



PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

MSU Is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

c:\circ\datedue.pm3-p.1

**AN INTERPRETIVE STUDY OF TEACHER LEADERSHIP
IN A BUILDING-LEVEL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT**

By

Gary Adams Rackliffe

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Teacher Education

1990

Rache

Comm

part

(MILL

impre

iden

solu

rela

augm

to d

Rach

Usin

whic

CE4G-44

ABSTRACT

AN INTERPRETIVE STUDY OF TEACHER LEADERSHIP IN A BUILDING-LEVEL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

By

Gary Adams Rackliffe

This is an interpretive study of the experience of Rachel, a teacher who accepted a leadership role as Steering Committee chair during the first year of her school's participation in the NEA's Mastery in Learning Project (MILP). This was a teacher-led, site-based school improvement project in which building staffs collaborated to identify concerns and determined the most appropriate solutions with the ultimate goal of restructuring relationships within their school.

Rachel's journal served as the primary data source, augmented with interviews and observations. These were used to develop an understanding of teacher leadership from Rachel's perspective. Three questions guided the study:

1. What kinds of changes should we expect to see in a teacher who takes a leadership role outside of the classroom?
2. What are the social tasks of leadership when it is exercised by teachers within the culture of today's public schools?
3. What does this leadership mean to the person involved?

Using interpretive research provides insight into ways in which an individual, acting as part of a social group, can

take on a
the report
events of
those even

Analy
to MILP's
for teacher
for her in
steering C
interactio
completion
develop ro
in ways th
Another pa
through co
credit, de
were a num

Findi
teachers a
have their
developed
intermedia

take on a role or make a role where none existed previously. The report includes a chronological description of major events of the year, and an analysis of Rachel's reactions to those events.

Analysis of Rachel's leadership includes her dedication to MILP's philosophy and goals and MILP's potential value for teachers and students. This served as the foundation for her involvement. Leadership included working with Steering Committee members to develop patterns of interaction, allowing them to work together toward completion of project tasks. One means of doing this was to develop routines that allowed Rachel, and others, to behave in ways that were not usually part of the staff's norms. Another part of leadership was team building, accomplished through communications, spreading ownership and sharing credit, delegating, and compromising. For Rachel, there were a number of costs and rewards related to the position.

Findings underscored the importance of considering teachers as individuals acting within social groups that have their own history and norms. The leadership role developed through a process involving creation of intermediate routines within those norms.

Copyright by
GARY ADAMS RACKLIFFE
1990

Dedicated to:
Lucye, Mary, and Betsy

D
thank
want t
my gra
Lucye,
encoura
their g
surely
their o
Their n

The
Rachel.
what I d
honesty
our unde
keeps me
stands fo
schools a
and their

My pu
Dave and D

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During this seven-year quest I have tried to personally thank people for their help when it was rendered, but I also want to take advantage of this public opportunity to express my gratitude. First, of course, are the women of my life; Lucye, Betsy, and Mary. Without their support and encouragement the quest could not have begun, and without their good humor, patience, tolerance, and sacrifice it surely would never have been completed. They have each, in their own way, contributed more than they will ever know. Their names should be included on the diploma.

The other woman who deserves special recognition is Rachel. Throughout this research effort she went beyond what I dared hope she would do, and it is her openness and honesty that make this study, and anything it might offer to our understanding of teaching, possible. Confidentiality keeps me from introducing her, but, in her anonymity, Rachel stands for all teachers who are willing to work at changing schools and take the risk of looking closely at themselves and their work.

My pursuit of education began at home where my parents, Dave and Dotti Rackliffe, instilled a love of learning that

was deep
me the i
always s
many oth

Cha
in the U
of advis
always b
advisor,
invaluab
as teach
opportun
much as t
enhanced
their adv

Bob
behind th
context f
schools f
Yoder, Ka
support a
leadership

The t
School in

was deep seated, although rather late blooming. They taught me the importance of doing "the right thing," and they have always supported my decisions to go back to school even when many others questioned the wisdom.

Charles Blackman started me on this quest one evening in the Upper Peninsula, and he continued in the central role of advisor throughout the long endeavor. Doug Campbell has always been available, and his help as teacher, scholar, advisor, colleague, and especially as a friend has been invaluable. Susan Melnick pushed my thinking in her roles as teacher and advisor, and she provided valuable opportunities for me to teach courses in which I learned as much as the students. George Ferns and Cass Gentry also enhanced my studies and strengthened this research with their advice.

Bob McClure, the director and inspirational force behind the Mastery in Learning Project (MILP), provided a context for this study through his efforts to improve schools for students and teachers. Bob, Shari Castle, Don Yoder, Kay Verstraete, and others involved with MILP gave support and helped develop ideas about teachers, change, and leadership.

The teachers and staff of Adams Community Elementary School in Richfield, Rachel's colleagues, welcomed me into

their school.

this study po

Finally,

colleagues wi

to name. To

Friday aftern

these ideas d

fortunate to

Roebler who w

people that m

Sandy Bryson

who took thos

teaching prac

their school. Their willingness to participate in MILP made this study possible.

Finally, thanks go to my graduate student friends and colleagues with whom I shared this quest, there are too many to name. To Donna Weinberg and Becky Kirchner and the Friday afternoon Dissertation Study Group where many of these ideas developed. To the MSU faculty and staff I was fortunate to work with, especially Gerry Duffy and Laura Roehler who were so helpful in getting me started. To the people that made it possible to teach classes, especially Sandy Bryson and the others at GSEO. And, to the teachers who took those classes and shared their insights into teaching practice as it is and as it might be.

CHAPTER 1
State
Context
Delimit
Organiz

INTRODUCT

CHAPTER 2
The Co
Type
Tra
Positi
Teacher
Care
Care
Teacher
Char
Summary

CHAPTER 3

School C
In th
Cultu
Ecolo
Chang
Schoo
Summar
Mastery i
Featur
Steeri
Proces
Steps
MILP S

CHAPTER 4 RA
Rationale
Why Thi
Why Thi
Rachel'
Evoluti
Rachel's
Method. . .
Data Col

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement Of The Problem and Rationale for this Study	3
	Context of the Study.	4
	Delimitations of the Study.	6
	Organization of the Report.	8
INTRODUCTION to CHAPTERS 2 and 3		11
CHAPTER 2	LEADERSHIP, CAREERS, and TEACHING	12
	The Concept of Leadership	13
	Types of Leaders	15
	Traits, Tasks, and Characteristics	18
	Positions, Roles, and Individuals	21
	Teacher Leadership.	24
	Career as Advancement.	25
	Career as Professional Growth.	36
	Teachers' Work.	43
	Characteristics of the Work of Teaching.	44
	Summary	56
CHAPTER 3	SCHOOL CHANGE, TEACHER IMPROVEMENT and the MASTERY IN LEARNING PROJECT	59
	School Change and Teacher Improvement	59
	In the Past.	60
	Culture.	61
	Ecology.	63
	Change Literature.	66
	School Improvement and Reform Efforts.	71
	Summary.	84
	Mastery in Learning Project	84
	Features of MILP	88
	Steering Committee	92
	Processes.	93
	Steps Toward Collegiality.	97
	MILP Schools	100
CHAPTER 4	RATIONALE, METHOD, and SETTING.	102
	Rationale	102
	Why This Topic?.	102
	Why This Method?	104
	Rachel's Perspective	106
	Evolution of This Study.	107
	Rachel's Comments about Journals	111
	Method.	115
	Data Collection and Preparation.	116

Dat
Settin
Ada
Ric

INTRODUCT

CHAPTER 5

Family
Educat
Teachi
Super
Involve

CHAPTER 6

Format
Septemb
Offi
Septemb
Cont
October
Refo
October
Sele
October
October
Prof
October
October
Novembe
Novembe
Bob
December
November
December
Five Top
Schoo
Relea
Meeti
Copie
In-Ou
January
February
March 3
March 9
Commit
March 9
March 9
to Loc
April 12
April 22
Dinner

Data Analysis and Writing.117
Setting120
Adams Elementary School.120
Richfield Public Schools123
INTRODUCTION to CHAPTERS 5, 6, and 7125
CHAPTER 5 RACHEL.127
Family.127
Education128
Teaching.130
Super Teacher133
Involvement in School Activities.135
CHAPTER 6 MILP EVENTS137
Formation of the Steering Committee138
September 8 - 15 -- Election of Steering Committee	
Officers139
September 29 & October 6 -- School Profile	
Controversy.140
October 8 - 11 -- Symposium on School-Based School	
Reform142
October 14 -- December Conference Participants	
Selection.145
October 16 -- Communications In-Service Day146
October 21 -- Time Limits and Preparing the School	
Profile.147
October 23 -- Personal Conflicts.148
October 27 - 31 -- Newspaper Interview.150
November 3 -- December Conference Program Conflict.151
November 3 - December 9 -- Continuing Conflict and	
Bob McClure's Visit.153
December Conference Preparation Continues155
November 20 -- Identification of Project Goals.157
December 11 - 12 -- The December Conference158
Five Topics on January 6.161
School Profile Presentation.162
Release Time163
Meeting Schedules.164
Copies of the School Profile for Distribution.165
In-Out Board166
January 13 -- Circus Day and Project Objectives167
February 17 -- Community Council.169
March 3 -- Board of Education Presentation.171
March 9 -- Determining the Role of the Steering	
Committee.173
March 9 -- Reorganization of Committees175
March 9 -- Planning Time Subcommittee and the Visit	
to Lockhart School176
April 12 -- Phi Delta Kappa Presentation.177
April 22 -- Decorating for Community Recognition	
Dinner177

April
Con
May 24

CHAPTER 7

Introdu
Dedicat
Earl
Ambi
Sust
Peri
Cheer
Summa
The Soci
Socia
Runni
Sched
Publi
Socia
Summa
Team Bui
Commun
Spread
Delega
Compro
Can't
Summar
Meeting t
Costs and
Costs.
Reward
Summary .

CHAPTER 8

Review of
Rachel
Events
Underst
Addressing
Relating t
within
Leaders
Teacher
School
Additional
Implication
School
Teacher
Other Fo
Personal

April 27 & May 23 -- Planning Time Committee	
Conflicts.178
May 24 -- Day-Long Steering Committee Meeting181
CHAPTER 7 COMBINING RACHEL and the MILP EVENTS for an	
UNDERSTANDING of LEADERSHIP183
Introduction.184
Dedication to MILP.184
Early Involvement.185
Ambiguity of Goals and Processes185
Sustaining Power186
Period of Despair.188
Cheerleading192
Summary.195
The Social Side of Running MILP196
Social Construction of Roles196
Running Meetings197
Scheduling and Organization.199
Public Speaking.199
Social Side of Running Meetings.202
Summary.211
Team Building212
Communications213
Spreading Ownership and Sharing Credit222
Delegating, Trusting, and Letting Go224
Compromising231
Can't Please Everyone.238
Summary.239
Meeting the Expectations of Others.241
Costs and Rewards245
Costs.245
Rewards.248
Summary262
CHAPTER 8 CONCLUSIONS265
Review of the Findings.266
Rachel266
Events268
Understanding Leadership269
Addressing the Questions.272
Relating the Findings to the Literature, to Change	
within Schools, and to Future Work277
Leadership Topics.278
Teachers' Careers and Rewards Issues282
School Reform Issues284
Additional Research286
Implications.287
School Improvement & Professional Development.287
Teacher Recruitment and Preparation.289
Other Forms of Support289
Personal291

EPILOGUE

Adams

Rachel

Tea

MILL

Powe

Geno

My Thou

LIST OF RE

EPILOGUE293
Adams School and MILP294
Rachel.295
Teaching295
MILP Results296
Power and Influence.298
Gender299
My Thoughts Now That It Is Over300
LIST OF REFERENCES304

Figure 1
Organiza

Figure 2
Mastery

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. The Translation of Values into Action in an Organization	15
Figure 2. Demographics of Schools Participating in the Mastery in Learning Project.101

After school
chaired her first
(MLP) Steering
Richfield. The
that included
a teacher lead
election she s
9/29/87)¹ At t
conversation,
during her year
I have. I thin
5/25/88)

These two
interested in s
1. What ki
teacher wh
classroom?

¹ Parenthe
Interviews, Spe
quoted material

² Through
"leadership" are
specified other
shall see, but t
meaning is an ac
show the dimensi
particular situa

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

After school on September 29, 1987 Rachel Mayfield chaired her first meeting of the Mastery in Learning Project (MILP) Steering Committee at Adams Elementary School in Richfield. That evening we had a wide-ranging discussion that included her election and her thoughts about herself as a teacher leader. At one point, when I asked her about the election she said, "I don't see myself as a leader." (I-9/29/87)¹ At the end of the year, in another after-school conversation, I asked Rachel in what ways she had changed during her year as chairperson. She replied, "I don't think I have. I think I was a closet leader all along." (I-5/25/88)

These two quotes raise three broad questions for people interested in school reform and teacher leadership.²

1. What kinds of changes should we expect to see in a teacher who takes a leadership role outside of the classroom?

¹ Parenthesis contain the dates of Journals, Letters, Interviews, Speeches, or Meeting minutes from which the quoted material was taken.

² Throughout this report the terms "leader" and "leadership" are used for want of better terms unless specified otherwise. They are poorly defined words as we shall see, but the general sense most people have of their meaning is an adequate starting point. This report will show the dimensions of the terms for Rachel in this particular situation.

2
is
to

3.
in

There are
guides for
chosen to
personal
and insti

This

her role as
participat
school imp
Education
developing
leader in
relations a
describe, a
this leader
first year
cannot, of
such as teach
interplay of
leader, and
involve part
the principal

2. What are the social tasks of leadership when it is exercised by teachers within the culture of today's public schools?

3. What does this leadership mean to the person involved?

There are several ways in which these questions can serve as guides for the consideration of teacher leadership. I have chosen to look at them from Rachel's perspective; the personal perspective of someone working within interpersonal and institutional contexts.

This is an analysis and report of how Rachel understood her role as a teacher leader in her school's first year of participation in the MILP, a school-based, teacher-led, school improvement project sponsored by the National Education Association. It is the analysis of one woman's developing understanding of what it means to be a teacher leader in her own school's attempt to make changes in staff relations and educational practice. In this study I describe, as well as an outsider can, the characteristics of this leadership role as Rachel discovered them during her first year as Steering Committee chair. Her role as chair cannot, of course, be totally separated from other roles such as teacher, faculty colleague, and friend. The interplay of all of these adds complexity to the role of leader, and a more elaborate study of this interplay would involve participation of members of the Steering Committee, the principal, and others outside the building.

STATEMENT OF

School re
teaching inclu
active in the
They describe
responsibilit
interaction, a
the building.
of these respo
often falls to
move toward th
it would be he
individual to
of a typical s
Committee chair
information on

Real change
in the cultural
Murphy, 1989;
cultural aspect
on individual p
change process,
the individuals
changes. It is
changes that hav
trying to change

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND RATIONALE FOR THIS STUDY

School reform proposals for the professionalization of teaching include recommendations for teachers to be more active in the life of schools beyond their own classrooms. They describe, in general terms, positions involving responsibilities for professional development, collegial interaction, and decision making shared among the people in the building. The Mastery in Learning Project contains many of these responsibilities, and leadership in these areas often falls to the chair of the Steering Committee. As we move toward these expanded professional roles for teachers it would be helpful to know what it is like for an individual to assume a position like this within the culture of a typical school. During her first year as MILP Steering Committee chair, Rachel kept a journal which provides information on what it means to be a teacher leader.

Real change in schools will only come through changes in the cultural norms of the school (Joyce, Murphy, Showers, & Murphy, 1989; Sarason, 1971). Although Sarason focused on cultural aspects of school change and blamed a narrow focus on individual psychology for past failures to understand the change process, I think it is important not to lose sight of the individuals within the culture who are making the changes. It is important to consider the culture and the changes that have to be made in patterns of interaction when trying to change schooling. At the same time it is

important to
people who al
that affect,
(Erickson, 19
both the cultu
simultaneously
process of dev

CONTEXT OF THE

Since the
Commission on
public's atten
crisis, a numb
variety of appr
developing that
authority to th
associated with
affecting their

The Nationa
Mastery in Learn
teacher-led scho
project is based
schools, teachin
those closest to
building. The p
research and rep

important to remember the school culture is enacted by people who also have personal lives, histories, and meanings that affect, and are affected by, changes within the culture (Erickson, 1986). I argue that we have to work on change at both the cultural level and the personal level simultaneously. The three guiding questions can help in the process of developing an understanding of these changes.

CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

Since the publication of A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) focused the public's attention on what was seen as America's educational crisis, a number of studies and reports have suggested a variety of approaches to improvement. A consensus is developing that changes need to be made by shifting more authority to the building level and allowing people associated with each school more control over decisions affecting their school.

The National Education Association (NEA)-sponsored Mastery in Learning Project (MILP) is a demonstration of teacher-led school reform at the building level. The project is based on the assumption that decisions about schools, teaching, learning, and curriculum are best made by those closest to the situation--the people in each school building. The project provides information in the form of research and reports of practice and time through release-

time funds to
school's part
Steering Comm
staff members
based consult
consultant fo
role was to f
taking action
completely in

Rachel t
Midwestern in
slowdowns and
enrollment of
sixth grade.
neighborhood,
and there is a
The school has
professional, p
personnel. Ric
more completely

Rachel, the
building's two
for 14 years, th
chair by members
keep a journal a

time funds to encourage local decision making. Each school's participation in the project is guided by a Steering Committee made up of teachers and other school staff members. Each school also had a half-time, site-based consultant who worked with the teachers. I was that consultant for two years at Adams School. As consultant, my role was to facilitate the process of identifying goals and taking action on them. MILP will be described more completely in Chapter 4.

Rachel teaches at Adams School which is in Richfield, a midwestern industrial city that suffered during economic slowdowns and has not recovered well. The school has an enrollment of 385 students from pre-kindergarten through sixth grade. The school serves a predominately middle class neighborhood, but there are also some professional families, and there is a low-income housing project within the area. The school has 15 classroom teachers, and a staff of 14 professional, para-professional, and technical support personnel. Richfield and Adams School will be described more completely in Chapter 5.

Rachel, the subject of this study, is one of the building's two kindergarten teachers. She has been teaching for 14 years, the last 11 in this building. She was elected chair by members of the Steering Committee and agreed to keep a journal and participate in interviews that provide

the bulk of
have previous
like this.
teaching will

DELIMITATION

This
individual in
space. These
other MILP St
kinds of scho
participating
features that
present in ot
city of Richf
history that
it may not be
beyond this pa

On the ot
depth descript
them as a teach
these descript
findings and co
situations. I
for teachers can

the bulk of the data analyzed for this report. She did not have previous preparation for or experience in positions like this. Rachel's background and personal beliefs about teaching will be discussed in Chapter 6.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This is a study of the personal reactions of a single individual in a particular situation frozen in time and space. These findings are not necessarily representative of other MILP Steering Committee chairs nor of leaders in other kinds of school activities. The project in which Rachel was participating has some philosophical and procedural features that relate to her role as leader that might not be present in other school improvement projects. Finally, the city of Richfield and its school district have features and history that make them unique. Because of this uniqueness it may not be appropriate to generalize these findings beyond this particular situation.

On the other hand, the study contains detailed, in-depth descriptions of events and the sense Rachel made of them as a teacher leader. Readers can compare and contrast these descriptions to their own situations and draw upon the findings and conclusions in ways that apply to their own situations. I believe people interested in changing roles for teachers can use Rachel's understanding of leadership

and these con
teacher leader

Rachel's
augmented by
memos, meeting
made, and my
her own point
considered in
were interview
understanding

The stud
interpreted a
is it a study
conceptually c
study of chang
restructuring
school restruct
use to people

My intenti
questions in so
instead, in usi
detailed descri
1987-88 school y

and these concepts, ideas, or characteristics of the role of teacher leader in broadening their own understandings.

Rachel's own journal is the primary data source, augmented by interviews. Additional information comes from memos, meeting minutes, the text of presentations Rachel made, and my observations. In her journal Rachel presents her own point of view, and that is the only perspective considered in this study. None of the other participants were interviewed because I wanted to focus on Rachel's understanding of her role.

The study is not intended to be, nor should it be interpreted as, an evaluation of Rachel's leadership. Nor is it a study of the success or failure of MILP either conceptually or in this particular location. This is not a study of change in schools, school reform, or school restructuring per se although it is set in the context of a school restructuring project and the findings could be of use to people contemplating such a project.

My intention here is not to answer the guiding questions in some concise, absolute form. I am interested, instead, in using them as a guide or framework for the detailed description and analysis of one aspect of Rachel's 1987-88 school year.

ORGANIZATION

The sea
literature.

Chapter
findings by r
changes we mi
formal leader
little litera
related topics
professional c
considered.

Chapter 3
literature, bu
discussion of
the Mastery in
features, organ

Chapter 4
the method of t
in some detail,
Richfield and o

The finding
I begin with a c
events of the ye

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The search for leadership begins with a review of the literature. This is presented in two parts.

Chapter 2 contains background for the study and its findings by reviewing existing literature for the types of changes we might expect during a teacher's first year in a formal leadership role among her peers. There is very little literature bearing directly on this topic, but such related topics as school reform, the change process, professional development, and the roles of teachers are considered.

Chapter 3 is a continuation of the review of literature, but it moves from leadership per se to a discussion of school reform in general and specifically of the Mastery in Learning Project, including its philosophy, features, organization, and the selection of sites.

Chapter 4 contains rationales for both the topic and the method of this report. The processes used are described in some detail, and it also contains a description of Richfield and of Adams Elementary School.

The findings of the study are presented in three parts. I begin with a description of Rachel, followed by the major events of the year. An understanding of leadership in this

situation comes
reactions within
presented in the

Chapter 5
background, per
This portrait i
description and

Chapter 6
school year. T
events. This p
Adams and also
in Chapter 7.

Chapter 7 c
88 school year.
leadership; the
leadership as Ra

Chapter 8 c
Questions raised
existing literat
others consideri
considerations f

An Epilogue

situation comes from an analysis of Rachel's actions and reactions within the context of the MILP events. This is presented in the third chapter of this section.

Chapter 5 contains a portrait of Rachel; her background, personal beliefs, and thoughts about teaching. This portrait is important as a starting point for a description and analysis of the 1987-88 school year.

Chapter 6 contains the first slice through the 1987-88 school year. The year is looked at as a chronology of events. This provides one view of leadership in MILP at Adams and also sets the historical context for the analysis in Chapter 7.

Chapter 7 contains the second slice through the 1987-88 school year. This time it is done in terms of leadership; the tasks, characteristics, and meanings of leadership as Rachel experienced it.

Chapter 8 contains my conclusions regarding the questions raised and the relationship of the findings to the existing literature. There are also implications both for others considering expanded roles for teachers and considerations for further research.

An Epilogue is included to fill in the time period

between June,

when the writ

reflective co

involvement a

Finally, I ha

experience an

with teachers

between June, 1988 when the study ended and November, 1990 when the writing was completed. Also included are some reflective comments from Rachel as she looked on her MILP involvement and in reaction to reading this report. Finally, I have some comments of my own about this research experience and what I have learned about research, working with teachers, and making changes within schools.

The list
chapters. I
leadership a
careers and
context. Ch
characterist
specific con
proposals ge
particularly.
important pa
situation.

INTRODUCTION TO CHAPTERS 2 and 3

The literature review is presented in the next two chapters. I have begun with a broad consideration of leadership and then moved to a consideration of teachers's careers and different meanings of leadership within that context. Chapter 2 ends with a discussion of the characteristics of teachers' work. Chapter 3 creates a more specific context for this study as it reviews school reform proposals generally and the Mastery in Learning Project particularly. The philosophy and goals of MILP is an important part in understanding Rachel's leadership in this situation.

Th
questio

1.
te
cl

2.
is
to

3.
in

Locking

there i

however

most ger

broadly

careers,

character

In

developi

teacher v

histories

school s

attempt t

leadershi

typical o

CHAPTER 2 LEADERSHIP, CAREERS, and TEACHING

This chapter is a review of literature around the questions posed in the first chapter:

1. What kinds of changes should we expect to see in a teacher who takes a leadership role outside of the classroom?
2. What are the social tasks of leadership when it is exercised by teachers within the culture of today's public schools?
3. What does this leadership mean to the person involved?

Looking at these questions in terms of personal meaning, there is not an established body of literature. There are, however, three topics that can provide some insight. At the most general level there is the concept of leadership broadly defined, then there is literature on teachers' careers, and finally there is information on the characteristics of teachers' work.

In a review such as this there is a danger of developing the portrait of a stereotypical or "average" teacher which would tend to conceal the variety of people, histories, motives, and meanings that are present within any school situation. Rather than that, my purpose here is to attempt to pull together some of the characteristics of leadership, teachers, and teaching that might be considered typical or that will provide analytic tools that will be

useful in
from my d
informati
boundarie

THE CONCE

The
meaning o
leadership
terms beg
through mo
Much of th
field of e

The c
in our ever
of the comp
or may not
says leader
organizatio
philosophy.

Adminis
adminis
leaders
does no
the sam
or conv
good ad
bad lea

useful in analyzing, interpreting, and drawing conclusions from my data. In other words, I hope to use this information to provide insights rather than to impose boundaries.

THE CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP

The first area of concern in this search for the meaning of a teacher's leadership is the concept of leadership itself. This will be done in rather general terms beginning with some theoretical points and moving through more specific types of leaders and their skills. Much of the literature in this section is from outside the field of education.

The concept of leadership is, at best, vaguely defined in our everyday language. It is generally thought to be one of the components of administration or management which may or may not be present in varying amounts. Hodgkinson (1983) says leadership is the process of using collective organizational action to affect policy, values, and philosophy.

Administration is leadership. Leadership is administration. . . [One cannot] administer without leadership or lead without administration. . . . It does not make good sense to talk of having at one and the same time good leadership and bad administration, or conversely. In short, good leadership is simply good administration and bad administration is simply bad leadership." (pg. 195) (emphasis in original)

throughout
analyzes le
managerial

Admini
leadership,
action with
in-action i
processes w
qualitative,
managerial p
practical, p
technologica

Hodgkin
administrati
management ea
as a flow cha
the philosoph
organization.

Throughout his book on the philosophy of leadership he analyzes leadership in terms of administrative and managerial functions.

Administration broadly speaking, and therefore leadership, is the process of putting one's philosophy into action within an organization. Leadership as philosophy-in-action is carried out in two ways, through administrative processes which are essentially abstract, philosophical, qualitative, strategic, and humanistic and through managerial processes which are essentially concrete, practical, pragmatic, quantitative, technical and technological (Hodgkinson, 1983).

Hodgkinson (1983) presents a taxonomy of the administrative process that divides administration and management each into three activities. This also functions as a flow chart to show the movement from values adopted at the philosophic level through to the daily activities of the organization.

figure
organiz

ADMINIS
(Policy
Making)

MANAGEM
(Policy
Impleme

Lea
where th
dealing

Types of

Hav
let me no
This beg.

Figure 1. The Translation of Values into Action in an Organization.

	<u>Stage</u>	<u>Deal With</u>	<u>Processes/Tasks</u>
ADMINISTRATION (Policy Making)	Philosophy	Ideas	Argument, dialectic, logic, rhetoric, & value clarification.
	Planning	Ideas	Written, persisting, & communicable form.
	Politics	People	Coalitions formed, levers pulled, people persuaded, power & support marshalled.
MANAGEMENT (Policy Implementation)	Mobilizing	People	Getting the stuff you need; motivating people, workers.
	Managing	Things	Day to day, short-term, long-term, routinization, programming
	Monitoring	Things	Supervision, auditing, accounting, & evaluation which loops back up to the philosophy and planning stages of administration

Leadership is most active in the middle of this process where the emphasis is on people although the initial steps dealing with ideas are also a major portion of leadership.

Types of Leaders

Having looked at a theoretical treatment of leadership, let me now turn to some more specific thoughts on the topic. This begins with the consideration of typical types of

leaders

have be

will co

during

(1983)

philoso

is not

categor

literat

The Pol.

people :

The

his

The

int

The

ana

of

The

for

Of t

best desc

substitut

self-inter

participat

leaders followed by some of the traits and behaviors that have been found helpful for leaders in general. Later I will consider findings that are more specific to leadership during the process of change. I depend on Hodgkinson's (1983) summaries of leadership types in his book on the philosophy of leadership for these examples. This certainly is not an exhaustive list, but it indicates the types of categories and characteristics dealt with in this literature.

The Politician Hodgkinson identified four archetypes of people in organizations:

The careerist, whose advancement in the organization is his or her only interest.

The politician, who places group-interest before self-interest.

The technician, who pragmatically uses logical analysis and relies on the science and technology of administration.

The poet, who leads for Good through the sheer force of his or her will.

Of these four types, the politician is the one that best describes Rachel's leadership. The politician has substituted a genuine interest in the group's well-being for self-interest and stresses group morale, group cohesion, and participatory democracy. The politician draws energy and

moral fo

articula

and the

This
bes
fun
for
rea
adm

This

politici

The heav

always b

This con

all the a

short-ter

reflectio

cynicism

Theory X

complete v

types of l

takes as i

or as memb

disinclina

whenever po

doing it.

workers and

moral force from the group and acts as spokesperson, articulator, and leader. This is done through group harmony and the continual search for and maintenance of consensus.

This is primitive democratic theory: the group knows best what it wants and what it ought to want; the function of the leader is to discover such values, formulate and represent them, then translate them into reality through the devices of organization and administrative process. (Hodgkinson, 1983; pg. 161)

This emphasis on the needs of the group commits the politician to a heavy schedule of personal interactions. The heavy emphasis on consensus requires that the leader always be congenial and willing to listen sympathetically. This constant pressure to meet and talk with people fills all the available time, keeps the politician focused on short-term goals, and leaves little time for solitude and reflection. The archetypical politician does this without cynicism because of a genuine commitment to the group.

Theory X and Y Leadership No review of leadership would be complete without at least mentioning Theory X and Theory Y types of leadership (McGregor, 1960). Theory X leadership takes as its basic premise the belief that people as workers or as members of an organization have an inherent disinclination to work. Because people will avoid work whenever possible, leaders need to somehow coerce them into doing it. People will need to be supervised, and, actually, workers and organization members prefer direction and the

security
of risk

The
They hold
and people
exercise
people a
they can
life and
1960).

Traits.

Much
industry
they do.
differ f
literatu
leadersh
review th
construct
position.

Reconcili

consensus
reconcilia
the organi

security of authority to responsibility and the insecurity of risk taking and decision making.

The presumptions of Theory Y are exactly opposite. They hold that if it is satisfying, work can be enjoyable and people as workers or members of an organization will exercise self-direction and assume responsibility. When people are committed to some kind of work or organization they can find opportunity for fulfillment in organizational life and can be left to work without supervision (McGregor, 1960).

Traits, Tasks, and Characteristics

Much has been written, especially for business and industry, about the characteristics of leaders and the work they do. Although the organization and purpose of schools differ from those of business and industry, some of this literature can be helpful when studying the nature of leadership in schools (Tucker, 1988). This section will review thoughts from both education and business for constructs that can add to the understanding of Rachel's position.

Reconciliation When leadership is thought of as focusing on consensus building, one of the major tasks for leaders is reconciliation. This takes the form of reconciliation of the organization to society, of organization members towards

organ
colle
group
creat
or dec

Checki

say it
and val
as lead
for a 1

1.
los
the
cha

2.
muc
con
comm

3. A
nega
calc
that
only
this
'pos.
prof
but h
and i
so l
the u
(pg. 2

organizational goals, and of individual and larger collective interests. Depending on the leader and the group, these reconciliations can be static or dynamic, creative or uninspired, divisive or harmonious, synergetic or degenerative (Hodgkinson, 1983).

Checking Feelings and Values Hodgkinson (1983) goes on to say it is important for the leaders to keep their feelings and values in check in order for them to help them operate as leaders. He lists three inhibitions that are important for a leader.

1. Not identifying emotionally to the point of loss of control with the ongoing flux of events, the ups and downs of vagaries of circumstance and chance.
2. A determination not to consider one's own ego, much less one's id, if the impulses of that consideration contradict one's organizational commitments in any way.
3. A general inhibition against expressing negative emotion, unless it be for deliberately calculated political purposes. This is not to say that the leader will not feel negative affect, only that he will not normally express it. Nor is this to be confused with the popular psychology of 'positive thinking.' The leader may well be profoundly pessimistic about the turn of events but he [sic] has a dramaturgical duty to express and inspire confidence and maintain commitment -- so long as he can do this without trenching on the unauthentic or undermining his credibility. (pg. 213-214)

Per

son

set

vie

des

at

lea

wit

let

org

her

of t

teach

Heroic and Unheroic Leadership Murphy (1988) presents a somewhat more specific look at leadership within school settings and arrives at the realization that the traditional view of leadership, a heroic boss, does not completely describe effective school leadership. The heroic boss has at least these 6 characteristics:

- A clear personal vision, sense of purpose, which they define for their organizations.
- Extremely knowledgeable with the right answers for pressing problems.
- Be strong, display initiative and tenacity.
- Communicate forcefully.
- Amass power and use it for organizational improvement.
- Solve difficult problems in ways that move the organization toward its goals. (pg 645)

Murphy argues, however, that these are unrealistic and lead to frustration on the part of leaders who are faced with problems more complex than they alone can understand, let alone solve. It also frustrates others in the organization whose leadership contributions do not fit the heroic mold. He suggests there is an unheroic side to each of these heroic leadership characteristics or activities.

- Developing a shared vision (as well as defining a personal vision).
- Asking questions (as well as having answers),
- Coping with weakness (as well as displaying strength).
- Listening and acknowledging (as well as talking and persuading),
- Depending on others (as well as exercising power), and
- Letting go (as well as taking charge). (pg 655)

Letting go was one of the challenges Rachel faced as a teacher leader. Murphy says leaders need to allow others to

4

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

deal with problem situations. And as part of letting others deal with situations,

administrators must decide to ignore issues that they believe ought not to be ignored and to do some things superficially that ought to be done with careful attention. A conscientious leader always has more high priorities to address than time and organizational resources allow. In the face of competing demands, deciding to do some things badly, letting go before the time seems right, and coping with the consequences are all ingredients of leadership behavior. (Murphy, 1988, pg 659)

POSITIONS, ROLES, AND INDIVIDUALS

Within social groups there are "positions" which are similar to boxes on an organizational chart. These positions are defined by a set of rights, obligations, privileges, and responsibilities that are agreed on, at least in general terms, by members of the society. These positions may be more clearly defined, such as the Chairperson of the Board in a large corporation or the principal in an elementary school, or they may be less clearly defined, such as a committee member or the trend-setter in a group of friends. The "role" a person plays is the pattern of behaviors performed in filling the position. This role and its behaviors are constrained by the rights, obligations, privileges, and responsibilities associated with the position (Sarbin, 1953).

Each individual brings to a position a personal

2

h

d

R

c

R

i

s

T

S

w

d

t

l

to

e:

re

w

re

is

fo

we

w

19

history, personal traits, and habits that influences their behavior within that position. Even the most closely defined positions are flexible enough to allow for some personal variation and style. When a new position is created in a social group there is much more latitude for personal variation as the person in the position works, implicitly and explicitly, with the others in the social group to define how the role will be played out (Getzels & Thelen, 1971). In the situation being studied here, the Steering Committee was a new social grouping and the chair was a new social position. Members of the group had to define the roles of committee members as well as the role of the chair, and this had to be done within the context of a long shared history and overlapping roles as friends, teachers, and professional colleagues.

When moving into a position or a new role, a person can either "take" the role or "make" the role. In taking a role, the person moves into an established role and stays within the well-defined boundaries of the position. Most roles, however, are actually made by a new incumbent. This is especially true in this case where the positions are new for this group, but even established positions are not as well defined as people generally think and there is a range within which the individual can shape the role (Turner, 1962).

