DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 465 586 SE 066 284

AUTHOR Pellicer, Leonard O.; Anderson, Lorin W.
TITLE Teacher Leadership: A Promising Paradigm for Improving Instruction in Science and Mathematics.
PUB DATE 2001-00-00
NOTE 17p.; In: Developing Teacher Leaders: Professional Development in Science and Mathematics; see ED 451 031. Update of "A Handbook for Teacher Leaders"; see ED 382 601.
AVAILABLE FROM ERIC Clearinghouse for Science, Mathematics, and Environmental Education, 1929 Kenny Road, Suite 200, Columbus, OH 43210-1080. Tel: 800-276-0462 (Toll Free); Fax: 614-292-0263.
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Improvement; *Mathematics Teachers; *Science Teachers; Teacher Empowerment; *Teacher Leadership

ABSTRACT

Without question teacher leadership is more important today to the success of America's schools than it has ever been before. As schools and the populations they serve have grown in size and complexity, principals can no longer be expected to be the sole, or even the primary, source of instructional leadership. This realization has come about as a result of the series of reform waves that swept across the American educational landscape during the past two decades. Although teachers traditionally have had limited authority to exercise control over conditions that affect students in their classrooms, school boards and school administrators traditionally have exercised almost total control over conditions that have shaped the working lives of teaches. The results of systematically excluding teachers from meaningful participation in decision making over the years should have been all too predictable--stagnation of the teaching profession and the failure of American schools. Nowhere is teacher leadership more needed than in the highly technical and critical content areas of science and mathematics. In addition to a discussion of the conditions that have led to the realization that teacher leadership is no longer a luxury but a necessity if schools are to succeed, this chapter gives attention to the need to professionalize teaching by promoting teacher leadership. The qualities and characteristics of teacher leaders as reported in the literature are summarized and the chapter concludes with a description of the challenges that confront educators in their attempts to embrace teacher leadership. (Contains 16 references.) (Author/MVL)

ERIC

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

ED 465 586

1 Teacher Leadership: A Promising Paradigm For Improving Instruction In Science And Mathematics

Leonard O. Pellicer &
Lorin W. Anderson
University of South Carolina

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

° Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Without question teacher leadership is more important today to the success of America's schools than it has ever been before. As schools and the populations they serve have grown in size and complexity, principals can no longer be expected to be the sole, or even the primary source, of instructional leadership. This realization has come about as a result of the series of reform waves that swept across the American educational landscape during the past two decades. Although teachers traditionally have had limited authority to exercise control over conditions that affect students in their classrooms, school boards and school administrators traditionally have exercised almost total control over conditions that have shaped the working lives of teachers. The results of systematically excluding teachers from meaningful participation in decision making over the years should have been all too predictable--stagnation of the teaching profession and the failure of American schools. Nowhere is teacher leadership more needed than in the highly technical and critical content areas of science and mathematics. In addition to a discussion of the conditions that have led to the realization that teacher leadership is no longer a luxury but a necessity if schools are to succeed, this chapter gives attention to the need to professionalize teaching by promoting teacher leadership. The qualities and characteristics of teacher leaders as reported in the literature are summarized and the chapter concludes with a description of the challenges that confront educators in their attempts to embrace teacher leadership.

Without question, teacher leadership is more important today to the success of America's schools that it has ever been before. Schools have grown substantially larger and academic programs have become increasingly complex. A greater number of young Americans, from

Note. This chapter is an update of a more extensive publication on teacher leadership: Pellicer, L., & Anderson, L. (1995). *A Handbook for Teacher Leaders*. Corwin Press, Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA

SE 066 884

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ERIC

far more diverse backgrounds, come to school at increasingly earlier stages in their lives and remain in school longer than they ever have. In addition, more of today's students bring with them to school an increasingly complex array of educational, social, physical, and psychological problems that stubbornly defy even the most creative solutions.

At the same time that schools and the populations they serve have grown in size and complexity, the American system of schooling has become a particularly attractive target for political leaders who have given voice to the demands of the citizenry that schools do more of what they are supposed to be doing better than they have ever done it before. Since there still remains a rather substantial difference of opinion in this country in regard to exactly what schools should be doing, this has confounded educators who are struggling to meet the standards placed squarely on their shoulders by accountability systems that currently are inadequate to measure meaningful results.

