

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 478 735

EA 032 637

AUTHOR Mizell, Hayes
TITLE Guiding Questions for Middle Grades Reform.
PUB DATE 2003-01-16
NOTE 22p.; Remarks made at a meeting convened by the Los Angeles Unified School District (Los Angeles, CA, January 16, 2003).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Administrator Qualifications; Adolescent Development; Change Agents; *Educational Change; Educational Environment; *Educational Improvement; Instructional Leadership; Junior High Schools; *Middle Schools; Outcomes of Education; School Organization; Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS *No Child Left Behind Act 2001

ABSTRACT

This speech addresses reform in the middle grades. The ideas were prompted by mandates of the No Child Left Behind Act. The speaker focused on eight fundamental questions, suggesting that the questions should have less to do with the techniques of implementation than with provoking discussion about a school system's or school's values, priorities, and practices. The questions are as follows: (1) Who will be the primary beneficiary of the reform? (2) What should be the results of all students' education in the middle grades? (3) What are the most effective ways to organize schools to help students achieve the results we are seeking? (4) What must we do to ensure that all students learn deeply and value their ability to demonstrate what they know? (5) How will we advance the affective development of young adolescents as a strategy to support their academic development? (6) What knowledge and skills must our teachers and administrators have and apply to help all students achieve the results we are seeking? (7) What will we give up to enable all students to achieve the results we are seeking? and (8) Who will lead middle-grades reform? (WFA)

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

Guiding Questions for Middle Grades Reform.

Hayes Mizell

January 16, 2003

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

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

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

H. Mizell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Remarks of Hayes Mizell on January 16, 2003 at a meeting convened by the Los Angeles Unified School District. Approximately 125 educators—local district superintendents, directors of instruction, middle school directors of school services, central office staff—participated in the meeting held at the Wilshire Grand Hotel in downtown Los Angeles. Mizell is Director of the Program for Student Achievement at the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation.

Guiding Questions for Middle Grades Reform

During the past ten years, there has been increasing attention to how middle level education should change to raise levels of student performance. One indicator of this growing interest is the name of a relatively new organization, The National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform. Its name is significant because the Forum boldly proclaims it is concerned with more than just marshalling support for the middle grades. The words “accelerate” and “reform” are not found together in the name of any other national education organization.

The National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform is but one voice of a deafening chorus demanding that schools dramatically raise levels of student performance. One consequence is that there are now a host of state accountability and assessment systems designed to achieve that result. These initiatives are sometimes clumsy and heavy-handed. Their quality and results are uneven, but their collective message is that school reform is no longer an option. Schools have been slow to respond, many going through the palsied motions of compliance, others with a death grip on denial. Perhaps it was only a matter of time before a single state’s accountability system emerged to shape federal education policy, having ridden on the coattails of a governor’s successful candidacy for president.

The No Child Left Behind Act has established as a national goal that all students will perform at the proficient level by the end of the eighth grade in 2014. The NCLB is

EA032637

not flawless legislation, and it is possible to deconstruct and parse it into impotency; indeed, that process is underway in many quarters. The real tragedy, however, is *not* the complexity or ambiguity of the law's provisions but that it has taken so long *and* the power of the federal government to insist upon what school systems should have embraced long ago: no tolerance for persistently low-performing schools, highly qualified teachers for every student, and compelling evidence that in successive grades all students are performing at increasingly higher levels.

No matter what one thinks of the law, school systems and schools are now faced with the practical dilemma of not only achieving the NCLB's long term goal of all students performing proficiently by 2014, but in the near term demonstrating that they are making adequate yearly progress towards it. Many school systems will respond as they always have, leaving it to individual schools to succeed or fail. Other school systems will assume their leadership responsibilities and partner with schools to provide the direction and support schools need to demonstrate improved levels of performance across all demographic groups of students. However, even if school system leaders respond positively, how should they begin? Each school system is different. Each school is different. There is no one approach to reform that is appropriate for the diverse geographical, demographic, cultural, economic, and political contexts that shape the schools of this country. This is as true for the middle level as it is for elementary and secondary schools.

