good job, they would be at the school immediately.

The role of support staff, community members and business partners. Support staff members are instrumental in the school's day-to-day operation, but most schools have not included them in the restructuring process. In addition, most schools are just beginning to involve local community and business leaders in the change process. Where this has occurred, outside expertise has been very positively received.

Central office support. For the most part central office staff is perceived as supportive of high school change. However, many respondents reported that central office staffs have not themselves undergone the restructuring of rules, roles, and relationships expected of school personnel. Teachers report they are frustrated because there is little direction and assistance coming from the central office on how to teach differently. School principals are frustrated because they are required by KERA to be in a new role of decision making without the central office staff understanding the new vision of school-based decision making.

New School Structures

1. Analysis of Configuration Map Data

Following are the results and findings on the implementation of New School Structures for the 33 high schools in the study. The complete Component Configuration Map for High School Restructuring is presented in Appendix A. Appendix B shows the mean implementation ratings and Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients for each Configuration Map component.

Table 3 details the percent of schools judged to be implementing New School Structures at different levels.

Table 3
Percent of 33 Schools Judged to be Implementing New School Structures (Section III of Configuration Map)

Section III				
Curriculum				
a Curriculum fully integrated across subjects 0%	b Curriculum partially integrated 15%	c Planning for integration underway 45%	d Some teachers working to link curriculum 28%	e No plans to integrate curriculum 12%
Staffing				
a School fully organized in teams 0%	b At least 1/2 the day teachers are teamed with students 3%	c About 1/2 of teachers are in teams 18%	d Team discussion underway 67%	e No plans for teaming 12%
Use of Instructional Time				
a Flexible schedule in place that allows teachers and teams maximum flexibility 3%	b New schedule is in place using larger or smaller blocks of time 58%	c A partial "block" schedule is in place 6%	d Discussions are occurring related to schedule 27%	e No plans to change master schedule 6%
Management of Student Behavior				
a Students are involved in implementing as self management system 3%	b Students are encouraged to participate in self management 40%	c Discussion occurring to align student management systems with curriculum 12%	d School rules and policies for student behavior are unchanged 45%	
Performance Assessment				
a Performance assessment is fully part of curriculum for all teachers 21%	b Students have many opportunities to engage in performance assessment 40%	c Students have few opportunities to engage in performance assessment 30%	d Students have almost no opportunities to engage in performance assessment 9%	
Expanded Technology				
a Technology used effectively by all teachers and students 18%	b Some teachers and students use technology effectively 33%	c School plans are in place to improve full use of technology 33%	d A plan exits but little has been done to implement the technology plan 16%	e The school has no technology plan 0%
Funding for Instruction				
a Funding follows instructional priorities 40%	b New funding process in place 15%	c Discussions underway to change budget process 15%	d Budget controlled as in the past, top-down 30%	
SBDM				

	Section III		New Structures	
a SBDM fully implemented 67%	b Council exists and is implementing a portion of its duties 6%	c Council in place, some change occurring 12%	d SBDM recently approved 6%	e School waiting until 1996 to adopt SBDM 9%
[illegible]				
a Staff development well received and planned with teacher input 42%	b KERA focus for staff development; generally perceived as positive 18%	c A few individuals plan KERA activities for professional development 37%	d Top-down planning for professional development; generally poorly received 3%	
[illegible]				
a Links to post-high school experiences are planned, authentic, and ongoing 3%	b Students have many opportunities to link post-high school work or learning 39%	c Students have some opportunities to link school to work, post secondary experiences 52%	d Little to no room in the curriculum for post-high school links 6%	

From the data displayed in Table 3 and Appendix B, it is evident that the implementation of new school structures is predominantly focused on changing the school schedule, incorporating performance assessment, using technology more effectively, and reallocating funding. Based on the Spearman Rank Order Correlation analysis displayed in Appendix B, the most crucial components indicative of schools with a higher level of engagement in high school restructuring were:

- The school budget is reallocated to support a student-centered curriculum--teachers have access to hands-on materials and alternative curriculum resources; and make decisions based upon what works for them
- Curriculum is planned to link across the disciplines and is focused on knowledge and the application of that knowledge
- Instructional time has been rethought to allow for more opportunities for hands-on activities and applications of curriculum in real-world contexts

2. Findings and Discussion of Interview/Observation Data

Following are the results of interviews and observations that supplement the data provided by the Configuration Map for High School Restructuring.

Specific restructuring initiatives. Most schools have initiated their restructuring efforts by exploring alternatives to the six-period day (20 of 33 schools). Schools using changes in the master schedule to drive restructuring have noted both advantages and disadvantages. The advantages include: (a) more time for a hands-

on curriculum, (b) fewer students per day for teachers, and (c) fewer teachers per day for students. These changes have led to fewer incidents of fighting and mischief in the halls because of fewer numbers of class changes. Some disadvantages include: (a) lack of teacher curriculum planning for a variety of significant activities, (b) higher impact of student absenteeism on student performance, (c) difficulty in determining what content can be mastered in less calendar time in those schools that have adopted semester courses, and (d) the need to develop new graduation requirements to match increased opportunities for credit. For example, in many schools students can now accumulate 32 credits (eight courses per year for four years). Changes that have not been in enough schools or been in place long enough to assess their impact accurately include:

- Interdisciplinary teaming/houses/school-within-a-school
- Tech-Prep
- Service learning
- Required extra- or co-curricular activities
- Individual graduation plans
- Flex-time or academic "study halls"
- Expanded portfolios
- Senior exhibitions
- Un-tracking
- Inclusion
- Varied administrative roles

Professional development. While professional development was cited as a major factor in providing assistance with restructuring, most of the respondents were dissatisfied with the current professional development they were receiving. There was a concern that the kinds of specific help needed to teach differently are not available and most teachers reported that they are "in-serviced out." Some were critical of curriculum coordinators or outside consultants who have not taught on a team or in larger blocks of time or used student exhibitions. When professional development was mentioned positively, it was when teachers were given choices, when teachers were given the time to plan among themselves, and when facilitators modeled the strategy and technique they were encouraging them to incorporate.