It is through social interactions that people create typical patterns of behavior that become roles and part of their social institutions which consist of "a widening sphere of taken-for-granted routines." (Berger & Luckmann, 1967, pg 57) At the same time the norms of existing social groups or institutions shape the behaviors of people; "the product acts back on the producer." (pg 61) The concepts of career, leadership, and the characteristics of teachers' work; the social positions; and the other concepts discussed in this study are all social constructions. They are all created by the participants based on their personal and collective histories, values, beliefs, agendas, and the context as they perceive them at the moment.

People construct meaning and enact meaning together at a number of levels. During each interaction the participants provide the environment within which each person acts. The actors create a scene in which each one has a part. Each person works within the situation to achieve his or her agenda (Mehan, 1980). Beyond this immediate, local level there is social influence from people and institutions outside the present interaction. In schools these might include other staff members, the principal, parents, community members, district policies, and union contracts. These all operate within an even larger social context or culture "which can be defined in cognitive terms as learned and shared standards for

2

c

F

c

"

le

hi

by

la

off

con

tea

and

of a

deve

ladd

more

1988

perceiving, believing, acting, and evaluating the actions of others." (Erickson, 1986, pg. 129)

TEACHER LEADERSHIP

School improvement programs of the 1980's have often called for teachers to move outside the classroom and participate more broadly in the life of the school. These calls have been couched in terms of "professionalism" or "leadership." In this section I will look first at leadership as teachers' advancement into some kind of hierarchy in roles or activities that are generally defined by people other than classroom teachers. These career ladder programs, as they are often called, provide opportunities for some outstanding teachers to make valuable contributions to the life of their buildings or districts.

A second perspective is then presented that argues that teachers' careers are enriched through personal development, and that career advancement for teachers is better thought of as opportunities for personal, professional growth and development, rather than as advancement up some career ladder. MILP views teachers' career satisfaction as coming more through growth than through advancement (McClure, 1988).

Career as Advancement

McLaughlin and Yee (1988) suggest there are two quite different views of the form and meaning of "career" in teaching: career as advancement through an organizational hierarchy, and career as personal growth and development as a teacher. Each view of career has implications for the form and substance of teacher leadership. The first view of "career" is institutional involving organizational structures and rewards, advancement in the hierarchy -- "Success" is getting to the top. Generally, in this model of career the rewards that are emphasized most often are in the form of money and perquisites.

"Career ladder" is often used as a generic term to cover a variety of these advancement schemes for teachers. Plans are generally state-sponsored attempts to motivate teachers, and they provide salary awards for teachers based on excellent performance, additional work during extended hours or contract year, mentoring new teachers, acting as master teacher, or for accepting additional duties. The common criterion of excellence in teaching, by some definition, applies to all plans. Qualifications for participation in most programs are specifically based on student achievement or progress. Selection procedures sometimes include peer review or classroom evaluations which are often based on "competencies associated with effective teaching." (Cornett, 1985, pg 8-9) The number of teachers

who can participate in these programs is generally limited by the level of funding made available by the state (Cornett, 1985).

In addition to these formal, state-initiated projects there are district-level positions in which teachers take on responsibilities beyond their classrooms. These roles are generally established by the administration to meet needs the administration has identified. The people who are chosen to fill the positions are selected either directly or through an application process by the administration. Although the positions often have no written job description or training, the general parameters are established by the administration. The teachers in these positions tend to have a great deal of latitude in shaping the nature of the job, but the jobs are not self-defined nor do they arise from teacher's decisions about needs and how they should be met (Little, 1988). In this way, they differ from teacher empowerment as envisioned by MILP and similar projects which emphasize the importance of teachers identifying issues of concern.

Many of the local programs take the form of department head, resource teacher, project director, grade-level chair, etc. Tasks differ in the degree to which the teacher leader intrudes into the work of his or her peers. They range from the least intrusive form of paper shuffling, which is

un

a

i

s

v

h

h

h

h

h

c

a

P

h

t

t

t

co

fu

fu

fu

fu

fu

fu

fu

fu

fu

fu

fu

fu

usually rotated among teachers every few years; to acting as a buffer between administration and teachers, which is more intrusive; to organizing workshops and study groups, suggesting assistance, participating in evaluation, etc. which was the most intrusive. Teachers tend to accept programs that are nonintrusive, but as teachers' experience increases so does their resentment of and resistance to more intrusive programs (Little, 1988).

In reviewing these forms of leadership, Little (1988) concluded there seemed to be little evidence of productive arrangements that were stable and long-lasting. Many programs were too new to have been thoroughly evaluated. In many cases effective arrangements fell apart quickly when the building principal left.

Career ladder programs are criticized on a number of counts. Lieberman and Miller (1984) see them as fundamentally flawed.

On the national level, we are currently engaged in a great debate about the quality of public schooling. That debate has tended to accept merit pay, career ladders, and more stringent requirements for teaching as among the best strategies for improving schools. All these strategies take as givens that most teachers are not meritorious and that most people who enter teaching are less than adequate. (pg 24)

Others feel the "promotion and advancement" emphasis of these plans does not fit the career visions of most people who enter and remain in teaching (Blackman & Hatfield, 1989;

McLaughlin & Yee, 1988). A third criticism is that this competition does not contribute to collegiality but, instead,

a payoff-centered environment, where strategies such as merit pay, summative evaluation, or bonuses reward successful practice, ironically encourages precisely what these policies hope to discourage--a backward-looking point of view, hiding of mistakes or disappointments, "show-and-tell" on evaluation day. (McLaughlin & Yee, 1988, pg 37)

Finally, competition between teachers for career advancement, climbing some kind of career ladder, and higher pay are probably not a sound way to improve the quality of schooling. They have little incentive value because they are available to such a small group of teachers after long tenure in the classroom. Nor are currently conceived career ladders and incentive pay apt to lure more talented people into teaching (Little, 1988; Rosenholtz, 1985).

In spite of the limitations of many programs and the criticisms raised, there are benefits. And in spite of the fact that they differ markedly from the design of MILP, some of the outcomes and characteristics help us understand aspects of Rachel's experience.

High Gain, High Strain Little (1988) referred to one outcome of leadership by teachers as "High Gain -- High Strain." (pg 98) High gains result from teachers' classroom focus, their wealth of experience, and the sheer number of people available. At the same time, high strain comes from

conflict with the egalitarian ideal among teachers, the image of teaching as mainly an idiosyncratic matter of style, and the norms of privacy and isolation. There are few if any provisions in the profession for the formal recognition of differences in skill, knowledge, or initiative. For that matter, it is actively resisted in some collective bargaining situations (Little, 1988).

Strain is compounded when teacher come straight from the classroom with little preparation or support. Relations with principals can also add to strain if the principal feels cut out of the action. The factors of strain, especially those involving their teaching colleagues, are often seen by the teacher leader as outweighing perceived gains causing them to back off or to not recognize their expertise (Little, 1988).

Selection Problems Perhaps the most obvious problem with this type of leadership is in the process of selection.

The selection of leaders has been cast both as a technical problem (what are the acceptable criteria for performance?) and as a political problem (who will teachers accept as leaders, if anyone?). To the extent that the selection problem remains at the forefront of discussions of teacher leadership, and elaborate selection strategies remain the heart of implementation plans, we can expect that the prospect of teacher leadership will decline. (Little, 1988, pg 101)

Because it is so difficult, the selection process consumes much of the time and energy of the people involved and

creates political problems that need to be attended to as the project begins, thereby unproductively using more time, energy , and goodwill and diminishing the chances for success, or at least limiting them.

Administrators' Concerns Some administrators and building principals are concerned about the difficulty of developing new role relationships with teachers in leadership positions and with the public's perception of leadership involving teachers. The new roles for teachers create ambiguity around the roles of the principal and the teacher leader and their relations with one another. Administrators resist encroachment on traditional administrative responsibilities such as budget, staffing, and, especially, teacher evaluation (Little, 1988). Geist (1988) argues that if teachers, and by extension the teachers' union, are involved in teacher evaluation there is a potential conflict of interest when the time comes to remove an incompetent teacher. He also criticizes teacher leadership plans for concentrating too much power in the hands of teachers' unions as they dilute the influence of the building principal. The roles that each principal plays as the building's instructional leader, as the accountable individual, and as the contact person for parents would be made more difficult if school decisions were being made by a committee of teachers who had the power to override the principal. On the other hand, Little (1988) reports that

P
P
t
r
c

P
w
t
a

T
l
w
(l
is
ra
we
th
Un
Le
te
of
se
le
and

principals who have established school structures that provided reason and opportunity for teacher leadership thought their influence over classroom events was increased rather than diminished through involvement of teachers in curriculum and instruction decisions.

Finally, administrators are concerned about the public's perception that "no one is in charge" of the school when responsibility is shared. The public is also concerned that the best teachers are spending time outside classrooms and are not available to teach the students (Little, 1988).

Teachers Studying Teacher Leaders A study of teacher leadership done by a group of classroom teachers working within the Puget Sound Educational Consortium (PSEC) (Diercks, et al., 1988) is especially interesting because it is the work of teachers coming to grips with their roles rather than outside researchers attempting to describe their work. The PSEC is a group of 14 public school districts in the Puget Sound area working in collaboration with the University of Washington. Within the consortium the Teacher Leadership Strand has been established in which classroom teachers consider the nature of teacher leadership and ways of expanding its possibilities. One of their projects was a series of interviews with 87 colleagues who demonstrated leadership within their districts. The teachers compiled and analyzed the data and reached conclusions regarding the

nature and the needs of teacher leaders as well as implications for teachers and for administrators.

The teacher leaders said success in their expanded roles depended on such traits as involvement, respect for confidentiality, history of past successes, resourcefulness, and leadership styles including persistence, organization, dependability, amount of involvement, degree of accomplishments. When asked what leadership skills they thought others attribute to them, over half of responses included enthusiasm, honesty, assertiveness, willingness to be democratic, and willingness to take risks. A third of the responses included being a good listener or communicator and being a team player. Only 20% included instructional and organizational skills. In several places the report emphasized that the teacher leaders were most interested in topics related to their classrooms. The leadership activities should be in support of, not a replacement for their teaching (Diercks, et al., 1988).

Most of the teachers in leadership positions received little or no preparation for their new responsibilities. Needs the teachers identified as most important were the information, time and resources necessary to learn the skills related to the new position. They identified "time management, communication, listening, group processing, conflict resolution, motivation, organization, stress

2

W

C

C

R

(

f

i

n

r

t

v

a

"b

d

a

w

t

i

r

r

d

o

management, computers and word processing, and grant writing" (pg 13) as areas of concern. In keeping with their concerns with classroom issues they also identified multicultural education, learning styles, and current education research as topics about which they wanted more information (Diercks, et al., 1988).

The teachers concluded that leadership has implications for teachers and their work, including the need for increased risk taking and divergent thinking. Teachers will need to learn to deal with ambiguity, different forms of responsibility, and potential, if not actual, failure as they work at breaking down isolation and learning to work with colleagues (Diercks, et al., 1988).

Implications for administrators began with a call for appreciation of the diverse roles teachers play as "bookkeeper, nurturer, referee, evaluator, counselor, dispenser of knowledge, and disciplinarian." (Diercks, et al., 1988, pg. 16) They also need to work cooperatively with teachers who are in authentic decision-making roles that are designed to support and improve classroom instruction. In order for the teacher to fulfill these roles administrators need to restructure time schedules and responsibilities to encourage "teacher-to-teacher dialogues, development of classroom instructional techniques and units of study, and student-teacher interactions." (Diercks, et

al
th
ad
sc
po
te
ed
th
al

Pro

pro
fiv
dim

imp
wor
nat
tea

and
101)
serv
inco

prov
for c

al., 1988, pg. 16) The leadership skills necessary for these roles should be developed through inservices, and administrators should seek out and develop potential leaders so that there is continuity as teachers move in and out of positions. Finally, administrators need to "recognize that teacher leaders value their classroom time, that the education of their students is their first priority, and that this relationship should be respected." (Diercks, et al., 1988, pg. 16)

Prospects for Teacher Leadership In summarizing the prospects for teacher leadership, Little (1988) identified five ways in which those prospects are advanced or diminished.

1. They are advanced when teachers see the work important and difficult, but they are diminished when the work is trivial, not related to school challenges, or not matched to the complexity and intellectual challenge of teaching.

2. They are advanced when the roles provide dignity and "rigorous, rewarding professional relationships," (pg. 101) but they are diminished when teachers are expected to serve as "hit men" to "fix, punish, or remove the incompetent or intransigent" (pg. 101) teacher.

3. They are advanced when the roles administrators provide public, concrete support and specific understandings for doing business together with teachers., but they are

diminished with restrictive agreements aimed at protecting the interests of particular groups.

4. They are advanced by incentives that reward cooperation and collaboration on the part of teachers, lending support to others who are taking a leadership role, and support for shared responsibility, but they are diminished by the types of disincentives for cooperation built into the current structure of schools and the work of teachers.

5. They are advanced by policies that select, evaluate, and reward building principals for encouragement of teacher leadership and shared responsibility, and by district policies for smooth transitions from one principal to another.

Institutional changes needed to improve the potential for success of teacher leadership programs include changes in the nature of teacher's work. Increases in the amount of teacher-to-teacher work are needed to provide a reason for teacher leadership. Teacher leadership requires changes in the structure of power, prestige, and authority relations in schools. These imply making changes in the conceptions of what teaching means. Little (1988) emphasizes the great difficulty of the last two challenges and, at the same time, their central role in the success or failure of a project.

The idea of changing the conceptions of teaching leads

into a second view of the meaning of a career in teaching: one which is based on a changed conception of the nature of teaching and learning and the work of teaching. MILP and similar programs differ greatly from programs that have grown out of the career-as-advancement model with its administrative domination. They tend to be more closely aligned with the career-as-growth model.

Career as Professional Growth

The second form of "career" in teaching focuses on personal growth and development within the profession and is based on a conception of learning, and therefore teaching and teachers' work, that differs markedly from traditional conceptions.

Nature of Learning and Teaching Devaney and Sykes (1988) argue that the nature of the learning students need to do to prepare themselves for the future is in line with the production of knowledge rather than the consumption of knowledge as has traditionally been the case. This shift in the nature of learning calls for a shift from teacher-centered, textbook- and test-driven, direct instruction to patterns of interaction and a culture of schools and teaching that are quite different from what we now have. Rather than being technicians effectively delivering course content to students for their consumption, teachers would have to understand the cognitive complexity of the school

work

inv

dev

This

"th

act

enc

. .

pri

clo

bui

sch

bro

must

dec

clin

ass

mak

either

incl

new

coll

inst

work needed to construct knowledge and to manage students' involvement in tasks that confront misconceptions and develop learning strategies and social and cognitive skills. This new conception of learning requires teaching that is "the continual and changing interplay between thought and action, based on close observation and reflection about the encounter or 'match' between students and subject matter. . . . Teaching is more than skilled transmission; it is principled action." (Devaney and Sykes, 1988, pg 6)

For this kind of teaching to be possible, the people closest to the teaching and the children, those at the building level, must make as many of the decisions about schooling as possible. These decisions must fit within broad local and state guidelines, but teachers' judgement must be the main determinant supported by faculty-wide decisions about curriculum, instructional methods, school climate, parental involvement, teacher selection and assignment, and evaluation. As a part of this decision making by teachers, "advanced assignments available on either part- or full-time, short- or long-term bases might include curriculum development, residency supervision [of new teachers], instruction of perservice students, collaborative research, staff-development planning and instruction, etc." (Devaney & Sykes, 1988, pg 7)

These tasks for teachers sound similar to those

proposed in career-as-advancement plans described above. The difference here is that they are embedded in a notion of teaching that requires a higher level of performance from all teachers. If we conceptualize teaching as helping students produce knowledge rather than the technically effective delivery of knowledge, Devaney and Sykes (1988) argue that all teachers will need to become professional in terms of decision making and instructional expertise. It will not be sufficient to have a corps of professional teachers making decisions about and directing the work of the majority of teachers as is suggested by some current reforms proposals (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986)

In the same vein, Lampert (1988) suggests that before we can have independent, problem-solving, creative thinking, cooperatively learning students we need to have teachers who have these traits. She asks how teachers can develop these traits in students if they do not have them themselves and when they are not a part of teachers' professional lives.

This way of thinking about teaching and the needs of teachers leads to the second conception of "career." Here career is seen as personal growth and development which is not necessarily tied to movement in the organizational hierarchy. Each person's development is individualistic which means it is difficult, if not impossible, to implement

a single plan on a district-wide basis which is possible with the career-as-advancement model. Individual growth is subjective and not standardizable.

Rewards In line with Lortie's (1975) findings on the importance of intrinsic, psychic rewards for teachers, McLaughlin & Yee (1988) found teachers thinking of career satisfaction in subjective terms. In a study of 85 teachers in 5 California school districts, they concluded

teachers, then, conceive of career and define career satisfaction largely in subjective terms--making a difference, sharing a discipline they love. Through these attitudes, teachers generate an expertise-based, individually determined notion of career; advancement is framed in terms of an ongoing process of professional growth, and success means effectiveness in the teaching role. The flat occupational structure that characterizes teaching has no necessarily positive or negative relationship to a career for most teachers. (emphasis in original) (pg 26)

Others have found teachers also get career satisfaction from professional connections outside of schools. British secondary teachers studied by Bennet (1985) gained professional satisfaction in associations with working scientists, artists, and university-based educators. American teachers were found by Yee (1987) to be more interested in a wider pool of professional opportunities than in hierarchical career advancement.

To promote this view of career as professional growth,

then, McLaughlin and Yee (1988) contend teaching positions need to provide opportunities to develop teaching competence and "access to resources and the ability to mobilize them, the availability of the tools to do their job, and the capability to influence the goals and direction of their institution." (pg 28) They found that school environments supporting this type of career had five interrelated qualities:

- adequacy of resources,
- unity of purpose,
- collegiality,
- problem-solving orientation, and
- a reward structure based on growth, risk taking, and change.

Leadership Focused on Students' Learning If teachers all need to become increasingly professional in terms of decision making and instructional expertise (Devaney & Sykes, 1988), and if career satisfaction can come through this kind of professional growth and development (McLaughlin & Yee, 1988), then teacher leadership should be different from traditional forms. This is especially true when that leadership focuses on the improvement of learning through the improvement of teacher/student interactions as Little (1988) suggested when she discussed improving the quality of teaching through collegial interaction. She proposed teacher leadership as "rigorous professional relations among

teachers" (pg 81) that would lead to increased satisfaction through success with students.

The target of teacher leadership is the stuff of teaching and learning: teachers' choices about curriculum, instruction, how students are helped to learn, and how their progress is judged and rewarded. Teachers who lead leave their mark on teaching. By their presence and their performance, they change how other teachers think about, plan for, and conduct their work with students. (pg 84)

This is different than leadership on curriculum committees and in quasi-administrative roles. This form of leadership is based on construction of knowledge as the guiding learning theory of the school. Other forms of leadership are based on and operate within a view of consumption of knowledge; leadership roles designed to improve and perpetuate the existing curriculum and its delivery.

Changing Norms Little (1988) points out that her proposal for leadership among teachers violates the cultural norm of not interfering in another teacher's teaching. As noted earlier, there is teacher tolerance for intrusive programs under some circumstances, such as helping a new teacher or vague offers of assistance, but teachers do not accept direct intervention as appropriate when both teachers are experienced.

In the culture that prevails, 'don't interfere' and 'ask if you need help' bound teachers' initiative toward one another. Teacher autonomy, in this view, is interpreted as freedom from scrutiny and the right of each individual teacher to make independent judgments about classroom practice. (Little, 1988; pg 94)

Reform proposals, therefore, should aim at breaking down existing barriers of isolation and individual autonomy among teachers, but in doing so they run counter to many of the norms and traditions of the occupation (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986; Lortie, 1975; Lieberman & Miller, 1984). The relations between teachers and leaders--of any kind--is strained because of isolation, privacy, and autonomy. "Teacher leaders" do not have a place in the culture of schools. "The relation with other teachers that is implied by terms like mentor, advisor, or specialist has little place in the ordinary workings of most schools. Even the simple etiquette of teacher leadership is unclear." (Little, 1988; pg 84)

What is called for is "an affirmative construction of professional obligations" (Little, 1988, pg 94) that would center on shared responsibility for educating children and would go beyond concerns about being intrusive or offering perfunctory invitations.

The prospects for school-based teacher leadership rest on displacing the privacy norm with another that might be expressed this way: 'It's part of your job to insure that all the teaching here is good teaching.' Teacher autonomy, in this view, is interpreted as the right of the teaching profession to construct and uphold standards of good teaching and the obligation of individual teachers to examine closely their own and others' professional judgments. In schools, teachers would in fact expect to be their brothers' keepers." (emphasis in original) (Little, 1988, pg 94)

of t
expa
clos
that
or w
the c

thro
some
form
dete
form
rema
stud
coll
(Lit

TEAC

lead
lead
advan
the f
activ

This is a much different view of the nature and goals of teacher leadership than those proposed by many for the expanded roles for teachers. The philosophy of MILP matches closely the philosophies of teaching, learning, and career that are described here. In this model every teacher could or would be a leader, not just the few who entered and won the competition for a limited number of positions.

While career advancement in terms of upward movement through some sort of hierarchy will always have an appeal to some teachers and will probably remain available in some form, in the final analysis it is student gains that will determine the availability of career opportunities, of any form, for teachers. "The prospects for teacher leadership remain dim if no one can distinguish the gains made for students when teachers in large numbers devote their collective attention to curriculum and instruction."
(Little, 1988; pg 100)

TEACHERS' WORK

The consideration of the literature on teacher leadership has provided insights into characteristics of leadership based on two views of teaching and career advancement. These insights, however, tend to be limited to the formal functions of leadership or to its public activities; they do not shed much light on the personal,

priv
of t
lead
cult
of t
thos
teac
publ
mili

Char

teac
is d
fact
lead
inte
numb

Isol

writ
appea
physi
class
their
group
with

private aspects of leadership. The literature on the nature of teachers' work expands the understanding of teacher leadership by adding information about the structure and culture of teaching as it is experienced daily; the nature of the work being done by the people being lead as well as those leading. This begins to expose the private side of teaching, and in the process expands our understanding of public leadership activities. It shows us features of the milieu in which leadership takes place.

Characteristics of the Work of Teaching

A number of factors combine to form the work of teaching and the social, cultural relations of teaching. It is difficult to know where to begin in discussing these factors because they are not linear with one automatically leading to the next. Instead, they form a complex web of interactions in which any one factor is influenced by a number of others and in turn influences a number of others.

Isolation The isolation of teachers is a common theme in writings about teachers and their work. This isolation appears in a number of forms, the most obvious being the physical isolation of individual teachers in self-contained classrooms. Teachers typically spend the vast majority of their working day inside their classrooms with the same group of students that they were with yesterday and will be with tomorrow. Interactions with adults are limited to

st

cl

co

no

pr

co

ex

pe

is

pr

th

so

is

su

ex

ra

an

sh

th

th

th

Un

un.

197

short conversations squeezed into a day that is dominated by classroom concerns.

Some forms of isolation can be traced back to the conditions under which teachers learn their craft. There is no shared ordeal of training as in medical or legal preparations. People in other professions share with their colleagues the difficulties of medical residencies or bar examinations. Teaching has no such experience that bonds people together. Most of what teachers learn about teaching is gained on the job. Teachers do not enter their profession at some beginner's level and work up, but instead they are expected to do the same things on the first day of school that a twenty-year veteran does. Working in isolation from other teachers and with very little direct supervision, the new teacher learns to teach through the experience of teaching. This leads to idiosyncratic methods rather than a shared understanding of the nature of teaching and learning. This is further complicated by a lack of a shared technical vocabulary with which teachers can describe their work (Little, 1982). These factors conspire to limit the amount teachers can share with their colleagues about their work (Lieberman & Miller, 1984; Lortie, 1975).

Unclear Standards for "Good" Teaching There is no universally accepted standard for "good teaching" (Lortie, 1975). Feelings of self-doubt about teachers' adult role

a2

p2

un

co

e2

te

ha

tl

be

(1

re

in

pe

an

R

de

sa

wa

un

ex

an

fi

co

re

are exacerbated by a lack of standards for determining their professional competence. The problem of not having a universally recognized standard for "good teaching" is compounded by the privacy and isolation of teaching which eliminate meaningful interaction with other educators about teaching. Not only is there no clear standard, but teachers have "no safe place to air one's uncertainties and to get the kind of feedback necessary to reduce the anxiety about being a good teacher, or at least an adequate one." (Lieberman & Miller, 84; pg 13-14)

Lack of certainty about the nature of teaching and the relationship between teaching behaviors and the all-important student outcomes from which teachers derive psychic rewards lead to privacy and practicality as additional themes.

Rewards The most significant rewards of teaching are those derived through interactions with students. Lortie (1975) says the strongest psychic rewards come from the case in which a student struggles with a concept and finally understands it. These rewards are more powerful than the extrinsic rewards, such as pay and fringe benefits, or ancillary rewards such as clean working environment and frequent vacations; but psychic rewards are not automatic or consistent. They arrive erratically, and teachers often must be satisfied with a less than ideal form. Other

stud

prof

from

inte

prof

rela

outs

the

peop

unea

Will

Priv

cons

prac

teac

studies (Bennet, 1985; Yee, 1987) indicate teachers find professional relationships outside the school rewarding.

But getting so much of one's professional satisfaction from students is a mixed blessing. The focus on student interaction as a source of rewards leads to living one's professional life with children and developing close relationships with children. This, in turn, leads people outside schools to view teachers as being out of touch with the real, adult world. This perception of teachers as people who do not live in the adult world leaves teachers uneasy or defensive about their roles as adults (Lieberman & Miller, 1984).

Privacy Privacy among teachers means,

not sharing experiences about teaching, about classes, about students, about perceptions. . . . By following the privacy rule, teachers forfeit the opportunity to claim their successes; but they also gain. . . . the security of not having to face their failures publicly and losing face. . . . Most schools do not provide meaningful supervision, and most teachers do not ask for it. The very act of teaching is invisible to one's peers. . . . Loneliness and isolation are high prices to pay, but teachers will pay them when the alternatives are seen as exposure and censure. (Lieberman & Miller, 1984, pg 8-9)

Privacy affects the types of interventions that are considered appropriate for a teacher to make into the practice of another teacher. Little (1988) studied "master teachers" and how their help was offered and accepted. Even

under the best of circumstances in a school with a history of collegial interaction and shared responsibility for students and their learning, teachers were hesitant about the principal asking a master teacher to have on-going meetings with experienced teachers to improve their practice. It was appropriate to distribute articles or other material the master teacher found helpful, but it was considered inappropriate to distribute successful lesson plans. Other school faculties thought it was appropriate for master teachers to be assigned to work with new teachers, and to offer assistance in a general way -- "Ask if you need anything." -- to experienced teachers. But going beyond offering assistance was considered inappropriate.

Department heads as well as administrators overestimated the support master teachers would have from other teachers if they agreed to work with a teacher having difficulty. Support fell off quickly among teachers as the level of intervention increased and as the experience of the teacher being helped increased. Administrators thought teachers were more supportive of intervention by master teachers than they actually were (Little, 1988).

Practicality The daily pressures of teaching and its psychic rewards produce teachers' focus on practicality. Practical ideas are those that address circumstances of

se

ad

ad

to

W

W

Q

f

n

c

n

i

ti

ti

school such as discipline, attendance, order, and achievement. Practical ideas have immediate application, and they are offered by people who are or have recently been teachers.

Practical ideas require little additional work or preparation; they fit into the existing rhythms of the school. Practical ideas are immediate and concrete and can be effected with the resources and structures that currently exist. . . . To be practical means to concentrate on products and processes; to draw on experience rather than research; to be short-range and not predictive in thinking or planning." (Lieberman & Miller, 1984; pg 8)

Idealism, the opposite of practicality, is identified with youth and does not take into consideration the "real world" of adult teachers.

Concern for each student's well-being and optimal learning is idealistic; acceptance of limitations of student potential and teacher influence is practical. Reflective self-criticism is idealistic; expression the belief 'I do the best I can; it's just that the kids don't try' is practical. Being practical saves one from shame and doubt. It is a useful rule to follow." (Lieberman & Miller, 1984; pg 8)

Control Teachers' lives are further complicated by frustrations and contradictions about control. Teachers need to gain and maintain control of their classrooms in order to survive. Some level of classroom control is necessary for instruction, but it takes on additional importance because it is the indication of teaching ability that is visible to colleagues and the principal, becoming the major factor these people use to identify "good

1

De

an

of

Ev

teaching." (Lortie, 1975) But this control is tenuous and often takes the form of an implicit agreement being constantly negotiated between the teacher and students in which students agree to behave in exchange for easy grades (Lieberman & Miller, 1984). Mehan (1980) describes classrooms as places where teachers and students construct events in which they each affect the others' achievement of his or her agenda. In spite of these negotiations and constructions, the teacher maintains at least the outward appearance of control.

Outside the classroom, most teachers have little or no control or input into decisions affecting their work or their students. So they find themselves in the frustrating situation of needing a high level of control in the classroom and having little control outside (Lieberman & Miller, 1984).

The feelings that surround issues of always being with children, of professional competence, and of being in-and-out-of-control are highly charged and little acknowledged. They should not be underestimated; these feelings often block a teacher's impulse to improve one's teaching or to influence what happens in the school (Lieberman & Miller, 1984, pg 14).

Dailiness The unrelenting press of daily routines, demands, and dilemmas are keenly felt by teachers, but their power is often underestimated by people outside the classroom.

Everyday the elementary teacher faces 20 to 35 students who

we

pa

Th

pl

w

e

p

e

c

r

s

m

i

n

C

c

i

tl

or

ge

re

(J

in

Th

st

lar

were arbitrarily assigned to this particular room, this particular group of students, and this particular teacher. They spend five to six hour together for 180 days in a physical space much smaller than any other social setting. Within this crowded setting the teacher chooses routines to engage students and manage classroom behavior, has 1000 personal interactions per day, teaches as many as 8 subjects each day, and deals with the fragmentation of time and content. The teacher's day is filled with dilemmas that require finding some kind of resolution or balance between such competing demands as content coverage and mastery of material, depth and breadth of coverage, concern of individuals and the class as a whole, and routine and novelty (Jackson, 1968; Lieberman & Miller, 1984).

Communications with Other Teachers The form and content of communication among teachers are shaped by the forces of isolation, privacy, and practicality mentioned above and by their vocabulary, norms of collegiality, and ways of organizing information about their work. Teachers are generally more interested in immediate and pragmatic responses to the daily pressures of classroom interaction (Jackson, 1968; Lieberman & Miller, 1984; Lortie, 1975) than in general or theoretical conceptions of classroom practice. These practical concerns are more apt to be expressed in stories about classroom situations than in the technical language of academics. This is not a new phenomenon.

Wi

le

mc

c

t

o

c

a

e

c

m

o

co

tl

st

or

(o

co

sc

pe

di

William James (1899) said of teachers that what they "seem least to relish is analytical technicality and what they most care for is concrete practical application." (pg iii)

Teachers commonly use anecdotes when they discuss classroom situations with other teachers making it difficult to discuss the ideas or theories one is using. Even outstanding teachers are hard pressed to describe the complexity of their practice. Because of teachers' isolation and the way their time is divided, they generally speak of events, activities, interactions, and incidents in brief conversations over lunch, during recess, or at the copying machine. These conversations concern the particular needs of their students and classroom (Lieberman & Miller, 1984).

Educational improvement programs, in contrast, often come in the form of large conceptions described in theoretical or generalized terms rather than in anecdotes or stories about classroom events. This mismatch of forms is one of the difficulties of changing classroom practice (Cuban, 1986; Lieberman & Miller, 1984). MILP's focus on concerns identified by teachers is an effort at creating school change in a form that is more acceptable to the people most directly involved.

In many schools the conversational norms discourage discussions about teaching, or they tend to encourage

discussions that focus on complaining about personalities and problems. There are, however, schools in which the norms that govern faculty conversations favor the development and use of a shared language that allows teachers to discuss with their colleagues the complexity of classroom interactions. The cooperative use of this well-developed language for planning, developing, and evaluating teaching activities is one of the characteristics of successful schools studied by Little (1982).

Recent research confirms that teachers also organize their thinking about classrooms differently than do academics. Classroom teachers tend to focus more on learning activities and classroom events as the organizing themes for what they read and learn about education and subject matter. Academics, on the other hand, tend to organize material around theoretical frameworks and the work of individuals or groups of researchers (Campbell, 1988; Rackliffe & Castle, 1989).

Relations with the Principal Principals set the tone in the building through "an umbrella of attitudes and emotions." (Lieberman & Miller, 1984, pg 12) "The principal (especially in the elementary school) makes it known what is important, what will not be tolerated, and, in a strange way, sets the tone for tension, warmth, openness, fear." (Lieberman & Miller, 1984, pg 28)

R

R

t

L

s

R

C

a

M

a

i

C

C

e

P

r

r

r

Th

ee

at

re

Mi

Principals arbitrarily hold access to almost all the privileges and assignments and, therefore, have the power to make working in a school pleasant or miserable. By trusting the staff's competence in classroom affairs, dealing with parents and community, supporting teachers' decisions, and safeguarding them from personal attack, principals can help make teachers' lives pleasant. Misery, on the other hand, can come through extra assignments, classroom and student assignments, and overt or subtle criticism (Lieberman & Miller, 1984). Even for those who have decided to work around the principal or in spite of him or her, "the importance of that office is always felt in the daily life of the school." (Lieberman & Miller, 1984, pg 12)

Teachers' morale and sense of professionalism are closely tied to their relationship with the principal, especially in elementary schools. These relations are played out in conversations, short comments made in passing, room and pupil assignments, access to materials and resources, and a myriad of other brief, daily encounters. The teacher and principal form a loosely tied couple who each spend most of their time with other groups of people, are rewarded through different interactions, and who do not really understand what the other one does (Lieberman & Miller, 1984).

E

r

de

st

st

Principals are seen as the key to change in schools either as the instructional leader (Edmonds, 1983) or as a facilitator of change (Hall & Hord, 1987). An insecure principal can destroy a school full of teacher activity just as a principal sensitive to teachers' methods of work and their insecurities can make a school come alive (Lieberman & Miller, 1984).

Centrality of Teaching A theme, mentioned briefly above, that runs through studies on the nature of teachers' work is the centrality of the classroom and students. With student interactions being the primary source of teachers' psychic rewards, the centrality of the classroom and teaching is not surprising, but the topic is worth addressing separately because of its implications for teacher leadership.

Most of the teachers we interviewed, when asked what they hoped to be doing in the next five years, replied that they wanted to stay in the classroom and do what they enjoy most--teach. Most were interested neither in moving vertically into quasi-administrative or expanded teaching functions nor horizontally into administrative or central-office resource positions. Career, for the majority of these teachers, clearly was conceived in terms of classroom teaching and continued direct involvement with youngsters." (McLaughlin & Yee, 1988, pg 24)

Even among those teachers who did consider mentor teacher, resource teacher, or quasi-administrative roles, there was a desire to maintain some classroom teaching and contact with students. If moving up within the hierarchy meant leaving students, as it often did, it did not fit most teachers'

v.

(

c

e

c

F

w

S

c

t

R

n

w

c

l

8

on

le

th.

or

or

vision of career advancement (McLaughlin & Yee, 1988).

In a study done about twenty years earlier, Lortie (1975) saw this focus on teaching in a somewhat different context. He asked teachers what they would do if given an extra ten hours for professional work, and the vast majority chose individual activities directly related to classroom practice or student interaction. Only 9% chose committee work on school-wide topics.