School systems and schools are now in the process of making critical decisions that will determine how they will respond to the NCLB. Some will take the low road of denial, hoping the law will eventually sink under the weight of its more than 1000

pages. Others will hope they can count on political leverage or the limited resources of state education agencies and the U.S. Department of Education to impede enforcement of the law. Many more school systems and schools will become so consumed with the minutia of compliance that they will gravitate to the lowest possible level of response to the law's intent.

Even school systems and schools that want to respond positively to the NCLB's challenges may resort to the tried, if not true, approach of looking for a methodology that will conveniently and quickly boost student performance. There is no shortage of such potential remedies, particularly if one succumbs to the siren songs of vendors and consultants who are capitalizing on educators' anxieties about complying with NCLB mandates. But this panic-driven approach to reform is not in the best interests of educators or students, and the results are likely to be disappointing or fleeting.

There *are* more helpful tools and strategies than ever before that can support substantive school reform, but choosing from among these requires time, thought, and a critical perspective. Two hours of searching the Internet will yield a treasure trove of these resources. But as tempting as it may be to believe, or hope, that a particular technique will transform a low-performing or a mediocre-performing school into a high-performing one, the reality is that school reform that yields significant, sustainable improvements in student performance is long, hard work. It requires a practical philosophical framework, a thoughtful theory of change, strategies tightly linked to achieving specific results, clear communication, politically savvy development of support, dogged application over time, frequent assessment of outcomes, critical reflection and analysis, and periodic refinements. This is a lot to expect of overburdened

school system and school leaders, but their pursuit of short cuts is one reason that in the past so many “reforms” have been marginal and the results ephemeral.

Middle level education has often been the victim of this phenomenon of leaping before looking. In years past, many education decisionmakers authorized and supported the creation of middle schools not because they really understood their purpose or what it would take to operate them successfully, but because they were responding to the recommendations of middle school advocates. In many cases, these schools did not live up to the expectations of either the advocates or the decisionmakers. One result is that a few prominent school systems are now shifting *from* schools with a six through eight grade structures *to* schools that include kindergarten through eighth grade. In these cases, education decisionmakers argue that “middle schools don’t work” when what they should say is “middle schools don’t work the way we choose to operate and support them.” No reform, and recall that middle schools themselves were once a “reform,” is self-implementing; it requires commitment, knowledge, skill, and hard work. Middle level educators should keep that in mind when considering how to enable all students to perform at the proficient level.

Before considering the most effective approaches to reforming the middle grades to increase levels of student performance, educators should pause, take a deep breath, and *think*. They may find it helpful to join with a small group of their colleagues in developing, considering and discussing a set of *fundamental* guiding questions for middle grades reform. These questions should have less to do with the techniques of implementation than with provoking discussion about a school system’s or school’s values, priorities, and practices. For example:

Question 1: “Who will be the primary beneficiary of the reform?” - This is a serious, even a radical question. It strikes at the heart of schools’ priorities and operations. It speaks to who has power and who does not, and who benefits from the use of this power. At first blush the answer to this question may seem so obvious that it is not worth asking. Many people would quickly say that of course reform should primarily benefit *students* in the middle grades. However, if this answer is literal rather than rhetorical, it has serious implications. Is the answer merely “students” or “all students”? If all students are the beneficiaries, then their educational interests must be *primary*, the convenience of adults must be secondary. All principals will have to organize their schools and develop their master schedules solely for the purpose of advancing the learning of all students. All teachers will have to accept assignments to teach all students who can benefit from their instruction, regardless of who the students are or their current levels of performance. All teachers will have to participate in high quality professional development that will improve their instruction. All educators will *not* have the option of picking and choosing what they will and will not do, placing their interests above the education of their students.