Changing instructional practice. Although this study did not involve direct observation of classrooms, teachers were asked how they have changed their instructional practices as a result of restructuring efforts. Most reported that they have increased their use of hands-on materials and cooperative learning, varied their instructional methods, increased writing assignments, and included performance-oriented assessments. Students reported that about one-half of their teachers did this effectively.

School-based decision making. Across the 33 schools there did not appear to be a relationship between having an SBDM Council and the level of engagement of high school restructuring. Some sites had very "hands-on" proactive councils while others had newer councils that were still getting acquainted with the complex issues of restructuring.

Other Results and Findings

This section contains additional findings obtained from field interviews, observations, and artifacts collected and supplements the results reported earlier for New Graduation Requirements, new roles and new school structures.

1. **Categories of restructuring schools.** Configuration Map data revealed four distinct groups of high schools in our study sample. For the purpose of discussion and based on the level of implementation the four groups of schools were identified as Trailblazers, Engaged, Cautious, and Not Restructuring.

    - *Trailblazers.* Trailblazer schools rated consistently at the upper end of the Configuration Map continuum. These schools have principals and faculties who are supportive of rethinking school structures. Six schools fit this category.

    - *Engaged.* Thirteen of the study schools fit this category. A school engaged in restructuring generally ranked in the upper half of the continuum. The common characteristic of these schools is that they have changed their school schedule. Also "engaged" schools tend to be in the planning phase of new graduation requirements.

    - *Cautious.* Seven participating schools are labeled "cautious." These schools typically had one strong Configuration Map component and were minimally involved in others. Principals at these sites stated that they were moving slowly on restructuring because their communities would not support rapid change. In addition, most school faculties were not yet comfortable with broad change efforts of High School Restructuring.

    - *Not restructuring.* Six participating schools in this study are labeled "not restructuring." This label means that generally the ratings on the Configuration Map are at the lowest end of the continuum. In these six schools, many initiatives that are underway are being done as individual reform efforts, not linked together in a common vision or restructuring plan. Also, a common characteristic of this category of schools was broad dissatisfaction among faculty with the school's leadership.

2. **Attitudes toward change.** No one interviewed at any school desired to go back to school structures as they were before 1990. There was broad and genuine support

for Kentucky school reform and for the need to continue to improve schools. In interviews with hundreds of teachers, administrators, parents, community people, and students, the researchers found a high level of commitment to making reform work. Even those most critical or cynical about certain aspects of reform were positive overall about the long-term change process.

3. **Assessing restructuring.** No school that has initiated restructuring has developed a plan to assess whether student performance improves as a result of restructuring. Very little data are being gathered by school sites to determine the success of innovations beyond what is required for KIRIS testing. At this stage in restructuring, few schools have a shared, long-term vision of what high school students should be like in five to ten years.

4. **The Impact of KIRIS.** In many schools visited the KIRIS assessment/accountability system was the number one topic of conversation. Because of the timing of the data collection for this study, researchers observed schools pre-occupied with creating incentives for students to do well on the open-response portion of the KIRIS assessments. Open-response items contribute most to the School Accountability Index.

   Preparing for and administering KIRIS assessments dominate many high schools activities during January and February. In some schools the KIRIS "tests" have been the impetus to think about teaching differently. In other schools KIRIS was described as inhibiting long-term restructuring.

   No school visited reported they were motivated by the rewards component of KIRIS; however, schools appeared to be motivated to get students to do well because of the negative stigma attached to the labels "in crisis" or "in decline." In high schools labeled "in decline" and assigned a Distinguished Educator, it was evident that there were many short-term changes being put in place to raise test scores. Some changes were designed to create a more positive climate in which students take tests. In other cases specific rewards were provided as incentives for students. In some "in decline" schools planned long-term change processes were put "on hold" while faculties developed practice sessions and sample questions to prepare students for KIRIS tests. While portfolios generally were perceived as a positive influence on learning, in only a few cases were teachers observed to incorporate portfolio prompts into the curriculum so that they evolve naturally from the work of the class. In most classrooms portfolios are developed and assembled within two or three weeks of their due date.

   Although KIRIS was not a major focus of this study because issues of assessment often precluded longer-term High School Restructuring plans, both concerns and recommendations emerged from the data collected. Researchers observed and recorded both strong positive and negative effects of KIRIS. All stakeholders

interviewed believe student writing has improved significantly over the past three years and there are more practical and performance-oriented curricula in high schools. On the other hand, teachers, principals and students felt the open-response component of KIRIS needed to be modified. There exists the belief that there are too many questions and that this portion of the assessment is more a test of endurance than of what students know and can do. Students reported they felt it was difficult to write for several days in the same format and sustain the positive energy to do well. While there is no formal announced curriculum required by the state, teachers, school administrators and students reported that the questions on KIRIS tests require specific content knowledge. One school called this the "secret curriculum" where only those who develop the questions know the specific content, concepts, and skills to be tested.

Most teachers reported they would like a clearer and more public list of specific curriculum topics by grade level that schools could be held accountable for addressing. Most teachers felt the links between the KIRIS assessments and Kentucky's Academic Expectations are very unclear. Also, teachers and principals wanted test scores returned to the school on a much shorter time schedule so they could use this information for making curriculum decisions and as a source of feedback and motivation for students.