Teachers who studied teacher leadership in the Puget Sound Educational Consortium also emphasized the centrality of teaching. In discussing directions for change, teachers they interviewed wanted to have an influence on decisions made concerning classrooms, but the majority expressed the need to remain centered in the classroom. They thought it was possible to provide leadership without leaving the classroom and becoming administrators (Diercks, et al., 1988).

SUMMARY

This review of literature has provided some information on the questions of interest. The first point was that leadership is administration. It is the process of getting things done. From there it follows that leaders will have, or will develop, skills and attitudes that will allow them or encourage others to participate in the work of the

organization. Several different types of leader were described. This section provided some broad ideas about leadership that will be helpful, but it did not address the unique features of leadership in the context of public school teaching.

The second look at leadership considered two forms of career in the teaching field. These tend to be based on different views of the work of teaching, and are definitely based on different ideas about what rewards teachers find motivating. MILP is more closely aligned with the model of career that emphasizes personal growth and professional development in the service of improving student learning and other student outcomes. There is interesting information here on the philosophical bases of teacher leadership and there are implications of the form that leadership might take, but there is little about the specifics of leadership or about the personal meaning it would have for individuals.

The third view of leadership actually looked at the work conditions of the teachers leading and being lead rather than leadership per se. This is an important part of understanding the meaning of leadership because it describes much of the day-to-day circumstances of teachers and the norms of interaction that have developed in public schools. These are the norms MILP is trying to change. Although this section provides insight into the meaning of teaching, there

is little here on the personal meaning of teacher leadership.

This entire review has provided some information related to the questions of change in teachers who become leaders, but there are still areas of personal meaning that we know little about. The information we have is also from people who are established in leadership roles so it leaves open the question of what to expect as a person becomes a leader; how is the role constructed by the individual and the group?

CHAPTER 3 SCHOOL CHANGE, TEACHER IMPROVEMENT
and the
MASTERY IN LEARNING PROJECT

In this chapter I will discuss school reform proposals generally and the Mastery in Learning Project in particular. It is not the objective of this discussion nor of this dissertation to fully describe school reform nor to evaluate reform proposals in general or MILP particular. Those proposals do, however, form the context of change within which Rachel worked as a teacher leader. In order to understand some of the things Rachel and her colleagues did, it is necessary to know about the philosophy of MILP and how that was similar to and different from other reform proposals.

SCHOOL CHANGE AND TEACHER IMPROVEMENT

Although in the past school improvement efforts have concentrated on organizational or curricular change, in recent years these efforts have generally been directed at improving the quality of teaching by changing teachers (Cuban, 1990). After a brief look at school change programs of the past I will discuss the importance of considering culture and the ecological nature of teaching if we are to change the work teachers do, and finally I will look at some

of t

In t

nee

thi

imm

dow

pre

for

by

197

ref

who

mov

the

cu

gr

re

im

pra

nat

to

of the forms school reform is currently taking.

In the Past

Historically, schools have been viewed as a means of meeting the changing needs of our society. Among other things, schools have been called upon to socialize waves of immigrants and to form a unified national identity, to break down racial barriers and form an integrated society, to prepare a productive and economically competitive work force, and to end such social plagues as drug abuse and AIDS by educating children (Bennett, 1988; Hawley, 1987; Ponder, 1976; Reed, 1988). The use of schools to achieve these reforms was often promoted by people outside the schools whose primary concern was social change (Cuban, 1986).

In addition to changing society there have been reform movements to improve the effectiveness of schools at meeting their instructional goals. These have included changes in curriculum, instructional technology, advancement or graduation standards for students, certification requirements for teachers and other staff members, and improved teaching practices (Cuban, 1986; 1990).

The improvement of schools and changing teaching practice have always been intertwined. No matter what the nature of the reform, teachers were always involved if only to be retrained as delivery agents. Changing teaching

prac

teac

Some

char

the

esp

con

pro

met

ref

dec

act

(G

co

pe

in

&

t

s

(

practice has generally been seen in terms of getting teachers to do, or buy into doing, what someone else wanted. Sometimes teachers were given control over the means of change, but seldom have they had control over determining the ends; although the ends are often things teachers value, especially student learning. Very seldom are teachers given control over the entire process--identification of the problem and desired end result, research and choice of method, and implementation of the change. A new wave of reform proposals, including MILP, embrace building-level decision making and increased teacher involvement. These activities are generally not seen as part of teachers' work (Geist, 1988). "Most of the literature on school change comes from a policy perspective or from a managerial perspective. One gets the view that teachers can be infinitely manipulated like puppets on a string." (Lieberman & Miller, 1984, pg. 81)

There are, however, views of school change that look at the process more broadly. These consider the culture of schools and their ecological nature.

Culture

It is important to consider the school culture when proposing changes. This culture is enacted through the procedural and behavioral regularities of the school. Sarason (1971) goes so far as to say that the only way to

make significant change in the outcomes of schooling is to change those procedural and behavioral regularities, and this can only be done through changes in the culture of schools. In the following passage he argues that changing textbooks or adding programs will not bring about the intended changes in outcomes when those outcomes are set in terms of student thinking and understanding. This can only be done by changing the relations among people within the school.

The goals of change, the outcomes sought, surely are not to see if it is possible to substitute one set of books for another, change the racial composition of a class or a school, or have children read or listen to black or Mexican history -- those possibilities are relatively easy to realize, and I have seen them realized in precisely the same way as in the case of new math, with precisely the same outcome: the more things change the more they remain the same.

Realizing these types of possibilities simply begs the question of their intended consequences, and in these as well as in other instances the intended consequences -- the basic goals and outcomes -- always intended a change in the relationships among those who are in or related to the school setting. But these intended consequences are rarely stated clearly, if at all, and as a result, a means to a goal becomes the goal itself, or it becomes the misleading criterion for judging change. Thus, we have the new math, but we do not have those changes in how teachers and children relate to each other that are necessary if both are to enjoy, persist in, and productively utilize intellectual and interpersonal experience -- and if these are not among the intended consequences, then we must conclude that the curriculum reformers have been quite successful in achieving their goal of substituting one set of books for another. (pg. 48) (emphasis in original)

Too often we think of school improvement as the implementation of a new program or adoption of a new and

improved textbook. These may be helpful, but they should not be expected to change the outcome significantly if they are not accompanied by changes in the ways in which teachers interact with students and with their colleagues.

But schools, although they appear similar, have very different relationships among the people who inhabit them, therefore different cultures (Goodlad, 1984). Differences are found in academic orientation, relations among teachers and between teachers and the principal, among student populations, and among district policies. These differences should make us cautious about oversimplified descriptions of schools and universal programs for changing school practices (Lieberman & Miller, 1984). MILP recognizes these differences, and, as we shall see in the description of the features of MILP, the project does not propose a single reform plan that is expected to work in all schools.

Ecology

Current thinking on school reform favors viewing schools as ecosystems that are made up of a number of interacting components. These form a loosely coupled organization that includes federal and state legislatures and bureaucracies; local district boards and administrators; and principals, teachers, staff, students, and community members at the building level. These are arranged in a hierarchy with power concentrated at the upper levels, far

from the classroom. In addition to being loosely coupled, the system is open on all sides to the influence of society and interest groups outside the system (Goodlad, 1984). The contribution made to thinking on school reform by the ecological perspective is its attention to the interactive nature of all the components and the importance of considering all of them at once when designing school change proposals.

Eisner (1988) identified features that act together in an ecological manner to "collectively give shape and direction to our schools" (pg 29). The first is the structurally fragmented character of schools, especially secondary schools, that breaks time into 50 minute chunks, and assign students, teachers, courses, and classrooms on the basis of these chunks. Second is the isolation of teachers and the different, but almost as powerful, isolation of administrators. Third is the combination of heavy reliance on extrinsic motivational incentives and their use to convince students to pursue "school-relevant" learning which is seen as having little to do with "life-relevant" situations. The final factor is the extreme focus on teachers' classroom role to the exclusion of other roles. In the literature review the centrality of teaching in teachers' professional lives was noted, but Eisner points out that the classroom is the only place where teachers have any authority, and they have little efficacy in shaping

policies that affect their work. These factors interact to form a stable system that can react to pressure without making significant, long-term changes.

Improving schools involves changes in these factors, and this will not be accomplished by merely imposing higher standards for teachers or students, requiring more homework, or adding courses to the curriculum. Functioning as an ecosystem, these factors have a self-correcting mechanism. A small change in one will not be sufficient to produce change in the others, and, over time, the system will return the changed portion to its original position. Large changes in one portion of the system will, however, influence what is done in all of the other portions of the system. "If significant changes in our schools are to occur, our educational system needs to be viewed as a whole, as an ecosystem of mutual dependence," (pg 29) with change and its effects being considered in terms of each part of the system (Eisner, 1988). The director of MILP, Robert McClure, describes this ecological nature of schools somewhat differently. He likens schools to a block of Jello and says "when you push on it here it jiggles way over there." (McClure, 1987) MILP tried to incorporate an understanding of this connectedness when it encouraged wide participation of groups in the decision-making process, and the study and thoughtful consideration of alternatives before making decisions.

Change Literature

There is a body of literature on school improvement and change in schools. This can be helpful in understanding the context within which this study took place, but this particular study and the context in which it occurred differ from most other reform efforts in important ways. This is not a study of school improvement or change per se but rather a study of one person's reaction to her leadership role in an improvement project. Also, MILP differs philosophically from most school improvement projects in that it allows -- actually, requires -- that people within each participating school make decisions about project organization, goals, and how they will be achieved. In contrast, many past studies of school change sought to find ways of getting teachers to acquiesce to the changes proposed by others -- administrators or outside reformers. MILP is designed to empower school staffs to take the responsibility for change within their school. It is a matter of activating staff members and enabling them to do the things they have determined are important rather than selling them on someone else's ideas.

Many past programs in staff development have packaged innovations and delivered them to teachers through direct instruction. Teachers were viewed at best as passive recipients, at worst as blocking the path to improvement. Staff development has too often been a paternalistic process

in which the only valid knowledge was based on university research, and it has ignored the wisdom of practice and knowledge gained through teacher inquiry (Lampert, 1988).

People Hall and Hord (1987) reviewed research on the process of change and the people who have lead those changes. Early leadership research in the 1920's concentrated on the traits of leaders such as their height, age, knowledge, and whether they were introverted or extroverted. Studies also considered social factors such as cooperation and adaptability. The findings of these studies were neither strong nor consistent. Later studies focused on leaders' style or patterns of behavior, developing the concepts of consideration for one's followers and of structuring work to achieve goals. These concepts have been expanded in the study of school principal's behavior to include aloofness, emphasis on production, consideration of faculty, and individual hard work and task structure. In the end, however, Hall and Hord conclude "what makes good leaders and what are the keys to their effectiveness are questions that still stir much debate and opinion." (pg 27) The questions being asked have become better, and the complexity of leadership is better understood, but answers are still elusive.

Processes In a review of work done on the processes of change, especially in schools, Hall and Hord (1987) find recent change literature focuses on models of the change process and sometimes the analysis of the role of change agent, but it does not talk about leadership per se. These descriptions of change are helpful in this study in providing an understanding of the evolution of thinking about the process of change. Four increasingly sophisticated models of change are described that show an increasing awareness of the individual's role in the change process. The models stop short, however, of examining the meaning of change for each individual.

Social Interactions models assume the innovation is fully developed and ready for adoption in the form it is presented. Adoption is considered a natural process in which an individual develops awareness followed by increasing interest and evaluation and then a decision to adopt the innovation. Outside change agents are active during the awareness and interest stages, but once the adoption decision is made the individual relies on a local, social network to learn about the innovation.

Research, Development, and Diffusion models emphasize a rational, systematic and sequential view of knowledge creation and use. They assume there is a rational sequence -- research, development, packaging, dissemination -- for

evolving and applying a new practice and that these involve large-scale, lengthy planning. High development costs are offset by mass dissemination and increased teacher efficiency through effective instruction. They further assume passive but rational teachers who accept and adopt the innovation as it is presented. This model guided the development and dissemination of the "teacher-proof" curriculum packages that came from the national curriculum development projects for the 1960's.

Problem-Solver models focus on the needs of the user. Here are the beginnings of the MILP philosophy. The change agent helps the user diagnose needs and arrive at a self-initiated and self-applied program that relies on internal resources. The change agent does not act as an expert or advocate for any particular plan. The most common form of this model is organizational development (OD) which assumes that group dynamics rather than individual skills are the source of most problems in schools. A variation of the problem solver model is concerned with establishing communications networks that channel information from innovation developers to potential users either within or outside the school.

Stages of Concern is a model of change developed by Hall and Hord (1987) based on the concerns teachers have about changes in their practice. Concerns are defined as "the composite representation of the feelings, preoccupation, thought, and consideration given to a particular issue or task." The concerns about a particular innovation or change progress from the teacher's first awareness through personal concerns about the demands and rewards of the change. The teacher, during adoption, becomes concerned with management issues and then goes on to concerns about the impact the change will have on students. Finally, concerns about collaboration with colleagues and the possibility of major changes to the innovation take the teacher's attention. These concerns change over time, although not in a lock step, one-way progression, rather; the relative intensity of different stages of concern vary (Hall & Hord, 1987).

Related to the Stages of Concern is the concept of Levels of Use. While Stages of Concern focus on psychological states of teachers, Levels of Use focus on behavior--the things teachers are doing to put an innovation into use. The perceptions and feelings of a teacher's Stage of Concern may be different from the behaviors of the Level of Use. These progress through preparation for the first use to a superficial, disjointed mechanical use. As use becomes more routine it is refined

and becomes integrated into the teacher's practice. Finally the teacher reaches the point of reevaluating and seeking major modifications (Hall & Hord, 1987).

The Stages of Concern and Levels of Use provide insight into the dual nature of change: both psychological and behavioral. MILP is designed to give teachers more control over the change process and to therefore ease the psychological aspects and facilitate behavioral changes. It is also interesting to note that each of these progressions end with the teacher moving beyond the current innovation and searching for new ways to improve practice; the implication being that change and professional growth are a continual process and no single innovation will be the answer to all concerns.

School Improvement and Reform Efforts

Looking beyond the literature on change to more specific school improvements of the last decade, there have been a number of reports of specific projects. Magazines such as Educational Leadership and Phi Delta Kappan have devoted issues to school reform or restructuring. At the 1990 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) there were 36 sessions devoted to school change, improvement, reform, or restructuring. That was up from 26 sessions on school change, improvement, and reform in 1989, and 16 sessions on school change and improvement in

1988 (AERA, 1990; 1989; 1988). A sampling of these reforms, especially those similar to MILP, will provide a background for the context within which MILP was developed and operated. This section begins with the changes in emphasis that occurred within the school reform efforts of the 1980's, then goes on to five elements of current school improvement efforts.

In a review of school reform efforts, Mary Hatwood Futrell (1989), past president of the National Education Association (NEA), found more discussion of needed changes than implementation of lasting reform, and said, "History will view the 1980's not as the decade of educational reform, but as the decade of educational debate." (pg 10) She identified four waves of school reform beginning with the 1983 publication of A Nation at Risk. The tone of that report and ensuing waves of school reform was set by this passage early in the report.

If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. . . . We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament. (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, pg 5)

Education is pictured as utilitarian: a vehicle for producing the technology needed for military superiority, a productive work force that could successfully compete in the international business arena, and the integration and assimilation of a large number of immigrants for the sake of

national harmony.

Between 1983 and 1985 the first wave of school reforms implemented this call for schools acting in the national interest through the passage of over 700 state statutes and countless local decisions concerning accountability through tests for students and teachers, increased advancement and graduation requirements, increasing both the number of school hours per day and days per year, and increasing use of homework. This amounted to a massive bureaucratic increase in the regimentation, regulation, and routinization of teaching. Much of the control over decisions about curriculum, teaching, and learning that had been in the hands of teachers and building staffs was usurped by local or state authorities (Futrell, 1989).

As a reaction to this top-down imposition of school improvement the second wave of school reform emphasized returning decision-making authority to teachers and principals. In 1986 a number of reports called for increased professionalization of teachers and the return of authority for educational decisions to those working most closely with students. (Futrell, 1989; Holmes Group, 1986; Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986) The Mastery in Learning Project was one of three programs begun by NEA in 1985 and 1986 that were predicated on the value of increasing teachers' participation in school decisions.

Included in this second wave was a realization that previous efforts were not serving well the students who were most in need of help. "Equity" became a central concern in addition to "excellence." Continuing with the emphasis on utilitarian education, programs were developed or adapted to more specifically meet the needs of inner city schools. Decentralization of decision making gave these schools the opportunity to tailor programs to their needs (Brickley & Westerberg, 1990; O'Neil, 1990).

Futrell (1989) identified increasing emphasis on economic preparation as a third wave in educational reform. Concern for the reassertion of American preeminence, especially with meeting increasing competition from Japan, led to calls for graduates who were prepared to staff our business and industry (Kearns, 1988; Spring, 1984). She claims this continuing emphasis on the utilitarian nature of education has kept us from addressing the intrinsic values of education for its own sake. She concludes with a call for a fourth wave of democratic, grass-roots reforms that will allow all members of each school community to make building-level decisions blending the virtues of both intrinsic and utilitarian education to prepare all students to meet the social, ethical, and economic realities of adulthood.

Five Elements of School Reform Currently popular school reform proposals contain varying emphasis on five elements: school-based decision making, teacher empowerment, school restructuring, findings of research on "effective schools," and changes needed at the district level. These terms are being used in a variety of ways in discussions about school reform. In some cases people call for school restructuring that will empower teachers to participate fully in a building-level decision process. But in other cases the emphasis on one element may greatly reduce another element. For example, one of the tenants of the effective schools movement is strong leadership from the building principal, and if this emphasis is incorporated in a building-level decision making program it could lead to decreases rather than increases in teacher empowerment (Conley & Bacharach, 1990). For the sake of this review I will try to pull the ideas apart and look at them as separate concepts, realizing as I do that none of them could exist in isolation from the others.

Teacher Empowerment. "Empowerment of teachers" is a label that is being applied to so many projects that it begins to loose any widely accepted meaning it might have once had and must be redefined by each of its users. Maeroff (1988) in his report on the Collaboratives for Humanities and Arts Teaching project (CHART) identified three guiding principles of empowerment. The first involves

raising the status of teaching, especially in the eyes of teachers themselves. The second is derived from Francis Bacon's statement that "knowledge is power." Teachers become empowered as they increase their subject-matter and pedagogical knowledge. Finally, empowerment to participate in decisions comes from reducing isolation, increasing collegial interaction, and developing an esprit de corps. It is perhaps easier to find agreement on what teacher empowerment is not than on what it is. In Maeroff's words, "the empowerment of teachers has to do with their individual deportment, not their ability to boss others. The kind of power discussed in this book is not of the strutting, order-issuing variety." (1988, pg. 4) Teacher empowerment is implied in all of the programs that call for restructured schools with some form of shared decision-making procedure.

School-Based Decision Making. Teacher empowerment is often played out in plans that involve collaborative, building-level decision making. One of the early calls for building-level decision making was from the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986). These initiatives delegate authority from the district level to the building level for decisions about budget, staffing, and curriculum (Cawelti, 1989). Plans include procedures for seeking waivers from district requirements or contractual restrictions, Buildings prepare an annual report of

progress on school improvement. A number of local districts have initiated plans along these lines including schools in Rochester, New York (Urbanski, 1988), and Jefferson county, Kentucky (Schlecty, 1987).

Although these plans vary in details of operation, they share characteristic perspectives on the nature of teaching and the work of teachers. Teachers are viewed as the people who should be in control of pedagogical knowledge. This has important implications for site-based administrators who have in the past been considered to be the instructional experts. "When administrators believe that teachers should be in charge of pedagogical knowledge, they implement professional school-site managerial strategies that reinforce the allocation of pedagogical control to teachers." (Conley & Bacharach, 1990, pg. 540) Secondly, they realize teaching is a varied and complex task; it is not routine and uniform. Good teachers are constantly responding to the changing needs of their students. Site-based management plans encourage experimentation and innovation among teachers. Finally, teachers are seen as decision makers and teaching is seen as work in which the primary task is making decisions in interactive situations that are ambiguous and unpredictable. Teachers are not seen as primarily delivering the results of other people's decisions (Conley & Bacharach, 1990).

Change from an administration-centered process for decision making to a participatory model does not always come easily. As is true with any area of human endeavor, there is variation among teachers' reactions to the initiation of participatory management, and individuals change their opinions over time making generalization difficult, but some reactions seem typical. The change is often resisted by teachers who have in the past been lead to believe they would be given control that was not forthcoming. They test the administration's resolve to follow through on its commitment. There are problems related to establishing procedures for making decisions and carrying them out. There is also a need for a new or improved communication network within the building staff and to outside individuals and groups. These communication patterns often need to be different in form and function than those that developed under a much different image of the work of teachers. (Conley & Bacharach, 1990; McClure, 1988)

Restructuring. The idea of restructuring as a means of school improvement is becoming popular among policy analysts, educational researchers, and policy makers at the local, state, and national level. "The logic of restructuring as a reform strategy appeals to common sense, and its advocates are persuasive. However, there is little agreement regarding what restructuring means or how it

should be implemented." (Timar, 1989; pg. 266) Not only is there no consensus on implementation, the term "restructuring," like "teacher empowerment," is being used for so many different things it has lost whatever meaning it might once have had. "This is becoming another catchword when the truth of the matter is that hardly any schools are restructured." (Goodlad quoted by Timar, 1989)

In most proposals the key feature of restructuring is bureaucratic decentralization. Not only moving decision making from the central office to the building level, but also breaking down the hierarchical arrangement of highly differentiated and specialized roles within schools. Timar (1989) identifies two approaches to restructuring. The first is the professionalization of teaching exemplified by the proposal put forth by the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. Professionalization would involve giving teachers more challenge, authority, and money. This would attract highly qualified people who will be proud of what they are doing and conditions in schools will improve, resulting, of course, in improved student learning. Changes would be made primarily in the contract between the schools and teachers with teachers, especially lead teachers taking a more active role in running schools. The proposal does not specifically address changes in the nature of schools and their offerings.

A second, contrasting, approach to restructuring is presented by Sizer (1984) and his Coalition of Essential Schools. This approach to restructuring focuses on students' needs rather than on motivating teachers. Sizer proposes that because teachers are the ones who are close enough to students to know what they need, they should be given the work conditions needed to understand and meet the needs of students. This program changes the goals, nature, and outcomes of schooling, resulting in changes in course structure and content, scheduling, student/teacher ratios and assignments, and evaluation procedures (Timar, 1989). The Mastery in Learning Project's approach to restructuring is closer to Sizer's than to the professionalism proposed by the Carnegie Commission.

"Effective Schools" Movement. The effective schools movement began in the mid 1970's as a alternative to an earlier movement that saw family background as the major determinant of school achievement. In that earlier movement funding programs such as Title 1 of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act and television programs such as "Sesame Street" were aimed at remediating deficits in students' home environment. Several groups of researchers studied schools that were effective in improving standardized test scores for low-income students, and they developed lists of school characteristics that correlated with improving test scores. There are a number of different

lists of these correlated of effective schools, and Edmonds's (1983) is typical.

1. Strong leadership by the principal, especially regarding instructional quality
2. A pervasive and broadly understood instructional focus
3. An orderly, safe climate conducive to teaching and learning
4. Teacher behaviors that convey the expectation that all students are expected to obtain at least minimum mastery
5. The use of measures of pupil achievement as the basis for program evaluation. (pg 5)

These broad items are often broken down into dozens of more specific characteristics.

Edmonds (1983) focuses on low-income students' academic improvement as measured by standardized tests because if the low-income students are improving the middle-income students will be doing even better. Effective instruction will result in all students at least obtaining minimum academic mastery, and from this will follow advances in "independent thinking, more sophisticated comprehension, and other intangible measures of intellectual gain." (pg 3)

Typically, when a school enters an effective schools program, school staff members complete a survey or questionnaire concerning the characteristics of their school. The results are tabulated by the district, and the building school improvement team is given the correlates their building is most in need of improving. The committee then plans activities for improvement.

MILP differs from these efforts in that it does not focus on improving test scores as the most important measure of school effectiveness. Nor does it limit participating schools to any set of school characteristics as the topics for consideration when making changes in their schools. Effective schools groups consider only the correlates of effective schools when deciding what to do in their schools. MILP also has a much broader needs assessment process than most effective schools programs have. In the MILP assessment there is, however, a survey that includes 33 effective schools correlates related to environment (8 items), program (7), teachers and support staff (8), school principal (7), and assessment and revision (3) (Mastery in Learning Project, 1984).

Changes That Districts Need to Make. Restructuring is essentially a building-level process because of the decentralization of decision making, but there are a number of changes that must be made at the local, state, and federal levels as well as by teachers' organizations and others in support of this restructuring. Lampert (1988) identified the following needs for school-based reform:

- restructured time within the school day and an extended school year,
- revised job descriptions for new roles,
- shared decision-making structures,
- discretionary funds for experimentation,
- open access to information,
- non-confrontational collective bargaining,
- options in staffing patterns, work contracts, and hiring practices,

peer-and self-evaluation systems,
secretarial support,
flexible bus schedules. (pg 668)

Summary

In order to bring about significant change in outcomes, schools should be viewed as ecological systems in which meaningful change requires change throughout the school culture. A number of models for change have been used in schools with limited success probably due to lack of concern for the complexity of teaching and the difficulty of changing practice. In addition, these approaches to change generally fail to consider that meaning change has to the individual participants.

Current efforts at improving education in the United States call for increased decision making at the building level. Teachers in these restructured schools will take a more active part in decisions that affect their classrooms. This vision of teachers empowered by knowledge and the authority to make decisions about their practice is at the heart of MILP. In the second part of this chapter I will describe the philosophy and structure of MILP.

MASTERY I

This
Learning
Associat
identify
goal is
structur
curricul
the basi
options.
backgrou
processe
schools a

In 1
reports,
"highly v
agencies"
(NEA, 198
women who
1) which t
were prese
schools f
to me
to e
succ
to p
to s
to i
schc

MASTERY IN LEARNING PROJECT

This study is set in the context of the Mastery in Learning Project (MILP) sponsored by the National Education Association (NEA). In MILP the staffs of individual schools identify concerns and initiate changes in their schools. The goal is for each school community to develop a school structure in which decisions about teaching, learning, and curriculum are made by all the members of that community on the basis of informed consideration of a range of possible options. Here I will describe MILP, beginning with background on its formation, followed by its features and processes, and, finally, information on participating schools and their activities.

In 1984 the NEA responded to 18 months of studies, reports, and programs for the improvement of schools from "highly visible commissions, civic groups, and government agencies" (pg 1) with an open letter to the American public (NEA, 1984). It provided "the perspective of the men and women who teach and serve our nation's young people," (pg. 1) which the other reports lacked. Concerns of teachers were presented, and 10 steps were proposed to prepare schools for the next century:

- to meet students' learning needs;
- to ensure each student's right to learn and to succeed;
- to provide students of all ages with equal access to school;
- to improve teaching and working conditions in the schools;

to improve the training of new teachers;
 to evaluate professional skills;
 to strengthen school management;
 to coordinate school and community services;
 to base teachers' salaries on those of comparable
 professions;
 to finance our schools adequately. (pg. 5)

To move along those steps, the report (NEA, 1984)
 offers nine "overarching principles" about schooling, and in
 two of them can be seen the seeds of MILP. The first
 principle is,

The objective of education should not be mere
 passing grades but a demonstrated grasp of the
 fundamentals, the competent use of skills, and
 command of subjects. Mastery of what is taught is
 the standard of excellence, with schools offering
 a comprehensive curriculum, organizing time, and
 providing resources for this purpose. (pg. 19)

This view of school learning as more than the memorization
 of some set of facts is at the center of the MILP
 philosophy.

'Mastery' in learning cannot be limited to a
 discrete listing of easily measurable skills. It
 must include the facility and confidence, judgment
 and strength, and command of knowledge and skills
 to understand relationships, solve problems, and
 contribute to the culture. (McClure, 1989, pg. 7)³

The other principle guides the way in which this
 mastery should be accomplished. "Authority must be vested

³ The name of this project, Mastery in Learning, should
 not be confused with the instructional technique of "mastery
 learning;" there is no relation between them. In a number
 of situations, unfortunately, that confusion has been made,
 and the project director says the choice of name was
 probably a mistake.

in the local school faculty. More appropriate decisions about teaching and learning are made by those closest to students and the community." (NEA, 1984, pg. 19) It probably comes as no surprise that the country's largest teachers' organization puts their emphasis on teachers as key people in the decision-making process. "The key to a school's quest for excellence is the involvement of a knowledgeable faculty empowered to act upon the central issues of schools--teaching, learning, and curriculum." (Lee & Obermeyer, 1986, pg. 64)

The union attacked the "first wave" reforms of the early 1980's. Futrell (1986) referred to "alleged reforms" and said,

Until now, what we have had is a teacher reform movement. The guiding thought--or thoughtlessness--fueling this reform effort has been 'fix the teacher and you fix education.' . . . [using] those reforms that in fact are disincentives, reforms that are insults: merit pay, career ladders, emergency certification, and, of course the faddish and fatuous pencil-and-paper competency tests for practicing teachers. With these initiatives, policymakers are giving new meaning to the term myopia. Policy makers, by and large, do not want to hear that reform efforts, to be effective, must target a complex constellation of problems. (pg. 6)

Futrell (1986) went on to call for reforms that recognized the complexity of education as "an organic process that involves the complex, dynamic interaction of multiple components." (pg. 6) Schools should be viewed as

ecosystems

that are just as fragile, just as easily polluted, and just as complex and precarious as any found in nature. The parts are tightly interdependent. Touch one part of the ecosystem and the entire system vibrates. That, quite simply, is why reforms that take aim at only one part of education are exercises in futility. (pg. 6)

Rejecting the competitive career ladder approaches to school reform and focusing instead on a collaborative view of school communities working together to help students master important educational skills and knowledge, the NEA began MILP as an alternate approach to reform.

The project began in 1985 with six pilot sites. The focus of that year was the development of an extensive needs analysis process and the first steps in organizing school faculties for this type of open-ended activity. In the fall of 1986, 21 demographically diverse schools were added. These had been chosen from a pool of over 700 applicants. The full set of 27 demonstration sites was to be active for three years, but the project was extended for a fourth year. Plans are now being made to combine the project in some form with other NEA demonstration projects and extend it indefinitely. This study took place during the 1987-88 school year when Adams School was asked to replace another school that was forced to withdraw from the project.⁴

⁴ This report is being written at the beginning of the 1990-91 school year, and Adams School is still active in MILP. The organization of the project has changed at the national level, but the goals and philosophy remain the

Features of MILP

MILP has five features that combine to set it apart from other school-based school improvement projects.

Local Responsibility First, the project places responsibility for determining needs, researching options, selecting programs, and implementing changes on the people directly associated with the individual school, rather than imposing these from outside. The "direction of the work comes entirely from the inventory and assessment that are generated locally." (Lee & Obermeyer, 1986, pg. 65)

Release Time A second feature is a release-time fund that can be drawn upon to pay for substitutes in order to provide release time for school staff members. In most MILP schools that fund is \$5,000 per year, enough to pay for 100 days of release time. Project participants often refer to this as the "sub bank." It is most often used to provide substitute teachers so MILP teachers and staff can have meetings during the school day. Day-long or half-day meetings allow participants to discuss complex topics related to schools, teaching, and learning. Too often the time structure of teachers' jobs has meant these topics were treated quickly in short conversations at the copy machine or over lunch. In some instances MILP teachers have chosen to use part of

same. Adams has also begun participating in Richfield's site-based management program.

the money as stipends for after-school work rather than release time.

Studying Options The third feature is an emphasis on considering options through the study of research, teachers' experience, and examples of wise practice. The study of options is supported by Teaching Resources and Knowledge (TRaK), a research service located at the project office in Washington, D.C. Research assistants provide support in the form of literature searches and packets of articles and other information that relate to specific topics of interest for each of the schools. TRaK has been expanded to include a computer-based communication network among MILP and other schools and research organizations interested in building-level school improvement. This network was developed in cooperation with IBM and provides wider access to the wisdom of practice among teachers. Besides resources at the project office, MILP has cooperative agreements with the regional research and development laboratories, federally-funded research centers, several universities, and private consultants.

Taking the view of the "teacher as thinker and informed decision maker," (McClure, 1989, pg. 8) MILP believes teachers should do more than be consumers of someone else's research.

Not only should teachers be involved in using

research, they should be involved in creating original research. Without active practitioner involvement in the creation of knowledge, the body of information is less germane to the persistent problems of schooling. (McClure, 1989, pg. 7) (emphasis in original)

The emphasis on use of research has lead to studies within the project on teachers' use of knowledge in decision making (Castle, 1988; Livingston & Castle, 1989). These have been conducted both by participating teachers and by consultants and project staff. There was also a call for broader cooperation between practitioners and the educational research community, a "dynamic interaction between teachers and researchers." (McClure, 1989, pg. 7) Research is needed that "solidifies and codifies the professional knowledge base on which the science of teaching rests." (Futrell, 1986, pg 7) To encourage this the NEA promises support for "all legitimate, nonprescriptive research proposals in this vital area." (pg. 7)

Site-Based Consultant Fourth, a site-based consultant works with each faculty providing whatever research or organizational support the staff needs to accomplish its objectives. The consultant is also the school's connection to the project office in Washington and to other schools in the network. I was the site-based consultant for Adams School. Consultants often are doctoral students from local universities who spend two to three days a week on the

project. Consultants received some training from the project but were encouraged to follow the lead of the local teachers and assist with their decisions rather than intervene in the process. There was a good deal of variation in the amount of intervention consultants thought appropriate for their role and the amount desired by their school staffs. In my role as consultant I tried to be as non-interventional as I could, perhaps erring on the side of non-intervention when I should have been more active. By being non-interventional I tried to move teachers into decision making roles rather than just changing from decisions made by building and district administrators to decisions made by an outside consultant. This seemed to me to best fit the MILP philosophy, but there were other consultants who felt they should be more directive.

Network Participation Finally, being part of a network of schools participating in MILP gives the participants a sense of being involved in something that extends far beyond their school. The network is held together by a number of forces. The MILP office in Washington, D.C. is one of the main components in the network. School staff members, as well as the site-based consultants, are in frequent contact with office personnel. The network communicates through a monthly newsletter, a computer communication and bulletin board service, and annual conferences. This network is one way to break down the isolation classroom teachers often

feel, and it shows them that they are part of a movement that reaches beyond the boundaries of their classrooms, their buildings, and their districts.

Steering Committee

Within MILP schools much of the direction for project activities comes from the Steering Committee that provides overall coordination, while subcommittees or task forces address specific topics. A Steering Committee is generally established soon after a school joins the project. The committee assists the site-based consultant in gathering the data for the School Profile and Faculty Inventory described below, and in preparation of the final report. At Adams School, I did most of the data collection, analysis, and writing; but I worked closely with the Steering Committee. In addition to helping collect and compile the School-Profile and Faculty Inventory surveys, they read and responded to drafts of all sections of the final report. In some instances their responses were quite pointedly critical, and they suggested many changes. My responsibility was to write a report that represented their interpretation of the survey data and its analysis.

From this report the committee develops a set of issues, concerns, or problems for faculty consideration. The Steering Committee is usually the most visible of MILP committees and the forum in which topics of school-wide

interest are discussed. Participation on the Steering Committee and in other MILP activities is generally voluntary.

Each Steering Committee selects a chairperson either through a school-wide ballot or within the committee. This person is, in most participating schools, the most active MILP participant, acting as spokesperson for the project, attending the annual MILP conference, working closely with the site-based coordinator, conducting meetings, and acting as liaison with the local administration. This report uses as its main data source a journal kept by Rachel Mayfield when she was Steering Committee chairperson during the first year of her school's participation in MILP.