Many middle level schools would argue that they are already student-centered, and some are, but upon close examination one often finds that it is the preferences of educators, not what is necessary to benefit all students, that determine the schools’ organization and activities. Because adults make virtually all the important decisions that affect the education of students, it is too easy to assume that in every case these decisions are intended to benefit the education of all students. But experience indicates this is not always true. The truth is that most school operations and even many reforms are shaped

as much by what adults do and do not want as by students' needs. School systems and schools must ensure that the reforms they pursue enhance the performance of all students, and they must have authentic processes in place to test whether their reforms achieve that goal.

Question 2: "What should be the results of all students' education in the middle grades?" - This is the most important question middle level educators can ask themselves, but it is the one they ask and discuss least frequently. Perhaps they assume that they are in agreement, or that the answer is provided by the state's academic standards, or by their school system's promotion policy, or by their school's mission statement. However, most teachers and administrators do not truly "own" these requirements. Seldom is there a living, flesh-and-blood consensus about the demonstrable results schools should help students achieve by the end of the middle grades.

There are myriad ways a school might frame the results that should focus and drive the school's educational goals. Should all students completing the eighth grade satisfactorily demonstrate their academic proficiencies in performance-based venues? Should all students entering the ninth grade qualify to enroll in high school courses that will prepare them to pursue some form of post-secondary education? Should all students who complete the eighth grade and remain in the school system satisfactorily complete the ninth grade?

In other words, what exactly *are* the desired results of students' middle grades education, and how will schools know whether they and their students have attained these results? When school systems and schools do not consider or answer these questions, in

effect they default in their professional responsibility to establish clear goals that complement but are independent of those mandated by the state. Without answers to these questions, reforms of school systems and schools will be unfocused, or the school systems and schools will adopt a reductionist reform agenda aimed only at increasing test scores. If students are really at the center of middle level education, then their schools owe it to them and their families to be clear about the results schools will help all students achieve.

Question 3: “What are the most effective ways to organize schools to help all students achieve the results we are seeking?” - Schools serving young adolescents often feel they have to genuflect before the holy trinity of middle level schooling: teams, advisories, and interdisciplinary curricula. In many cases they are unsure why they are doing so, they just know that professional norms dictate that these are essential elements of a true middle school. Unfortunately, many features of middle schools have earned a bad name either because schools have implemented them more in form than in substance, or because schools have not intentionally used them to foster learning. This should not be the case.

Teaming, for example, can be an important structure that enables teachers to address their students’ learning styles and needs more effectively. Teams can become small learning communities not only for students but also for the professional development of teachers. Because teachers on teams do not work in isolation, teams can foster mutual accountability. The potential of teams is almost boundless. Teachers can work together to examine and analyze student work. Teachers can collaborate to share their knowledge and insights about pedagogy that is most effective with individual

students. When teams are organized without regard to students' ages but rather their learning styles or curricular interests, there is greater opportunity to focus on student performance than on assumptions about what students should know because they are a certain age. When teams are coupled with looping, the potential benefits for students and teachers are even greater. Looping teams can provide the structure and stability that so many students in the middle grades need. They can even increase teachers' *internal* accountability because for two or three years teachers live with the results of their teaching. Looping teams do not have the luxury of merely passing on low-performing students to teachers in the next grade.

However, these benefits of teaming are not automatic. They are not guaranteed just because a school has teams. Any experienced and wise middle school principal will testify to the fact that teams need constant oversight and development. Organizing teams is like a chef deciding which mix of ingredients will produce the most flavorful stew. Teams are, in fact, a human relations stew and if the personalities, values, content knowledge, and pedagogy of teachers do not blend to accomplish specific learning goals, teaming will frustrate teachers and students will not benefit.

Teaming, then, makes good sense. It can be a practical means to increase levels of student performance. However, it takes hard work for teams to be productive. School systems and schools should not mandate teaming or hastily organize it merely to satisfy a shibboleth about what constitutes a true middle school.