Apart from the KIRIS assessments, teachers and principals felt the Accountability Model needs adjustment. High schools with large numbers of students from low socioeconomic backgrounds reported they feel penalized by the current School Accountability Index which they believe rewards schools more for encouraging students to drop out than for retaining students and helping them move toward graduation. In some schools tougher attendance policies have been enacted which has eliminated some students with poor attendance and who are likely not to do well on the KIRIS tests.

5. **Safety issues.** High schools in the study sample have focused on safety and other key issues reported in the Johnson and Immerwahr National Study of Schools entitled First Things First (1994). They have not ignored these priorities for the sake of restructuring agendas. Students, teachers, and parents are generally satisfied with their school's culture and climate relative to a safe school environment; however, the persons interviewed were more than familiar with other schools that had problems.

6. **Kentucky Department of Education Support.** Support from KDE regarding the restructuring grants was very positive. However, school personnel expressed concerns that statewide limitations on flexibility regarding certification for teaching assignments and the state's mandated program of studies for high schools prevent and discourage restructuring. Some schools have sought waivers from specific regulations and have been successful in varying their program offerings. Because

KDE does not have a specific division designated to address high school programs school practitioners are often confused by the multiple reports, surveys, and communications required and not knowing which KDE administrative unit to contact. Principals specifically are concerned about multiple sources of correspondence often about the same issue and the increased amount of reporting required.

7. **Middle School Connections.** Many high schools were deeply concerned with the level of performance of their incoming ninth graders; however, researchers found that few high schools in the study sample had any formal connections with feeder middle schools. Since key components of High School Restructuring are new roles, relationships, and organizational structures, expanding the formal links to middle school must become an integral part of all high schools' restructuring effort.

8. **Decision-Making Processes.** Schools in the study sample who use consensus decision making for planning and implementing change had wide discrepancies in their interpretation about what constitutes a decision. Teachers who had less involvement with restructuring efforts tended to see consensus decision making as a new way to exclude minority opinion from the decision-making process. School practitioners more involved in restructuring tended to see consensus as a prudent strategy to move toward change and not "sit still." As with other components the role of the school principal is crucial in gaining support for the process of making decisions and school-wide support for the decisions made.

9. **The effect of restructuring on special school populations.** If restructuring in KERA is implemented to better address the learning needs of all students, it seems important to monitor the impact on special populations. However, no school in this study had a formal process to determine the impact of restructuring on students who are perceived to be "at risk," students who are physically and/or mentally challenged, or students specially identified as gifted and talented.

10. **The Impact of Extended School Services (ESS).** ESS was found to vary a great deal from school to school in the study sample. In some schools ESS was extremely successful, unique and well planned; in others it was reported to be ill defined, disorganized and problematic. Thus, the impact of ESS on restructuring was judged to range from very positive to negative depending on the strength of the program.

11. **The Impact of Youth Service Centers (YSCs).** YSCs have been judged by teachers and school administrators as one of the most positively received initiatives of KERA. Data from the interviews in the study sample reinforced this positive image of YSCs with special reference to their impact on removing barriers to success for young people.

12. **KIRIS Results for Study Schools.** Early in 1995 the KIRIS results for all elementary, middle and high schools for the first biennium of Kentucky's school

accountability program were made public. Schools were placed into four categories: Eligible for a Reward, Successful, Improving, and In Decline. Schools in the study sample were represented in all categories of the accountability results categories. Furthermore, there appears to be no relationship between the results categories and school size. These data are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4
1992-94 KIRIS Results for Study Schools

	Size of School		
School Results Category	**Under 1000**	**Over 1000**	**Total**
Exceeded Improvement goal (Eligible for Reward)	5	3	8
Achieved Improvement goal (Successful)	4	5	9
Improved but did not meet goal (Improving)	4	6	10
School performance declined (In Decline)	4	2	6
Totals	17	16	33

Major Findings

Findings of Critical Factors for High Implementation based on Configuration Map Data

The analysis of the data from the Configuration Maps for High School Restructuring reveals a number of factors that are critical to a higher level of implementation. These factors are related to the three major areas that were the primary focus of the study: new graduation requirements, new roles and new school structures.

1. Critical factors related to *New Graduation Requirements* include:

    - Standards and processes are developed for required school sponsored or approved activities
    - Standards and processes are developed to verify new graduation requirements (exit review)

2. Critical factors related to *New Roles for Individuals and Groups* include:

    - The school principal brings vision and facilitates shared decision-making
    - Student input is sought and used in decision-making
    - Teachers have transformed roles from "lecturers" to facilitators, guides, or academic coaches
    - The community is integral part of learning environment
    - Parents are included in all aspects of school program planning

3. Critical factors related to *New School Structures* include:

    - School budgets are reallocated to support student-centered curricula--teachers have access to hands-on materials and alternative curriculum resources; they make decisions based upon what works for them
    - Curricula are planned to link across the disciplines and is focused on knowledge and the application of that knowledge
    - Instructional time has been reallocated to allow for more opportunities for hands-on activities and applications of curriculum in real-world contexts

Findings Based on Structured Interviews and the Review of Artifacts Collected

1. Four clusters of schools were identified at different levels by their overall progress toward restructuring:

    - Six high schools were identified as "trailblazers" because they had principals and faculties who were highly supportive of rethinking school structures

- Thirteen high schools were identified as "engaged" because they were generally involved in planning for restructuring and have changed their school schedules
- Seven high schools were identified as "cautious" because they had at least one strong component in place described by the Configuration Map
- Seven high schools were identified as "not restructuring" because any initiatives toward restructuring were fragmented and not linked together in a school-wide restructuring plan

2. There is broad and genuine support for Kentucky's education reform in high schools. No one interviewed wanted to retum schools to what they were before 1990.