Processes

The project has only three requirements for participating schools: participating faculties vote with at least 75% in favor of the school's involvement in the project, they complete the School Profile and Faculty Inventory process describing the school as it enters the project, and they study options before making decisions on issues. Beyond those, each participating school is free to determine its own organizational structure, topics of interest, and methods for pursuing those topics.

The final goal of participation in MILP was a

restructured school characterized by collegial interaction, shared decision making, and comprehensive change. The project design included four phases leading to this.

Profiling the School The first thing each school did when it entered the project was conduct, with the help of the site-based consultant, an analysis of current conditions at the school in relation to four topic areas: teachers and teaching, students and learning, school faculty, and curriculum. This was done through a series of structured interviews with teachers, students, parents, and administrators over a period of several weeks. Information and opinions were gathered on 18 broad questions in a process that used group discussions, questionnaires, and rating scales. The school profile provided baseline information about the school as it began work in MILP.

Inventorying the Faculty The second phase of the process took a few days and was sometimes done concurrently with the first. The Faculty Inventory included a discrepancy questionnaire on which each staff member rated the current condition and the ideal condition at the school for 118 items. The process also included a half-day meeting of the entire school staff during which they participated in individual and group activities designed to focus their concerns about the school and to begin development of a

shared vision of what their school could become.⁵

Information in the Faculty Inventory and the School Profile was analyzed by the site-based consultant working with faculty members, and a report prepared for presentation to the school community. During this analysis and reporting process the faculty began to identify topics of concern that they wanted to address. Although there were some guidelines, the details of the analysis process and the identification of topics were left to the discretion of each faculty and consultant.

Empowering the Faculty Toward Renewal The third phase of the project took two to three years for most faculties, and, unlike the first and second phases, there was no clear indication of successful completion. Empowerment of the faculty involved creating "the skills, attitudes, and inclinations necessary for sustained inquiry into the assumptions and practices that define their school." (McClure, 1989, pg. 8) During this phase the faculty created committees or some other organizational structure to address the topics they had identified as important. They read research, explored options, initiated programs, and

⁵ For more complete information on conducting both the School Profile and the Faculty Inventory including interview protocols, forms, questionnaires, and instructions for analysis, contact the Mastery in Learning Project at the National Education Association in Washington, D.C..

evaluated results. Faculties learned to work together sharing ideas and making decisions about their school and their classroom practices. The project did not impose any kind of structure or process beyond the requirement to consider options before making decisions. A wide variety of processes was found among the participating schools.

(Livingston & Castle, 1989)

Cultivating Comprehensive Change The final phase is actually the beginning of a new culture within the school and is the ultimate goal of the project: to "transform the school into a self-renewing center of sustained inquiry-- the MIL concept of a restructured school." (McClure, 1989, pg. 9) The project said very little about the nature or characteristics of a "restructured" school, because it was felt that this had to come from within each school. It was feared that if the project proposed any features they would be considered part of the "right" answer, and would limit the range of possibilities schools would consider.

Each of the phases in the project requires collaboration at two levels. For access to resources, both financial and informational, there is collaboration among institutions: the participating school and its central administration; the local, state, and national education association; regional research and development labs; federally-sponsored research centers, nearby universities;

and the national project office. There is also collaboration within each school community. The entire school-building staff, students, parents, and community members work together in differing combinations on the planning and implementation of MILP projects. This level of collegial cooperation was new to many of the MILP faculties, and learning to work together with a variety of individuals and institutions for the benefit of their school was often a difficult developmental process.

Steps Toward Collegiality

Nine steps in the development of collegial relationships among MILP school faculties have been identified by Robert McClure, the national director of MILP (1988). This is not a lock-step sequence of events, indeed the sequence of some of these may be different from one school to the next. This evolutionary process is typical, however, within participating schools, whatever the size, grade level, or student body makeup. In relating these steps to the phases in the previous section, these tend to occur during the third phase, empowering the faculty. The final step here, comprehensiveness, would signal the beginning of final phase, cultivating comprehensive change, described above.

Testing Each school begins with a period in which teachers test the limits of the administration's commitment to change, trying to determine the level of the administration's support for change and the latitude they will allow. This testing can be seen in initial projects that are of low risk to teachers, such as hallway behavior or campus clean up.

Exhilaration Members of the faculty are excited about the prospect of being given authority over issues and resources that concern their work. "Expectations are high; possibilities seem endless." (pg. 61)

Commitment Issues to be addressed have been identified, and faculty members begin work on schoolwide, as opposed to individual classroom, projects. Often new people move into leadership positions on these projects.

Dispiritedness Disillusionment sets in when the faculty realized "no one from outside the school is going to provide solutions," (pg. 61) and problems do not easily resolve themselves. This has been dubbed the "Halloween Syndrome" because it generally strikes at the end of the second month of school. A number of staff members are likely to drop out or drastically reduce their participation.

Regeneration "This is a critical phase in the life of a reform effort." (pg. 61) A nucleus of people remains active and carry on. In many cases they felt they needed to go back "to the original findings about the school, talk at great length about rekindling commitment and what commitment means, and assess how many other faculty members could be brought into active work." (pg. 61) This leads to a recommitment to the project based on a deeper understanding of its goals and its process.

Seeking Small Successes In order to produce visible results, the group chooses "a few simple, straightforward ideas" that will recapture the interest of other faculty members. These successes also act as "springboards to more comprehensive projects." (pg. 61)

Using Research As groups move into more comprehensive projects they begin using resources available through the project to access research and the wisdom of practice. The national project office supplies packets of information on any topic in response to teachers' requests. Through the computer network, participating schools have access to all MILP schools, schools in the Coalition of Essential Schools, members of the National Network for Educational Renewal, the regional research and development labs, and several research universities. Teachers use traditional research literature and also draw upon a richly diverse wisdom of practice as

they weigh options for improvement.

Experimentation Through the study process staffs develop plans for changes. They generally pilot an approach, evaluate the results, and then implement it on a wide-scale basis. Some faculty groups are engaged in full-scale research projects to evaluate the effectiveness of changes.

Comprehensiveness The final stage of the evolutionary process is a comprehensive change "from fragmented efforts to comprehensive school reform." (pg. 62) Improved skills in managing and directing projects leads to continued success with improvement projects which in turn encourages wide participation among the faculty. Collegial interaction increases the faculty's "attention to coordination of its efforts and great interest in making separate activities mutually supporting." (pg. 62)

MILP Schools

NEA originally chosen 27 schools in which to demonstrate the effectiveness of this approach to school improvement. These schools were selected from over 700 applicants to form a demographically balanced group representing the different types of schools found across the country. They included elementary, middle, junior, and senior high schools in urban, suburban, and rural communities of varying socioeconomic composition. The

student bodies of the schools reflected, in varying proportions, almost all the different racial and ethnic groups that make up our nation. The network of schools selected included 20,000 students, 1,200 teachers, 450 support staff, and 64 site-based administrators.

Figure 2. Demographics of Schools Participating in the Mastery in Learning Project.

Racial Makeups

13	Majority white
6	Predominately minority (African-American, Hispanic, Native American, Asian, or Pacific Islanders)
8	Racially balanced

Locations

19	States	4	Inner city
24	Cities	5	Urban
		7	Suburban
		4	Small town
		7	Rural

Socio-economic levels

4	Upper-middle
12	Middle
7	Lower-middle
4	Lower

Grade distributions

PreK-4
 K-2
 K-4
 K-5
 K-6
 K-7
 K-12
 6-8
 6-12
 7-8
 7-9
 9-12

CHAPTER 4 RATIONALE, METHOD, and SETTING

This chapter will be divided into three sections. It begins with a rationale for the topic and for using this type of research. The methods I used for collecting data, analyzing it, and writing this report are described in the second section. The chapter will close with a description of the setting, both Adams Elementary School and the Richfield school district.

RATIONALE

Why This Topic?

The previous chapters have provided some insight into the nature of leadership, teachers' work and careers, and into school reform. These have provided some information about the nature of leadership, but they tend to stop short of describing the social work performed by a person in a leadership position within a social context. Several authors offer suggestions on how this should be approached.

Too often people who have studied school change have focussed on the behaviors and reactions of individuals rather than looking at their positions and roles within a social culture that constrains the ways in which they can act. Sarason (1971) argues that researchers get so caught

up in the concerns of personal psychology when they think about teacher change that they miss the importance of culture.

In my opinion the primary reason is so many of us are intellectually reared on a psychology of the individual; that is, we learn, formally or informally, to think and act in terms of what goes on inside the heads of individuals. In the process it becomes increasingly difficult to become aware that individuals operate in various social settings that have a structure not comprehensible by our existing theories of individual personality. In fact, in many situations it is likely that one can predict an individual's behavior far better on the basis of knowledge of the social structure and his position in it than one can on the basis of his personal dynamics. (pg. 12)

In directing us away from the psychology of individuals, Sarason points to the importance of the culture of the school. This study considers how that culture acts upon, and is acted upon, by an individual in a leadership position.

Hodgkinson (1983) also directs our attention away from the personal psychology of the leader, but he focuses on the person rather than the culture. He says researchers have ignored the "value-ethical domain . . . [and the] phenomena and phenomenology of commitment" (pg 200) He goes on to argue that research on leadership should focus on the philosophy of leaders because "the very nature of leadership is that of practical philosophy, Philosophy-in-action." "Affect, motives, attitudes, beliefs, values, ethics, morals, will commitment, preferences, norms, expectations,

responsibilities -- such are the concerns of leadership philosophy proper." (pg 202)

Blackman (1989) raises the issue more broadly when he says, "This person-as-professional brings values, beliefs, knowledge, attitudes, and insights to whatever professional role he or she may play." (emphasis in original) (pg 3) To develop understandings of the roles people play in schools, both as teachers and in roles outside the classroom, we need to understand people in the complexity of their lives as individuals and also in the complex culture of the school.

These authors have presented an array of topics for research related to teacher leadership. The findings of this study show one teacher's reaction to her changing role and the kinds of change might we expect in a person becoming a leader.

Why This Method?

Personal meaning and social interaction are relatively new concerns for educational researchers, but during the 1980's they have become legitimate topics of educational research using qualitative methods. "The dominance of behaviorist psychology in American educational research in this century may partly explain the fact that meanings, perspectives, and beliefs have only recently become respectable objects of study." (Feiman-Nemser & Floden,

1986; pg. 523) As they became objects of study, research methods were developed that were more suitable than the positivistic methods that had been used in the past.

Hodgkinson (1983) criticizes the positivistic research of the past because it too often uses as its main variable "leader personality," a trait that cannot be easily or accurately measured or quantified. We have a lot of evidence about "the multi-dimensionality of man" (pg. 199) that must be studied using qualitative techniques. The variable of "leader effectiveness" is also difficult if not impossible to define, in part because of our inability to decide on the desired outcomes of an organization, especially when the organization is as complex as public schools. As with all positivistic research, the structure necessary to do the research limits the applicability of the findings.

By contrast, qualitative, or interpretive, research methods are better suited for finding the meanings being constructed by the people within a situation. By carefully describing a situation and the meanings it has for various participants, interpretive researchers shed light on that unique situation and, at the same time, develop theories about the situation that readers can take beyond the situation (Eisner, 1981).

The situation in this study is a new one. There are few, if any, models of teachers being chosen to formal leadership positions by their peers. This set of circumstances allows us to study a person moving into a new position and inventing, with her colleagues, a role that did not exist previously. Interpretive methods allow the study of these kinds of events and their meanings.

Rachel's Perspective

I have chosen to view the year solely from the perspective of the Steering Committee chairperson, Rachel, rather than examining it from the perspectives of other staff members. Although I realize this leadership role is co-constructed through interaction with others, what I want to report here is the meaning of leadership for the individual who is living the role. As we move toward increased professionalization of teaching and expanded roles for teachers, we need to better understand how these changes in role will affect the people we are asking to change, and how we might better prepare them for those changes.

In this study Rachel's own journal is the primary data source, augmented by interviews. Additional information comes from memos, meeting minutes, the text of presentations Rachel made, and my observations. In her journal Rachel presents her own point of view, and that is the only perspective considered in this study. None of the other

participants were interviewed because I wanted to focus on Rachel's understanding of her role.

Reliance on this single source is the best way to get that person's perspective on the situation. During the time we spent together, both as subject and researcher and as teacher leader and consultant, Rachel and I developed a relationship of openness and trust that gave me the opportunity to see into her role in ways that would not be possible for someone who was not as involved. What might be lost in giving up "objective distance" is compensated for by the insider's perspective I was able to develop.

When my roles of consultant and researcher seemed to be in conflict during the period of the study I generally felt I should give priority to my role as consultant and move the researcher role to the background. Most of the study's analysis and interpretation took place after I left the site so the role of consultant seldom intruded. This separation in time between gathering information and its analysis reduced potential conflicts between the two roles.

The Evolution of This Study

The final version of this report, both the topics covered and the arrangement, is the result of an evolutionary process that took place over the life of the study. My original goal was to discover the information or

the kinds of knowledge Rachel drew upon as she made decisions in the leadership role. I realize now this was rather naive, but at the time it seemed a rather good idea. I hoped to develop some kind of a taxonomy that could be used as the basis for some kind of educative activities that would prepare teachers for these new roles. After about two months of working with Rachel I realized she was not consistently drawing on any particular body of knowledge or experience as she went about the work of leading. She was basing some decisions on a broad understanding of the philosophy of MILP or on suggestions I made that were based on a somewhat more developed understanding of the project, but she was not going back to her past and saying things like, "I remember learning how to conduct meetings in Girl Scouts." When I tried to push on her during interviews to see if there was some subconscious knowledge she was using, she kept referring to her collective or individual experience with the people in the building. At the time I was not sure what this meant, other than it was not what I had expected to hear. I continued gathering information, confident that the meaning would eventually become clear.

In the winter following the 1987-88 school year I did a preliminary analysis of Rachel's journals and wrote a paper (Rackliffe, 1989) to present at the American Educational Research Association (AERA) conference. As I read and reread the journals I was struck by a number of recurring

themes, and the one that was most interesting was the meaning of leadership for Rachel. At least a dozen times she made explicit remarks about leadership: "As a leader. . .," "Maybe that's part of leadership. . .," ". . . to feel like a leader." I took this as the central theme for the paper, and divided the findings into three sections. I separated the meaning of leadership in terms of its institutional aspects related to running meetings and accomplishing tasks, its interpersonal aspects among Rachel and other staff members, and its personal aspects for Rachel herself. In the process of choosing this theme, I chose not to describe Rachel's first year in terms of the chronology of events nor in terms of descriptions of specific, pivotal events; although I recognized these were important in understanding the chosen themes.

When I began work on this expanded version I had mixed feelings about the adequacy of the AERA paper. I was still pleased with the focus on the meaning of leadership. This was a topic Rachel had, perhaps inadvertently but certainly frequently, identified as one she was thinking about in her journals. The personal aspect of leadership that went far beyond the minutia of running meetings and other day-to-day tasks was important to her. That is what she wrote about in her journals, and when she read the AERA paper she agreed this was an important side of the position to show to the public.

On the other hand, there were two aspects of the paper with which I was not pleased. I realized the chronology of events was important first to set the context of the other findings. Also, many events were important because of the issues raised and the things the group learned during or as a result of the event. I decided to present the findings in this report as two slices through the year. First as a chronological description of major events for historical context and because the events often provided information about changes within the group. The second chapter of findings presents an analysis of the year in terms of Rachel's leadership.

The second troublesome aspect of the AERA paper was the arrangement of the findings about meaning into institutional, interpersonal, and personal categories. More complete analysis and explanation of the topics within categories showed the categories were overlapping and very interactive. The complexity of the situation had been distorted by the separations. I decided to present topics in a more holistic way showing how interpersonal arrangements were made to facilitate the accomplishment of institutional tasks, and these arrangements had a personal impact on Rachel. The topics remained basically the same, but the ordering of the presentation changed. Combined with increased detail in the analysis this made a much more satisfying presentation which more accurately showed the

complex interactions among tasks, group norms, and Rachel's personal reactions.

Finally, there are two things I do not want to imply in this discussion of evolution. First, although I accept complete responsibility for the decisions, I do not want to imply that I went through all of these changes without input from others. On the contrary, a number of people read drafts and offered valuable suggestions. Secondly, I do not want to imply that this is the only possible way to look at this year, or even that it is necessarily the "best" way. Any year in the life of a school teacher contains enough material to fill dozens of dissertations. This is the approach I felt was interesting, an addition to our knowledge about teachers, and in keeping with the things Rachel saw as important during that year of her professional life.

Rachel's Comments about Journals

Before moving on to the section on how the study's data were treated, I would like to discuss Rachel's journal and her comments about keeping a journal. Her reaction to keeping a journal has implications for its use as the primary information source in this study.

When Rachel agreed to participate in this study she realized there would be some limit to the anonymity I could

provide because of the public nature of the project. I did, however, tell her that her journal entries would only be made public as edited quotes. I would not show the entire journal, or unedited portions to anyone except my advisors and the dissertation study group I was in. Group members were sharing material from their studies and were pledged to respect confidentiality. She showed this appreciation when, after comments on a very sensitive issue, she wrote. "I'm glad only you read this -- I'd be lynched [if this got around]." (J-10/14/87)

On the day Rachel agreed to participate in the study she said she would keep a journal with daily entries about her role as a teacher leader. Nothing more was said about it for two or three weeks. Finally, I asked her if she had been able to work on the journal. She looked rather surprised, said she had told me she would, and had been writing each day. Nothing more was said. In late October I went to Japan for four weeks to teach classes for the university. Before I left I had mentioned to Rachel that it might be helpful if I could see what the journals looked like, but we never seemed to get around to looking at them. One day a copy of the first 27 entries arrived in the mail with a note from Rachel saying she was sorry she did not have a chance to get these to me before I left.

The entries for the first two or three weeks were like diary entries. They seemed to be Rachel's personal notes to herself. She referred to me as Gary, as though I was just another member of the building staff, not as though I would be reading and analyzing the entries. After that early period the entries remained very personal and self-revealing but had more the tone of a letter written to me. She commented one day that it came as something of a surprise to her when she got ready to mail the copies and she felt the full impact of the realization that someone else was going to be reading them. Later, when she began giving me copies more regularly she wrote, "Knowing you weren't reading it until some future nebulous date allowed me to feel a certain freedom. Now that you're going to reading it often -- I feel a little stranger -- not that I want it [to be] different. It will just take me a while to adjust." (J-1/8/88) It seems reasonable to conclude that these journal entries give us the best possible look into Rachel's inner thoughts.

The first time Rachel saw herself quoted was during the second year of the project when she read the AERA report. Even though we discussed my use of quotes as I was writing the paper, she had not realized just how much I would rely on her words or what that would look like until she read the paper. Her reaction was that if she had thought about the text being used in that way she would probably have written

it differently. Fortunately, she did not.

Another issue of interest with the journal is the process of writing and the subject matter. Rachel commented a number of times about writing in the journal. One group of comments concerned the time it took to write the entries. Many evenings Rachel would leave the building with one arm full of school work and the other full of MILP work, and it was difficult to find time for the journals. When the Steering Committee was particularly busy preparing to present material to the building staff she wrote, "Well, I have to work on guidelines yet tonight so this is all you get." (J-1/7/88) In April things were particularly difficult, and it affected her writing. "Well, I'm exhausted emotionally and physically so this is going to be short. So much has happened to me in the past 2 weeks I am drained." (J-4/29/88) Finally, the crush of year-end responsibilities also made writing difficult. But this time Rachel took a different approach to her relation to the journal.

Because I have so much to do normally, I almost at this point resent having to [write in] this [journal]. It's just one more thing, and I have too many already. So much is happening both with regular end of the year stuff and end of the year MILP stuff, that I can't always find time and sometimes -- because I can't put aside any of the other stuff -- I put aside the one thing I can control and it's this. (I-5/18-19/88)

The other part of writing that was problematic is more

difficult than finding the time and energy; this concerns the subject matter. Rachel often chose to write about her feelings concerning the very difficult situations in which she found herself. Writing in the journal made her go back through these as she says here.

To be honest, even this is hard. It's just one more thing to do and it's kind of taking on a life of it's own. It's almost as if these last couple of weeks -- I dread it. I guess cause it makes me rehash all the things that have set me off. And that's like getting upset twice. It's hard. (J-5/13/88)

Apparently this had not been as much of a problem earlier in the year. The week after this entry she wrote,

Because of the stress of getting everything in [for the end of the year] pervades all facets of my life I never have anywhere to get away to. This journal has made this situation worse -- it forces me to rehash all the emotional upheavals of the days and, where earlier in the year this helped me, now it never allows me to let go. And that is not a healthy situation. (J-5/18-19/88)

METHOD

This section separates the activities of data collection and data analysis. This is a rather false distinction, and the two activities overlapped in reality. It is done here in hopes of making the procedures I used clearer.

Data Collection and Preparation

Rachel wrote 101 journal entries between September 29, 1987 and May 5, 1988. Most of these were made on a daily basis and written in the evening about the happenings of that day. Five entries covered periods of two to five days. In the journal Rachel generally wrote about her reactions to events rather than writing descriptions of the events. These were typed and combined with the text of two speeches Rachel made and meeting agendas and minutes for a total of 132 double-spaced pages of text. Our five interviews lasted a total of approximately 11 hours and were tape recorded. I listened to all of the tapes, taking notes and transcribing portions of the conversations I would want to draw on. Added to the journals this made a total of 215 pages.

Rachel's journal entries were all hand written which presented some problems when transcribing them to typed text. The computer printer does not, unfortunately, have the expressive latitude of the pencil and paper. I have retained all of Rachel's underlining and have not added any of my own. Capitalization and punctuation were generally maintained as Rachel used them. I did, however, take the liberty of correcting the few spelling and punctuation errors I found and adding a few commas where they were needed for clarity. There was seldom more than one correction per page. These changes were made on the

assumption that Rachel was writing more for meaning than for perfection in technical details. Any words I have added are in square brackets [], and these are generally words added to the text for clarification rather than words I have substituted for Rachel's. I discussed the changes with Rachel in general terms, and she agreed they were appropriate and would tend to clarify rather than distort her meaning.

All names including the school and the city in which it is located are fictitious. This was done to provide some confidentiality for participants in spite of the fact that this is a highly publicized demonstration project, and the participants often sought publicity for their efforts. The exception to this was a handful of nationally known people like Bob McClure, director of MILP, and Mary Hatwood Futrell, who was then president of NEA. Rachel met several people of national stature as a part of her leadership activities, and the nature of these encounters would be changed if I used pseudonyms.

Data Analysis and Writing

Again in this section I will make a distinction -- analysis and writing -- that was not as sharp in actuality as it appears to be here. Generally speaking, an inductive analysis was used to find patterns in the topics Rachel wrote about, and preliminary categories were developed. As

these categories were developed they were tested and refined or expanded by fitting examples from the journals into them. As a result of this continued development, boundaries of the categories shifted as overlapping ones were combined and new ones created. This process went on throughout the time I worked on the report.

With an inductive analysis it is important to be as thorough as possible in identifying all the instances of a particular topic in the data so that they can be matched to the developing explanation. In the past few years technology has become much more helpful in this process. There was a time when interpretive researchers would go over copies of their fieldnotes using colored pens to identify different categories (Erickson, 1986). Now there are computer programs that can be used to label text files and then sort through them for any combination of codes. I used a program named The Ethnograph (Seidel, Kjolseth & Clark, 1985).

The file I made containing all of the journals, speeches, interview notes, and other material was coded showing what topics applied to particular blocks, or segments, of text. Any line of text could have up to 12 codes. Coded blocks could be nested within or overlap other blocks. In that file there were 10,975 lines of text. I coded 2,625 segments to show the people involved or using

one of 173 codes for different topics. During the analysis, which actually continued into the writing, I used the computer to sort the file and print out all of the segments of text with a particular code. I did this for a total of 80 different topics.

During the writing process I went through printouts of all the coded segments that applied to the topic being discussed and labeled each of the segments that would be used as examples. At this point the second recent technological advance came into play. Having the coded segments available in printouts was helpful, but it was small, yellow Post-it notes that were used to label the edges of the pages that insured that every example would be used in the proper place. Without those to label blocks of text and to use as notes for things to come back to, the inductive process of matching examples to developing discussions would have been much more difficult, and I would not be as confident that I had indeed covered all the examples.

Finally, during the writing process I kept notes on items I found that made me rethink things that had already been covered. Aided by the Post-it notes and other notes, I returned to a number of topics and continued refining the analyses so that they fit better into the total picture of Rachel's year. This on-going reconsideration of topics

increases my confidence in having dealt with all the instances of each of the topics I addressed.

Throughout the discussion of the findings, I have relied heavily on Rachel's own words. Selecting the best quotations to exemplify or support a particular point was sometimes difficult because much of what Rachel wrote or said applied to more than one topic. I decided to try to avoid repeating quotes. A consequence of this decision is that I did not quote every instance in which Rachel addressed a particular topic. I have selected the quotations that I think address the issue most clearly. In spite of this there are a few instances in which the best presentation required using a quote in more than one location because it was the best example of two different points I addressed.

SETTING

The final section of this chapter contains a description of Adams Eelmentary School and its neighborhood, and the Richfield school district.

Adams Elementary School

Adams Elementary School serves an area of approximately 47 blocks on the southeast side of Richfield. South and east of the school are blocks of single-family, frame homes,

which are owned by the occupants. Many of them are small, but they are very neat and well maintained. This is generally a well established, middle-class black neighborhood, whose residents are old enough that most of their children attended Adams but have now moved on to other schools. Some of Adams' present students are the children of former students. North of the school is a publicly financed housing project that provides apartments for low-income families. Many of Adams' current student come from these families. On the west side of the school, a city park extends to a railroad line and light industrial area.

Of the 385 students who attend Adams, 96% are black and 4% white. Most of the white students arrive by bus or cab for the Pre-Primary Impaired (PPI) classes offered for 3 to 5 year-olds. Adams students come from 297 families, 246 of which live within the immediate area.

There are 15 classroom teachers at Adams; two Chapter I teachers, one each for reading and mathematics; and six aides. The building staff also includes a principal, secretary, Instructional Media Center (IMC) clerk, home-school counselor, and two custodians. Itinerant staff include specialists in reading and mathematics, social workers, speech therapists, a psychologist, an art and music team, and other consultants.

There are two African-American classroom teachers and 13 white classroom teachers, including Rachel. One of the Chapter I teachers is black as are the principal and school secretary. One of the six classroom aides is white.

Collectively, the Adams faculty has accumulated 184 years of teaching experience. They have been at Adams for an average of 9.2 years, the most senior member having been in the building for 34 years while two teachers were in the building for the first year. Ninety percent of the professional staff have earned masters degrees, and the principal has a doctorate. The average age of the faculty is 42 years, and they range in age from 29 to 57.

The Adams Elementary school was built in 1955, and in many ways the building is typical of the elementary buildings constructed during the 1950's and early 1960's. It is a one story building with two classroom wings. The A wing (east) houses the office, pre-school, and primary grades; the B wing (west) houses the upper elementary grades, a second pre-school, the instructional materials center (IMC), and the compensatory education reading and mathematics rooms. The south ends of the wings are joined by the gymnasium and an auditorium. The building covers a total of 58,000 square feet.

Richfield Public Schools

Adams Elementary School is located in Richfield, a city with a population of 160,000 in which automotive manufacturing and related businesses predominate. The population of Richfield now has an African-American majority while the surrounding county is predominately white.

The Richfield Community School District enrollment for 1986-7 was 30,213 with 17,532 students in 35 elementary school buildings. District-wide the students were 61% African-American, 35% white, and 4% other minorities. These enrollment percentages show a major change since 1960 when African-Americans represented 24%, whites 75% and other minorities 1%.

The district is a leader in the community school concept. Students attend neighborhood schools unless bussed to a magnet school. Within each building there is a community council which is an active part of the school's decision making process. Each school also has a community school director who teaches half time and operates after-school enrichment and athletic programs.

Because of this emphasis on community participation, and Adams' history of staff involvement, it was agreed from the beginning of their MILP involvement that it would be a community-wide project. The Steering Committee has included

members from all parts of the school staff and community members.

INTRODUCTION TO CHAPTERS 5, 6, and 7

The findings of this study are presented in the next three chapters. I begin with a description of Rachel's family, education, and dedication to teaching. As I wrote the other findings chapters it became increasingly apparent to me that knowing Rachel as a teacher was a prerequisite to understanding her leadership.

In Chapter 6 I present a first, chronological look at the events of MILP during the 1987-88 school year at Adams School. These events are the context within which Rachel's leadership developed. In earlier versions of this report I had attempted to incorporate this chronology with the analysis that follows, but each part seemed to get in the way of the other. While the main thrust of this report is not the recording of this chronology, the events are important for understanding Rachel's leadership, and they need to be presented with a certain amount of detail. In some cases they also have significance on their own for our understanding of the change process in schools.

An understanding of leadership, at least in this particular case, comes from the analysis of the person within the events, and it is presented in the third chapter of the findings. This is a second, more complex, way of

looking at the events of the year. In Chapter 7 I have described, using Rachel's words as much as possible, the meaning of leadership and how Rachel, along with the others at Adams School, managed to work through the difficulties and challenges of the first year in MILP. This is Rachel's perspective on her leadership role in the events of the year.

CHAPTER 5 RACHEL

This chapter is the first of three ways in which I will describe the findings of this study, and in it I will describe Rachel. She spoke a great deal during our interviews about her family background, her education, her thoughts about teaching, and her involvement in activities at school. I will rely heavily on her own words to describe these. This personal background is the first part of the portrait of this teacher leader. The personal history, values, and attitudes Rachel brought with her were among the foundations on which she built this role and were an important part of the meaning the role had for her.

FAMILY

Rachel was the second of four sisters; her father was a plumber, and her mother went to business school and then became a school secretary. Rachel said she thought one of her leadership attributes was that she was outspoken; a trait that developed at home.

I was always outspoken at home. That isn't something new. My older sister is a conformist, I was outside the line. The next one's a conformist, and the youngest one is totally outside the line. . . . I'm very close to my family. We're all very, very different. (I-9/29/87)

Rachel was 35 years old at the time of the study and married to Mike, a robotics engineer. They had no children. "Not that we didn't want to; it just didn't work out. So we have [our dog] Captain." (I-10/14/87) They had recently gone through a difficult time when Mike was laid off for a while and then went back to school to complete his engineering degree. Rachel said one of her strengths as a leader was Mike's patience and support. "You need someone to cry on their shoulder and to remind you to leave it at work and that this too will pass." (I-5/25/88)

EDUCATION

Education was very important to Rachel's parents as can be seen in these two comments from our discussions.

"College was very important for both of them." (I-9/29/87)

"There was one prerequisite in my family. You would go to college. You would have a degree. What it was in was irrelevant, as long as you had a degree." (I-1/28/88) Two of Rachel's sisters are nurses and the "third has a degree in some kind of design but stays home with two little kids."

(I-9/29/87) At one point in her college career, Rachel thought about dropping out, but "My dad took me aside and said, 'No, you don't want to work with your hands for the rest of your life like I do, and you don't want to have to be dependent on a man to take care of you, so you go to school.' So I went to school." (I-9/29/87)

Rachel went to the local university, and majored in sociology and elementary education. Here she describes her education as a teacher:

[I] graduated from there in 3 1/2 years in January, 1974. [I] got a contract [with Richfield Schools] in October 1974. [I] subbed for one semester and probably learned more from subbing than from 4 years of school. . . . I've taught - - this is my 13th year -- pre-K, kindergarten, comp-ed reading, first grade, second grade, and I've been in kindergarten now [for] 11 years. I have my master's [degree] in early childhood. My thirty hours past that are in more interesting things. A little computer science, a little special ed. (I-9/29/87)

When I asked her about the 30 credits she has past her master's degree she explained it this way.

This sounds terrible, but -- I have a very good friend who was also a teacher. We got our master's together. We looked at each other and we said we couldn't foresee ourselves ever being able to quit teaching, financially. If we were going to teach for the next 20 years we might as well do it as high on the pay scale as possible. That's why I did it, and why I didn't go on for my doctorate. Dr Haslett asked when I finished up my 30 hours why I didn't go on for my doctorate. [And I replied,] "because we don't get paid more for a doctorate." . . .

I did take things that interest me, and I did enjoy. Once you get back in school it's hard to get out. The second 30 was for the money, but in doing so I did do a lot of interesting things. I took a lot of computer science courses. (I-9/29/87)

TEACHING

Rachel is a kindergarten teacher, the level she has taught for last 13 years. Prior to settling in kindergarten she spent two years in split-time assignments in second grade, first grade, pre-kindergarten, and compensatory education reading.

For most of this study the teacher half of Rachel's teacher leader role is taken for granted; it is beyond the scope of the study. But, of course, it is the central part of her professional life. A number of times she discussed her beliefs about teaching in general and about balancing her classroom responsibilities with her MILP work.

She began her teaching career full of hope and enthusiasm, but she encountered the real world in an inner-city school.

When I graduated from undergrad school I had a sociology degree and I had an elementary education degree. Of two idealistic majors, you really couldn't combine two much better than that. I was just so sure that when you go in this classroom you are going to go out and save the world. And then the real world hits you. You get kids coming to school that aren't prepared or they come to school hungry and dirty. . . . We have to deal with so many factors. (I-10/14/87)

She said that over the years she had developed what she considered a healthy cynicism.

The cynicism comes from being in a school system like Richfield where the bottom line is dollars rather than education. . . .

You have to function within the guidelines of

reading series and math series and core objectives and essential skills and [retention] tests and 14 meetings, reading reports, . . .

That's where the cynicism comes from. Not about teaching, not about the kids, just about dealing with all the [stuff] that goes along with teaching. The "unfun" part. It's like one of the teachers said, "If they would just let me go in my room and close the door and teach." (I-10/14/87)

In spite of that cynicism, Rachel looked upon teaching as an important profession.

I look on my teaching as a profession. Not as something that is going to end tomorrow. Not something I'm using to tide me over till the next job. I never really had a problem with that. Teaching is very important. And if anyone asks me about it I just tell them, "Listen, you send your child to school, and you put your child in that teacher's hands. You're trusting that teacher to do the right job and to teach the right thing. I think teachers take a lot of responsibility. (I-

9/29/87)

It was a responsibility Rachel took very seriously.

I tend to believe in causes. And when I believe in a cause I follow it. . . . I think teaching is a very important profession. I enjoy what I'm doing. . . . If you enter a profession or any job you do, you should do it to the best of your ability and not do it half way. (I-9/29/87)

In her class Rachel emphasized academics in terms of reading and math readiness, and each year she retained approximately 15% to 20% of her students who were not ready for first grade. Rachel balanced the academic needs of her students and their developmental needs.

You have to have developmental concepts. You have to have a program that's based on the developmental needs of the students you work with.

But just as you have to provide things for children that are low developmentally you also have to provide things for children who are more advanced -- who are ready for more. So that's what I kind of try to do with my program. . . .

Those children who are not ready for all the academics I do get individualized work. They have lower requirements. I try to build into the program that they have time for play time at the end of the day. A lot of them need social interaction. (I-5/11/88)

As a part of her dedication to her profession and doing it well, Rachel continued to change her program each year. During the year of the study Rachel tried to improve the art activities she used.

Coming up with more art things that were not trace and cut along the lines and paste together the way I paste them together. More painting. . . . Things like wet chalk. Kids don't like to just draw, they like to use different mediums. Although they do like to draw. They love that big paper. . . (I-5/25/88)

She saw this kind of change as an important part of an on-going process of improving her practice.