This is also true for advisories and interdisciplinary curricula. Surely there are some schools where advisories help schools respond to students' developmental needs and where interdisciplinary curricula are rigorous. Like teams, these innovations may

have potential to directly impact student performance. Like teams, they often dissolve into pale and impotent imitations of middle level practices that truly benefit students and advance their learning. Quite often, these and other standard features of middle schools never become powerful enough to significantly impact the development and performance of students because schools are not committed to ensuring their quality. The problem is not a lack of information. All one needs to know about how to make teams, advisories, and inter-disciplinary curricula function effectively can be found on the Internet, or in books written by practitioners, or in the expertise of successful principals and teachers who have become consultants.

School system and school administrators may legitimately claim that they cannot attend to the quality of middle level structures and processes because they are burdened by many demands on their attention and time. However, if administrators are genuinely seeking better results, then they have to decide *which* structures and processes are most likely to help students achieve those results. They have to be coldly realistic about their own and their faculties' commitments to make these techniques function at the highest level of effectiveness. Otherwise, their schools will simply go through the motions of reform, and the only result will be embittered teachers who become convinced that no reform can live up to its promise.

Question 4: "What must we do to ensure that all students learn deeply and value their ability to demonstrate what they know?" - Many middle level educators are rightly concerned that state assessments are excessively shaping their schools' curricula. This is chickens coming home to roost. It is one consequence of school systems' and schools' lack of clarity about the results they want students to achieve. Inadequate attention to

student results, combined with school systems' and schools' poor oversight and support of teachers, has caused states, and now the federal government, to mandate rigorous assessments in an effort to focus curriculum and instruction. This trend will not abate until the general public and policymakers believe that students are pursuing and achieving school system and school goals that meet or exceed those set by the state or federal governments. That will require educators to demonstrate levels of professionalism that go beyond paint-by-the-numbers approaches to administration and teaching that at root are bureaucratic and formulaic, and therefore usually ineffective.

Achieving this credibility will be difficult, and it will require a combination of vision and bravado. Some school systems and schools will have to defy what prove to be controlling but academically ineffective requirements of state and federal governments. This will be a dangerous game because these school systems and schools will be betting that their educational approaches will outstrip the expectations of state and federal governments, and they will have to produce compelling evidence that they do. It remains to be seen how many school systems and schools will be confident enough in their own methodologies, personnel, and performance-based assessments that they will make this bet and produce the evidence to win it.

Such deviations from the mannered norms of public education may be necessary if middle level schools are going to intensify teaching and learning with the result that students comprehend more deeply, and more proficiently demonstrate what they know. Currently, schools are trying to shoehorn standard upon standard into limited time made even more finite by students' learning challenges. Under these circumstances, it is very difficult for students to deeply comprehend concepts and demonstrate at a high level the

application of their understanding. School systems and schools owe it to their students, however, to struggle with the task of identifying what is *most* important for students to know and do, and then focus their energies and resources towards those ends. Families do not send their young adolescents to school expecting them to learn everything, or even to learn everything it is desirable to learn. They do expect the public schools to enable their children to learn and apply what is most important.

Middle level schools have to determine what *is* most important for students to learn, and then do whatever it takes to make sure they learn it. This is already occurring in school systems that have decided to dedicate large blocks of the school day to literacy and mathematics instruction. Maybe they are motivated more by fear of students' low performance on the state test than by clarity about what it is most important for students to learn, but their focus illustrates biting the bullet to give priority to what the school systems believe students should learn.

There is also the question of what middle level schools will do to ensure that students value the ability to demonstrate their application of what they have learned. Currently, it is students' performance on state tests that rules. This is almost the exclusive focus of school systems and schools, and they communicate in no uncertain terms that this is what students should value as well. But what this means in practice is that students (a) interact with inanimate objects (pencil and paper), to (b) answer test questions conceived by people they have never seen, that (c) a machine will score using criteria the students do not understand, to (d) produce judgments students cannot use to improve their performance, and then (e) provide test results that will not be available for weeks or months.