So what does teacher leadership have to do with all this? Quite simply, if schools are to successfully meet the challenges of the times, then teachers have to play a greater role in providing key leadership at all levels. Teachers must be treated as equal partners in decision making because they bring a wealth of experience and information to the table that can be used to significantly improve teaching and learning in America's schools. The National Teacher Forum (April, 1998) has identified several ways in which teachers can lead: participating in professional organizations, being involved in school decisions, defining what students need to know and be able to do, sharing ideas with colleagues and mentoring new teachers, helping with personnel decisions, becoming leaders in the community, leading efforts to make the work of teachers more visible while still communicating positive messages about schools and teaching, and creating partnership with the community, businesses and organizations, and colleges and universities. These are all critical leadership roles that teachers must increasingly assume.

Nowhere is teacher leadership more needed than in the highly technical and critical content areas of science and mathematics. In the remainder of this chapter, we discuss the conditions that have led to the realization that teacher leadership is no longer a luxury, but a necessity if schools are to succeed. We also give some attention to the need to professionalize teaching while promoting teacher leadership and explain why principals cannot do the job alone. The qualities

ERIC

and characteristics of teacher leaders are summarized, and the chapter concludes by describing the challenges that confront us in our attempts to embrace teacher leadership.

Why Teacher Leaders?

For much of the past 15 years educators have been overwhelmed by an avalanche of reports from a wide assortment of blue ribbon commissions, committees, and task forces all declaring that American education is broken and suggesting ways to fix it. *A Nation at Risk* (1983) was the first report of this time period to gain public attention on a grand scale. *A Nation at Risk,* in concert with a flood of similar reform reports issued in its aftermath, spawned an unprecedented flood of public outrage in protest of what was perceived as the complete and total failure of the American system of public schooling. It is important to note that this is not the first time that American education has come under attack (see, for example, Alkin, 1942, and Silberman, 1970). Critiques and responses of education in this country seem to be as American as apple pie. During the intervening years since this great flood of reform reports, state legislatures have struggled mightily to pass massive school reform programs to address the perceived ills of America's schools.

The first major wave of school improvement efforts followed closely on the heels of *A Nation at Risk* (1983) and crested in a mountain of state mandates and regulations designed to reform almost every aspect of American public schooling including, but not limited to, attendance requirements and academic standards for students, professional licensure requirements and performance standards for teachers, and student contact hours, curricula, and accountability measures for schools.

Unfortunately, these massive efforts to reform American education met with disappointing results. Despite all the time, energy, and fiscal resources invested, the expected results were never achieved. However, these efforts did produce more and longer school days, tighter attendance requirements, more tests for students with higher standards for success, and more stringent requirements to enter into and remain in the teaching profession. But when this first major reform wave receded from the American educational landscape, what remained for the most part, was a great deal more work, stress, and frustration for teachers, staff, and administrators, with only very modest gains for students.

ERIC

The false assumption that drove the first big reform wave of the 1980s was that the chief problem with American education could be found in watered-down curricula, low academic standards for students, and lax accountability measures for teachers, administrators, and schools. That assumption was essentially flawed, but served to teach educators and politicians a valuable lesson. Simply doing more of the same thing, even if we did it a little better, would not produce the results we were hoping to achieve.

The late 1980s witnessed the birth of a second major wave of school reform aimed at restructuring public schools. The intent behind restructuring schools was to do the business of education in a different way by redesigning roles and relationships to get the job done more effectively and efficiently. In the words of Ann Lieberman of Teachers College, the call for restructuring schools, "raises issues of fundamental change in the way teachers are prepared, inducted into teaching, and involved in leadership and decision making at the school level" (1988, p. 4). As such, restructuring represents an important evolution in our thinking about education because the underlying assumption behind restructuring is that the chief problems with American public school education resides in the structure of schools and in the roles teachers and principals play in those schools, not in the curriculum, academic standards, or accountability measures that happen to be in place. This is an important insight for a number of reasons.