Even though I've taught kindergarten now for 12 years I feel that you have to continue to change your program. Even though I have a program that I get a lot of feedback that it's good. That's one thing Dr. Haslett gives me positive feedback on. He likes the program. But just because the program is successful that doesn't mean there aren't things I would like to do differently. And so when I brought up the art it was for the point that this was something I felt needed to be done differently. And yes, it does take more time to prep for it and to plan for it. But it was something I had decided last year that that was my goal for this year. So it was trying to find the time to implement that goal. (I-5/11/88)

The time required to implement new things in her

classroom was a concern for Rachel as she took on the responsibility of being Steering Committee chair. She was determined not to let the new responsibilities affect her teaching.

SUPER TEACHER

In her third journal entry Rachel wrote, "I am determined to be Super Teacher -- give my best to the kids and still be able to handle this." (J-10/1/87) This was the first time she used the phrase "Super Teacher" to describe her determination to do the leadership role and, at the same time, have her teaching remain above reproach. Super Teacher became a code word for this combination of demands she put upon herself. The day before she had written, "I am determined that I will show I can handle the demands this chair and my classroom as normal including completing the pilot program of computer use in kindergarten that Joyce [with whom she team-taught the previous year] and I started last year." (J-9/30/87) In February the demands of the position were increasing, and she pushed herself to do both well. "I also have to teach full time, and I feel this need to be even better at that than usual to prove I can do both jobs without shorting either one." (J-2/29/88) This concern went on for the entire year. In a discussion in May Rachel said, "it's always in the back of my mind that I wouldn't ever let anyone say that this project has affected my

teaching or my children. So that's been a real concern of mine all year." (I-5/25/88)

Being Super Teacher was not easy. The roles of teacher and leader made demands on Rachel that kept her very busy, and she often wondered how she would get everything done. Before a conference we attended in October⁶ she wrote, "I have to have everything in my classroom ready for the sub and for next week. I had to have the letters ready for the meeting and I can't take any time during the day because of parent volunteers and because I don't want to mess my plans up." (J-10/6/87) December brought with it preparations for the holidays and preparation by the Steering Committee for a presentation at a state-wide conference.⁷ This all became almost too much to handle. "There have been so many demands this week. Christmas program prep, progress reports, bulletin boards, hall bulletin boards, testing forms, reports and normal holiday commitments -- I feel myself overloading." (J-12/2/87) This pressure to be Super Teacher, to do everything at once was not resolved during the school year. In late January Rachel said, "And it concerns me because I know myself emotionally. I'm not

⁶ See Chapter 6, October 8 - 11 -- Symposium on School-Based School Reform.

⁷ See Chapter 6, November 3 - December 9 -- Continuing Conflict & Bob McClure's Visit, December Conference Preparation Continues, and December 11- 12 -- The December Conference.

going to be able to keep it up." (I-1/28/88)

INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

Even before becoming chair of the MILP Steering Committee Rachel had been an active member of the Adams faculty. As she explained it, "over the years if . . . the waters have ever gotten ruffled -- I'm quite often in the middle of it. Not the head of it, but in the middle of it. So I guess I do have a history of kind of going against the grain . . . a little bit. (I-5/11/88) She did not see herself as a leader of the faculty but as a member of an active group within the faculty. She discussed this during our first interview just after her first meeting as chair. "I do tend to be on the groups that do a lot of action on things. I guess because I figure if you're going to run your mouth about it you might as well do something about it." (I-9/29/87)

This involvement as a participant, although not a leader, in school activities brings us to the beginning of Rachel's involvement with MILP and her election as chair of the Steering Committee.

I was ready for a change. A couple years ago they asked me to take a kindergarten coordinator position. I wasn't really ready then, and it was one of those things where the funding was only guaranteed for six months. And I said, 'give up my classroom in a school that I'm happy in, give up my full time kindergarten, no.' This way I get

a little bit of both. (I-9/29/87)

During the spring of 1987, when the staff was deciding whether to vote for participation in the project Rachel was an active supporter, and the next fall she felt that early participation was part of why she agreed to be the chair. "I think that's one of the reasons I went ahead and said I would be willing to be chairperson when people asked me. I felt a certain responsibility because I did say that [in the spring]." (I-9/29/87) Now she wanted to be active.

I tend to want to have things done and done right. And I tend to be impatient about waiting for other people to those things. And maybe that's a part of it. Rather than sit there and wait for someone else to do it, I'll only wait for so long and not say anything. (I-9/29/87)

In the following chapters I will take two different slices through the 1987-88 school year when Rachel led her colleagues into their participation in MILP. The first will be a chronological listing of the major events of the year which provides an historical overview of the year and some insight into Rachel's role as leader. Chapter 7 is a different view of the year and is a discussion of leadership as Rachel experienced it.

CHAPTER 6 EVENTS

In this chapter I will take a first slice through Rachel's year as Steering Committee chair. The major MILP-related events of the year that proved important for the development of Rachel's understanding of leadership will be described in chronological order. The focus of this study is the meaning Rachel found in her leadership rather than the history of the 1987-88 school year. The purpose here is not to provide a detailed history of the project's first year, but rather to set the scene for what is to follow. Some of these events took on their significance in hindsight, while for others it was obvious at the time.

This narrative does not include all the activities associated with the staff's classroom responsibilities. Except when they are related to MILP activities, I have not mentioned daily teaching responsibilities, parent conferences, Halloween, records and report cards, administering the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, Promotion and Grade Retention testing, Valentine's Day, and the multitude of other teacher responsibilities that had to be carried out in addition to MILP activities.

FORMATION OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

Each of the MILP schools formed a Steering Committee when they entered the project. This committee worked with the site-based consultant in gathering and analyzing the data for the School Profile, and went on to direct the school's involvement in the project. Adams School replaced a school that was forced to withdraw from the project and thus entered at the end of the project's first year, joining schools that had been working on the project for a year. An ad hoc committee was established in the spring of 1987 to help with data gathering which was done during the last three weeks of the school year. Over the summer a few teachers met with me to begin analyzing the data, but most of the work was postponed until the fall.

At the beginning of the 1987-88 school year a notice was posted in the school office announcing a meeting to form a permanent MILP Steering Committee. Because of Richfield's emphasis on community schools, committees like this typically have the widest possible representation and include community members. The committee was made up of volunteers representing teachers from both wings of the school, support teachers, aides, clerical staff, parents, and community members and held its first meeting on Tuesday, September 8. The first order of business was the election of officers. The project guidelines suggested at least a chairperson, secretary, and historian. The committee agreed

with that recommendation and decided to choose officers at a meeting on the following Tuesday.

SEPTEMBER 8 - 15 -- ELECTION OF STEERING COMMITTEE OFFICERS

During the week between meetings a number of people asked Rachel if she would be willing to be chair. She explained this by saying staff members normally ask someone in private if they were willing to take a position before pressing it publicly. "That's the kind of staff this is. They're not going to put anyone in a position they don't want to be in." (I-9/29/87) At the September 15 meeting Rachel won a secret ballot vote among three people, with a large majority. Jane Myers, the librarian, was chosen to be historian, and Marjorie Hunt, the sixth grade teacher, was chosen to be secretary. About her election Rachel said, "So I think it's a combination of two things: that I was willing to do it and their perception that I will speak out." (I-9/29/87)

In the week following the election I discussed this study with Rachel and she agreed to participate. We agreed that she would keep a daily journal about her role as chair and we would have periodic interviews to provide data for the study.

SEPTEMBER 29 & OCTOBER 6 -- SCHOOL PROFILE CONTROVERSY

For Rachel September 29 was "a day of firsts -- first meeting as chairperson, first day of the month with no Mrs. Williams [Rachel's aide], first day in this journal." (J-9/29/87) The main topic at the Steering Committee meeting was consideration of the School Profile. I had been working on analyzing the data collected in the spring and writing draft sections of the School Profile for the Steering Committee's consideration. Some of the topics mentioned were sensitive for individuals on the Steering Committee. There had been some heated discussions during the week about how to present them because this report would be read by the administration and circulated among the school community and to others outside the school. Rachel was concerned about how to handle problems she anticipated would arise when it came up for discussion by the entire committee.

I did worry about the meeting today -- I've spent two days thinking over how I would maintain my cool, how I would respond to Harriet when she read her section, how I would respond to Dr. Haslett, and how I would handle the concerns about 'airing dirty laundry' in public. Additionally, I tried to mentally come up with an agenda for directing the meeting. (J-9/29/87)

This meeting is significant because it is the first time in this project that people came together and dealt with a controversial issue. Dealing with controversy in this kind of a forum was not common among the staff. Rachel said they were accustomed to having someone present them with a task, form a committee to complete the task, and then

go on about their work. She was paraphrasing the principal when she described committee work as, "Just do what you have always done with new projects, sit down, write it up, and do it." (S-12/12/87) Now, however, they had to work together, in public, on topics of their own choosing.

September 29 was also the day of the first extended interview Rachel and I had as part of this study. We discussed a range of topics, most of which related to the immediate tasks of getting the project under way. I told Rachel I had been asked during the summer by a state school organization if we would be able to present a progress report at an annual conference they have in December. I had accepted, pending approval by the Steering Committee in the fall. The Steering Committee's attention, then, would be focussed on completion of the School Profile, preparation for the December presentation, and organizational aspects of the project.

The controversy over the content of the School Profile continued during the next week, and came up again at the Steering Committee meeting of October 6. The meeting began with a discussion about some of the points I made in the draft they had been reading and the quoted comments I was using to support them. That evening Rachel wrote:

You conceded nothing and we were all so civilized. Shirley set up Harriet's comments by complaining about a quote, and one thing led to another. A

very controlled argument by Harriet, in which she pointedly refused to address me, ensued. Well, needless to say, nothing was accomplished except to establish that a quote is a quote and can't be changed. (J-10/6/87)

Another controversial topic came up at the meeting and was not resolved the way Rachel thought it should have been. She wrote in her journal, "I need to learn to compromise too, so I kept my mouth shut. I only hope we can get beyond this bickering and fighting and see the profile for what it is -- a tool and not a weapon." (J-10/6/87) These are early incidents of conflict among the staff, the first of many that resulted from the staff coming together to consider issues rather than remaining isolated in their classrooms. It is also an early instance of Rachel developing an understanding of the characteristics of leadership; such things as being civil, controlled arguments, and the need to compromise. Each of these will be discussed in the following chapter.

OCTOBER 8 - 11 -- SYMPOSIUM ON SCHOOL-BASED SCHOOL REFORM

The next major event was the Symposium on School-Based School Reform, October 8 - 11, in Minneapolis, Minnesota sponsored by the National Education Association in cooperation with the Coalition of Essential Schools, directed by TedSizer, and the National Network for Educational Renewal, directed by John Goodlad. All of the

MILP schools participated along with about ten schools from each of the other groups. Each school sent three representatives. For the MILP schools they were the Steering Committee chair, principal, and site-based consultant. The conference site was the Scanticon Center, a brand new facility specifically designed for conferences like this. MILP paid transportation costs for each of the participants, and the local projects were responsible for the on-site expenses, thereby equalizing the expenses for each of the participating schools.

The conference program included several different activities. Addresses to all the participants were given by Theodore Sizer, Mary Hatwood Futrell, and Ann Lieberman. There were also about 20 smaller sessions on topics such as using computers, scheduling options, and school culture. The schools were divided into groups of four or five schools that represented the different networks but were the same grade level. These small groups met five times during the conference to discuss different topics affecting school change. A pilot version of the IBM computer network that now links the MILP schools was set up with a half dozen stations where people could experiment with electronic mail and bulletin boards. Finally, there were sessions that brought together all of the people from each of the school roles represented -- teachers, principals, and consultants - - to discuss their common concerns. It was four days of

highly concentrated activity.

The conference was Rachel's first opportunity to learn about the philosophy and goals of school-based reform from anyone other than me. The first night she wrote, "I am beginning to get infected with the excitement of the people that have been in this program several years. Is it possible that it can work?" (J-10/8/87) She made friends quickly and adapted to the situation.

Then in the evening I was wandering around until I saw Betsy [a kindergarten teacher from Wyoming whose school was in our small group], and she asked me to join them. Started talking kindergarten, and I knew I was set for the weekend. Then along you came, and I kept meeting people, and it dawned on me that this could be fun! (J-10/8/87)

The night she returned from the conference, Rachel wrote a page-long letter to the Adams staff describing some of the events and sharing with them the enthusiasm she had gained for the project. In part she said:

The exchange of ideas, the suggestions, and tips on how to make the project work and hearing about the successes other schools have had was fantastic. It gave me a whole different perspective of what we can achieve if we make a true commitment to the premise that this project is based upon -- that staffs are capable of sharing in the decision-making processes that determine the direction of schools. (L-10/11/87)

OCTOBER 14 -- DECEMBER CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS SELECTION

On October 14 the Steering committee met after school. Following a short discussion of the importance some committee members saw in the inclusion of community comments in the School Profile, the meeting was spent determining who would represent the school at the December conference. It was to be a two-day conference, Friday and Saturday, at a suburban conference hotel. Much of the discussion was about how to fund registration, transportation, and housing for those who wanted to spend the night. Money was available from the district's professional development funds; the local teacher's organization, United Teachers of Richfield (UTR); and from the school's MILP funds. A number of people wanted to participate, and the funding became complicated because, due to job classifications, not everyone was eligible for funding from all of the sources. The discussion changed back and forth from funding to the role individuals wanted to play in the presentation. Finally, as five o'clock drew near, the group decided to just draw names from a hat to decide who, other than Rachel, would represent the school.

This meeting pointed out to a number of people the importance of organizing meetings better. It lead to a closer following of some sort of rules of order and more cooperation on forming consensus. That evening Rachel wrote, "One good thing came out -- we have to get a system

to deal with things more efficiently so I as 'Madame Chairperson' will work on it. Consensus was reached but at a terrible waste of time." (J-10/14/87) During the year groups tried a number of different strategies to control the use of time: agendas were prepared with time limits for each item, lunch-time meetings were held that imposed a strict time limit, and Robert's Rules of Order were followed more closely.

OCTOBER 16 -- COMMUNICATIONS IN-SERVICE DAY

October 16 was an inservice day for the district. The Adams staff attended a program on communications and conflict management. This topic had been chosen by a committee of faculty members in cooperation with another school. The presenter was a university professor with a business background, and Rachel appreciated the new perspective. "What did I learn -- we all have to change to communicate, including me -- as Dr. Rupert put it, focus on the problem -- not the personality." (J-10/16/87)

Rachel referred often to this distinction between issues and personalities as we will see in the next chapter. At the same time she wondered, "What happens when [a] person is the problem?" (J-10/16/87) We will also see patterns of interaction developed to handle these personality conflicts.

OCTOBER 21 -- TIME LIMITS AND PREPARING THE SCHOOL PROFILE

The next Steering Committee meeting was on October 21, and the first agenda item introduced was a procedure for staying on schedule. Rachel was to prepare an initial agenda before the meeting and changes would be made at the beginning of the meeting. Then a time limit would be set for each of the items. At the end of the time limit the group would either vote or table the item for future consideration. Robert's Rules of Order would be observed, and the chair would limit discussions to the time limits the group set.

The tension over items in the School Profile remained, but, at least during meetings, people were trying to avoid open arguments. Rachel referred to this behavior as being "oh, so civil."

We had our meeting, and we were oh so civilized, but I think it went well. We started out after giving everyone a grace period to arrive and set ground rules for future meetings. I tried to make it very clear that the method was open for change -- and they revised it immediately -- but that if we were to get anything done we had to adopt some measure and so we did.

Shirley made a real effort -- more the Shirley I've always known -- to mediate and direct all of us to get it together. I feel she was real successful. (J-10/21/87)

Throughout October there was tension over decisions about who would attend the December conference in Detroit. Working out the details of funding, accommodations, and

travel arrangements among all the parties involved was difficult. A number of phone calls would be made and agreement reached, only to find out a few days later that some aspect of the agreement would not work and the process started over. Each time a set of arrangements fell apart someone felt they were being slighted.

OCTOBER 23 -- PERSONAL CONFLICTS

As is true with all groups of people who have worked together for a number of years, there were personal conflicts within the staff of Adams School. The history and details of these conflicts are beyond the scope of this study, but, at the same time, they cannot be ignored because they affected Rachel both in her role as Steering Committee chair and as a staff member. Some of the routines and characteristics of leadership relate to these personality differences. It seems reasonable then to introduce one of those conflicts in this description of events at a point where Rachel had to confront her own relationship with one of the staff. This will provide background for discussions in the following chapter. This particular situation should not be taken as the only such problem that existed within the staff, nor is this confrontation typical of Rachel's dealings with this person or the staff as a whole. On the contrary, it stands out as being atypical.

By October 23 Rachel had been convinced through

discussions with other Steering Committee members that she needed to attempt to resolve the conflict between Harriet Lyons and herself because it seemed to be impeding the committee's progress on several issues. They met that afternoon after school and aired their grievances with each other. They agreed in the end that their differences had developed throughout the 9 years they had worked together, they were deep-seated, and they were not resolvable in a single, after-school discussion. In the interests of the group, however, they agreed, at least implicitly, to set aside their differences, separating their professional responsibilities from their personal feelings. This agreement, like the resolution of other interpersonal conflicts, was played out through patterns of interaction that will be described in the next chapter.

Before leaving this topic, I should mention that as the year went on the relationship between Rachel and Harriet improved. In March Rachel wrote, "Our relationship has moved from continually adversarial to occasionally actually exchanging jokes. Amazing." (J-3/21-22/88) At the end of the year Rachel supported Harriet for the position of chair-elect for the next year. It would be too much to say, however, that the underlying causes of the original conflict had been resolved or that the two had become friends.

OCTOBER 27 - 31 -- NEWSPAPER INTERVIEW

On October 23 I left for a four-week, university teaching assignment in Japan, returning after Thanksgiving. This had been arranged during the summer, and I had scheduled it for as late in the term as possible. I had thought the School Profile would be completed by now, and the December conference presentation would be in much better shape than it was. Rachel and the Steering Committee were left without a consultant during a period when people on the staff were learning how to work together as a team rather than as autonomous teachers. This was complicated by their working on two tasks with which they had no experience.

On October 27 the local newspaper called the school for information on the project. Rachel happened to be in the office when the call came in, and because Dr. Haslett was not available she took the call. "They wanted a telephone interview. But I felt since it was going to be quoted it was best to prepare a statement. So I started [writing it] and then stood in the office and had everyone who would read it and comment." (J-10/27/87)

The reporter called her at home that evening, and she read the statement and answered questions. "I stressed repeatedly that it should be stressed that the statement, etc. was a cooperative effort and please stress this in the article. She wasn't pleased but said she would." (J-

10/27/87) Rachel worried that she might have said something wrong, that the paper would not give credit to the staff, or that something in the article would bother people in the district office. The article appeared in the October 30 edition of the paper and Rachel thought "it was pretty innocuous except my name is quoted so often." (J-10/30/87)

The end of October and the beginning of November Rachel sensed a change in her relationship with Dr. Haslett and in herself.

It's almost as if being involved in this program has 'empowered' me. I no longer go humbly hat in hand to him -- I go direct -- not belligerent but not subservient. . . .

I am also seeing new facets of myself -- my capability for work (I am still determined to be the best K teacher), my developing ability to face confrontations professionally -- I don't cry -- and my expanding role to the staff. More and more I seem to be the answer person -- the sounding board. Interesting. (J-11/2/87)

NOVEMBER 3 -- DECEMBER CONFERENCE PROGRAM CONFLICT

On November 3 Rachel's "confrontation skills were tried to the limit." (J-11/3/87) Lewis Homer, the person at the state organization who was responsible for arrangements at the December conference, called Rachel and told her that, due to space constraints on the program, Harriet Lyons and Gary Rackliffe would be the only names appearing on the program with rest of the people referred to as "panel." When we had first agreed to present at the conference those

two names were used to hold a space in the program with the understanding that the entire panel would be listed when it was formed. This had all been arranged, I thought, before I left the country.

Rachel "politely told him off," (J-11/3/87) explaining that it was symbolically important to the project that everyone be listed on the program, not just one of the teachers and the consultant. She told him they had worked hard to form a team of presenters and she "could not understand his lack of understanding, [or] his inability to understand the animosity generated by his refusal to understand." (J-11/3/87) In about 20 minutes Homer called back to tell her that it was too late in the printing process to add all the names, but he had removed the teacher's name so the program would read "Gary Rackliffe and Panel."

This incident was seen by Rachel as the climax of a long-term set of conflicts over representation at the conference. She also saw it as a step in her development as a leader. That evening she wrote:

How did I feel -- triumphant. I got through to him -- finally. Also a little powerful. I see it in little ways -- how I word a note to Dr. Haslett, how I react to Harriet, how I feel about myself. Do I like it -- I think so, but I think I'll reserve comment or commitment for now. But it sure helps to have that feeling when dealing with the Homers of the world. (J-11/3/87)

NOVEMBER 3 - DECEMBER 9 -- CONTINUING CONFLICT AND BOB**McCLURE'S VISIT**

The apparent resolution of the program listing actually lead to more, rather than less, conflict. During the next week Harriet Lyons, feeling slighted, resigned from the conference presentation and the Steering Committee; and friends of hers on the staff were upset, resigning or threatening to withdraw from the presentation. Rachel wrote at the end of the week that she "had about reached the end of the road in terms of this project. As has happened in the past we get so far and then we get blown out of the water." (J-11/9-13/87) She also thought her relations with Dr. Haslett were deteriorating, and she "felt totally overwhelmed." (J-11/9-13/87) On Wednesday Rachel needed to take a personal business day because "I was at the point of overloading, and I needed to remove myself emotionally." (J-11/9-13/87)

Rachel, Shirley Franklin, Marjorie Hunt, and Valerie Keyes discussed the situation with David O'Brien, president of the local teachers' organization, after a staff meeting on Tuesday, November 10. O'Brien offered to act as a mediator in the situation and to straighten out things with Homer. Rachel said, "It was such a relief for someone to say it really wasn't our -- excuse me -- my fault. It was also a relief to know someone was out there to help." (J-11/9-13/87)

O'Brien contacted the state teachers' organization and Victoria Cummings, director of professional development, came to Richfield to meet with concerned staff members. O'Brien also contacted Bob McClure about concerns over the faculty's decreasing morale and enthusiasm for the project. It was agreed that McClure would come to Richfield to meet with building and district people in an attempt to re-energize the project. The state organization would sponsor dinner at a local restaurant for the school staff and others involved with the project.

This all took place while I was out of the country. I returned to Adams School the Monday after Thanksgiving. Three lines of activity related to MILP run through this period. The first is McClure's visit on Wednesday, December 9. The night before, the building, especially the A wing, had been sprayed for roaches, and the lingering fumes in Rachel's room had made her sick. When McClure arrived she was sitting by one of the doors in B wing. "I will probably always be remembered as that wild-looking green woman hacking away. What an impression." (J-12/9/87) The positive side of that introduction was, "I have never felt so much concern and attention from anyone other than family." (J-12/9/87) At dinner that evening 15 Adams staff members were joined by four state and local teachers' organization officials who all offered words of encouragement. McClure also explained the goals and

philosophy of the project and urged participation. Rachel felt that Steering Committee members and other staff members came away from the meeting with a better understanding of MILP and energized by his enthusiasm.

DECEMBER CONFERENCE PREPARATION CONTINUES

The second line of activity during November and early December was the continuing preparation for the December conference presentation. While I was out of the country, the group's attention was often taken from the content of the presentation and directed toward procedural issues of who would be participating in the presentation and what roles they would play. When I returned, these had generally been decided, but most of the participants felt unprepared and uncertain about how to proceed. I spent most of my time during the week of November 30 helping people identify topics, organize ideas, and write speeches. December 10 the people who were to present took one of the release days provided by MILP and worked on polishing the presentation.

Preparation for the presentation was made more difficult by the timing of the conference during the school year. Rachel wrote,

There have been so many demands this week. Christmas program prep, progress reports, bulletin boards, hall bulletin boards, testing forms, reports, and normal holiday commitments -- I feel myself overloading. . . . I keep telling myself

"this too shall pass," but I wonder. . . . We're all worried about the conference -- the only ones really prepped are Susan and Jane. Shirley has a made a good start, but Valerie, Roy, and I [have not]. I better get moving. I've been thinking about it a lot, but I've got to get something on paper. (J-12/2/87)

One part of the conference presentation had been moving along smoothly. Susan Hunter, the Comp-Ed math teacher, and Jane Myers, the librarian, were preparing a slide show that would introduce people to Richfield, the Adams School community, and the people of the school. This was originally planned as a five to ten minute presentation but grew to a twenty-minute production complete with music and professional narration. There was agreement that the presentation was effective in establishing the context of the project, and the quality was very good, but the production process presented another set of problems for the Steering Committee. The cost of film and processing was over \$125 and eight release days were used for production. The project was agreed on by the committee before it began, but the expenses had not been specifically approved in advance. The committee learned that even the best of ideas need to be monitored as they progress. At first this was seen as placing limitations on teachers' decision making which MILP was designed to increase, not limit. The group worked through a number of procedures as they attempted to find balance among accountability, flexibility, paper work, and bureaucratic structure. These issues appeared over and

over again through the year.

NOVEMBER 20 -- IDENTIFICATION OF PROJECT GOALS

The third line of activity during late November was the identification of project goals based on consideration of the School Profile and Faculty Inventory. The primary activity of the Steering Committee during the fall was supposed to be the identification of a set of priority concerns for the school to begin addressing. This was often pushed to the background by concerns over the December presentation, but it was never completely forgotten. Based on drafts of the School Profile, Steering Committee members were asked to prepare lists of the concerns they thought should be presented to the faculty. On November 20 Rachel distributed a memo to the faculty along with a list of 31 items grouped under the following headings: General (4 items), Communications (5 items), Curriculum (9 items), Policy (5 items), Students (2 items), Parents/Community (4 items), and Environment (2 items). She explained that "the next step in the Mastery in Learning Project is for the staff to select goals that they would like to see implemented in the coming year," (L-11/20/87) and asked them to choose up to eight items and rank their importance. The results of this survey would be presented to the faculty in January.

DECEMBER 11 - 12 -- THE DECEMBER CONFERENCE

The long-awaited conference took place on Friday and Saturday, December 11 and 12, with the Adams School presentation on the second day. Rachel and three other teachers went on Friday and spent the night. The rest of the presentation group went on Saturday. The luncheon speaker was Madeline Hunter, and the MILP session was scheduled right after lunch during a period when she was having an informal question and answer session. Twenty-five people had pre-registered for the session but only about five people attended who were not associated with the project.

Roy Johnson acted as Master of Ceremonies, I gave an overview of the philosophy of MILP, Valerie Keyes told how the school became involved in the project, and Mrs. Marsh gave a parent's perspective on what the project might do for the school. Rachel spoke after Valerie Keyes and talked about the progress being made on the project. Most of her comments, however, concerned challenges being faced by the staff. She spoke of the difficulty of change:

Change of any kind is difficult. But sometimes I think that we as teachers resist change as much as possible. Oh, we can survive changes in reading series and new students, but changing the fundamental way we regard our role as teachers is unsettling and intimidating. Let's face it, we spend years working towards routines and methods that work and once we find them we tend to carve them in granite and hang on to them for dear life.
(S-12/12/87)

She went on to discuss the problems associated with learning to work together, first due to the demands the project made on their time:

Once we adopted the program the fun really began. The paper work, the meetings, the disagreements, the meetings, the planning, the meetings. The process of organizing the project seemed unending and was particularly difficult because we never seemed to be accomplishing anything. You know educators, we want action, we want results, and we want them right now. (S-12/12/87)

Then she went on to comment at length about the nature of teachers' jobs and how that complicates becoming part of a decision-making team:

As a classroom teacher, my traditional role has been to educate children. In that role, I can determine, within limits, the scope and nature of that education. I have not been included in, nor been encouraged to be included in, the decision-making process that determines the direction that education will take in the Richfield system. This chain of command is not unique to Richfield -- it is, in fact, considered normal operating procedure for most systems. . . .

[Participation is] not an easy task for people who are king or queen of their own room, for people who are used to their word being gospel, for people who are used to running the show. All of a sudden we are expected to be team players in a true sense of the word, not just in the lounge. And let me tell you that is difficult. My needs as a kindergarten teacher -- and we all know mine are more important than yours -- are different than those of a sixth grade teacher. And she knows hers are more important than those of the math teacher or the classroom aides. But, in reality, all are equally important. (S-12/12/87)

At the end of her speech she spoke of how MILP was designed to change these conditions.

And so we come to the heart of the project -- how must we as teachers change if we are to move beyond the traditional role of the teacher working with children in the classroom to the teacher who also works with adults in determining the educational direction of a school. How do we move from being "just teachers" to being professional educators? A difficult question, but one that the NEA is trying to help us answer with this and other projects. . . .

In our classrooms, we are rarely challenged - - when we come out of our classrooms and into the adult world, it happens frequently. We are having to learn to interact, to work cooperatively and to listen. We are having to learn the skills necessary for garnering support, funding, and publicity. And we are having to learn that change cannot necessarily occur in an hour, or a day or even next week. We have to begin to see that some decisions must be long range with slowly evolving changes. A difficult lesson to learn for people who have always been action oriented. (S-12/12/87)

The presentation went very well according to members of the audience and the presenters. The slide show, which had dozens of pictures of students, provided an emotional ending. As soon as the presentation ended, Harriet Lyons came to the table and embraced Rachel, and said she hoped she could rejoin the Steering Committee. We all moved to the hotel bar where we celebrated a job well done. That evening Rachel summarized in her journal, "I think my actions afterwards said it all!! Every now and then my craziness shows." (J-12/12/87) The presentation had united the group and had verified their ability to face a challenge and, by working together, bring it to a successful conclusion.

Rachel enjoyed the recognition that came at the conference. She wrote,

What was nice was the recognition we got, and I enjoy it. . . . I think it sunk into Roy's head just how important we are -- the attention we got when we walked in, the attention we got at lunch -- we sat next to the head table with Victoria Cummings and Arthur Betts and Norma Dodge and Darcy Glass -- all union mucky mucks -- being mentioned in Alice Anderson's speech, being mentioned in the NEA director who was the keynote speaker's speech. Roy finally looked at me and said we must be important. I said we sure are! I think it was good for him -- it will draw him in better, and he will tell Joyce [one of the other teachers]. (J-12/11/88)

This was one of the first times Rachel wrote about herself as a leader.

I guess I can say I do see a side of me emerging that's always been there but fairly unused -- that of a director. . . . This is a side of myself I have trouble recognizing and accepting. I'll have to think about this a while -- can I handle leading -- I think I can. (J-12/12/87)

FIVE TOPICS ON JANUARY 6

After the break for the holidays, everyone's attention turned to the completion of the School Profile, identification of objectives, and organization for a new phase of the project. I spent time during the break finishing the analysis of parent and student interviews and completing the final draft of the School Profile report. At the Steering Committee meeting on January 6, five topics were raised that, in retrospect, were important. In some cases these were new issues while others were on-going and

one was the completion of a project.

School Profile Presentation

The first topic was discussion of the staff inservice meeting planned for the next Wednesday afternoon. Richfield is visited each year by a circus, and arrangements are made for children's performances which allow buildings a half day for staff development activities which have become known as "Circus Day." For Adams School, Circus Day was to be January 13, and approval was given by the central office for the afternoon to be used by MILP.

At the Steering Committee meeting, the afternoon inservice was planned. First the slide show from the December conference would be shown, then the School Profile would be presented and highlighted. This would be followed by an explanation of the goals the committee had identified and formation of subcommittees to address each of the goals. Each committee would have at least one Steering Committee member and staff members would be encouraged to volunteer, but it would be emphasized that participation was completely voluntary and people could join or leave subcommittees at any time during the year. Each subcommittee would be given one of the packets of research information prepared by the national MILP office. Rachel would explain the procedures that had been developed for requesting money or release time. Then the subcommittees would meet that afternoon to

begin discussing their topics or to work on organizational procedures. The committee agreed to meet again on Monday to give final approval to the list of objectives and to insure everything was ready for the presentation of their work to their colleagues.

Release Time

The second topic was a discussion of the use of MILP-funded release time: should non-MILP people have access to those days? This discussion raised important issues about what it meant to be a staff participating in a project such as this. The use of funds for committee work related to the goals identified by the Steering Committee was easy to decide. But activities outside those "official" topics were less clear. When the staff has agreed in principle to participate in this project, what must an individual do to be considered a participant? If an individual has a concern that he or she wants to pursue, must it first be given some type of official sanction by the Steering Committee before any MILP funds can be used? In the end it was decided that if a person, or group, had an interest that related to some kind of improvement in the school they could present the plan to the Steering Committee for funding. MILP money would not, however, be used to provide time for day-to-day operational activities, such as catching up on paper work. A form and procedure were designed.

Meeting Schedules

The third topic was another in the on-going series of plans to deal with the profusion of meetings. A few days after this meeting Rachel wrote in her journal a sentiment that was becoming rather wide spread among the active members of the staff. "What is MILP - meetings forever - AM, lunch, PM." (J-1/11/88) To ease this press of meetings, and as part of the committee's continuing efforts to control the time spent in discussions, they decided to meet every Wednesday, alternating between lunch-time meetings and after-school ones. The lunch-time meetings could be used for approval of funding requests and other short items, and the after-school meetings would provide time for extended discussions of more complex issues.

This decision was one of a series of efforts at trying to balance the demands of time required to run the project and the desire to minimize the extra time staff members had to put in. Other decisions during the year included drawing on the release-time funds to pay a stipend for after-school work based on the \$50 per day provided by the project, and using the funds to hire substitutes so the committee could meet during the school day. In the next chapter I will discuss these and other patterns of behavior the staff worked at developing to accomplish the work of MILP within changing cultural norms.

Copies of the School Profile for Distribution

The fourth topic was a decision about distribution of the 81-page School Profile report at the upcoming staff meeting. Dr. Haslett suggested two or three copies be made that interested staff members could check out at the office. Committee members suggested that a copy should be made for each of the staff members. Dr. Haslett argued that the expense of producing that many copies would be excessive, especially when many members would probably not read the report. Committee members argued that providing each person with a copy might not guarantee they would read it, but it would be a tangible outcome of their efforts, and giving each person a copy would at least be a symbolic gesture of openness. The committee had, from time to time, been concerned about the project becoming a closed group that other staff members would not be willing to join, and they sought ways of being open to participation by others. The final decision was, on a vote of eight to one, to print copies for everyone.

The decision about the School Profiles was significant because it was the first time the committee had acted independently of Dr. Haslett. Rachel wrote in her journal that evening:

We're changing. I am changing. It's working. . . .
 . We survived personality conflicts, . . .
 tension, a conference, etc., and now we're ready
 to move, and all those things that he thought
 would stop us didn't. . . We didn't cow.

Rationally and politely we listened [to Dr. Haslett's points] and then did what we wanted. And our decisions were based on discussion, looking at options including his suggestion. And then we made our decision -- and it wasn't his.
(J-1/6/88)

This was the first time there had been a difference of opinion between the committee and the principal. For the most part he did not participate in meetings or discussions.

In-Out Board

The fifth topic appears now to be rather minor, but at the time it seemed to be a major accomplishment. Indeed, it was the first building-wide accomplishment. One of the concerns raised earlier in the year had been people not knowing who was in the building each day. This was especially problematic for teachers who did not know which of the specialists would be in the building on a given day. After a lot of discussion, the Steering Committee decided to make an In/Out board and put it up in the office. Discussion of the form and function of the board stretched across a number of meetings. The discussions moved through such questions as whether the board was a way to try to "check up on" certain staff members, the most convenient location, and the order of the names. Final decisions were made on December 16 -- the names would be alphabetical rather than by position in the school, the board would be hung next to the mailboxes, up to \$100 could be spent on materials. Over the holiday break Joyce Wallace's husband

made a board with cuphooks on it and Rachel made labels for each of the staff members. When it was finally hung on January 6, the In/Out board was the first physical example of the MILP project at work in Adams School.