Given what we know about the development of young adolescents and how they learn, it is no wonder that this method of assessment is alien, and perhaps alienating. Is this really the best way to communicate to students that it is important for them to be able to demonstrate their mastery of deep learning? Is this likely to cause them to value authentic performance as the best means to assess what a person knows and can do? Is it even the best way for school systems and schools to understand, deeply understand, what students know and are able to do? The state tests will not go away, but that does not relieve school systems and schools of the obligation to develop and use other means of assessment to communicate more powerfully to students that in the real world it is authentic performance that counts.

Question 5: “How will we advance the affective development of young adolescents as a strategy to support their academic development?” - For many years, middle level practitioners have debated whether their schools should devote greater attention to students’ academic development or their affective development. One camp believes that given the challenges young adolescents experience, schools should focus on their social and emotional development. The other camp argues that what is really important is what students know and can do. Unfortunately, these opposing views create a dichotomy that undermines the efforts of middle level schools to help students perform at the proficient level.

In years past, many middle level schools gave priority to students’ affective development, at the expense of their academic development. That strategy failed. It is no longer appropriate, therefore, for middle schools to depend on affective approaches as the

portal to improving student performance. The priority must now be students' mastery of content and the development of skills necessary to learn at increasingly higher levels.

This does not mean, however, that schools should turn a blind eye to the reality of students' social and emotional needs. Most young adolescents will not be able to succeed academically if they are troubled, depressed, distracted by their vulnerability, or if they are not secure in their sense of self. Conversely, no matter how healthy students may be, if they are not succeeding academically it will ultimately erode their feelings of confidence and self-worth; in many cases it results in students exhibiting negative behaviors. Students who are happier perform better academically; students who perform better academically are happier. Students' affective and academic development, then, are opposite sides of the same coin. One challenge middle level schools face is how to keep these two dimensions of education in balance while recognizing that student performance is the bottom line.

There are middle schools that do this well, and there is much to learn from them. At their best, these schools do not just compartmentalize their equal attention to students' academic and affective needs, addressing these separately and even at different times during the school day. Instead, the schools assume an affirmative obligation to *blend* students' affective and academic development. For example, when teachers use cooperative groups effectively, which is frequently not the case, the result can be students who interact more productively with their peers while also developing academic proficiencies. When schools engage all students in a school-wide movement to eliminate bullying, it cannot only increase students' confidence that they can take responsibility for and change their own community, it can also create more safe space for learning.

Whatever the method, schools that make wise and strategic uses of affective strategies to strengthen students' academic development will experience greater success than schools that fail to do so.

Question 6: "What knowledge and skills must our teachers and administrators have and apply to help all students achieve the results we are seeking?" - It is now apparent that many middle level teachers and administrators do not currently know enough to enable all their students to become proficient by 2014. There are several dimensions to this problem. It takes time for newer teachers to develop the skills to manage their classes effectively, and at the same time it is often only through daily interactions with their students that teachers learn how students' developmental characteristics and needs impinge on their learning. Among more experienced teachers, many are struggling with the demands of standards, increasing numbers of limited English proficient students, expectations that all teachers will assume some responsibility for improving students' literacy performance, and larger classes and less support resulting from state budget cuts. State accountability initiatives and the No Child Left Behind Act have increased pressures on teachers to perform at higher levels, but at the same time the challenges of the contexts in which teachers work have risen exponentially.

Many teachers and administrators respond to these pressures in one of three ways. Some keep their heads down and continue to teach and lead much as they always have, hoping they can survive even if their students may not. Others, particularly newer teachers, choose to leave the profession, or in the case of prospective principals they never enter it, thereby creating the shortage of educators that confront many school systems. Some teachers and administrators scramble to play *ad hoc* catch-up, trying as

best they can to fill the gaps in their content knowledge and instructional and leadership skills. So long as these scenarios prevail, there will be no great leaps forward in student performance.