3. The school principal and his/her leadership appeared to be the most important factor related to the progress of high school restructuring.

4. The support of assistant principals, counselors and other school staff appeared to have a significant impact on the restructuring process.

5. High schools where the entire faculty worked together to plan and solve problems had a higher level of support for restructuring and less resistance to change.

6. Students provided the most complete and comprehensive descriptions of innovations in their high schools; however, very few schools have involved students in the planning process.

7. Most high schools have not included school support staff, parents, community members and business partners in the restructuring process.

8. Parents on School Councils and parents not on Councils were generally supportive of high school restructuring efforts; however, few were knowledgeable about the specifics of the changes being planned and implemented.

9. The most frequent restructuring initiatives have been alternatives to the six-period school day (20 of 33 high schools). Examples of other restructuring initiatives developed but used less frequently are interdisciplinary teaming, Tech-Prep, service learning, individual graduation plans and senior exhibitions.

10. No high school visited has developed a plan to assess whether or not student performance will improve as a result of the overall restructuring efforts or specific changes; however, KDE is currently working on a program to evaluate the success of demonstration-site and mini-grant initiatives and to gather statewide data.

11. High schools that were designated developmental or mini-grant sites appeared to have a more well developed planning process and specific rationale for their efforts than high schools that were not receiving financial assistance from the Kentucky Department of Education. However, there was no observed difference in the level of

implementation associated with the type of assistance or the amount of support received.

12. Both positive and negative effects of the Kentucky Instructional Results Information System (KIRIS) were observed. In some high schools the KIRIS tests have been an impetus to think differently about teaching and learning. In other schools short-term strategies to score well on the assessments inhibited efforts toward long-term goals for restructuring.

13. Teachers were generally critical about professional development they received; however, when they were given choices, time to plan among themselves and when facilitators modeled strategies and techniques that were the focus of the training, teachers' evaluation of professional development was much more positive. The specific types of training and technical assistance needed were reported often as not available.

14. A majority of teachers interviewed reported that as a result of KERA they have increased their use of hands-on materials, cooperative learning, writing assignments and performance-oriented assessments; however, reports from students indicated that only about half of their teachers were implementing these new instructional strategies.

15. Teachers and principals interviewed reported that most central office staffs have been supportive of high school restructuring; however, there is little evidence that central offices have restructured their roles and processes to support restructured high schools.

16. School personnel often perceive the existing statewide regulations on teacher certification and program studies in high schools to prevent and discourage restructuring. While some high schools have sought and obtained waivers from regulations, others report they are confused by multiple communications they receive and are not sure how to approach the Department of Education to obtain the flexibility they need for change.

17. High school teachers and administrators often expressed concern about level of performance of incoming ninth graders; however, very few high schools had formal connections with feeder middle schools.

18. The impact of other KERA initiatives showed wide variations depending on the program and the local situation:

    - There did not appear to be a relationship between the extent of restructuring and whether or not a high school had a School-Based Council
    - Extended School Services were highly praised in some high schools and harshly criticized in others

- Youth Service Centers in general were positively received and often cited as removing barriers to success for students

Conclusions

1. High school restructuring in Kentucky was mostly in the planning and development stage for the 33 study schools visited.

2. The most critical factors that appeared to advance implementation of High School Restructuring were:

   - A visionary and supportive principal
   - A majority of teachers involved in decision making and the change process
   - School counselors providing a leadership or supportive role
   - High school students actively involved in the change process
   - A reallocation of funding to support instruction
   - Standards established for new graduation requirements
   - Parents and community supportive of change
   - Time for teaching, learning and planning used in new ways

3. In the next few years the need for development training and technical assistance will be focused on specific high school restructuring initiatives:

   - Shared decision making that involves a broad range of constituents
   - Increased use of teams for instruction
   - Greater use of flexible scheduling
   - Performance-oriented graduation requirements and students assessed by multiple measures
   - More linking of the high school curriculum to the requirements of the workplace and other post high school environments
   - Year-round high school schedules
   - The introduction and use of multiple measures to determine school success

Recommendations

1. All high schools should design and implement formal plans to evaluate the progress of restructuring and the impact on students (including special populations), educators, the school and the community.

2. The recruitment, preparation and support of the next generation of school leaders should become a high priority of the Education Professional Standards Board, the Kentucky Department of Education and Kentucky Institutions of Higher Education.

3. The Department of Education should modify the state's school assessment and accountability system to minimize incentives for short-term strategies to achieve high KIRIS scores at the expense of effort to achieve long-term restructuring goals.

4. High schools should develop specific strategies to gather and use students' input and ideas in the planning, development, implementation and assessment of restructuring initiatives.

5. High schools should work more directly with KDE staff to explore waiver options for programs of study available to them that facilitate their restructuring goals.

6. Local schools, the Department of Education, institutions of higher education and the media should facilitate public dialogue and discussion about the role, purpose and organization of high schools of the future.

7. The KDE should create a division or administrative unit to directly address and manage multiple issues affecting middle and high schools.

8. High schools with exemplary restructuring components should be identified, and descriptions of the successful innovations widely disseminated to high schools throughout the Commonwealth.

9. Successful strategies for involving parents, business partners and community patrons need to be developed and/or disseminated to high schools involved in restructuring.