Rachel was more comfortable with this phase of the work than she had been with preparation for the December presentation. She wrote,

I'm feeling real good about this project finally. We are getting away from unfamiliar territory and into something we have no difficulty handling -- hard work, but we're good at that. This I can handle. This gives something back -- I put in work, out comes change. . . . Overall, I'm feeling up and honestly excited about this. And I feel other people are too. And I feel good about being in the position I'm in. (J-1/8/88)

Just before the staff inservice she wrote, "I'm going nuts and it's just beginning. But it's exciting because now I'm not the only one excited. Everyone seems to be perking up - - to be aware of the possibilities (J-1/11/88)

JANUARY 13 -- CIRCUS DAY AND PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The Steering Committee met on Monday, January 11 to discuss and approve the final list of goals to be presented to the staff at an inservice session that Wednesday. The committee agreed on the list after discussing whether it was too long, if any could be combined, and if all of the goals were directed toward improving the school for students -- there were administrative concerns that the improvements

would be for the benefit of teachers rather than students. The committee approved the following list with the understanding that they or the subcommittees could make changes to any of the goals as the year went on.

ADAMS COMMUNITY SCHOOL MASTERY IN LEARNING PROJECT GOALS

These are goals or interests that received large numbers of votes in the staff survey. Some have been combined; for some the wording has been somewhat modified; they are in NO PARTICULAR ORDER. It is now time for individuals to identify the topics that are the most important or interesting to them.

1. Improve communications among and between all the people involved with this school and community. One of the goals of this improved communication would be a better understanding of the talents, needs, opinions, values, contributions, responsibilities, etc of each of the people involved with this school.
2. Investigate the possibilities of establishing a developmental kindergarten and/or full day kindergarten at Stewart School. (This seems to already be under consideration, but that does not mean that school staff and parents should not be involved in monitoring progress and planning for implementation.)
3. Investigate alternatives for scheduling or staffing in the upper elementary classes to avoid the problems associated with half-time positions.
4. Improve the math and reading ability of students, especially at-risk children.
5. Investigate ways to increase the use of the computers that are currently available.
6. Investigate ways of scheduling that would provide longer blocks of time for planning, interaction with other staff members, and the implementation of new ideas and techniques.
7. Develop programs to increase opportunities for interaction between the school staff and the community.

Each year the circus comes to Richfield for a week, and elementary students attend afternoon performances. Those afternoons are used by each building for staff development activities. Circus Day was chosen by the Steering Committee to present the MILP goals to the Adams School staff. The meeting went smoothly, and 22 people volunteered for the seven subcommittees (14 teachers, 5 aides, 2 other staff members, and 1 community person). The following week subcommittees began meeting, generally on a biweekly schedule.

Rachel and others on the Steering Committee had also developed procedures for requesting funds and release time for committee activities. She had prepared forms to be used when requesting funds or substitute teachers to provide release time, and also a form for suggesting a new topic of interest to the committee. These procedures were explained and forms distributed during the meeting. In the next chapter we will see how these were part of an on-going effort to develop new norms of interaction among the staff.

FEBRUARY 17 -- COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Even before the formation of the subcommittee on computer use, Susan Hunter, the comp-ed math teacher, was concerned about the computer that was moved from room to room on a wobbly typewriter stand. The first action of the

subcommittee was to seek funds for a computer cart. At the February 17 Steering Committee meeting Dr. Haslett suggested MILP use its funds to buy a cart and a filing cabinet for MILP materials. The committee discussed these purchases at length and decided that a filing cabinet was not needed at the time. For the computer cart the committee decided to approach the Community Council, a group of community members and parents who act in an advisory capacity to the principal as part of the Richfield neighborhood school concept. The group also raises money to support school activities, and the previous year they had purchased the computer that now needed a cart. At the council meeting that evening Rachel explained the cart situation and asked if they would be willing to pay for a cart which would make the computer more usable and make moving it around the building safer. They agreed that would be an appropriate use of their funds.

This was an important event because it was a continuation of the Steering Committee's fiscal independence and the beginning of more active cooperation between the teachers and the Community Council. For years teachers had not been attending the evening meetings of the council, but during the fall Rachel and some of the other teachers had begun attending. She had made short reports about MILP, but communication between the council and the staff had always been through Dr. Haslett. This meeting was the first time the teachers had gone directly to the council with a request

rather than having the communication initiated and carried out by Haslett.

MARCH 3 -- BOARD OF EDUCATION PRESENTATION

The board of education invited the Adams staff to report on their project at the March 2, 1988 meeting. The presentation was to last about 20 minutes, and the Steering Committee decided to have Dr. Haslett introduce the project and staff, have Rachel report on their progress, and close with a shortened version of the slide presentation. At their February 24 meeting the Steering Committee discussed what they thought Rachel should include in her report.

In her speech Rachel described MILP as

a process that encourages us to use the expertise of all members of the educational team: administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals, support staff, maintenance staff, the union, the MEA, the NEA, parents, and community in determining the educational course in their school. It is a process that stresses professionalism in all educators by teaching decision making as a research-based activity. And finally, it is a process designed to improve education by uniting school, union, and community personnel into a cohesive unit that will strive toward the common goal of providing the best education possible for our students. (S-3/2/88)

She went on to describe the time demands and the difficulty of change as she had in December, but this time she could point to evidence that the process can, indeed, work.

Paper work, meetings, disagreements, planning, the process of organizing the project was overwhelming

Dece

Susa

pres

the

for

nece

the

said

shor

prog

dec

some

time

staf

need

betw

nerv

and unending. Added to these demands was the need to change our thinking. We needed to move away from being individuals with individual needs to being functioning team members with the capability to interact, to listen, and to work cooperatively with other adults toward goals that would benefit the school as a whole. A difficult lesson to learn, but with the completion of the first two steps of the project the school profile and the first set of our goals, we have shown it can be done. (S-3/2/88)

Preparation for this presentation, like the one in December, included friction over decisions on content. Susan Hunter and Jane Myers were asked to trim the slide presentation down to about 10 minutes by eliminating some of the description of the city and school. This was helpful for the state-wide group in December, but would not be necessary in Richfield. The two of them worked at editing the show for two weeks with little success. Dr. Haslett said they would not need to shorten it because he could shorten what he had to say, and it would be alright if the program ran a little long. Rachel was upset by that decision, fearing they would appear rude and run over into someone else's time slot. She also felt the presentation time should be spent reporting on progress being made by the staff. This was another situation that exposed conflicting needs and interests of the staff.

Rachel's attitude about presentations changed a little between the December and March presentations. She was nervous beforehand, writing, "I'm antsy -- I know it's the

prese

over

OK bu

antic

this

guess

MARCH

inclu

in th

First

prior

Comm

often

began

A num

school

The g

event

shoul

Steer

optio

subco

Comm

subco

presentation but it doesn't help." (J-3/1/88) After it was over she wrote, "Well, the presentation is over and it went OK but the feeling when it was all finished was anticlimactic. . . . Maybe it was because it was easier this time so the relief that it was over wasn't as great. I guess I'll never know -- and I guess it went OK. (J-3/2/88)

MARCH 9 -- DETERMINING THE ROLE OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

The after-school Steering Committee meeting agenda included two items the committee had discussed and decided in the past but found it necessary to revisit at this time. First, the formation of working subcommittees to address priorities identified by the staff led to the Steering Committee rethinking its role. This reconsideration of role often arose indirectly through other topics. On March 9 it began with a discussion of Steering Committee meeting times. A number of committee members were unhappy about long after-school meetings and wanted to change to lunch-hour meetings. The group discussed the time needed for their meetings and eventually came to the point of considering what decisions should be made by the subcommittees and which by the Steering Committee. Was the Steering Committee to discuss options on each of the subcommittee topics and then have the subcommittees carry out their decisions, or was the Steering Committee to act as a coordinating body that listened to subcommittee decisions about action and tried to avoid

confl
the m
ackno
issue

Steer
month
using
but t
idea.
dolla
spent
four,
compe
May 1
for w
other

for c
pract
decis
decis
discu
weeks

conflict and overlap? It was decided that the latter was the more appropriate function, but the group also acknowledged a periodic need for longer discussions of issues of planning and overall concern.

I pointed out that in a number of MILP schools, Steering Committees were using release time that made monthly, half-day meetings possible. The group considered using substitute teachers so they could meet during the day, but the classroom teachers on the committee rejected the idea. They decided instead to pay themselves at the \$50 dollar per day rate substitutes received for the hours they spent at the longer, after-school meetings. There were four, two-hour meetings for which committee members were compensated following this decision: March 22, April 26, May 10, and June 1. They also decided to compensate people for work outside school hours on newsletter production and other MILP activities.

This agreement on Steering Committee role and a method for carrying it out seemed satisfactory, but in actual practice the line between coordination of subcommittee decisions and discussion and approval of subcommittee decisions was not so clear. There were a number of discussions about the limits of subcommittee autonomy in the weeks that followed this meeting.

MARCH

reorg

inser

Subco

been

group

confl

decid

Socia

inclu

Comm

showe

Subco

outs

of a

prote

out v

chang

inter

as o

this

conf

smoo

MARCH 9 -- REORGANIZATION OF COMMITTEES

A second agenda item on March 9 relates to reorganization of subcommittees formed during the January 13 inservice day. The tasks of the School/Community Relations Subcommittee and the Communications Subcommittee had not been clearly defined at the beginning, and as these two groups began work they often found themselves overlapping or conflicting. After some disagreements over function it was decided the Communications Subcommittee would be renamed the Social Committee and would deal with in-house activities, including the activities of a long-established Social Committee that had sent flowers and cards and sponsored showers for many years. The School/Community Relations Subcommittee would handle relations with people and groups outside the school. Their main activity was the publication of a monthly newsletter for the school and community.

This process of reorganization exposed some turf-protection concerns that had been hidden. It was carried out with a minimum of conflict by encouraging people to change committee membership in order to match their interests. Rachel was concerned about keeping the project as open to wide participation as possible. She had feared this problem with committee function would lead to more conflict, and she was pleased when the reorganization went smoothly.

MARC

LOCK

frie

Lock

Subc

arra

a lo

toge

time

the

into

leav

schoo

Wedne

sched

of th

sched

arran

discu

the

need

been

inte

the

**MARCH 9 -- PLANNING TIME SUBCOMMITTEE AND THE VISIT TO
LOCKHART SCHOOL**

March 9 was also important because Rachel and her friend Joyce Wallace, the first grade teacher, visited Lockhart School. As members of the Planning Time Subcommittee they were considering different ways of arranging the contractual planning time in order to provide a longer block of time in which teachers could work together. By reorganizing instructional time and planning time they could extend class time a little each day and move the short planning time they normally had each afternoon into a block on Wednesday afternoon with the students leaving at lunchtime. Lockhart was one of two magnet schools in the district that had a block of planning time on Wednesday afternoons. Rachel found the teachers liked the schedule, although it was not without its drawbacks. None of the Lockhart teachers wanted to go back to the previous schedule.

The subcommittee's consideration of alternative arrangements of planning time including this visit, discussions with members who visited the other school, and the process of writing a proposal convinced Rachel of the need for increased interaction among staff members. She had been aware, intuitively, of the importance of collegial interaction, but this process provided a concrete example of the need for more time for staff interaction.

APR

sch

12.

inv

but

nigh

thin

all

what

Even

toge

talk

end

reac

and

APRI

Comm

acti

howe

APRIL 12 -- PHI DELTA KAPPA PRESENTATION

Rachel was invited to be part of a panel discussing school reform at a Phi Delta Kappa chapter meeting on April 12. Other members of the committee were university people involved in theoretical and practical work on school reform, but Rachel was the only classroom teacher in the group. The night before the presentation she wrote she was "was thinking about just an outline but I'll probably write it all out. I'm more comfortable reading so that's probably what I'll do." (J-4/11/88) Afterward she wrote,

Well, I survived your meeting [PDK] and you were right -- everyone was nice. I still can't say I like it though. I'm always a wreck. I do wish I could wing it like the others. I still need the security of a written speech. I myself hate to listen to people drivel and I'm afraid I will too, I guess. (J-4/12/88)

Even though she learned to relax more, during our two years together Rachel never did get to the point where she enjoyed talking to groups outside of her school. Her comment at the end of the April 12th journal entry seemed to sum up her reaction to public presentations. "As usual, I'm relieved and tired." (J-4/12/88)

APRIL 22 -- DECORATING FOR COMMUNITY RECOGNITION DINNER

As mentioned above, a decision was made by the Steering Committee to pay people for time they spent on MILP activities beyond the school day. The committee did not, however, come to grips with some of the implications of that

de
de
Co
co
th
pr
th
din

Nine
to s
requ
that
of p

APRI

sche
of t
pres
exac
a ch

decision until they worked with the Community Council to decorate for the annual Community Recognition Banquet, the Council's main fund-raising event of the year. Here was a conflict between wanting to be paid for extra time, but, at the same time wanting to present an image of dedicated professionalism to the school community. Rachel wrote about the discussions over payment during the week before the dinner and what she saw as a proper method for resolution.

There's controversy over being paid for Friday night. I understand both sides -- we don't want to upset the community and we don't want to use the days. This is difficult. I keep telling everyone to discuss it at Steering Committee and maybe we'll straighten it out. Sometimes I think it's better to let things be a group decision -- discussions often lead to seeing the proper course of action. (J-4/19/88)

Nine staff members from Adams showed up on Friday afternoon to set tables and decorate for the dinner. They did not request to be paid as the Steering Committee had decided that there are times when you donate your time for the sake of public relations.

APRIL 27 & MAY 23 -- PLANNING TIME SUBCOMMITTEE CONFLICTS

The subcommittee working on alternative ways of scheduling planning time in order to provide longer blocks of time continued working on the proposal they wanted to present to the administration. They also tried to determine exactly what the district procedure was for requesting such a change. Apparently there was little precedent for such a

ch

ch

to

ma

no

ma

ch

ca

gr

men

sta

cam

com

con

they

with

slou

just

aban

me."

the

lead

it p

at t

change. Dr. Haslett said the staff had to approve such a change so the committee surveyed the staff for a second time to reconfirm support for the proposed had not changed. The majority of members favored the idea, a few said they were not enthusiastic but would not block implementation if the majority wanted it. Two people were vocally opposed to any change.

These two went to Dr. Haslett with complaints and then called the teachers' association with threats of a grievance. They were also very vocal in their opposition to members of the planning time subcommittee and any other staff members who would listen. On April 27 Joyce Wallace came to Rachel and told her she was withdrawing from the committee because of the stress generated by the staff conflict. Joyce was Rachel's best friend on the staff, and they had team taught for the previous two years. Her withdrawal was a blow to Rachel, who wrote, "I tried just to slough it off -- or at least told myself I could, but it just got to me worse and worse as the day went on. I felt abandoned -- I felt like someone kicked a leg out from under me." (J-4/27/88) This incident shows, perhaps better than the others, the importance of the personal side of leadership and the cost of leadership in terms of the strain it put on Rachel's friendships. This will be discussed more at the end of the next chapter.

sch
cal
sen
spl
the

What
in a
agre
pres
impl
they
staf
work
the
much
been

The controversy over the alternative planning time schedule came to a head on May 23. A staff meeting was called to endorse the final version of the proposal to be sent to the administration. Rachel anticipated a meeting split between the vocal opponents threatening grievances and the supporters of the proposal.

When you're dreading something, occasionally your fears turn out to be groundless. I have wondered what would happen when this all came to a head over this scheduling. There was such a hassle initially.

But on Monday, it all worked out. We had our meeting to discuss the scheduling proposal and to discuss how decision making should be handled in our building, and everyone looked at me slightly confused. And finally someone said -- "but we said go ahead" and "why meet -- majority rules." So that said it all. (J-5/23/88)

What had the earmarkings of a major confrontation evaporated in a matter of minutes. The staff members who attended agreed that MILP participation was voluntary, but when MILP presented something to the staff and it was approved for implementation everyone was expected to participate, just as they would with a decision that originated in any other staff committee. This was another example of learning to work together and share decision making. It was also one of the many times Rachel and others found an actual event to be much less disastrous than the anticipation of the event had been.

o
p
o
t
c
re
of
wh
th
ye

for
wou
was

meet
grow
help
abov

have
card

MAY 24 -- DAY-LONG STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

The final major event was a day-long Steering Committee meeting on May 24. One of the activities was the preparation of the Year End Report. The national MILP office wanted each school to report on their activities for the year, both to collect information on the projects and to create a situation in which each of the schools would reflect back on the events and activities of the year. Each of the subcommittees was to turn in a report summarizing what they had done during the year. The committee discussed these and used them as starting points to plan for the next year.

A second item of business was the election of officers for the next year. Rachel had decided that, if asked, she would accept the chair position for the next year, and she was unanimously elected.

In her journal that evening Rachel wrote, "Well, the meeting went really well I think. We as a group have really grown. We're learning how to run a meeting -- with a little help. We're also learning to interact as a team, to rise above our personal differences. (J-5/24/88)

The year closed with the usual rush to complete work, have picnics, complete reports, clean rooms, fill in report cards, and bid farewell to colleagues and students until the

fall when it would all begin again.

INT

wha

Ada

exp

lea

Wha

tea

dis

cha

the

arr

MIL

pre

ins

amor

move

rela

pers

CHAPTER 7 COMBINING RACHEL and the MILP EVENTS
for an UNDERSTANDING of LEADERSHIP

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I present another way of looking at what happened during that first year of MILP activity at Adams School; another slice, if you will, through the experience that reveals a different understanding of teacher leadership. Here I will look more directly at the question, What kind of change should we expect when someone becomes a teacher leader?

In her journal and during our conversations Rachel discussed the forces that motivated her, some of the characteristics of leadership, and the costs and rewards of the role of Steering committee chair. We can see here the arrangements people made in order to accomplish the work of MILP, much of which was described in the events of the previous chapter. Analysis of Rachel's comments provides insight into the development of new patterns of interaction among the school staff that made it possible for them to move through the activities of MILP and to form new working relationships. It also provides a look at Rachel's private, personal reactions to the happenings of the year.

DEDI

what

sust

affe

Earl

proj

coll

chan

In a

elec

supp

spee

one

Lea

do

the

DEDICATION TO MILP

I have put this topic first because it underlies all of what follows. It inspired Rachel's early involvement, sustained her through periods of disappointment, and affected much of her action as a leader in the project.

Early Involvement

Rachel was one of the original supporters of the project, and, in the spring of 1987, she had urged colleagues to take advantage of this opportunity to make changes in their school by voting for project participation. In a discussion about her involvement, just after her election in the fall, she said:

I do believe we can make some changes with the staff. I believe very strongly in that. . . . I really talked hard for this last spring because a lot of the staff was not for it at all. They said it was just going to be another [project], another thing we have to do. . . . [They said,] "It's not going to work." I told them, "What do we have to lose? This is a forum. It's the only chance we're probably ever going to have to make any changes and to do it under a protected environment." (I-9/29/87)

When she became Steering Committee chair, she saw supporting the project as a major part of the job. In her speech at the December conference she said, "As chairperson, one of my major roles has been to sell the Mastery in Learning Project to both the committee and to the staff. To do that, I had to first get a clear understanding of what the project was, what it could accomplish and where it would

lea
ent
Sym
Min
exp
con

Dur
Lieh
Cons
she
talk
Lieh

Amb

com
pro
gro

lead us." (S-12/12/87) This understanding developed and her enthusiasm for MILP's potential was reinforced during the Symposium on School-Based School Reform conference in Minneapolis. In the letter she wrote describing her experience to the staff when she returned from the conference, Rachel summarized her feelings.

It gave me a whole different perspective of what we can achieve if we make a true commitment to the premise that this project is based upon -- that staffs are capable of sharing in the decision-making processes that determine the direction of schools. I discovered that we can reform our school if we cooperate, collaborate, and learn decision-making skills. . . . We are part of a very important and exciting movement of reform, and for the first time I was really getting the feeling that this isn't just another project -- others have seen change and so can we. So I listened, tried to learn, and I hope I will be able to give to you what was given to me, the energy and excitement to make this work. (L-10/12/87)

During the conference she wrote in her journal, "Ann Lieberman [Executive Director, Puget Sound Educational Consortium] was great! I was a little awe struck though -- she's been at the root of so much of the research and she talked about the realities of school reform Ann Lieberman dedicated me." (J-10/10/87)

Ambiguity of Goals and Processes

Rachel's dedication to the project, however, was complicated by its ambiguity, both in its goals and in its processes. This ambiguity was especially troublesome as the group worked on forming objectives for the project. The

nat
but
of

pro
the
or
"pe
to
all
sta
add
and
con
pro
amb

The
nev

nature of the project has been explained here in Chapter 4, but it was not as clear to all the participants at the time of these activities.

The project had no clear-cut guidelines laying out a procedure to be followed. All the decisions were left to the school staff who often looked to Rachel for explanation or guidance. She said the staff considered her to be the "person in the know" (J-10/29/87), and she frequently talked to staff members about the benefits of the project which allowed them to set their own agenda for change. In her staff letter following the October conference, Rachel addressed concerns about the identification of project goals and their building's objectives. She wrote about conversations with people whose schools had been in the project during the previous year and their advice on the ambiguous process of setting goals.

Everyone I talked to . . . stressed that we are in one of the most difficult phases of the project and to hang tough. They did give us a few hints on making the next step of our project -- goal writing -- more successful. They stressed repeatedly, that while anything could be used as goals, that we should initially, make sure they were not too broad to be impossible, or too vague to be unattainable. As they pointed out, we don't need to save the world our first year. (L-10/12/87)

These are not very specific instructions for a group who had never done this sort of thing before.

sus

MIL

con

she

boo

make

She

of t

in A

in t

to c

But

the

wro

goi

smi

won

to

she

Sustaining Power

This dedication or commitment to achieving the goals of MILP helped sustain Rachel through the tensions and conflicts of the project's first year. In her role as chair she was involved in discussions and activities that would boost her confidence in the project at one moment and then make her doubt the possibility of change the next moment. She occasionally expressed doubts about whether the concept of teacher empowerment and shared decision making would work in Adams School's situation. This journal entry from early in the year is an example of those doubts and her commitment to overcome obstacles.

Final concern -- can we make this work? I'm worried. Staff is basically uninterested -- I keep talking but don't know where I'm getting to. Tensions are high -- and should we waste the energy? I don't know. We need a method to get total staff involved. It would help us get around this divisiveness too if we could start on something now. I do so want it to work! (J-10/20/87)

But through it all she felt she had to remain dedicated to the project and its philosophic base. The next week she wrote, "This program offers us so much, [I'm certainly not] going to let animosity between us ruin it. And so I'll just smile, nod my head, . . . -- whatever it takes -- because I won't let us fail." (J-10/26/87)

Later in the year a situation arose in which Rachel had to make what she felt was an unfair apology for something she had done. Her dedication to the goals of the project

can be seen in her journal comment that evening. "And you know what, I didn't care. If this is what I have to do to keep the project moving, I'll do it." (J-4/11/88) Here she gave up on something she believed in for what she saw as the good of the group and the project. This will be discussed later as one of the characteristics of her leadership. It is included here as an example of how dedication to MILP and its goals affected Rachel's actions and gave meaning to some of the unpleasant parts of the job of Steering Committee chair.

Period of Despair

In spite of her dedication to the goals of the project, there were times during the year when Rachel became very discouraged. In the spring, a number of factors related to MILP, teaching, and her family came together to make life particularly difficult. Little progress was being made by MILP subcommittees, and Rachel saw no hope for success. The following is part of a journal entry from that period:

Well, I'm exhausted emotionally and physically so this is going to be short. So much has happened to me in the past 2 weeks I am drained. And I am seriously questioning the value of this project and my involvement. It's as if I've lost faith and I have no reserves to draw on. For the first time, I am admitting that maybe there is no purpose in this project because the system will never allow it to work. And I don't know if I have enough energy to pull it off. And I don't know if 3 or 4 people pushing a staff to do something they don't really want to do -- cause it's a hassle -- is worth it. And I really at this point don't think that being chairperson is worth it. I'm on Maalox and headache tablets and

It
wer
per
not
the

pro
mor
gue
pro
3/7
aro
as

spr
wit

I don't think it's going to change. Am I depressed, deeply. Am I ready to quit, yes. (J-4/29/88)

It can be seen here that dedication to MILP and its goals were not always enough to sustain Rachel. During this period she had to turn to other things to sustain her. I do not want to imply these were not present at other times, but they played a larger part here and will be discussed next.

Part of the source of Rachel's discouragement with the project was the pace at which change proceeded, or perhaps more accurately from her perspective, did not proceed. "I guess I have this internal schedule I'm following, and I probably need to abandon it -- it would be easier. (I-3/7/88) But an even larger part of the problem revolved around what Rachel considered "success" in the project, and as her ideas of success changed her despair lessened.

In our year-end interview Rachel thought back to this spring period, and the discussion progressed from dealing with crises to the nature of success.

Everyone has different ways to get through their lives and crises and such. My way of getting through everything is if I just count the days and say, "I just have to do this this much longer and it will be done." You can do anything for a given length of time as long as there's an end in sight. And I would have thought that that attitude would have hit me last October, November, or December. But it didn't. It didn't hit until this spring. I think it was when I finally realized that this will never work the way it's supposed to. The system will never change enough. (I-5/25/88)

Rachel realized that at Adams School the changes would not be as sweeping nor come as quickly as she had hoped they would.

I have a better understanding of what we want to accomplish. But along with that understanding came the realization that this project will never be what it was meant to be . . . And that's why I got so depressed about a month ago. So I've changed in that I have a better understanding of what we're doing and why we're doing it. But in gaining a better understanding you also gain insight into the limitations. (I-5/25/88)

That insight was difficult to handle when she had invested so much time and energy into the philosophy and goals of this project.

The type of changes Rachel found rewarding, and had hoped to achieve in this project, were generally substantial; although she seldom said that in specific terms. During this conversation she said, "That's why I don't teach special ed. I need major accomplishments to get my strokes." (I-5/25/88) But looking for these major changes lead to frustration.

You can always make changes of some type. I think that's what bothered me though. I wanted major changes! Even though I knew rationally, intelligently that there would be no major changes.

Telling yourself that in September is completely different than realizing in April that going through a case of Maalox and giving up a good share of my free time, giving up the time to socialize with my friends, really hadn't accomplished a whole lot. And I know I can sit down and listen to the aides today say, "Yes, there has been change." Kelly Pierson [an aide in the Pre-Primary Impaired program] in particular feels there has been radical change in attitude

phi

imp

abo

the

a s

the

Rac

on

dea

att

qui

I n

exp

toward the aides. And I know that there is better communication on the staff and among staff. (I-

5/25/88)

The conversation continued and we discussed the MILP philosophy and the difference between that and the implementation of specific programs. MILP is more concerned about the relations among the people, including students, in the school than it is with implementing programs. This was a subtle distinction, and we all continued learning about the implications of that distinction.

Rachel: Maybe I needed to understand we aren't going to get major things but there are minor things we can get that will improve our class.

Gary: [Those can be] major things.

Rachel: They are major things to our own psychological --- And the children's psychological --- Gee Gary, I think I'm finally understanding what you've been saying. (I-5/25/88)

Rachel's understanding of this new meaning of success raced on faster than she could find words to express it.

The final thing to consider as we look at Rachel dealing with despair has been alluded to but deserves attention on its own. That is her determination not to quit. "I'm the type of person who says, 'I started it, and I need to finish it.'" (I-5/25/88) She seldom spoke this explicitly, but it is implied in many other statements.

cheer

capt

dedi

dedi

inte

had

the

ind

the

act

res

ide

Cheerleading

"I feel like the head cheerleader." (J-10/29/87)

captures the most common visible manifestation of Rachel's dedication to MILP. This represents a public side of her dedication; where previous examples were more private and internal, this is public and external. In a discussion we had in late January, she looked back on the first half of the year and said,

There really is a lot of value in the project. I felt real strongly about that from the beginning, and I . . . still feel that my role as chairperson, a lot of it is being head cheerleader in terms of getting people involved and getting people to want to come to these things and keeping interest. Part of the speech [at the December conference] was that. That the hardest part of any project or anything you're going to do is maintaining the level of interest and that kind of stuff. (I-1/28/88)

Generating and maintaining interest in the project was indeed one of the hardest parts of Rachel's job. Part of the difficulty was that the position of chair and the activities of MILP were added on top of her classroom responsibilities. In the journal entry where she first identified cheerleading, this pressure shows.

My only problem is I'm so tired. All I do is run and talk. I feel like the head cheerleader. I think more people are thinking of me as a leader -- at least I seem to be regarded as the "person in the know" but unfortunately I still have to teach and I am determined that I'll be an even better teacher to prove this can be done without sacrificing the kids. I sometimes wonder if it's an impossible dream. If I can just get by report cards I'll be home free -- at least I hope I will be. (J-10/29/87)

of
bef
"Th
a l
che

ent
do
she
giv
(L
ent
day
"I
en
I l
ob
in
sh

Of course she was not "home free." Even the last days before the holiday break contained cheerleading demands. "Thursday -- Crazy frantic action. Parties, programs, and a little campaigning." (J-12/14-18/87) As we will see, cheerleading is a never-ending part of leadership.

As cheerleader Rachel tried to pass on to others her enthusiasm for the project and her vision of what they could do at Adams School. In the staff letter mentioned earlier she said, "I hope I will be able to give to you what was given to me, the energy and excitement to make this work." (L-10/12/87) But it is difficult to pass on to others the enthusiasm one gets at an out-of-town conference. On the day she handed out this letter, Rachel wrote in her journal, "I tried to talk to people -- to give away a little of the energy/hope/excitement, but not everyone is interested. So I held out a few carrots -- sub bank -- outside observations, conferencing time, etc. Got a little more interest." (J-10/13/87) In an interview the following day she said more.

I thought that by writing something up and giving [the letter] to them, that was a good way of letting them know. Trying to get them excited [about] it. I think some of them thought it was, "Well, she had to go off to a conference and then had the gall to come back and write about it." . . . [One] comment was, "Well, maybe if the rest of us had been able to go we would be as excited." That's normal human nature. Wouldn't it have been nice if we could have all gone. (I-10/14/87)

che
wou
to
peo
dra
her
pro
wha
to
enc

cha
the
its
bei
rou
coe
thin
with
dis
sec
fun
to
why

Being cheerleader was not always an easy task. Being cheerleader for a championship team with a loyal following would be easier than being cheerleader for a team struggling to get started. "I'm tired of being a cheerleader for people who aren't interested." (J-2/25/88) The cheerleading drained psychic energy as well as physical as Rachel says in her journal. "I feel the responsibility for keeping the project going -- to be the main cheerleader and so I spend what used to be my time to be quiet or to get caught up or to socialize constantly on MILP business -- talking, encouraging, running, and right now I'm tired." (J-2/29/88)

The need for cheerleading did not end, but its goals changed somewhat as the year went on. In the interview at the end of the year, Rachel talked about cheerleading and its intended consequences. "A lot of this job is still being head cheerleader. It's still running around and rounding people up and coercing them into meeting and coercing [them] into doing things, and nicely checking if things are coming along, and maintaining a good relationship with them." (I-5/25/88) A few minutes later when she was discussing why she had decided to remain chair for the second year, Rachel referred again to the cheerleading function when she said, "I think I can rally enough people to participate to accomplish some things. So I guess that's why I did it." (I-5/25/88)

S

w

th

pe

ch

na

de

pe

ve

id

the

che

act

the

mee

time

by s

to m

acti

is t

soci

Summary

Rachel's meaning of leadership in this project began with, and was founded upon, a dedication or commitment to the philosophy and goals of MILP. She was one of the first people to see the potential for using MILP to bring about changes at Adams School, and as she learned more about the nature of possible changes and the process of change her dedication deepened. This dedication carried her through periods of difficulty and helped sustain her when she became very discouraged. She also overcame despair by changing her ideas about the nature and timing of success. By the end of the year many others on the staff shared her enthusiasm.

Rachel's enthusiasm for MILP often took the form of cheerleading. This was a constant part of her leadership activities and included creating interest and involvement in the project and then encouraging or coercing people to go to meetings and complete tasks. Cheerleading took much of her time and energy and was not always enthusiastically received by staff members. The reason for Rachel's cheerleading was to move the staff toward, or through, consideration of and action on the goals of MILP. The next topic I will consider is the operation of MILP as an organization within the social context of Adams School.

THE

not

by

don

ele

des

and

est

of

is

wit

Soc

pla

oth

rol

som

but

int

a r

but

whe

wit

oth

amo

THE SOCIAL SIDE OF RUNNING MILP

The previous section dealt with topics related to motivation. This section will deal with arrangements made by Rachel alone and with others in the school to get things done. The group began by forming the Steering Committee and electing officers. These and other group activities were described in Chapter 6. Here I will discuss both personal and group organizational tasks and relationships or routines established by the group as ways of getting on with the work of the project. Before discussing these topics, however, it is important to mention the social construction of roles within a group.

Social Construction of Roles

In the position of Steering Committee Chair, Rachel was playing a role that was new to Adams School, as were the other roles within the Steering Committee. To fulfill these roles and complete the tasks involved in MILP people sometimes drew upon existing skills or patterns of behavior, but sometimes the group had to develop new ways if interacting. In some instances Rachel can be seen taking on a role that has in some ways existed before in the school, but at other times she is making a new role for herself where none has existed before. This role making is done within the context of her history of relationships with others in the building, and there are variations in the amount of independence she has in making these roles.

Run

much

she

res

Rac

mee

tha

org

mee

mee

age

gen

dis

bef

the

dis

mot

wer

sys

cor

Cor

St

Running Meetings

When Rachel began as chair she did not feel she had much background as a leader. As mentioned earlier, she said she was elected because she was willing to take on the responsibility and people thought she would be outspoken.⁸ Rachel began her term knowing she would have to conduct meetings of the Steering Committee. She had never been in that position before, although years ago she had belonged to organizations that conducted formal meetings. The first few meetings were relatively unstructured. Before her first meeting she wrote, "I tried to mentally come up with an agenda for directing the meeting." (J-9/29/87) Rachel generally prepared a written agenda listing the topics to be discussed. These were sometimes copied and distributed before the meeting, but more often they were distributed at the beginning of the meeting. The meetings were informal discussions leading to consensus rather than formal use of a motion followed by discussion and a vote. Although meetings were long and ranged over a wide variety of issues, this system worked adequately for the first few weeks.

But as topics became more complex and more controversial, this changed. On October 14 the Steering Committee had a meeting to decide who would represent the

⁸ See Chapter 6, September 8 - 15 -- Election of Steering Committee Officers.

sch

an

dec

fir

agr

tha

of

eve

tha

dis

ric

to

the

"Ma

mo

me

of

li

th

sa

Pa

school at an upcoming, state-level conference.⁹ They spent an hour and a half debating all facets of the issue, only to decide to draw names from a hat, which had been one of the first suggestions. By the time the meeting ended, everyone agreed more structure was needed to prevent the wandering that had occurred. They agreed to try to use Robert's Rules of Order and to adhere more closely to the agenda. That evening Rachel said, "One thing that came out of it [was] that we spent an hour and a half wasted on futile discussion. At the end we finally all said, 'this is ridiculous.'" (I-10-14-87)

Out of the frustration of this meeting came a decision to structure meetings more tightly and for Rachel to run them more strictly. She referred to this as her new role of "Madame Chairperson," and with it came the need to learn more about conducting formal meetings. During subsequent meetings committee members reminded Rachel and other members of the importance of staying on the topic at hand and limiting discussion. Robert's Rules of Order were used, and they were adhered to more closely for issues the committee saw as important, especially those involving money.

⁹ See Chapter 6, October 14 -- December Conference Participants Selection.