To have any hope of enabling all students to perform at proficient and higher levels, school systems and schools will have to take a more serious and targeted approach to professional development. Certainly this requires more resources, but the first obligation of school systems and schools is to make more effective use of their *current* professional development resources. This means ferreting out isolated, uncoordinated, and ineffective pockets of professional development buried in categorical programs, special projects, and state requirements. It means abandoning professional development that cannot provide evidence of increased learning for educators and students. It means identifying *specific* content knowledge and instructional and leadership skills that teachers and administrators lack but must master *and* apply to significantly impact student performance. It requires professional development to become more narrow but much deeper. It means professional development dictated by gaps in student performance rather than by certification requirements, union contracts or educators' preferences.

Most middle level schools have tremendous professional development needs. Teachers and administrators may know little about the developmental characteristics of their students. The curricula may not be standards-based or it may be so broad that it does not provide adequate opportunities for inquiry and deep learning. Science and mathematics teachers may have inadequate knowledge of the subject content they teach,

with the result that they are textbook bound, unsure how to move their students from factual knowledge to comprehension and insight.

If schools are clear about the results students should achieve as a consequence of their middle grades education, the schools then have to assess honestly whether teachers and administrators both *have* and are *applying* the knowledge and skills necessary for students to demonstrate those results. There is a direct correlation between the performance of adults and that of students. If schools do not understand and address this, they are working on only one half of the problem of student learning. Raising the performance levels of teachers and administrators requires knowing with a high degree of certainty the knowledge and skills they need to raise levels of student performance. It then requires reforming professional development itself to ensure that teachers and administrators learn *and* apply that knowledge and those skills.

Question 7: “What will we give up to enable all students to achieve the results we are seeking?” - When middle level educators think of reforming their schools, what first comes to their minds is additional money, staff or time they believe will be necessary to succeed. Almost never do they consider what they could relinquish, what they could give up, what they could surrender that would also help all students achieve results schools say they want. Yet, in most middle level schools there are beliefs, habits of mind, and practices that get in the way of increasing student performance.

In some schools, educators assume that if a student enters the sixth grade reading below grade level by two or more years there is little that can be done and that by the end of the eighth grade the student will be just as far behind, if not more so. The mental model of these educators is a middle school that can only effectively educate students

who enter performing at grade level. Even though these educators may know that this concept is wildly unrealistic in today's world, emotionally they are resentful that students do not come prepared to learn at the levels and in the ways that their teachers want to teach. This is understandable, but it creates a school climate that is defensive and rigid rather than accepting and innovative. The school's *de facto* posture is that elementary schools and their students should change to meet the needs of the middle school, but not that the middle school should change in whatever ways may be necessary to enable students who are behind grade level to make up lost ground. If a school's educators are not willing to give up this mental model, reform will never be anything but veneer that fails to change the substance of the school or the results its students achieve.

It does not take much looking to find similar examples. Some schools are not willing to give up their methods of assigning students to classes that provide disproportionate benefits for some students at the expense of others. There are schools that are not willing to give up their traditional schedule, length of the school day, or their ways of relating to students' families or to community agencies. Other middle level schools are not willing to give up their belief that it is not appropriate to provide all students the curricula and support to keep open the option of pursuing post-secondary education. Central offices of school systems are not willing to give up their habit of producing blizzards of directives and requests that further confuse principals about priorities. There are even school boards that are not willing to give up their practice of treating the middle level as the accordion of the school system, expanding or compressing the grades of middle schools to accommodate enrollment pressures or other interests at the elementary and high school level.

There is no doubt it is difficult for a middle level school to identify and discuss deeply held beliefs that may have seeped into the fabric of the school's spirit and practices but stained its results. Some people in the school will consider it an assault on their values or their intentions to raise the issue. However, it is precisely because school systems and schools rarely confront such beliefs and practices that the inequity of results continues day to day, year to year. Unless middle level schools look inward to first identify and then give up those things that are impeding their own efforts to help students, they will corrupt their reforms before they even begin.