10. The KDE and higher education institutions need to develop a greater capacity for providing professional development with respect to the specific high school restructuring initiatives that have been identified as high priorities.

11. District offices should explore and develop supportive roles for central office staff relative to High School Restructuring.

12. All high schools should develop formal linkages with feeder middle schools to facilitate a continuous and supportive curriculum middle school through high school for all students.

Suggestions for Further Research

1. Follow-up, longitudinal studies should be conducted on all high schools engaged in restructuring efforts to (a) track the progress of the high school restructuring initiative statewide and (b) determine the impact of high school restructuring on student performance.

2. Processes and products of schools ranking in the top half of the implementation continuum of the Configuration Maps should be studied to determine their contribution to the school's restructuring goals and the long-term impact of these processes and products on student performance.

3. In-depth longitudinal case studies should be conducted of significant high school restructuring efforts to determine the interrelationship of high school restructuring initiatives and other KERA initiatives.

References

Glickman, C. (1992). The essence of school renewal: The prose has begun. Educational Leadership, 50 (1), 24-27.

Hall, G.E., & Hord, S.M. (1987). Change in schools: Facilitating the process. New York: State of New York University Press.

Hodgkinson, H. (1993). A demographic look at tomorrow. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Johnson, J. & Immerwahr, J. (1994). First things first - What Americans expect from the public schools. New York, NY: Public Agenda.

Kentucky Revised Statutes, Annotated, Official Edition. (1987/1990). Charlottesville, VA: The Michie Law Company Publishers.

Legislative Research Committee. (1991). The Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990: A citizen's handbook. Frankfort, KY: Legislative Research Commission.

Powell, A., Farrar, E., and Cohen, D. (1985). The shopping mall high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence. (1989) The path to a larger life: Creating Kentucky's educational future, a report of the Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.

Schlechty, P. (1991). Schools for the twenty-first century. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Simpson, K., et al. (1995a). The Status of the Kentucky secondary school. Final report to the Joint UK/Uof L KERA Research Center. Lexington, KY.

Simpson, K., et al. (1995b). Resources on high school restructuring. Final report to the Joint UK/Uof L KERA Research Center. Lexington, KY.

Sizer, T. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sizer, T. (1992). Horace's school: Redesigning the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Task Force on High School Restructuring (1993). Task force on high school restructuring final report. Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Department of Education.

Weston, S. (1991). School-based decision making: A guide for school council members and others. Lexington, KY: Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence.

Appendix A

Configuration Map

AN INNOVATION COMPONENT CONFIGURATION MAP FOR HIGH SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING

School:	Observer:	Date:
Total number of teachers:	Total number of students:	Number of teaching teams:

Please note:

This document was developed by the Kentucky Institute for Education Research for the purpose of studying the implementation of High School Restructuring and is not to be used as an evaluation instrument. While it was designed as a research tool, this document can be used for planning and self-assessment of local patterns of implementation.

This document, known as a Component Configuration Map, identifies key components of High School Restructuring and describes variations in practice one would expect to find across the state. The variations farthest to the left are considered by Kentucky practitioners, researchers and developers to be the emerging practice advocated in the KERA initiative. Determining which is the most effective or efficient variation of practice will be the challenge of ongoing research.

The developers of this Innovation Component Configuration Map are periodically reviewing and revising this instrument to improve its usefulness and ability to identify important variations in practice. Please send all comments and suggestions to Roger Pankratz, Executive Director, Kentucky Institute for Education Research, 146 Consumer Lane, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601. Fax 502-227-8976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. CORE COMPONENTS FOR HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

A. Individual Graduation Plans
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

1) Standards for graduation plans *[established, state & national standards, communicated]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
Standards are formally established, and implemented addressing state learning goals and national standards. Systems are in place to communicate standards to students, parents and related others.	Standards are formally established and focus mainly on state learning goals. Systems are in place to communicate standards to students and parents.	Standards have been written, but little has been done to communicate them to students, parents, or the public.	Stakeholders are not involved in a process to develop standards.	There is no formal process to involve stakeholders in the development of standards.

2) Process for graduation plans *[established, involvement of stakeholders, monitored]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
An established process for developing graduation plans involves students, parents and others who support the after-high school transition and monitor this on-going process.	This established monitored process involves only two of the following: students, parents, or others who support the after-high school transition.	A formal process for developing individual graduation plans for all students is under development.	A process for developing individual graduation plans for all students is not under development at the present time.

3) Support system for student options *[breadth of options, link to career choice, advisement]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Students choose from a broad range of courses linked to career skills and options which utilize a variety of data sources for advisement. Students have regularly scheduled, frequent interaction with assigned advisors. Students are prepared for all post secondary options (college, military, work, technical school, home...).	Students choose from a number of options linked to some career choices. Students have regularly scheduled interaction with an assigned advisor.	Students choose from a limited list of alternative, optional, and additional courses and programs with help from available, but not necessarily assigned advisors.	Students have available to them a traditional course offering without an expanded support system. Students meet with an advisor/counselor only once a year for scheduling/planning.

4) Assessment & evaluation of individual student plans *[frequency, comprehensiveness]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Evaluation of graduation plans is ongoing. An advisory panel is available and parents are involved.	Graduation plans are reviewed each semester with students and advisors.	Graduation plans are reviewed at least once each year between students and their advisors.	Graduation plans undergo no formal periodic review and assessment.