Se

wa

to

ex

go

ke

sa

en

I'

An

as

re

Ra

En

Th

ro

ac

ru

Pu

de

th

ch

Cd

Scheduling and Organization

Another skill that Rachel felt she needed to sharpen was scheduling and reminding herself of things that needed to be done. She did this well for her teaching, and extended it to her work as Steering Committee chair. "I am going to have to start keeping my calendar with me so I can keep track of everything I need to do." (J-9/39/87) Rachel saw a payoff in her improved organizational skills at the end of the year. "Today, I saw what organizational skills I've gained in getting the reports I was responsible for in. And everyone acted as if it was OK -- they just did as I asked. Kind of neat." (J-5/25/88) Here we also see the result of the developing social organization that allowed Rachel to tell people their reports were needed for the Year End Report¹⁰ with the staff accepting that and complying. These skills were part of a new set of social norms or routines Rachel and the group developed for getting things accomplished at meetings, and they go beyond scheduling and rules of order.

Public Speaking

In addition to these organizational skills, Rachel developed her skill as a public speaker. Recalling her thoughts from the evening she had agreed to run for the chair position, Rachel said, "The more I thought about it

¹⁰ See Chapter 6, May 24 -- Day-Long Steering Committee Meeting.

ti
B
i
t
a
h
c
s
w
i
l
(
w
c
u
M
h
s
o
w
j
c

the more I felt that public speaking would be real hard. But I might be able to live through it." (I-9/29/87) Later in that conversation she was quite surprised when I told her the Steering Committee had been invited to make an hour and a half presentation at the December conference.¹¹ I helped her and others prepare what they would say, organizing outlines, typing speeches, and coaching presentations. As she prepared for the speech, Rachel wrote in her journal, "Thanks for the speech outline. I'm feeling overloaded, and it really helped. I keep telling myself I can do this , but I'm getting real nervous. Gad -- I hope I don't bomb!!!" (J-12/3/87)

The whole presentation went very well. The audience was small, mostly people who were from Adams School or otherwise familiar with the project. We were, unfortunately, scheduled opposite an informal session with Madeline Hunter. After the session the group went to the hotel lounge to celebrate. It was a wonderful two-hour session of self-congratulation for the people from Adams.

Giving the speech was not as bad as Rachel anticipated, or, perhaps more accurately, the relief of having given it was exhilarating. After the speech Rachel wrote in her journal, "It's done -- I survived -- in fact -- at least

¹¹ See Chapter 6, December Conference Preparation Continues and December 11 -12 -- The December Conference.

he

12

as

sk

1/

ad

me

be

th

al

wh

By

sa

co

a

P

here -- I can say I wasn't half bad -- and I can relax." (J-12/12/87) We talked about the presentation later, and I asked what she had been feeling. "Utter terror!" But "the skills [came] back from taking two liberal arts majors." (I-1/28/88)

In April I arranged for Rachel to be on a panel addressing school reform issues at a Phi Delta Kappa meeting.¹² The evening before her journal entry was "brief because I've got to write my talk for tomorrow -- I was thinking about just an outline but I'll probably write it all out. I'm more comfortable reading so that's probably what I'll do." (J-4/11/88) After the meeting she wrote,

Well, I survived your meeting and you were right -
- everyone was nice. I still can't say I like it
though. I'm always a wreck. I do wish I could
wing it like the others. I still need the
security of a written speech. I myself hate to
listen to people drivel and I'm afraid I will too,
I guess. . . . As usual, I'm relieved. (J-
4/12/88)

By the end of the year she had gotten to the point that she said about speaking, "I've changed now that I don't completely panic when someone says I'm going to have to give a presentation. I just semi-panic." (I-5/25/88)

¹² See Chapter 6, April 12 -- Phi Delta Kappa Presentation.

Social Side of Running Meetings

Let us return now for another look at running meetings. There was more to this, Rachel found, than having an agenda and knowing Robert's Rules of Order. In addition to the structure imposed on meetings after the October 14 debate and at other times¹³ there were a number of social concerns related to running meetings. One pertained to the norms of teacher equality. As mentioned earlier, there generally is no allowance for the formal role of leader in the culture of teachers.¹⁴ Other topics included routines of politeness and ways in which Rachel could work toward accomplishing the group's objectives.

At Adams school, as in most other organizations, there were some people who were more active in school affairs than others. In describing the staff Rachel said, "There are leaders on the staff, and there are followers on the staff, but the bottom line is, that [the] staff is pretty cohesive." (I-9/29/87) These active groups worked on two general types of tasks: committee work whose objectives were, at least broadly, defined by the administration or on social activities and social activities. Rachel alluded to the first in her December speech.¹⁵ She was describing the

¹³ See Chapter 6, Meeting Schedules.

¹⁴ See Chapter 2, Career as Professional Growth.

¹⁵ See Chapter 6, December 11 -12 -- The December Conference.

st

sh

pr

pr

Ra

al

te

I

ab

co

pe

ar

pa

Ne

Li

te

sp

sc

un

Ma

Co

ta

Ma

th

Steering Committee's problems with starting the project and she paraphrased the principal's reaction as, "What is the problem? Just do what you have always done with new projects, sit down, write it up, and do it." (S-12/12/87)

Rachel did find herself on a number of these committees although she acknowledged they were not for everyone. "I do tend to be on the groups that do a lot of action on things. I guess because I figure if you're going to run your mouth about it you might as well do something about it. The committees are always open and welcome anyone. But some people don't want to work through committees." (I-9/29/87)

About the second set of activities she said, "The group arranged parties. Social hours every Friday, birthday parties, retirements, baby showers, etc." (I-9/29/87)

Neither of these types of activities seem to contradict Little's (1988) contention that "the relation with other teachers that is implied by terms like mentor, advisor, or specialist has little place in the ordinary workings of most schools. Even the simple etiquette of teacher leadership is unclear." (pg 84)

Madame Chairperson Rachel and members of the Steering Committee developed an "etiquette" that allowed Rachel to take a position of formal leadership, at least as far as MILP business was concerned. The first manifestation of this was Madame Chairperson. When she put herself into the

2
s
r

2
s
r

l
t
n
t
n
I
a
t

G
a
w
C
w
p
o

th

role of Madame Chairperson Rachel could impose upon other staff members through rules of order in ways that she would not have been able to without that role.

Tyranny of the Clock Another approach that was tried at a few meetings was to rely on the tyranny of the clock.¹⁶ This was a plan for organizing meetings to avoid having them run too long, or having the group find itself out of time before covering the agenda items. Each item was assigned a time limit which the group agreed to at the beginning of the meeting. The first few times this was used I was the timekeeper assigned to interrupt the discussion with reminders of the amount of time remaining for each topic. Later Rachel took on the timekeeper role. This was another attempt to develop an etiquette that would allow one teacher to impose upon other teachers.

Guidelines The problem of achieving the group's objectives and completing tasks within the norms of teacher equality was also played out at a broader level between the Steering Committee and the staff. In these instances a third method was developed: the use of published guidelines, forms, and procedures. Procedures and application forms were originally introduced at the January in-service when the

¹⁶ See Chapter 6, October 21, Time Limits & Preparing the School Profile.

S
T
s

T
s
h
c
s
p
i
u
s

St
au
su
co

Pr
th

School Profile was presented and committees were formed.¹⁷

These procedures continued to develop quickly and Rachel spoke of the need for continued formalization of them.

Maybe what we need is to do is get these guidelines and what-have-you taken care of and written up. So we can say, "you haven't done this or this or this." Or people will say, "well, we can't go ahead and plan this until we run it past the steering committee." [But,] I don't want to generate paper work and things like that -- we already have enough paper work. (I-1/28/88)

These were bureaucratic attempts at fairness for the entire staff. Just as Rachel did not think it was appropriate for her to impose her will on the Steering Committee, the committee felt it had to develop processes that would allow staff members as much freedom as possible to shape the project to their needs. At the same time, as Rachel indicates, there was an on-going concern about MILP imposing unnecessary additional bureaucratic requirements on the staff.

During the year there were several times when the Steering Committee wrestled with the appropriate level of authority it should exercise over staff members and subcommittees. They generally tried to resolve these conflicts through formal statements of procedure.¹⁸

¹⁷ See Chapter 6, January 13 -- Circus Day & the Project Objectives.

¹⁸ See Chapter 6, March 9 -- Determining the Role of the Steering Committee.

2
1
V
S
1

T
R
t
i

p
b
d
c
c
o
w

p

Imposing vs. Standing Back At the beginning of the year Rachel was very concerned about the idea of imposing her will on the group. In a discussion we had early in the year she went so far as to try to remove her own thoughts and feelings completely from the role of chair.

I'm trying to remember that as a chairperson of anything you have to take your personal feelings out as much as you possibly can -- you aren't able to do it 100% of the time -- so you can deal effectively with issues without letting your own personal feelings interfere too much. So I went in with a "yeah, I've got to direct it, but I've got to sit back" attitude. (I-10/14/87)

This came in reaction to an indirect comment someone made to Rachel about the possibility of her being on a power trip in this position. She was very concerned about this impression, and I will discuss it in more detail later.

Part of the reason for Rachel's wanting to separate her personal feeling from her position in the last example was because of the nature of the Steering Committee meeting that day. October 14 was, as you recall, the day when there was controversy over selecting participants for the December conference. She did not want any of her personal feelings or relationships -- positive or negative -- to interfere with her ideas of fairness in the selection process.

She was, however, able to impose her ideas concerning procedural matters. In the same interview she said,

I am not finding it all that difficult to say, "alright, we're going to have this meeting, and

Th
de
co
pr
Pr
la
th
si
wo

po
in
th
"M
di
it
in
Ra

A

this is what I think we should be doing at this meeting." I try to basically figure out in my head what I think we should be doing in terms of a deadline for things and the responsibilities we have at this point. (I-10/14/87)

The kinds of things she is referring to here are the project deadlines for submitting applications for the December conference and the responsibilities of preparing a presentation or reading and discussing drafts of the School Profile. She was not including discussions or decisions on larger philosophical issues because the group was not, at that time, dealing with those. The procedural issues were similar to things they had encountered in previous committee work.

As time went on, she moved away from the original position, but she commented on the balance between not imposing her will on the others but still covering the things that needed attention. The next month she wrote, "Meetings are interesting when you run them. Gives you a different perspective. Must keep reminding myself to play it low key." (J-11/6/87) The group eventually developed an implicit understanding of how meetings should be run.

Rachel wrote about this in March.

Meetings are getting easier for me. I am really sensing a change in my attitude, I have no trouble conducting the meetings. I guess my confidence is growing. It is helped by other people's attitudes towards me -- they expect me to do well and are very supportive. (J-3/21-22/88)

After this entry Rachel made no comments about not imposing

o
u
o

Th
le
de

on
se
in
te
gu
th
te

Q
n
e
s
t
o
b

on the committee. It seems as though they had come to an understanding. A month later she wrote concerning a problem one of the subcommittees was having,

The point was that we sat down, looked at the committee, discussed the problems Kelly Pierson was having [with conflicts in her schedule] and came up with a solution. All nice and easy. It's like at yesterday's meeting -- we're learning to interact on a professional level and not a personal level. A major step. (J-4/14/88)

The topic of moving away from dealing with issues on the level of personalities is an important one that will be dealt with in more detail.

Near the end of the year Rachel wrote, "If there's one thing I've learned, it's how to run meetings. We all seem to be getting better at it." (J-5/3/88) In our final interview I asked if she had changed, and she replied, "In terms of running meetings and getting up and doing that, I guess I could say yes to that. I have a little more skill there. I'm more confident in terms of getting up and telling people what to do." (I-5/25/88)

Oh, So Civilized Within every cultural group there are norms for appropriate behavior that make up the group's etiquette. The patterns of behavior that prevailed at Adams School before MILP were carried over into the project, but the new social situations created by the project made some of these interaction patterns more obvious than they had been.

These routines were used primarily to deal with personality conflicts such as the one described in the previous chapter.¹⁹ The week after that confrontation there was a Steering Committee meeting. Rachel wrote in her journal, "Harriet and I were actually cordial. . . . She said she'd be cordial and she is so and so am I." (J-10/26/87) Two days later, after another meeting she wrote, "More meetings -- continuing cordialness -- I guess we'll weather it." (J-10/28/87) This was the beginning of a pattern of interactions she would later refer to as being "Oh, so civilized." (J-10/16/87)

Before leading this project, Rachel could go to her classroom and avoid conflict; now she was often at the center of it. Being "Oh, so civilized" provided a way of interacting when topics of strong disagreement were raised at meetings. Rachel and others would make their points through "controlled argument" (J-10/6/87) without becoming emotional or upset. Arguments were carried out peacefully, sometimes by talking through intermediaries, but the outward appearance was always civilized.

¹⁹ See Chapter 6, October 23 -- Personal Conflicts for a specific example. This kind of conflict or tension is also mentioned, or at least alluded to, in other places.

Personalities The discussion of civility as a method of dealing with interpersonal conflict in order to move toward MILP goals brings up an issue that has been mentioned before.²⁰ Rachel, and the others, learned to focus on issues rather than personalities, although it was sometimes difficult to separate the two. She knew that as a leader she would have to avoid being drawn into personality conflicts. During a crisis period early in the year she "heard some flack about the meeting -- general stuff. Tried to point out that we have to get beyond our personalities - - me included -- if [MILP] is going to work." (J-10/7/87) Progress toward this end was being made though. In January Rachel wrote, "We survived personality conflicts, tension, a conference, etc., and now we're ready to move." (J-1/6/88) In March she described a meeting by saying, "I was pleased at how far we have come. We are learning to sit and exchange ideas without getting personally involved. We are learning that it isn't necessary to win each point to establish our validity personally. A major step." (J-3/21-22/88)

This movement away from reacting on a personality level was important to Rachel, and she mentioned it often. In April she wrote, "It 's like at yesterday's meeting -- we're learning to interact on a professional level and not a

²⁰ See Chapter 6, October 16 -- Communications Inservice Day.

personal level." (J-4/14/88) And a month later she wrote, "We're learning to interact on a professional level and not a personal level." (J-5/24/88) This last quote introduces another aspect of leadership: team building. This is often seen as an important part of leadership in any organization and will be discussed in the next section.

Summary

Norms and history do not include teachers formally elevating one of their own to a leadership position; it has always been initiated by administration. To provide an acceptable mechanism for managing meetings and accomplishing objectives, Rachel and the Steering Committee used methods beginning with new roles, such as Madame Chairperson, that were outside their existing relationships. Over time the need for this kind of role faded as people gained experience and developed new norms and relationships. Rachel was, however, always cautious about imposing her will on others. These new norms for group interaction were supplemented by norms of civility, controlled arguments, and a conscious effort to focus the group's attention on issues of concern rather than personalities.

It should be noted here that imposition of ideas discussed in this section differs from cheerleading discussed previously. Rachel's formal role as Steering Committee chairperson carries with it a level of authority

that makes imposing her ideas possible, at least in theory. On the other hand, her cheerleading comes from her personal commitment to the philosophy and goals of MILP. These draw their authority from her personality and her social standing with her peers; they have no formal authority. This separation embodies one of the balances Rachel had to achieve as a teacher leader.

TEAM BUILDING

Rachel intuitively knew team building was an important part of being a leader in MILP. It is widely held to be an important part of leadership in any organization. In this section I would like to discuss some of the ways this part of leadership was played out by Rachel and the rest of the Steering Committee. The topics in this section are all related to efforts Rachel made to encourage participation and involvement in the project by making other people feel they were an important part of it. The topics of this section are: communications, spreading ownership and sharing credit, compromising, and delegating. As has been true of other topics, Rachel's enthusiasm for these came from her dedication to MILP and was often seen in the form of cheerleading.

Team building includes encouraging teachers, who are accustomed to working independently to cooperate with

others. In the two speeches Rachel gave during the first year of the project²¹ she addressed some of the challenges of building collegial teams within school building cultures and traditions. At the December conference she said,

[Shared decision making is] not an easy task for people who are king or queen of their own room, for people who are used to their word being gospel, for people who are used to running the show. All of a sudden we are expected to be team players in a true sense of the word, not just in the lounge. And let me tell you that is difficult. My needs as a kindergarten teacher -- and we all know mine are more important than yours -- are different than those of a sixth grade teacher. And she knows hers are more important than those of the math teacher or the classroom aides. But, in reality, all are equally important. (S-12/12/87)

Addressing the Richfield Board of Education in the spring, she emphasized again the importance of moving from individual interests to team membership and alludes to the difficulty of that transition.

We needed to move away from being individuals with individual needs to being functioning team members with the capability to interact, to listen, and to work cooperatively with other adults toward goals that would benefit the school as a whole. A difficult lesson to learn, but with the completion of the first two steps of the project, the School Profile and the first set of our goals, we have shown it can be done. (S-3/2/88)

Communications

Communication among the people in Adams School was a complex topic. It began with insuring that a wealth of

²¹ See Chapter 6, December 11 - 12 -- The December Conference and March 3 -- Board of Education Presentation.

information on a variety of topics was shared among all the people in the school. This kind of communication was important because it allowed everyone to participate and feel a part of the group. But it went beyond that, especially for Rachel, to include developing new norms of communication with Dr. Haslett and conferring with people as part of their decision-making process. All of this took a great deal of her time and energy.

Organizational Communications Communication as the passing of information was a concern of many of the schools in MILP. Half of them specifically included improving communications in their first set of MILP priorities. The Adams School staff identified communications problems in their School Profile. When asked in the Faculty Inventory if they thought that open, positive, and timely communication is important, the staff responded that it was by giving it one of the highest ratings, but, at the same time, they gave the current communications situation a low rating. This was the largest discrepancy between how things should be and how they actually are in the 111 items on the inventory. They also pointed out "problems with communications between wings of the building and between some groups within the staff, for example between teachers and aides." (pg 32)

Communications within the building and between the building and the surrounding community were identified as two of the

objectives for the Adams MILP.²²

The need for this kind of communication was addressed during the inservice program chosen by a faculty committee for Adams School on October 16.²³ Rachel wrote that evening, "We discussed the how, why, and wherefors of communication. . . . What did I learn -- we all have to change [in order] to communicate including me -- as Dr. Rupert put it, focus on the problem -- not the personality." (J-10/16/87) This inservice emphasized the mechanics of good communications as a path toward conflict resolution.

Rachel saw the importance of sharing MILP information as broadly as possible. Her intuitive understanding of this was strengthened when she heard Ann Lieberman speak at the school improvement conference in Minneapolis. She emphasized the importance of working cooperatively and of avoiding the formation of an "inside" group and an "outside" group. Active communication about project events was one of her suggestions for keeping the door constantly open to people who want to begin their participation once the project is underway. We discussed the need for this in a January conversation.

²² See Chapter 6, January 13 -- Circus Day & Project Objectives and March 9 -- Reorganization of Committees.

²³ See Chapter 6, October 16 -- Communications Inservice Day.

I think we need . . . maybe every 2 weeks [to] have a sheet that goes out to the staff that says this committee did this, this committee met and did this and this and this. One line or two lines. Because I'm worried about losing people. . . . I think we need to get a chart up in the office that says meetings today or something. (I-1/28/87)

In March this idea was discussed in a meeting when the Steering Committee discussed ways of giving "Information to staff, some form of summary should go to staff each week, suggested posting minutes on an MILP bulletin board in office." (M-3/16/88)

Social Events Beyond this rather formal concern for sharing information, there were informal situations in which communications played an important role. Of course, much of what is reported in this chapter takes place through some form of communications. But Rachel specifically mentioned the demands that communication made on her, and it is a part of her leadership that is worth some consideration.

Rachel had always been an active member of her faculty, but as a leader she found herself involved in many more conversations than ever before. "My only problem is I'm so tired. All I do is talk and run." (J-10/29/87) She referred again to these demands during her speech at the December conference when she said the position of chair "required much more time, tact, and communication skills than I could have ever imagined." (S-12/12/87) These

informal communications were, naturally, carried out whenever an opportunity to talk presented itself. One thing the communications committee did to provide more such opportunities for the entire staff was to sponsor monthly coffee hours before school.

At this morning's coffee, I never did get to sit down because every time I did, someone called to me to talk about this or that. . . . It's flattering but irritating -- well, not irritating, but it makes getting my stuff done difficult at times. If there are teacher-leaders, I'm fast coming to the opinion, they are going to have to be given release time. I feel as if I'm always running. (J-2/10/88)

Communication with Dr. Haslett Rachel's new relationship with the principal involved many hours of discussions in his office. These discussions became so common that after three meetings with Dr. Haslett in one day Rachel wrote, "I laughed and said I'd put my name on one of his chairs -- he laughed and said get used to it." (J-10/01/87)

Conversations with the principal ranged from rambling philosophical discussions to what Rachel perceived to be heated debates over particular activities.

Most of the conversations, however, were about the day-to-day operations of MILP. Rachel felt it was very important to keep Dr. Haslett informed about project plans and activities on a regular basis. This communication between Rachel and Dr. Haslett was different than what they had been doing for 10 years. It had been between a teacher

and her supervisor, but now it was between people who were both leaders in the school; "equals" is going too far, but the relationship was clearly different. As Rachel pointed out at the beginning of the project, "I hope that Dr. Haslett will accept me as chairperson -- close work with him on a positive note will not only be helpful but I also think necessary for the success of the program." (J-9/29/87)

The lines of communication, and the nature of the communication, seemed to Rachel to begin changing during the conference in Minneapolis. The two of them had a number of long conversations about the nature of MILP and its implications for relations within the school. Rachel worked at keeping those lines open after they returned to Richfield. "I'm trying to talk to him as much as possible - - to keep open the lines set up in Minneapolis -- it's been easier this week." (J-10/27/87)

Keeping Dr. Haslett informed was an on-going challenge. It meant developing a new pattern of interactions, just as the staff had to develop new norms of interactions for meetings. At least nine times in her journals, Rachel mentions the importance of establishing and maintaining communications with Dr. Haslett. As had been done within the staff, Rachel and Dr. Haslett worked at developing procedures that would lead to new patterns of interactions. In January she wrote, "I told him I would personally make

sure in the future that he was informed." (J-1/4/87) Again in March she wrote, "I am pleased with the way our conference went with Dr. Haslett. I think your idea of having one weekly is probably a good idea." (J-3/2/88) Later in the month she wrote, "We are going to talk to Dr. Haslett about coming to more of the meetings or about setting up a time we'll meet with him weekly to discuss what we're talking about. . . . [I talked to him, and he said] he'd like us to come and talk to him when he isn't at the meetings." (J-3/30/88)

The traditional patterns of interaction between teachers and administrators are difficult to change because they are so tightly woven into the cultural fabric of our schools. Rachel wrote, "The problem with empowering elementary teachers is everyone is so used to telling us what to do, they don't know how to stop." (J-2/24/88) Indeed this type of relationship between workers and supervisors has prevailed, usually without question, throughout our society until recently, and changing it in schools or elsewhere will require, as we have seen here, the development of new norms of behavior.

Conferring with Others In addition to using communications to give ideas and information to others, Rachel used it to get opinions, evaluations, and information from others. She conferred with many on the staff as a part of her decision-

making process. She felt this improved the quality of the decisions as well as involving more people as active participants in the project.

Conferring with others often took the form of formal or informal surveys. Especially during the beginning of the year when decisions were being made about project priorities and other operating concerns, Rachel often polled the Steering Committee or the staff for their preferences and presented summaries at meetings. In part this was to gather more ideas, but it was also designed to make everyone feel they had input into the decisions that were being made.

An example of her conferring with others is in a request for information from the local newspaper.

Just by circumstance I was in the office when the [newspaper] called. Dr. Haslett wasn't available so I took the call. They wanted a telephone interview. But I felt since it was going to be quoted it was best to prepare a statement. So I started [writing it] and then stood in the office and had everyone who would read it and comment. (J-10/27/87)

Over time she did less of this, at least the informal checking with people, but it remained a concern. In a journal entry where she was interested in things she might read that would help her she wrote,

One attribute that I haven't developed is the ability to make a decision without worrying about what everyone else would say/want/etc. I am narrowing the number I check with, but I still need that reassurance that I'm doing the right thing -- I guess it's my insecurities showing. (J-

1/5/88)

But throughout the year she valued the input of others into decisions and encouraged the broad discussion of topics.

"It was a good interchange, and what I think we should be working towards -- exchanging information -- communicating - - looking at options and then making decisions." (J-3/2/88)

Later, during the discussions over whether people should be paid for time spent decorating for the community recognition dinner,²⁴ she wrote, "I keep telling everyone to discuss it at Steering Committee and maybe we'll straighten it out.

Sometimes I think it's better to let things be a group decision -- discussions often lead to seeing the proper course of action." (J-4/19/88)

Summary Improved communications among the staff and with the community were among the original goals of MILP at Adams School. In addition to working toward these goals, Rachel knew it was important for her to communicate with the staff about MILP activities in order to minimize the formation of an "inside" group and an "outside" group. She also needed to work with Dr. Haslett to develop new patterns of communication, and used regularly scheduled meetings as one approach to this. As the Steering Committee chair Rachel recognized the value of conferring with others during the decision-making process, and she encouraged them to bring

²⁴ See Chapter 6, April 22 -- Decorating for Community Recognition Dinner.

topics to the Steering Committee for discussion as a way of improving decisions. But all this talking and listening takes time, and Rachel often commented on the demands on her time and energy that were made by the competing pressures of MILP, friends, and teaching. Throughout all of this Rachel was working toward the goal of a unified staff. "I'm continuing to try and work and communicate with everyone so we will eventually work this into a cohesive unit." (J-10/28/87)

Spreading Ownership and Sharing Credit

Other important aspects of leadership and building a team are spreading ownership and sharing credit. These are related to communication because they are often the desired outcomes of the communication, or it is shaped in a way that would spread ownership or let others share in the credit. This is the outcome Ann Lieberman had in mind when she cautioned against the formation of inside and outside groups. Rachel was inspired by Lieberman and wrote,

I was a little awe struck though -- she's been at the root of so much of the research and she talked about the realities of school reform -- the inside/outside problems that affect it. So many of them applied to us, but, as she pointed out, they can be dealt with. (J-10/10/87)

And the way to deal with them was through sensitivity to the importance of wide-spread participation, which was one of the foundations of MILP, and the use of a variety of team-building techniques.

The newspaper interview mentioned earlier provides an example of Rachel's trying to share credit for project activities early in the project.²⁵ A reporter for the local paper called the school and requested a phone interview about MILP. Rachel wrote a statement that she had others read and comment on. When the reporter called her Rachel wrote, "I read the statement -- she asked questions -- I answered when I could and I stressed repeatedly that it should be stressed that the statement, etc. was a cooperative effort and please stress this in the article. She wasn't pleased but said she would." (J-10/27/87) When the article was published on Friday, Rachel wrote it was "not too bad -- I thought it was pretty innocuous except my name is quoted so often." (J-10/30/87) The following Monday she wrote, "Not too many people mentioned it -- don't know if they're upset. My name is the only one there -- but I did try to tell the reporter to mention all of us." (J-11/2/87)

Rachel was even more upset by the MILP newsletter. Each month the national office of the project published a newsletter that contained articles about school reform and a section that had a brief report about project activities at each of the participating schools. For two months in a row her name was the only one used in that section. She wrote,

²⁵ See Chapter 6, October 27 - 31 -- Newspaper Interview.

"I am not comfortable with mine being the only name -- I don't want people to think I want all the attention. I don't. So I called Dwight Mason [the newsletter editor] back and asked that everyone's be put in the next one. He said OK." (J-1/4/88) As we will see later, Rachel had mixed feelings about being the center of attention. On the one hand she knew it was important to share the credit with the others as a part of building a team, but, on the other hand, the attention was a form of reward and recognition that she enjoyed. The topic of rewards will be discussed in some detail in the final section of this chapter.

Delegating, Trusting, and Letting Go

One way of spreading ownership of the project was to encourage others to be active participants, and one way of doing that was by delegating parts of the project's responsibility, authority, and work to others. Delegating was as simple in some cases as asking someone to remind members of an upcoming Steering Committee meeting. As the work of the project expanded, especially after the formation of the subcommittees in January, there was clearly more activity than a single person could do, or even keep track of. In many cases what I will call delegation is actually Rachel turning over control of aspects of the project to others.

This act of letting go and, in the process, trusting

others, was difficult for Rachel, and she wrote about it a number of times. "My expectations of others are too high - - perfectionist me would never be happy with what anyone else did." (J-12/7/87) In an interview at the end of the year Rachel commented again on ways in which she trusted, and did not trust, people.

It goes back to I'm not real trusting of other people. I'm not trusting of other people in terms of expecting them to get things done. I trust people with confidences and I can trust people with friendship, but in terms of doing things and getting things done, no. (I-5/25/88)

It is not a matter of trust concerning personal integrity, but Rachel had problems trusting people to complete tasks in a way they would meet her standards for performance.

Dr. Haslett reminded Rachel early in the year of the need to delegate some of the work of the project to others. She was trying to make travel arrangements for the Minneapolis conference and arrange for the speaker for the October inservice day²⁶ when she wrote, "Dr. Haslett told me to learn to delegate and I am -- Roy offered to fill out the forms and turn them in -- I got them after school and Susan offered to take them to the ad building." (J-9/30/87) In October when she was having problems reaching people on the phone to remind them of Steering Committee meetings, Rachel wrote, "Jane came down and said she would handle some phone

²⁶ See Chapter 6, October 16 -- Communications Inservice Day.

calls for me -- I am trying to learn to delegate." (J-10/12/87) These are instances of delegating in terms of sharing the existing tasks of the chair with others who have the time and energy to help with them. In a moment I will look at a somewhat different type of delegating.

In many cases the delegating described above worked well both in terms of accomplishing the tasks that needed doing and in terms of increasing people's active involvement. In some cases, however, it did not work. In one instance when a teacher volunteered to take on a task and then forgot to do it, the problem was much deeper for Rachel than just the uncompleted task. We have an example of delegation that did not work and Rachel's private reaction to it.

Then I find out that she didn't do what she said she would . . . so I covered for her, but I am irritated --it is so hard for me to delegate -- I'm not particularly trusting of others, and things like this don't help. And why I always feel I have to take responsibility for everyone, I don't know. (J-10/14/87)

This is Rachel's first comment about her difficulty with trusting people to carry through on commitments. This kind of trust is an important part of being able to delegate and, as we will see, to let go of parts of the project. Rachel was always careful to point out that she was not using trust in terms of other people's personal honesty but rather in terms of her confidence that they would complete tasks.

As the project became larger Rachel knew she would not be able to remain as centrally involved in all its aspects as she had been. As committees were formed around the objectives presented in January²⁷ and began acting independently Rachel realized she would have to change. She was very concerned about not dominating the group, and especially the subcommittees. She did not want people to continue depending on her leadership but rather to develop their own leadership, both for their own benefit and for the benefit of the project. In a conversation we had in January she said,

I can't keep everything going at once. And I don't want to feel responsible to keep everything going at once. And I keep kind of waiting [for others to take over]. And sometimes I wonder if it's me; if I have taken too much on. If I have made people feel that they can't handle things on their own. I know that that is a fault in myself that I'm not real trusting of other people in terms of their capabilities. That's a fault of my own. I do not trust people to do things. Then what happens when you're not there? What happens when I do burn out and I just say, "I'm not going to do this any more; if you want to do something you have to do it?" (I-1/28/87)

This act of letting go runs much deeper than just delegating a task like telephoning to someone. Two weeks after the interview Rachel was still concerned about her new relationship with the project and the people with whom she was working.

²⁷ See Chapter 7, January 13 -- Circus Day & Project Objectives

This new phase of the project is going to be the hardest for me. I have to learn to let go and to trust others. I have to stop thinking that things won't get done if I'm not involved. I am not indispensable, and I want to make myself realize this. I guess I'm being obsessive about this, but I know how it irritates me on others, so I want to avoid it in myself. (J-2/15/88)

Subcommittees Rachel's first concern was whether people would continue with the project if she was not present, even when she was not in a formal leadership position as with the subcommittees. In January, even before the subcommittees were formed, this concern surfaced. "This project occupies a lot of my thoughts. I wonder sometimes if I didn't worry about it if others would -- but I'm sure they would, they just wouldn't let it occasionally obsess --too strong -- fret them." (J-1/7/88) After the committees were formed Rachel continued to worry about her participation and its effect on others. In February she wrote,

Part of the problem is that I'm on so many committees, but when I think about withdrawing from them something happens, or someone tells me I can't. And now that people are used to me being there, they've come to expect me. So am I imagining the need for me to be at all of these or could I trust enough to bow out? I don't know. (J-2/10/88)

Two weeks later she wrote, "I was hoping I could drop off committees as time went on, but with the decreasing interest, I'm afraid that if I drop out so will the rest of the committee, and then this will all go down the tubes for lack of interest." (J-2/25/88)

Rachel had joined several subcommittees dealing with topics she found particularly interesting. Often at meetings the others would wait for Rachel to arrive before beginning, and people would defer to her more than they did to other members. It was easy for her to fall into conducting, at least informally, these meetings. She expressed her concern when she wrote, "I do have to watch it though. I have a tendency that I have become more aware of -- to lead things and when it's other people's meeting, I need to curb myself. I'm working on it -- I know I need to do better." (J-2/15/88) We had discussed that during a conversation earlier, and I had suggested that Rachel would have to wait longer to give other people time to come forward and begin taking more responsibility.

Rachel: I kind of expected Susan to do more. To be willing to do things. She talked about [doing a lot of things].

Gary: You don't give her a chance.

Rachel: So, shut up and let her work.

Gary: You know all that great wait-time research. Wait 3 to 5 seconds before jumping in.

Rachel: I'm not good at that. Alright. That's on the list of improvements. (I-1/28/88)

Rachel understood the importance of delegating, trusting, and letting go in order both to increase participation in the project and to protect her own time and energy, but the difficulties of doing these did not go away. In March she wrote again about trusting enough to let go.

"This is the hardest thing for me -- letting go of the control, trusting others to make the right decision. Not that I can necessarily do it any better, but it is very difficult for me to trust." (J-3/18/88) At the end of the year Rachel forced herself to pull back and let others do more. She wrote, "I know I have to maintain a certain distance or I'll be overwhelmed." (J-5/4/88)

Summary Delegating began for Rachel when she asked others to do some of the tasks that were falling to the chair. As the project expanded, the nature of delegation changed to what she called letting go which required a level of trust in others that was often difficult for Rachel. I should point out here that there were very few instances in which people did not follow through on major responsibilities. Perhaps not all the phone calls were made on time, but the larger tasks were generally carried out as well as it would be reasonable to expect. Rachel had some disagreements with people over the decisions that were made, but her fears that no one would continue working on MILP were unfounded. By the end of the year she had learned that she could rely on others,

That you don't have to solve every problem yourself. That it's alright to look elsewhere for solutions. Whereas in the past I have been more of the nature to just say, "I'll take care of it myself or deal with it myself." (I-5/5/88)

Compromising

It may be that compromise is the cornerstone that provides a foundation for this entire project; it is implicit in much of what has been said to this point. In this section I will discuss a broad notion of compromise, going beyond the compromises made for Steering Committee actions to include those Rachel made, often privately with herself, to avoid or minimize polarization among staff members or to avoid offending individuals. She sometimes questioned the appropriateness of these, and at times these sustained diplomatic efforts took a physical toll. The compromises presented here are related to the idea of not imposing her will on the Steering Committee, which was presented above, but these differ because they extend beyond the committee procedures to other kinds of interactions.