Question 8: "Who will lead middle grades reform?" - If school systems are serious about middle grades reform, they have to provide at least one person whose sole concern is making sure reform occurs in fact as well as in name. This individual has to get up every morning with the understanding that each day their primary mission is to help schools define, organize, and implement reform, as well as assess its effects. This person cannot, of course, "make" reform happen, only teachers and principals can do that, but he or she can be the catalyst, the motivator, the monitor, the facilitator, the troubleshooter, and the evaluator of reform. Effectively carrying out these roles requires this individual to have considerable authority. School systems often make the mistake of assigning a central office person to "coordinate" or "direct" middle schools but fail to give them the authority to mobilize the school system's resources for middle grades reform, and to clear central office roadblocks that impede reform.

Schools inevitably get conflicting messages from the central office about what should command their attention. These conflicting messages emanate from different sectors within the central office and while separately their intentions may be legitimate

and even necessary, schools experience them collectively as a deluge of memos and e-mail messages that are distracting and sometimes contradictory. One role of the school system person responsible for middle grades reform should be to minimize these distractions and reconcile conflicting agendas among different sectors within the central office.

Above all, this person should be the ally rather than the director of middle level schools. He or she should be the central office advocate for the middle level, and schools should look to them for guidance and support, while also understanding that this individual's role is to accelerate middle grades reform, ensure its quality, and improve its results. This leader does not necessarily need to hire, supervise, and evaluate middle level principals, but he or she should be intimately involved as a consultant to persons charged with these responsibilities, and participate in attendant decisions.

While strong central office leadership for middle grades reform is essential, it is no substitute for comparable leadership at the school level. There, administrators and teachers should be partners in leading reform. Though reform is everyone's responsibility, it is useful to designate one individual, or a small team, as the school's advocate and conscience for reform. Like their counterpart in the central office, this person should systematically provide feedback to the school about the progress, pace, and results of its reforms, and help ensure that it stays on course. A school system and its schools can chose to configure leadership for reform in many different ways, but they must be make sure that every day the gestalt of middle grades reform is *the* priority on someone's agenda.

These eight questions can provide the framework for school systems and schools to consider thoughtfully issues that are central to middle school reform. Focusing on these questions and hammering out honest answers to them is a demanding task. It is more tempting for middle level educators to follow the same path that have led many of their colleagues down the wrong road in the past. Meaningful benefits for all students do not result from educators installing packaged programs or implementing what they do not understand. Middle grades reform is demanding intellectual work, requiring a combination of inquiry, constructivism, courage, and insight into human behavior. If middle level schools are going to enable all students to perform at the proficient level by the end of the eighth grade in 2014, they will have to devote more time to confronting tough questions than to seeking easy answers.

Thank you.



U.S. Department of Education
Institute of Education Sciences (IES)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



Reproduction Release

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <input type="text" value="Guiding Questions for Middle School Reform"/>	
Author(s): <input type="text" value="Hayes Mizell"/>	
Corporate Source: <input type="text" value="Edna McConnell Clark Foundation"/>	Publication Date: <input type="text" value="1-16-03"/>

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <i>SAMPLE Hayes Mizell</i> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <i>SAMPLE</i> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <i>SAMPLE</i> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only
Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.		

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractor requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: <i>H. Hayes Mizell</i>		Printed Name/Position/Title: Hayes Mizell, Distinguished Senior Fellow	
Organization/Address: National Staff Development Council c/o 6408 Goldbranch Road Columbia, SC 29206		Telephone: 803-787-0760	Fax: 803-787-0769
		E-mail Address: hmizell@msn.com	Date: June 23, 2003

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:	
Address:	
Price:	

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:	
Address:	

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: Document Acquisitions Department ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management 5207 University of Oregon Eugene, Oregon 97403-5207