For more than 100 years, American schools have operated on a 19th century industrial model that casts principals in the role of management and teachers in the role of labor. Perhaps more than anything else, this outmoded model has contributed to fractured school communities where there are few shared values and no clear consensus on the most appropriate educational outcomes for students or the best means to achieve those outcomes. Consequently, few school communities have a consensual, shared vision of what they should or can be. This lack of a shared vision has limited the effectiveness of schools and created adversarial relationships where teachers and principals are pulling in opposite directions more intent on maintaining a balance of power than in achieving a common dream.

There can be little doubt in anyone's mind that schools need a transformation in terms of how they have been organized and how the people in them have worked together to meet the needs of students. The old assumption that the *principal must be the instructional leader*

ERIC

of a school is no longer relevant. In fact, the rigid, bureaucratic, organizational structure encouraged by this kind of thinking has been largely responsible, during the last century, for preventing teachers from exercising the kind of leadership that could bring about the long-awaited rebirth of schooling in America.

Although teachers traditionally have had limited authority to exercise control over conditions that affect students in their classrooms, school boards and school administrators traditionally have exercised almost total control over conditions that have affected the working lives of teachers. The results should have been all too predictable—stagnation of the teaching profession and the failure of American schools.

Many of us now believe that effective instructional leadership requires a partnership between teachers and principals. It's no longer enough for a principal to have a vision for what a school can be. If we have learned anything during the past 15 years, it's that teachers and principals must share a vision of what a school can be. In order for schools to excel, teachers, as well as principals, must take responsibility for providing the leadership that is required to create this common vision. In the words of Peter Senge (1990):

> *A shared vision is not an idea. It is not even an important idea such as freedom. It is, rather, a force in people's hearts, a force of impressive power. It may be inspired by an idea, but once it goes further—if it is compelling enough to acquire the support of more than one person—then it is no longer an abstraction. It is palpable. People begin to see it as if it exists. Few, if any forces in human affairs are as powerful as shared vision. (p.206)*

In answer to the question, "Why teacher leaders?" the answer is really quite simple. Principals cannot do the job alone--they never could do it and they never will be able to do it! As Senge has noted, without the support of more than one person, a vision is just an abstraction. It takes principals and teachers working together to transform this abstraction into meaningful reality. Without question, teachers have important leadership roles to play in their schools.

The Need to Professionalize Teaching

We have mentioned the factory model of schooling and the impact it has had on "de-professionalizing" teaching. Teaching can never be regarded as a true profession as long as people cling to the notion

ERIC

that principals are the managers of the school enterprise and teachers are the workers. This view presents an insurmountable obstacle to tapping the vast leadership resources available in the teaching force and cripples any attempts to truly restructure schools.

In a restructured school, the principal's most important task is to organize and cultivate the talents of all of the players in the school, thus providing a dynamic new kind of leadership. In a restructured school, teachers' roles must be expanded; they must make decisions that affect not only the students in their classrooms, but also other teachers and even the entire school community.

The reaction to this new role for teachers has been mixed. Although some teachers have willingly embraced it, others have been more hesitant. Even some of those who have embraced new roles for teachers have serious questions about how their new roles and responsibilities should be defined. Many lack confidence in their ability to perform some of the new tasks expected of them. Although many teachers have consistently demonstrated their ability to lead, some have not had an ample opportunity to develop and practice leadership skills. Some prospective teacher leaders fear the chasm the new roles might place between them and their colleagues; others are called on to assume responsibility but are unsure of the authority they have been given or whether they even want that authority. In many settings, teacher leadership roles are still ambiguous, and many teachers are frightened by that ambiguity.

If teachers are to get past these concerns and function as true professionals, principals must change the way they function as leaders. Although schools have developed new mission statements and implemented strategic planning and site-based management in recent years, most are not set up to accept teachers in leadership roles and "often discourage teachers from taking on additional responsibilities" (Creighton, 1997, p. 1). Principals must make it a priority to secure, maintain, and provide an adequate array of resources and support services that will enable teachers to perform the work for which they have been certified and employed. An important part of that work should focus on teachers providing instructional leadership for their colleagues.