B. Integrated Portfolios
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

1) Performance standards *[established, involvement of stakeholders, monitored]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
Quality pieces in portfolios exceed national standards for academic excellence. Documentation reflects a total integration of post-secondary academic interests of the student. Documents show a breadth of student preparedness for post-secondary experiences and reflect ongoing development of the students.	Portfolio pieces meet national standards for excellence. Documentation reflects some integration of student interests with academics and reveals a breadth of high school experiences that show the four year development of the student.	Portfolio pieces meet some academic standards and show some integration of student interests with academics. Documents show some expanded experience base and reveal some ongoing development of the students interest.	Integrated portfolios have content standards only (no performance standards).	Only required KIRIS portfolios are in place.

2) The process of portfolio development *[established, involvement of stakeholders, monitored]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
A portfolio process is established through involvement of all stakeholders. The process is formally monitored.	A portfolio process is established. The process is the product of a committee with input from stakeholders. The process is monitored.	A portfolio process is in the planning stage.	School personnel have not established a process for academic portfolios beyond the KIRIS requirements.

3) Collaborative support system *[faculty-student collaboration]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Multiple faculty, from middle school through high school, collaborate with students to support ongoing portfolio development.	Faculty and students have ongoing collaboration on portfolios throughout high school.	Faculty and students have periodic collaboration on portfolios.	Faculty and student collaboration on portfolios has no operational support system.

4) Portfolio research *[number of pieces & references]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Numerous integrated portfolio pieces contain exhaustive references revealing a strong primary research base.	Several integrated portfolio pieces contain numerous references revealing a primary research base.	One or two portfolio pieces reflect primary source material as a research base.	Portfolio pieces contain no primary source material.

5) Reflective student assessment and evaluation *[documentation, self reflection, use of technology]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
Portfolios contain complete faculty and community documentation of developmental progress of students and also contain strong self-reflection pieces in which students assess their post-secondary preparedness. Students utilize a wide variety of technology to prepare and present pieces.	Portfolios contain much faculty and community documentation of developmental progress of students. They also contain self-reflection pieces which address many aspects of post-secondary preparedness. Students utilize varied technology to prepare and present pieces.	Portfolios contain some faculty or community documentation of developmental progress. Self-reflection pieces address a few aspects of student preparedness. Students utilize some technology to prepare and present pieces.	Portfolios contain little documentation. Self-reflection pieces are poorly developed. Students use only written media to present pieces.	Portfolios contain no faculty and/or community documentation of progress. Student self-reflection is not evident.

C. Culminating Project and Panel Presentation (CPPP)
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

1) Content standards *[established, collaboration, communication]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
The CPPP completely integrates academic with military, work force, and postsecondary interests and exceeds national standards. The CPPP also shows strong oral and written defense skills and uses a wide variety of technology in preparing and presenting pieces.	The CPPP shows much integration of academic interest with post- secondary goals and meets national standards. The CPPP shows good oral and written defense skills and uses a variety of technology in preparing and presenting pieces.	The CPPP shows some integration of academic interests and post-secondary goals. The use of national standards is evident. The CPPP also presents oral and written defense skills and uses some technology in preparing and presenting pieces.	No specific standards seem to be developed in the CPPP.	No CPPP is in place at this time.

2) Process for developing culminating projects *[established, collaboration, communication]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
The CPPP process was established as a collaborative effort of the school council and stakeholders. The process was communicated to students, faculty and parents. All students are involved.	The CPPP process was established by a committee with input from stakeholders. The process was communicated to students and faculty. Some students are involved.	The CPPP process was the work of one or two individuals. The process was communicated to faculty.	The CPPP process is in the planning stage.	School personnel develop no CPPP process.

3) Support system for culminating projects *[collaboration, interaction]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
Students, parents, advisors and community provide ongoing input into CPPP. Students demonstrate strong evidence of revision of written products and a thorough oral and written defense covering the breadth of the project.	Parents, students, advisors, and community provide input into the CPPP at a beginning level. Students show evidence of revision of written products and oral and written defense covering the breadth of the project.	Input into the CPPP is limited to advisors and students. Revisions and an oral and written defense are made.	The CPPP is a student generated project. Few revisions are made and the oral and written defenses are incomplete.	Students apparently have not developed or presented CPPP's.

4) Culminating project for assessment and evaluation *[level of development, communicated to students]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
A collaborative panel and students design a rubric for assessment that is distributed to students and key stakeholders a year in advance. It is used to evaluate the CPPP.	A collaborative panel designs a rubric for assessment that is distributed prior to the end of projects. It is used to evaluate the CPPP.	A group of educators develop an assessment rubric and make it available at the CPPP assessment. It is used to evaluate the CPPP.	No specific panel or assessment instrument is in place to evaluate the CPPP.

D. Required School Sponsored and Approved Activities
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

1) Standards development *[established collaboration communicated]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
School activity standards are formally established with the broad involvement of all stakeholders and formally communicated through documentation.	School activity standards are established through a committee with input from stakeholders.	School activity standards are in the process of development.	The school has not begun development of standards for school sponsored activities.

(2) Ranging option for activities *[variety, student choice]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
The school provides a wide variety of options and maximizes choice of interest areas for each student.	The school provides a variety of options and a high possibility of student choice.	The school provides some variety of options and some possibility of student choice.	The school provides minimal variety of options and little possibility of student choice.	Students are assigned to activities.

3) The process for school sponsored and approved activities *[established, involvement, monitored]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
A process has been formally established that involves students parents, faculty, and community. The process is formally monitored with on going feed back.	A process has been established that involves the student and an advisor. The process is monitored.	A process for engaging students in school sponsored activities is under development.	The school has not developed a process for school sponsored and approved activities.