If the education community truly desires to professionalize teaching, then it must alter its conception of teachers and teaching. In this regard, some of the fundamental practices and policies that presently encourage the rationalization or routinization of teaching

ERIC

must be changed. School leaders must dispense with ineffective evaluation systems that fail to recognize the complexity of teaching, spurn peer review, and cause principals to act as supervisors. They must halt competition for teacher loyalty and eliminate teacher isolation by bringing professional educators together to engage in meaningful dialogue. They must regard the work of teaching as mission-bound, rather than as time-bound.

Most important, however, school districts must shift a major portion of the responsibility for instructional leadership from principals to teachers. Such a shift enables principals to do better what they do (be administrators), while at the same time permits teachers to do better what they do best (make and act on decisions in the best interest of their students). Lieberman, Saxl, and Miles (1988) cut to the heart of the matter:

> *It is paradoxical that, although teachers spend most of their time facilitating for student learning, they themselves have few people facilitating for them and understanding their needs to be recognized, encouraged, helped, supported, and engaged in professional learning. Perhaps this is what we mean by "professionalizing" teaching and "restructuring the work environment" of teachers. (p. 152)*

As Little (1988) noted, even the most conservative workplace reform proposals require teachers to "act differently toward their work and one another..." and "to take the *lead* [italics added] in advancing the understanding and practice of teaching" (p. 82).

Principals Can't Do It Alone

About a decade ago, we were part of a national research team that conducted an in-depth study of instructional leadership in American high schools (Pellicer, Anderson, Keefe, Kelley, & McCleary, 1990). Initially, our expectations were that, in accordance with the general thinking and attitudes reflected in the profession at that time, principals would assume primary responsibility for instructional leadership and be recognized by teachers as *the instructional leaders* in their schools. But that turned out not to be the case. We discovered convincing evidence that instructional leadership, at least in the most effective schools we studied, was a shared responsibility. In no instance did we find that the principal was the sole source of instructional leadership in an effective school, and only in isolated instances could the principal

ERIC

be characterized as a primary source. Surprisingly, most of these high school teachers told us that they "never sought the advice of the principal on instructional matters" and that discussions of instructional improvements tended to be "department centered," rather than "school centered." More often than not, department chairpersons were identified as the major source of instructional leadership in the secondary schools we studied.

This should not have been a surprising finding given the breadth and complexity of modern high school curricula. Principals simply do not have the knowledge and skills required to provide the primary leadership for so many diverse and divergent fields of knowledge. One of the authors of this chapter, Leonard, is a former high school principal. His teaching expertise was in the area of English where he was certified as a secondary language arts teacher. The other author, Lorin, was a secondary mathematics teacher. It would be patently ridiculous for anyone to assume that if Leonard happened to be the principal of the school where Lorin was teaching mathematics, that Leonard could provide substantive instructional leadership in Lorin's area of expertise. But this is exactly the kind of thinking that has led many of us to assume that the principal can and should be *the* instructional leader of a school.

The best that principals can hope to do in working with teachers to provide instructional leadership across a broad range of academic fields is to make a rough judgment as to how well teachers practice a generally accepted set of generic instruction skills (e.g. organizing classrooms, managing classrooms, planning instruction, delivering instruction, and assessing and evaluating students). At best, this might allow a principal to make a general estimate as to whether a teacher is competent or incompetent in terms of the application of that generally accepted set of teaching competencies--no more, no less. This estimate must necessarily be rough, because without in-depth content knowledge and, increasingly important, pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987), an observer of a teaching performance has no way of knowing if the teacher has chosen the *proper* learning objectives for a *particular* lesson, *matched* those objectives with the *most suitable* teaching techniques to communicate the selected content to the students, *employed* the selected teaching techniques *appropriately*, and, finally, *used* the *proper* formative and summative evaluative techniques to measure how well students have achieved the learning objectives. This is pretty complex material when put into the

proper context. In order for a principal to really judge the effectiveness of a teacher in a given subject field, the principal would have to be at least the content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge equal of the teacher in the subject field that was being taught. It is an extremely rare set of circumstances that would permit this situation to occur. For highly technical and complex fields such as mathematics and science, the principal will rarely be the content equal of the teacher since relatively few principals have mathematics or science teaching backgrounds. Even for those few principals who do, their content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge can quickly become obsolete because they do not have adequate time to maintain their academic edge with the pressing demands of their administrative responsibilities. The only reasonable conclusion that can result from the foregoing discussion is that principals simply can not be *the instructional leaders* for schools no matter how much they should be or want to be.

What Is Instructional Leadership?

So exactly what is instructional leadership? What is it that principals were not doing and that teachers were doing in the schools we studied? These are difficult questions to answer, even for those who are actively engaged in the instructional leadership process. More than 50 years of combined experience and research have led us to define *instructional leadership* as initiating, implementing and sustaining planned change in a school's instructional program, which is supported by the various constituencies in the school, and that results in substantial and sustained improvement in student learning.

The exercise of instructional leadership calls for providing vision and direction, resources, and support for teachers and students. As we wrote a few years ago, "Instructional leadership begins with an attitude, an expressed commitment to student growth and productivity, from which emanates values, behaviors, and functions deliberately designed to foster, facilitate, and support student satisfaction and achievement" (Pellicer et al., 1990, p. 31).

We believe that the act of instructional leadership must be the responsibility of teachers if schools are to improve and if teaching is to achieve professional status. This assertion raises one final question: What do we know about teacher leaders that can provide us with a basis for improving teacher leadership in the areas of science and mathematics?

ERIC

Teachers Who Lead

In addition to the obvious leadership behaviors that teachers display on a daily basis in their classrooms, teachers have for more than a century assumed formal leadership roles in their schools. Department chairpersons, team leaders, lead teachers, grade-level chairs, curriculum teachers, consultants, master teachers, and mentors are just a few of the important formal leadership roles fulfilled by teachers over the years. Hatfield, Blackman, Claypool, and Master (1987) estimated that from 10% to 20% of the teaching staff are engaged in leadership roles designated by more than 50 titles. In these formal roles, as well as in a variety of less formal roles such as members or chairpersons of formal and informal study groups and committees, teachers have served as planners, initiators, developers, facilitators, promoters, ombudspersons, problem solvers, nurturers, values clarifiers, and catalysts for individual and school-wide change and improvement. Without question, teachers have always been leaders, regardless or whether or not their leadership has been fully acknowledged.

We believe that titles are relatively unimportant. Whether a teacher leader is called a lead teacher, department chairperson, grade chairperson, curriculum coordinating teacher, master teacher, or whatever is less important than the functions he or she performs and the ability of that leader to establish and maintain acceptance and credibility with those he or she leads. Leadership involves change, and change requires the ability to take others where they would not normally go. Wasley (1991) defined teacher leadership as "the ability . . . to engage colleagues in experimentation and then examination of more powerful instructional practices in the service of more engaged student learning" (p.170). We like this definition; it is focused on children and instruction and denotes change in a positive direction.

To function as leaders, teachers who lead engage in a wide variety of behaviors. They assume responsibility for the continued development of their professional colleagues. They mentor those new to the profession by serving as role models. They provide leadership in content areas by producing instructional materials and creating positive work environments under trying circumstances. And for the most part, teacher leaders engage in these leadership activities while continuing to teach their own classes of students (Lieberman, 1988; Wasley, 1991).

ERIC

Lieberman et al. (1988) added to and expanded on this list of teacher leadership roles and responsibilities. In a multiyear study of 17 teachers in a variety of teacher leadership roles, Lieberman and her colleagues found that successful teacher leaders employed a set of skill clusters that allowed them to (a) build trust and rapport, (b) examine issues within an organizational context, (c) build skill and confidence in others, (d) use resources wisely and efficiently, (e) deal with the change process, and (f) engage in collaborative work with teaching colleagues. From the results of their study, they concluded that "finding ways to create structures for teachers to work together, to focus on the problems of their school, to enhance their repertoires of teaching strategies--all are part of the work of teachers who work with other teachers" (p. 6).

O'Connor and Boles (1992) reported the results of a survey of Massachusetts teacher leaders on the nature of their roles and the support they needed to be successful in those roles. These researchers found that a significant majority of their sample of teacher leaders was involved in curriculum leadership, grade-level or departmental decision making, and staff development. The vast majority had conducted workshops and seminars for other teachers; most had served as mentors for other teachers. The major roadblocks to effectiveness in their leadership roles were a lack of time, unsatisfactory relationships with other teachers and administrators, and a lack of fiscal resources to get the job done. In terms of the additional skills and knowledge they needed in order to be more effective, teacher leaders in Massachusetts cited the need for a more complete understanding of the politics of schools, increased power and authority, better interpersonal relationships, and better communications skills in group dynamics, presentation skills, and organizational skills.