4) Support system *[options, link to learning goals, link to career options]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
A broad array of service options have been developed in the school and community. There is a clear link to Kentucky's learning goals and career options.	An array of options are available, mostly in school. There is some link to Kentucky's learning goals and career options.	A service options program is under development.	The school has not yet developed service options.

5) Assessment and evaluation *[frequency, comprehensiveness]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Evaluation of service experiences is formal and ongoing with feedback to students.	Evaluation of service experiences is established and completed at the end of each semester.	Evaluation of service experiences is required but the process is up to the discretion of the advisor and student.	No process for evaluation of service activities has been established.

E. Exit Review

Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

1) Standards *[established, focus on learning goals, multiple data sources, communicated]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Exit review standards are established. They focus on Kentucky's learning goals, use multiple sources of documentation, and are widely communicated to stakeholders.	Standards are established focusing on Kentucky's learning goals. They include different sources of data, including academic portfolios and test scores and are communicated to select stakeholders.	Standards for exit review are under development.	The school has not yet developed standards for exit review.

2) Process *[established, broad involvement & participation, communicated]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
The process for exit review is formally established and involves the student with a number of faculty and staff. Structures are in place for communicating results via a portfolio or other School-Based Decision Making approved graduation measures.	The process for exit review is established and mainly involves the student with one or two faculty. The process is communicated to students through documentation.	A process for exit review is under development.	The school has not yet developed a process for exit review.

3) Evaluation *[established, frequency]*

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
A formal evaluation of the exit review process is conducted each semester.	A formal evaluation of the exit review process is conducted annually.	An evaluation of the exit review process is under development.	The school has not developed an evaluation of the exit review process.

F. Impact of New Graduation Requirements *[process, established]*
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

(a)	(b)	(c)
A formal evaluation process of the new graduation requirements is in place.	An evaluation of the impact of the new graduation requirements is being developed.	There is no evaluation of the new graduation requirements in place.

II. NEW ROLES FOR INDIVIDUALS & GROUPS

A. Students *[role defined, activities congruent, interactions]*
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
A new student role is defined (i.e., student as worker). Most curriculums are congruent with the new role. There is evidence of increased interactions between students and staff in the learning process.	A new student role is defined (i.e., student as worker). Some new curriculums are evident. There is some reported increase in interactions between students and staff.	New student roles are under discussion. There is some new curriculum based on new roles by some teachers and students.	Students maintain more traditional roles of students as passive learners, a majority of their school day.

B. Principal *[role defined, activities congruent, interactions]*
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
A new principal role is defined (i.e., principal as instructional leader and developer of human resources). Principal activities are consistent with the new role. There is evidence of increased interactions between teachers and students. The principal fully operates under the premise of shared decision making.	A new principal role is defined. There is some evidence of new activities congruent with the role. There is some evidence of increased interaction between teachers and students. The principal partially operates under the premise of shared decision making.	A new principal role is under discussion. There is some experimentation with a new role.	The principal maintains a more traditional role as school administrator.

C. Teachers *[role defined, activities congruent, interactions]*
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
A new teacher role is defined (i.e., teacher as facilitator and manager of learning activities). There is evidence of curriculum congruent with the new role and interactions with students and the larger school community.	A new teacher role is defined. There is some evidence of change in curriculum and types of interactions with students and some of the school community.	A new teacher role is under discussion and there is new curriculum with new roles by some teachers.	Teachers maintain a more traditional role of instruction and presenter of content a majority of the time. There is little evidence of any attempt to change role.

D. Parents and Adults *[role defined, activities congruent, interactions]*
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
A new role for adults is defined (i.e., parents and adults as facilitators and mentors in the learning process). There is evidence of increased interaction between students, parents, and other adults in the learning process. Parents and other adults feel included in all aspects of the school.	A new role for parents and adults is defined. There is evidence of some increase in interaction between students and adults in the learning process.	A new role for parents and adults is under discussion. Some projects and practices are experimenting with new roles.	Little or no attempt to change the role or to increase adult interaction with students has been made.

E. Central Office Staff *[role defined, activities congruent]*
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
A new role for central office personnel is defined (i.e., more support and less regulation). There is evidence of activities which are congruent with the new support role.	A new role is defined but activities have no evidence of being congruent with the new support role.	A new role for central office staff related to local schools is under discussion.	There is no discussion about changing the role of the central office personnel to support High School Restructuring.

F. The Community *[role defined, activities congruent]*
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
A new role for the community is defined (i.e., the community works as an active integral part of the learning environment). There is evidence of an increase in community support and in community based learning projects.	A new role for the community is defined. A few efforts to develop and use community learning projects have been initiated. More community support is evident.	Discussions are being held with community members about a new role.	Little or no effort is being made to increase the role of the community as part of the school learning environment.

III. NEW SCHOOL STRUCTURES

A. Curriculum *[integration]*
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
The curriculum is integrated across most subject matter areas. At least 100% of instruction is focused on the learning, application and integration of knowledge.	The curriculum is integrated across several disciplines. At least 70% of instruction is focused on the learning, application and integration of knowledge.	Teacher planning is underway to link knowledge directly to application, and integration of knowledge.	A number of teachers in the school are integrating learning across courses.	There is no schoolwide mechanism to develop an integrated curriculum

B. Staffing *[teaming]*
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
The school staff is mostly organized in teaching teams. Teams are flexible and change according to curriculum.	The school staff is organized so that half of the day allows for team teacher instruction and the other half for flexible scheduling.	The school staff establishes no schoolwide effort to increase teaming for instruction. About half of the instruction is produced by teacher teams.	The school staff is discussing teaming for instruction. Several teachers are experimenting with teaming.	The school staff velops no schoolwide ort to change school staffing patterns.