Wasley (1991), in her revealing in-depth case study of three teacher leaders, was struck "by how enormously complex teacher leadership roles are as they play out in practice" (p. 154). She noted that the roles involved power, authority, decision making, and different kinds of collaboration. Wasley's work strongly reinforces the notion that both teaching and leading are exhausting, even more so when they are done simultaneously. Furthermore, in most cases, there are no real incentives for teachers to lead; apparently they lead because they believe in what they are trying to accomplish. In other words, they are motivated by internal forces, rather than external factors.

Established teacher leadership roles, such as department chairpersons and team leaders, when contrasted with emerging teacher leadership roles, such as those highlighted in Wasley's study of teacher leaders, can lead to significant role confusion. Teacher leaders are teachers first, but they also are rare individuals who differ in significant ways from many of their colleagues. It is not surprising that all of these circumstances together can mean that the intentions for teacher leadership roles may not match the realities. Paradoxically, the confusion surrounding emerging teacher leadership roles led Wasley to conclude that the "factors that enabled the teacher leaders to be successful with their colleagues also constrained them, at once enhancing and diminishing their potential" (p. 154).

Zinn (1997) reported on a very interesting three-stage case study of teacher leadership at the elementary school level. Three issues guided Zinn's study including: conditions within the educational context that act as sources of support or barriers to teacher leaders, conditions outside the educational context that act as sources of support or barriers to teacher leaders, and the internal intellectual and psycho-social factors that motivate or impede teacher leaders. One of the key outcomes of the study was a matrix that categorized key sources of support and barriers to teacher leadership. Among the most significant sources of support were a strong network of colleagues, administrative support, and family and friends. Included among the most significant barriers to teacher leadership were insufficient time, a lack of support from teachers and administrators, and family and other commitments that conflict with the demands of teacher leadership.

Clearly, the demands of teacher leadership are many and challenging. At the same time, there are substantial barriers to achieving success in teacher leadership roles. But fortunately, there are many sources of support and means to enhance teacher leadership. The challenge can be simply stated--remove the barriers and increase the sources of support.

The Challenge Ahead

Creating the revolutionary organizational structures needed to promote the kind of teacher leadership envisioned by those at the forefront of educational restructuring will not be a simple task. Old ways die hard. Redefining roles in ways that encourage teachers to assume major responsibilities for instructional leadership is a tall order for many of us in the educational establishment. Moving away

ERIC

from the factory model of schooling requires no less than a major revolution in thinking that many teachers, principals, superintendents, board members, and especially legislators may not yet be prepared to embrace.

But if teacher leadership is to play a significant role in the genuine renewal of schools and schooling in this country, education professionals must expect the challenge to be difficult. They must recognize that significant social change rarely occurs suddenly and, like all meaningful change, is difficult to achieve. How long has American society been struggling to become fully integrated? To ensure equality for men and women? To combat alcohol and drug abuse? Complex structural changes on the scale and of the significance required to substantially alter the way schools do business will be no less challenging than issues relating to integration, equality, and substance abuse. Everyone must realize that real change--the kind of change discussed here--must occur first and foremost in the hearts and minds of individuals, not in the politics and policies of institutions. When enough individual hearts and minds change, then policies and practices will change with them.

Even if American educators are successful in their efforts at reconceptualizing the way schools should be organized, they still must address a number of important issues before they can realize the goal of creating significant leadership roles for teachers on a large scale. The "egalitarian ethic" that encourages educators, and the general public as well, to think of every teacher as being just like every other teacher regardless of "how experienced, how effective, or how knowledgeable" individual teachers may be remains a major obstacle to designing meaningful teacher leadership roles (Lieberman, 1988, p. 7). The isolation imposed on teachers by the way work responsibilities are divided, time schedules and work calendars are arranged, and buildings are designed continues to prevent them from active participation in the discussion of educational reform. And turf wars between bureaucratic school hierarchies and powerful teacher organizations initially spawned to protect teacher rights and privileges now stand in the way of true collaborative relationships that embrace the entire educational community.

Although these issues will not be resolved easily, the potential rewards are more than worth the effort. The end of forced teacher isolation and the building of colleagueship among teachers and between teachers and principals are achievable goals. In addition,

greater recognition and enhancement of the status for teachers, a more favorable system of teacher rewards, and the building of more flexible and responsive school structures to reshape teaching as a legitimate profession can improve the work lives of teachers and encourage greater numbers of talented young people to pursue teaching as a career (Lieberman, 1988, p. 8). Perhaps most important, a realization of the potential for teacher leadership on a broad scale can truly professionalize teaching and revolutionize schooling in America.

Although a number of forces have been driving the educational establishment toward a reconceptualization of schools and schooling, the extent to which it is possible to effectively restructure American public school education may well depend primarily on educators' ability to change their conceptualization of teachers and the conditions in which they work. As it is currently structured and practiced, many thoughtful observers would not even consider teaching to be a true profession. Far too many novice teachers leave after a very short (one or two year) "trial period."

On the basis of our examination of the work of others and our own observations and discussions with hundreds of teacher leaders over the years, we have arrived at two major conclusions. First, if schools are to be restructured successfully, teachers must assume a variety of important instructional leadership responsibilities. Second, many teachers are willing to assume these responsibilities, but have not been adequately prepared in terms of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to function as instructional leaders. As a profession, we must find ways to help teachers develop the attitudes and gain the skills and experiences they need to lead successfully.

Without question, teachers are the best and most abundant source of leadership available for our schools. Teacher leaders remain the last best hope for significantly improving American education. If teachers fail to embrace their responsibility to provide the leadership needed in our schools, then our schools will fail. And if administrative bureaucrats do not provide the conditions and support necessary for teacher leadership to flourish, then our schools will fail. In the final analysis, the efforts of teacher leaders at the forefront of change will be only as successful as the bureaucracy *allows* them to be!

Our experience has proven to us that it is absolutely vital that teachers remake the profession and establish a culture in which classroom teachers are seen as fully empowered partners in shaping policy, creating curriculum, managing budgets, improving practice,

ERIC

and bringing added value toward the goal of improving education for children (Troen & Boles, 1994, p. 40).

References

Alkin, W. (1942). *The story of the eight-year study.* New York: Harper and Row.

Creighton, T. B. (1997). *Teachers as leaders: Is the principal really needed?* Paper presented at the Annual National Conference on Creating Quality Schools, Oklahoma City, OK.

Hatfield, R. C., Blackman, C., Claypool, C., & Master, F. (1987). *Extended professional roles of teacher leaders in the public schools.* Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Lieberman, A. (1988). Expanding the leadership team. *Educational Leadership, 45* (5), 4-8.

Lieberman, A., Saxl, E., & Miles, M. (1988). Teacher leadership: Ideology and practice. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *Building a professional culture in schools* (pp. 148-166). New York: Teachers College Press.

Little, J. (1988). Assessing the prospects for teacher leadership. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *Building a professional culture in schools* (pp. 78-106). New York: Teachers College Press.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE). (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

O'Connor, K., & Boles, K. (1992, April). *Assessing the needs of teacher leaders in Massachusetts.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Pellicer, L. O., Anderson, L. W., Keefe, J. W., Kelley, E. A., & McCleary, L. (1990). *High school leaders and their schools: Volume II. Profiles of effectiveness.* Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art of the learning organization.* New York: Doubleday.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Education Review, 57*, 1-22.

Silberman, C. (1970). *Crisis in the classroom.* NY: Basic Books.

Teachers leading the way: Voices from the national teacher forum (1998). [Available online]. http://www.ed.gov/pubs/TeachersLead/forms.html

Troen, V., & Boles, K. (1994). A time to lead. *Teacher Magazine,* pp. 40-41.

Wasley, P. (1991). *Teachers who lead: The rhetoric of reform and the realities of practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Zinn, L. F. (1997). *Supports and barriers to teacher leadership: Reports of teacher leaders.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").

EFF-089 (3/2000)