C. Use of Instructional Time *[flexible scheduling]*
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
The structure of the school day is designed to allow teachers and teams maximum flexibility at the level closest to students.	A new school schedule is in place using blocks of time either greater or less than traditional 50 minute periods.	Part of the school day is scheduled with flexibility and part of the day is scheduled as standard 50 min. to 1 hr. periods.	Some teachers are experimenting with flexible scheduling. There is some interest among faculty but not all are in favor of changing the instructional time schedule.	The instructional day is fairly traditional with 50 min. to 1 hr. time blocks. There is little understand as to why instructional time needs to be varied.

D. Management of Student Behavior *[self management, responsible group membership]*
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Students are involved in establishing and implementing schoolwide self management systems that emphasize responsible group membership. The community is supportive.	Students are encouraged to engage in self management and responsible group membership. Some community support is evident.	Discussions are underway to align student behavior management systems with the curriculum.	Student behavior is primarily governed by a set of school rules enforced by school staff.

E. Varied Authentic Performance Assessment *[frequency of use, integrated with instruction]*
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Faculty make regular use of performance assessment (PA) integrated with instruction. Most faculty use PA in their teaching.	Students have many opportunities to practice PA. Nearly half of the teachers regularly use PA in connection with instruction.	Students have some opportunities to practice PA. Performance assessment is often practiced apart from ongoing instruction.	Students have few opportunities to engage in PA. Traditional knowledge assessments are the rule. (ie. teacher made traditional tests).

F. Expanded Use of Technology *[frequency, instructional tool]*
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
Technology is utilized by most teachers and students daily as a tool for learning and communicating, and integrating knowledge.	Some teachers and some students are using technology to the fullest while others are not.	The school has a plan and is making progress toward full use of technology for instruction.	The school has a plan but little has been done to implement the plan for using technology for instruction.	The school has no plan for using technology beyond its' current system.

G. Funding for Instruction *[relates to priorities]*
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Funding follows instructional priorities. School budgets are the result of a collaborative process.	The school has a new process for determining funding priorities. Efforts are being made to change practices.	Discussions are underway to change how school budgets are made and how funding priorities are determined.	The school follows a more traditional budgeting process based on a history of expenditures.

H. School Based Decision Making (SBDM) *[full operation]*
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
The school is making every attempt to fully utilize innovative components of SBDM.	The school has an SBDM council that is partially operating and is implementing some components of SBDM.	The school has adopted SBDM and is having mild success with implementation of components.	The school is considering or has recently approved the move to SBDM.	The school is not considering SBDM as an option at this time.

I. Professional Development *[collaborative, linked to KERA initiatives, based on need]*
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Collaborative school based staff development is focused on KERA and based on teachers needs. Staff development is planned collaboratively and based on developmental needs.	Collaborative school based staff development is focused on KERA. A number of options for staff are provided.	Staff development is planned by a committee or a few individuals. There is a focus on KERA initiatives.	Administration provides staff development but there does not appear to be a focus on staff development.

J. Linkage to Post High School Experiences *[frequency, authenticity]*
Circle the statement that most accurately applies.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Linkages to post high school experiences are planned, authentic, ongoing, and connected to revised high school graduation requirements.	Students have many opportunities to link to post high school work or learning.	Students have some opportunities to link school experiences with post high school experiences.	The high school curriculum shows no evidence of linkage to post high school experience beyond the traditional processes previously in place.

Appendix B

Mean Scores and Correlation Coefficients for 33 High Schools

Appendix B
Mean Scores and Correlation Coefficients for 33 High Schools[1]

Restructuring Component	Mean	Correlation Coefficients
New Graduation Plans	3.36	
Standards for Individual Graduation Plans	3.30	.69
Processes for Individual Graduation Plans	2.97	.71
Student Options in Individual Graduation Plans	2.58	.61
Assessment for Individual Graduation Plans	3.00	.67
Standards for Integrated Academic Portfolios	4.18	.54
Process for Integrated Academic Portfolios	3.15	.71
Support for Integrated Academic Portfolios	2.55	.67
Research Sources in Integrated Academic Portfolios	2.97	.56
Assessment of Integrated Academic Portfolios	3.27	.61
Standards for Culminating Project	4.45	.42
Process for Developing Culminating Project	4.12	.62
Support System for Culminating Project	4.45	.45
Assessment for Culminating Project	3.67	.40
Standards for Required School Activities	3.15	.87
Options for Required School Activities	2.52	.56
Process for Required School Activities	3.18	.76
Support for Required School Activities	3.03	.72
Assessment for Required School Activities	3.55	.71
Standards for Exit Review	3.36	.75
Process for Exit Review	3.27	.78
Evaluation of Exit Review	3.58	.69
Impact of New Graduation Requirements	2.58	.59
New Roles for Individuals and Groups	2.12	
New Roles for Students	2.21	.63
New Roles for Principal	1.88	.74
New Roles for Teachers	2.09	.83
New Roles for Parents and Adults	2.39	.72
New Roles for Central Office	1.97	.53
New Roles for the Community	2.18	.74
New School Structures	2.65	
Curriculum	3.36	.69
Staffing	3.88	.41
Use of Instructional Time	2.79	.66
Management of Student Behavior	3.00	.63
Authentic Assessment	2.27	.59
Expanded Technology	2.45	.63
Funding for Instruction	2.33	.72
School-Based Decision Making	1.85	.62
Professional Development	2.00	.65
Linkage to Post-High School Experience	2.60	.51

[1] A mean of "1" represents the highest level of implementation "A," and a mean of 4 or 5 represents the lowest level of implementation on each component, "D" or "E.".