Most of this report has put Rachel at center stage, which is, of course, helpful for the purpose of discovering characteristics of teacher leadership, but gives a somewhat distorted picture of the entire project. Others played an important role in many aspects of the project as Rachel mentioned a number of times in her journals. Some individuals on the Steering Committee tended to mediate tense situations and move the group toward compromise. During the continuing controversy over who would represent the school at the December conference, Rachel wrote after one meeting, "Shirley Franklin [an aide in a special

education classroom] made a real effort -- more the Shirley I've always known -- to mediate and direct all of us to get it together. I feel she was real successful." (J-10/21/87) Shirley had for years been one of the people who had mediated problems between teachers and aides and among other groups and individuals. She worked behind the scenes in MILP to calm some of the fall crises.

For Rachel at a personal level, much of the process of compromise was seen as giving up something for the good of the group. She seldom spoke or wrote of it as the process of give and take between parties in which each party makes gains from the other in addition to making concessions. The first explicit mention of compromise came in the fall during the conflicts over representation at the December conference and items for the School Profile.²⁸ At the October 6 meeting both of these topics were discussed, and one person kept trying to push decisions in a direction opposite to what Rachel thought best. Neither discussion turned out exactly the way Rachel wanted, and after the meeting she wrote, "It should be a group effort, but then I thought about it -- I need to learn to compromise too, so I kept my mouth shut." (J-10/6/87) Rachel became upset by another person's attempt to dominate the group's decision and ended

²⁸ See Chapter 6, September 29 & October 6 -- School Profile Controversy and October 14 -- December Conference Participants Selection.

up seeing that she had been attempting to do the same thing and would need to change.

Give Up for the Good of the Group Because she represented the entire staff in her position as chair, Rachel felt she had to look at situations more broadly, and sometimes she had to take positions with which she did not completely agree. After another session related to the conflict over participants at the December conference Rachel wrote, "I'm trying. Maybe that's part of leadership -- learning to talk and listen. Learning to do things that don't always feel right to you personally but are right when you look at the picture as a whole." (J-11/9-13/87)

In April Rachel was again thinking about giving up her own position for the good of the group and reflecting on advise she had received earlier from Bob McClure, the director of MILP. She wrote that part of McClure's most valuable advise was "that when you're the leader you sometimes have to give up your position on an issue and bow to others for the sake of the group. Very difficult." (J-4/19/88) But the next day she went on with the thought and wondered, "How much do I have to give away because I am leader. How do you know when what you're doing should be set aside or pushed. Sometimes, it seems as though if I am involved it automatically gets questioned." (J-4/20/88) There were people on the staff whom Rachel felt questioned

or resisted things just because she was supporting them. The question of how much to give in was, of course, never really resolved. This is an example of the lack of give and take in Rachel's view of compromise. She never wrote of what she got in return for the compromises she made in her positions.

Another aspect of compromise as a part of team building was the way in which some of Rachel's personal relations were played out. I have already mentioned new patterns of communication, such as being "Oh, so civilized," that were developed to accomplish MILP objectives. What is presented here is only slightly different in that this was Rachel's reaction to these patterns. Rachel had to establish working relations for MILP with a number of people in the school with whom she otherwise had little contact. She tried to change her feelings about them, but even as late as May she was still uncomfortable as can be seen in this response to a question I asked about her relationship with one of these people.

I'm not comfortable with it. I'm not comfortable with her. I'm not real good with playing games. Right now I think that's the level the relationship is on. We're very nice to each other. Everything is sweetness and light. As far as I'm concerned I'm being a hypocrite. . . . For the sake of getting along and for the sake of this project I will continue to play the game. (I-5/11/88)

This raises again, in a somewhat different context, the question of how far leaders have to go in compromising their

beliefs for the good of the group. This question is as difficult for Rachel to resolve in this context as in the previous one.

Much of what has been said above can be seen as team building through avoiding the alienation of any of the individuals or groups in the school. As was true with most MILP schools, activities during the early months of the project at Adams School were often complicated by tension among groups within the staff, the problems Lieberman had warned about. As a part of building a team, Rachel had to work at not offending any of the groups. "I am trying to be real careful not to always be the one that blocks things -- that way I don't alienate [any group] -- oh politics." (J-10/28/87) Throughout the year Rachel felt she had to be careful about what she said and to whom she said it. This was an aspect of leadership that she did not like as can be seen in these journal comments. "I've decided that this is one aspect of leadership that is particularly difficult -- being so careful about what you say to whom -- who you tell what to -- and how to do it all without stepping on anyone's toes." (J-10/14/87) This problem did not seem to evaporate as the year went on. "I do resent having to make decisions based on political expediency. . . . I know it's the reality of the situation, and I'm living with it, but it doesn't make it right." (J-5/25/88)

By mid-year people were making half-serious, joking remarks about Rachel's diplomatic skills. Referring to one of the other teachers, she wrote, "Valarie Keyes said tonight when I'm finished I can run for president" (J-2/3/88). The next evening she wrote, "For the second time in two days someone made a comment about my developing diplomatic skills -- Roy said the rate I was going, I could be ambassador to Beruit." (J-2/4/88) But all this pressure to compromise did take its toll, psychologically and physically. In November Rachel took a personal business day and later wrote,

I was at the point of overloading and I needed to remove myself emotionally. The business of always having to worry about other's feelings and other's reactions forces you to put your own to one side. It also causes you to doubt your own decisions. It also causes you to resume drinking Maalox and eating aspirin. (J-11/9-13/87)

Summary Compromise operates at the level of making decisions and taking action in an organization like MILP. But, for my purposes in this report, it is much more informative to look at compromise at a much more personal level. Here we found Rachel putting what she saw as the interests of the group first and giving up positions she held, for the good of the group. The other form of personal compromise was avoiding alienating any individuals or groups. All of this was done in the service of building a unified team or, at the very least, trying to avoid breaking up whatever coalitions had been formed. In the process

Rachel developed a variety of diplomatic skills.

There are no norms within most school building cultures for sharing the power that might come with a position like Rachel's because there has never been such a position, especially not in elementary schools. New patterns of behavior need to be developed around these new roles, and these should be in harmony with existing norms of independence among teachers. School reformers will not gain much if they exchange one unequal distribution of power favoring administrators for another unequal distribution of power favoring a small group of teachers.

Finally, compromise, giving in, and avoiding alienation can go only so far and remain helpful. Rachel also learned that at some point you, as a leader or as an individual, have to take a stand and make a decision. She wrote in April that one of her most valuable lessons came from Bob McClure.

All he said was, "Do it and don't worry," and I think that's when I began to step away from the confusion of always trying to please others to understanding you only allow yourself to be hamstrung when you do that. That sometimes you have to make decisions that won't please everyone -- that the majority is more important than the minority. This is probably the hardest realization I have had to come to. (J-4/19/88)

It was, of course difficult for Rachel, and she worked constantly at trying to find within each new situation the best balance between compromise and action. McClure's

advice about not being able to please all the people all the time introduces a discussion of Rachel's reactions to not being able to please everyone.

Can't Please Everyone

As Rachel said above, there are times when team building does not work, and trying to please everyone can sometimes leave you unable to take any action. A leader has to accept that, inevitably, some people will not be pleased. This was difficult for her to accept because it contradicted much of what she was doing in terms of team building and cheerleading, and it went against her personal nature. During the conflict over representation at the December conference Rachel first began dealing with the fact that some of her colleagues would not be pleased with the outcome, no matter what that outcome might be. After one of her friends brought Rachel the news that some staff members were upset with the way she was handling the situation, she wrote,

The interesting thing was I didn't feel panic -- I just thought, 'Oh well, not everyone can be happy.' This is a real switch for me -- normally I feel obligated to please everyone, and, even though that's impossible, I tear myself up trying. In the past Dr. Haslett has on a number of times reminded me of that -- to no avail. But, now I seem to be changing whether that's good, I don't know, but changing I am. He's right -- you can't please everyone. (J-10/13/87)

This was deeply ingrained in her personality, and, as

we have seen, she would go to great lengths to try to please people. At the end of the year when we were discussing what she had learned she said, "One thing is you can't please everyone, no matter how hard you try. As you listen to me talk to my sister, that runs over into my personal life, that's just my nature." (I-5/25/88)

The lesson of not being able to please everyone, like some others, Rachel seemed to learn a number of times and in a number of forms. In December, just after the state-level conference, when things were relatively settled she was refining this idea of pleasing everyone to include the idea that you can not do everything for everyone. She wrote,

I also feel my attitude changing. I [am] beginning to realize you can't please everyone, and you don't have to. . . . This attitude has come out of the conference -- you can only do so much and then you just move on. I've spent my life bending over backwards for others, and finally at 35 I'm learning its only necessary to bend so far, then it's OK to stand up. (J-12/14-18/87)

Summary

A variety of activities have been grouped together as team building. Communication served a number of functions within MILP. It was used to inform the staff and Dr. Haslett about MILP activities and to encourage people to participate. It was also used among the participants to develop a sense of collegiality. Communication often served the purpose of spreading ownership of the project and

sh
ot
p
p
a

r
h
i
s
t
i
s
st
be
so

sharing the credit for successes. Rachel often talked with others as a part of her decision-making process, and in the process, gave them ownership in the activity. Whenever possible she emphasized that this project was a team effort, and many people in the school were contributing.

Building a team also involved having other member take an active role in the project's activities. Rachel delegated to others, but it was not easy for her. Delegating required trusting others to complete tasks and letting go of some of her control. As the project grew this became necessary because there was too much for her to continue her original level of involvement.

As ownership spread and more people took responsibility for tasks, Rachel found she had to compromise as a part of building a team. As teachers became empowered and invested in the project they wanted an increased voice and Rachel sometimes had to give up a point she was interested in for the benefit of the group. At the same time, she found that in some cases compromise was not enough. There were situations in which she was not able to please some of the staff. It was difficult for her to accept that there would be times when the group would not be able to arrive at a solution that would satisfy everyone.

MEETING THE EXPECTATIONS OF OTHERS

In this section I would like to deal with Rachel's reactions to the expectations of others on the Steering Committee. The social construction of Rachel's role as chairperson has been mentioned before in relation to running meetings and communications. This section will focus on her reactions to the expectations others had for her in periods of crisis. Rachel thought she was elected in large part because her colleagues perceived her to be outspoken. During the year there were a number of times when she felt she was called upon by her colleagues to exercise her leadership through the use of that outspokenness.

As we have seen, the fall activities of MILP were often contentious events, at least as Rachel experienced them.²⁹ A number of times during this period and across the year Rachel felt her role was to fight the battles no one else was willing to fight. To say the least, she did not like this aspect of leadership. During this period of tension and conflict she wrote, "And leadership -- what a joke -- all it means is that I get to fight everyone's battles for them while they sit on the sidelines safely and watch." (J-10/22/87)

²⁹ See Chapter 6, September 29 & October 6 -- School Profile Controversy, October 14 -- December Conference Participants Selection, October 23 -- Personal Conflicts, and November 3 - December 9 -- Continuing Conflict & Bob McClure's Visit.

A couple of weeks later, as the crisis lingered on, she wrote, "Being a leader is lonely, and as most people that are my peers only regard me as a leader when there's junk to be dealt with -- the job isn't nearly what it's cracked up to be." (J-11/9-13/87) At this point David O'Brien, president of the local teachers' organization, had been called, and he was helping Rachel and the others cope with their problems.³⁰ Rachel was ready to quit, but the situation resolved itself some and people encouraged her to continue. "When I announced I was ready to quit -- as were most of us; everyone tried to talk me into staying -- whether because they think I'm doing OK or I'm a good scape goat -- I don't know but it's interesting. (J-11/9-13/87)

Later, just after the December conference presentation, Rachel wrote about her perception of the Steering Committee's reaction to her leadership. "I've seen it really come to the fore this past month, and I've seen the rest of the group allow it, and it appears they actually want me to direct. I guess partly because that way I can take the flack." (J-1/12/88) The mood had changed from the previous examples, partly due to the success of the presentation, but partly because some of the crises had passed. But her role still involved the expectation that she would be in the forefront when conflict arose. Rachel

³⁰ See Chapter 6, November 3 - December 9 -- Continuing Conflict & Bob McClure's Visit.

saw that as a part of the job. In a conversation we had late in January Rachel talked about this aspect of leadership, and she also spoke of raising issues for others.

Roy will sit there when we're in a meeting or something and make continual comments under his breath to me. Knowing I am going to voice those. Yes, I'm going to end up taking the flack. . . . At this point I don't mind because I knew that was part of being chairperson. Right up front it was, "well, do you want the position?" "I wouldn't mind it." It was an unspoken thing that you're willing to take the flack. But sometimes it upsets me a little bit. Last fall I came pretty close to blowing up. (I-1/28/88)

As time went on and situations settled Rachel's role tended to change from fighting battles to raising issues. When a controversial issue came up within the staff, it would be discussed informally and Rachel would be encouraged to raise the issue, as she mentioned above. Of her leadership at that time, Rachel wrote, "I think more people are looking to me to speak out." (J-1/5/88) The next day she wrote about the meeting at which the group turned aside Dr. Haslett's suggestion to print only a few copies of the School Profile to circulate out of the office and, instead, print a copy for each staff member. As discussed earlier, this was an important event in terms of the Steering Committee establishing its independence.³¹ "As Shirley put it later -- I had to verbalize it, but they were willing to support it." (J-1/6/88) As soon as Rachel suggested at the

³¹ See Chapter 6, School Profile Distribution.

meeting that there was a value to providing copies for everyone the discussion turned, and many of the committee members spoke in favor of it.

Rachel sensed a new pattern of behavior was developing within the staff, both among her peers and between Dr. Haslett and herself. The next week, just before the Steering Committee presented the School Profile to the building staff, Rachel wrote,

Everyone seems to be perking up -- to be aware of the possibilities and they all seem a little more assertive -- they're tentative at first, but they don't back down. And that's where I come in -- or so I've been told by some -- I need to broach the subject so they can support it. It's a role that I'm getting used to, and I think Dr. Haslett is getting used to me doing it. Some of the animosity I was feeling before Christmas has drained away. But I'm less uncomfortable about doing it. Sometimes I do get frustrated about under the breath comments that I am supposed to verbalize because one of my peers doesn't want to.
(J-1/11/88)

Rachel was still taking the lead in raising issues, but the burden of fighting for them was shared by others. Sharing increased as more people became active in the subcommittees that formed around the project's objectives. This was more an implicitly understood arrangement than an explicit agreement among the parties.

COSTS AND REWARDS

Some of the costs and rewards of this position have been described in preceeding sections, and they have been alluded to or implied in others. Although a specific description of these may be somewhat beyond the question of what Rachel learned or how she changed, it seems to me that this chapter would be somehow incomplete without at least a summary of the variety of costs and rewards that accompanied the role. Let me begin with the costs.

Costs

The costs of chairing the Steering Committee have been mentioned a number of times in this chapter. There are some additional costs that should be mentioned before leaving the chapter. The demands on her time made Rachel miss a number of the things she normally did after school. They might sound trivial here, but even small disruptions took on larger significance when they were repeated weekly. They also took on added significance because all too often enjoyable activities were being crowded out by meetings and confrontations. After school on Thursdays Rachel indulged herself with what she called "nails and needles." She had her nails done and then she went to a weekly needle point class which she attended with her mother. She often had to cancel the nails appointment and arrive late for the class. Monday and Wednesday was exercise class. She often missed that due to long after-school meetings. This bothered her

not only because she valued the physical release but also because it was a social outing. "My oldest friend and I exercise together, and if I don't keep in contact with her it's like this void. So it's hard when I miss that." (I-10/14/87)

The competing demands that leadership, friends, and teaching made on Rachel's time can be seen when she wrote,

I'm always running off to meetings and I have no time for my friends, feeling the constant demands on my time by other people -- it's all wearing on me. Yes, I can admit, peoples' attitudes towards me have changed -- I feel they're always waiting for me to find the solution, . . . for me to have the time to listen. I guess that's what everyone wants a teacher leader to be there for, unfortunately, I also have to teach full time. (J-2/29/88)

Interactions with people occupied much of Rachel's time as a leader, and, especially during periods of tension, drained much of her energy.

The MILP time demands also affected Rachel's friendships at school. I have already mentioned her comments about MILP meetings using up all her time for herself and for socializing with her friends at school. During one of our interviews Rachel talked about the reaction of one of her friends to the demands of her involvement in MILP. She quoted her friend as saying, "You know, Rachel, I think one of the reasons I hate this project so much is that I never see you, and it's interfered with

our relationship - our friendship. I really think that's one of the reasons I hate it." (I-5/25/88) There was, however, at least one time when Rachel pushed the project aside to make time for her friends. The day before the Steering Committee presented the School Profile and project objectives to the Adams staff a meeting was scheduled for lunch time. Rachel did not show up, and that evening she wrote,

Today, I don't know what my problem was -- I guess I was playing hookie -- meetinged out. . . . I guess I needed to touch base with people outside of MILP. I have begun to feel isolated from some of my friends -- and I'm not alone -- they make comments to me about never seeing me anymore. And so I needed to squeeze some time in for them. (J-1/12/88)

Another cost that has been mentioned previously is the effect the tension of the role had on Rachel's health. She had a history of stomach problems including an ulcer, and several times when situations became stressful it acted up. This situation, which refers to the very difficult period in April, contains the health problem and also introduces changes in the relations Rachel had with some of her friends on the staff.

I was so down when she came in . . . I was still struggling with all the turmoil from the past 2 weeks and here she came all smiles. . . . Personally my only gain has been a resurgence of my stomach problems. And I work so hard to share the little positive credit we've had, and here she comes with her name all over memos. And all I could think was all the [stuff] I've put up with and she'll get the credit. And it was hard. Especially when she's nabbed on me in the past

about being too controlling. Enough. (J-5/9-12/88)

The new roles within the Steering Committee and the subcommittees changed the relationships among the people in the building. Previously, they had operated as professional colleagues or as friends, but now there was a new set of elements thrown in for which they had not yet developed ways of interacting.

Rachel needed the support of her friends, but the role of chair interfered; it changed the relationships. When two staff members complained loudly about the proposal to change the afternoon planning time³² one of Rachel's friends withdrew from the committee. She tried at first to deny the impact, but as her journal entry shows it was painful, and the constraints Rachel felt left her with few options.

It started with her dumping out of the scheduling committee -- too much stress. And I tried just to slough it off -- or at least told myself I could, but it just got to me worse and worse as the day went on. I felt abandoned -- I felt like someone kicked a leg out from under me . . . All I really wanted to do was scream at her -- you think you're under pressure??? What about me -- but I can't do that because people expect me to persevere. (J-4/27/88)

Rewards

At the end of the year, when talking about her

³² See Chapter 6, March 9 -- Planning Time Committee and the Visit to Lockhart School, April 27 -- Planning Time Committee -- Joyce Withdraws, and May 23 -- Planning Time Committee and Reaffirmation of Majority Rule.

reactions, Rachel said, "I have to admit it, I've enjoyed it somewhat." (I-5/23/88) This chapter has not always presented Rachel's year as a time to enjoy -- even somewhat. But I have been focusing on change and often change that occurred in periods of tension or crisis. There were also periods when things went well, and Rachel found the role of chair rewarding. In early January, when the fall crises were behind her, she wrote, "And you know what? I am beginning just a little to feel like a leader -- and I kind of like it -- with reservations. Strange position but nice in some ways." (J-1/6/88) It is these ways in which Rachel found the position "nice" that I would like to discuss.

Recognition & Associations For a classroom teacher accustomed to spending all of her professional life with kindergarten students or, for a few days each year, in inservice activities being told how to do her job, being Steering Committee chair for a national project moved Rachel into situations that were new to her. It was a new experience for her and others on the Steering Committee to be treated like celebrities as they were before their presentation at the December conference. In a journal entry she wrote the evening before the presentation she wrote about the luncheon earlier that day.

What was nice was the recognition we got -- and I enjoy it. Everyone -- . . . Jack [Richfield's local teachers' organization president], Alice Anderson [state vice president of the organization] was very solicitous.

R
t
R

R
c
s
t
t
r
w
c
P
V
t
t
t
w
Sh
on
me

I think it sunk into Roy's head just how important we are -- the attention we got when we walked in, the attention we got at lunch -- we sat next to the head table . . . being mentioned in Alice Anderson's speech, being mentioned [by] the [organization's] director who was the keynote speaker. Roy finally looked at me and said we must be important. I said we sure are! (J-12/11/87)

Here it is not just the recognition that is significant but the people from whom the recognition came -- important people, therefore we must be important.

Rachel's new position put her in regular contact with people in national- and state-level offices, and she especially appreciated Victoria Cummings, a director in a state level organization. She helped Rachel during some of the fall crises, and each time they talked, even during those trying times, Rachel was affected. During the last-minute preparations for the December conference Rachel wrote, "Victoria called to catch me up on what she had been doing regarding our problems. The feeling was great and powerful and and and." (J-12/7/87) She enjoyed working with Victoria and other decision makers because "You get to be on the inside track -- you get deference and attention -- all the things you don't get as a teacher and let me tell you the feeling is heady." (J-12/7/88) Later in the year she wrote, "Talking to Victoria is always a pleasure and a lift. She is so rational, so helpful, and she always gives me tips on how to handle things. If ever there was a natural-born mentor, I think Victoria is it." (J-2/25/88)

In another situation Rachel's room was fumigated just before a visit from Bob McClure, MILP's director, and others, and the bug spray had made her sick.³³ She was sitting next to an open door in the B wing when McClure found her. That evening she wrote about the incident.

I got sick. After all my preparations for all of our mucky mucks. I will probably always be remembered as that wild looking green woman hacking away. What an impression.

The up side -- I have never felt so much concern and attention from anyone other than family and husband of course -- and it did help. I also felt powerful again and if I had felt better, I'd have enjoyed it. (J-12/9/78)

Rachel found the attention and honest concern of these people and others rewarding.

Within her own building Rachel's position broke down some of the isolation that has traditionally plagued teaching, and she become better acquainted with other teachers, which she saw as a benefit. After the October in-service day she wrote, "I had a surprising 'gift' -- I got to know Roy [Per-Primary Impaired Program teacher] better." (J-10/16/87) In interviews during the year she often mentioned the value of learning about other teachers and their classrooms, as well as developing personal relationships with her peers. Because of the structure of the school, people, like Rachel, in A wing seldom interacted with the upper-elementary people in the B wing. Participation in

³³ See Chapter 6, November 3 - December 9 -- Continuing Conflict & Bob McClure's Visit.

MILP tended to break down that separation.

Being the center of attention was rewarding for Rachel, but, at the same time, there was her concern for spreading ownership and sharing the credit that I described earlier in this chapter. This created a tension between her enjoyment of the personal attention and her desire to promote the group and its project. She began coming to grips with this in a December journal entry about a situation where someone else was taking credit for something Rachel had arranged.

He took credit and it upset me -- me who has always tried to stay out of the limelight. What is happening to me? I am actually enjoying the limelight, and I guess -- can this be true -- I want it.

This is a side of myself I have trouble recognizing and accepting. I'll have to think about this a while -- can I handle leading -- I think I can. (J-12/12/88)

The newspaper interview discussed above³⁴ provided an opportunity for Rachel to share the limelight with others on the staff, and she was not pleased when it did not come out the way she hoped. "My name is the only one there -- but I did try to tell the reporter to mention all of us." (J-11/2/87) And later when the MILP news letters arrived quoting only her she wrote, "I am not comfortable with mine being the only name -- I don't want people to think I want all the attention. I don't." (J-1/4/88)

³⁴ See Chapter 6, October 27 - 31 -- Newspaper Interview.

These concerns for sharing the credit seem to contradict her enjoyment of the limelight. One part of the resolution of this conflict within Rachel can be seen in an earlier journal entry written at the time of the newspaper interview. " I also have developed a new attitude -- since I'm working [so hard]-- I want a little recognition. Is this a power trip??? I think not -- more a justification for spending my life currently on this project!!"

Rachel seldom, if ever, spoke publicly about enjoying the position of steering committee chair, and she generally qualified it when she wrote about it in her journals as she did above saying she had "enjoyed it somewhat." If there is currently no place in the culture of teaching for a role like Rachel's, it is not surprising she would find enjoying that role to be a new "side of myself I have trouble recognizing and accepting." This dilemma, like many of the others, did not disappear as the year went on.

Power & Control Power, or being empowered, has been mentioned a number of times already in this and preceding chapters. It is a component of leadership, however, that is important enough that it should receive consideration on its own. Rachel generally wrote about using power as a means of accomplishing objectives. In an early interview she talked about power with regard to other staff members and the principal.

I don't need to feel power over any of the staff because I have nothing to prove their -- Not because they aren't worth taking the time to prove something to, but because I don't feel any need to. I like the feeling of power when it comes to dealing with Dr. Haslett. That I will say yes to. . . . Because there the relationship . . . is power based. It's not with the rest of the staff. There's no need for one person to have power over another one with the rest of the staff. (I-

10/14/87)

During the crisis over participation at the December conference, Rachel had to insist on changes being made in the names appearing on the printed program.³⁵ A number of phone calls were made, there was a confrontation, and at the last minute the changes were made. After the incident she wrote,

How did I feel -- triumphant. I got through to him -- finally! Also a little powerful. I see it in little ways -- how I word a note, how I react to others, how I feel about myself. Do I like it -- I think so, but I think I'll reserve comment or commitment for now." (J-11/3/87)

Here Rachel had used a confrontation to bring about changes she, and others, thought were very important for the survival of the project. After other confrontations during the year this feeling of having the power to make things happen increased, and Rachel appreciated it as a tool to use in moving toward the project's goals. This use of power seems consistent with Rachel's compromising and her tendency to avoid imposing her personal views on the Steering

³⁵ See Chapter 6, November 3 -- December Conference Program Conflict.

Committee as described earlier.

Rachel found the ability to control things rewarding, not for the sake of controlling others but for the sake of making change. "And I like being in control of things. . . . I feel I would still be real involved whether I was chairperson or not. If I was going to be involved I'd rather be in control. That just doesn't sound right." (I-5/25/88) But, as the end of this quote shows, she is still bothered by the idea of having power in the teachers culture where everyone is supposed to be equal in terms of power.

Completions There were several points during the year when Rachel or the group had a clear sense of having completed a task, and these completions were satisfying. The first was the presentation at the December conference. The group celebrated in the hotel lounge, and that evening Rachel wrote, "It's done -- I survived -- in fact -- at least here -- I can say I wasn't half bad -- and I can relax. . . . I think my actions afterwards said it all!! Every now and then my craziness shows." (J-12/12/87)

Two other completions were also presentations, and with each one the level of satisfaction seemed to decrease. After the Board of Education presentation in March³⁶ the

³⁶ See Chapter 6, March 3 -- Board of Education Presentation.

feeling of elation was replaced by one of satisfaction. In her journal she compared the two after-presentation celebrations.

Well, the presentation is over and it went OK but the feeling when it was all finished was anticlimactic. Maybe it was because we didn't have a bar to head to to celebrate . . . maybe -- oh who knows -- but it's over. Maybe it was because it was easier this time so the relief that it was over wasn't as great. I guess I'll never know -- and I guess it went OK. (J-3/2/88)

When she did the Phi Delta Kappa presentation in April, Rachel was alone.³⁷ After the presentation she wrote that she "survived your meeting," and that "as usual, I'm relieved." (J-4/12/88)

The other task Rachel worked on and brought to completion was the proposal of the planning time subcommittee.³⁸ They worked throughout the spring reading, discussing, and visiting other schools to develop a schedule for the school day that would combine their afternoon planning time into a block of time on Wednesday afternoon. The committee of four wrote a detailed, 20-page proposal to be sent to the central administration explaining the benefits of the plan and why this new schedule should replace a seven year old one. When it was finished Rachel wrote, "I also feel good about finishing up the proposal.

³⁷ See Chapter 6, April 12 -- Phi Delta Kappa Presentation.

³⁸ See Chapter 6, April 27 -- Alternative Scheduling Committee -- Joyce Withdraws.

It's good to have at least one thing done." (J-6/1/88)

Stimulation One of the goals of MILP was the renewal of teachers and their practice. Rachel found intellectual stimulation and learning to be a rewarding part of her role. It had been two or three years since she had completed her MA +30 requirements, and while she had no intention of returning to classes, she said, "But you do miss the stimulation. I think this has been a good exposure, a good stimulation, for me." (I-1/28/88) Referring to the work she had done preparing for her December speech and the earlier school-reform conference she said, "So . . . one thing that came out of this [the conference speech] and came out of Minneapolis was that there really is some good research out there and it really is useful." (I-1/28/88) At the end of the year she reconfirmed the value of this. "That's one good thing about being involved in this because it's been a while since I've taken any grad classes. You do need -- to bring new freshness to your job -- you do need renewal sometimes." (I-5/25/88)

Money Mastery in Learning Projects included in their budget money that could be used to make time available by paying for substitute teachers or by compensating teachers for out-of-school work.³⁹ I have described earlier how the group

³⁹ See Chapter 4, Release Time in the section on the Unique Features of MILP.

made some of the decisions about reimbursing themselves for meeting and other work done as a committee, and Rachel was included in those decisions.⁴⁰ In addition to that there were suggestions Rachel also be compensated for the time she put in on the work of being committee chair. This practice was done in some other MILP schools, even going to the extent of providing a release day each month for the Steering Committee chair. At one point Rachel wrote "Terry [a teacher on the Steering Committee] thinks I should put in for reimbursement for all my hours," (J-3/2/88) but she never did request the money.

Rachel appreciated the reimbursement for committee work she received, but she never thought it was necessary. She thought the work she did was part of her professional responsibility as a teacher. Late in the year we talked about this topic in terms of a discussion about compensation for time people were proposing to put in during the summer. A day-long meeting at the home of one of the committee members had been suggested as a way of preparing for the next year. Rachel commented,

Well, I need to say that going out and sitting around a pool somewhere does not constitute working as far as I'm concerned. It's nice and you do get some work done, but you also get a lot of pleasure out of the work. . . . Roy [a teacher on the Steering Committee who acted as treasurer] is right. He's even more adamant about

⁴⁰ See Chapter 6, Release Time, Meeting Schedules, and April 22 -- Decorating for Community Recognition Dinner.

it. I got used to getting paid for these after-school things. But he's the one all along who said, "Now wait a minute." Like decorating for the dinner. "How's this going to look?" That's where his expertise as [an ex-]community [school] director comes in. He has a tendency to look more into the PR aspects of the program than we would and see those pit falls. (I-5/25/88)

From Rachel's prospective money was nice, but it was not a particularly important reward, it was possible to abuse it as a reward, and its use had public relations implications that were important to consider.

Travel The final reward I want to discuss is the opportunity to travel. It is related to some of the others, such as the associations Rachel had because she was able, through the project, to go to conferences. Rachel enjoyed shopping and took pains to point out to the staff when she returned from the conference in Minneapolis⁴¹ that "the conference center was 10 miles from anything," and "I can honestly say I didn't miss a single scheduled session (my shopping was done one night after hours). (L-10/11/87) When she and I were discussing her reasons for continuing in the position for a second year, Rachel referred to the next year's fall conference when she half jokingly said, "Besides, I wanted to go to Washington; I haven't been shopping there yet." (I-5/25/88)

⁴¹ See Chapter 6, October 8 - 11 -- Symposium on School-Based School Reform.

Rachel's travel was also a perquisite that was obvious to others, and she was sensitive to their reactions. In the letter mentioned above she was careful to point out the hours of meetings she attended saying, "The conference ran Thursday through Sunday, and lest you think it was all fun and games, we were in meetings every day from 8:30 - 6:30 (at least) except for Sunday -- that was a light day -- we only met from 9:30 - 12:00. . . . And you will be happy to know that while you were working hard, so was I." (L-10/11/87) In spite of these assurances of her hard work, Rachel got at least one remark from a friend, quoted earlier in the section on cheerleading, that "if the rest of us had been able to go we would be as excited." (I-10/14/87)

Rachel referred twice to having to pay for the trip to Minneapolis. The first time was in a journal entry, quoted earlier, where she wrote about raising issues and having others speak in favor of them. She closed the entry with, "Sometimes I do get frustrated about under the breath comments that I am supposed to verbalize because one of my peers doesn't want to, but I guess they figure I'm paying off my Minneapolis trip. (J-1/11/88) The next month, as the subcommittees began operating, she was overwhelmed by the work load and at the end of a journal entry wrote, "Well enough complaining, but I'm telling you -- I seriously question whether 3 days in Minneapolis was worth this year of _____!!" (J-2/25/88)

The last quote raises the question of whether the rewards outweighed the costs of the position. Already in this chapter there have been several times when Rachel expressed, implicitly or explicitly, concerns about this. Explicitly, in November, shortly after her triumphant confrontation over the December conference program, she found herself again mired in controversy and wrote, "This position is hard work -- and so far the disadvantages outweigh the advantages." (J-11/6/87) April was generally a month of despair for a project that was not going well. Late in the month she wrote, "What good is this doing? I work till I drop and get nothing back." (J-4/27/88) Finally in a May interview we looked back over the year that was ending and forward to the next year when Rachel would again be Steering Committee chair. She was discouraged by the lack of progress during the year and the effort she and the others had expended. "I don't think it gives back enough for the grief you put into it at all. I really don't." I asked then why she had decided to continue and her half-serious response was, "Because I'm a glutton for punishment." She went on to say she did not want to leave the job only partially finished. There were things she hoped to accomplish the next year, but she still questioned the payoff; she questioned whether people in the building and the school system would be able to change enough.

Because it sure isn't worth it. It really isn't. Not in our building. And probably I'll regret doing it. I shouldn't say it's not totally worth

it. You do get the satisfaction of knowing that you have made an effort, and you have seen some changes. And you've had interactions that have changed perspectives -- that kind of stuff. (I-5/25/88)

The question remains, and it brings us back full circle to the beginning of this section on costs and rewards; is it enough change, enough progress, are there enough rewards to offset the costs?

SUMMARY

The view of leadership presented in this chapter differs from the previous one which concentrated on the chronological flow of events. Here I have tried to discuss the year in terms of what people, mainly Rachel, did in order to accomplish the work of MILP. As this work was done in a public arena through new and developing patterns of social interaction, Rachel's journal also provided a look at her private reactions to this.

All of the things Rachel did as a participant in or leader of her school's participation in MILP was founded on her belief in the project's goals and philosophy. She believed in the value of moving the decision-making process as close as possible to the people who will be most affected by the decisions, in other words, making building-level decisions. She knew that this kind of shared decision making would require new patterns of interaction among the people in the school. She learned throughout the year,

however, that these new patterns do not appear with the wave of some reformer's wand.

The members of the Steering Committee, and others on the school staff had to create new ways of interacting in order to conduct the business of MILP. Rachel and her colleagues developed structures for situations as a first step in the long process of cultural change. Some of these were as simple as scheduling meetings at lunch time to impose limits on the amount of discussion. Others drew on existing social norms and applied them in new ways to MILP. Being "Oh, so civilized" allowed people with deep-seated personality conflicts to work together within the group.

Much of what Rachel did was directed at team building. This served several purposes and took on several forms. Like other MILP schools, the Adams staff felt the need to improve communications. In addition to improving the flow of information about the school, Rachel saw the advantage of using it as a team building tool. Conferring with people and spreading information about the project helped minimize the formation of inside and outside groups. Another aspect of team building was spreading ownership of the project. This was done through communications, but it was also done by letting go of the project and turning parts of it over to others. This involved trusting them and was difficult for Rachel. Rachel often found herself in the position of having

to give up something she valued as a way of compromising for the larger good of the group. Finally, she had to learn and relearn the difficult lesson that you can't please everyone.

Rachel did many things as a leader in this project that were in response to the expectations of others. One form of this that developed early in the year was Rachel acting as a spokesperson for issues the group wanted raised. This often put her in the middle of controversial situations.

The position had a variety of costs, physical, social, and emotional that Rachel tried to balance against the position's rewards. The rewards ranged from the obvious ones of travel and stipends paid for after-school work, to psychic rewards that came from completing tasks, and intellectual stimulation. The things Rachel found most rewarding were the people she associated with and the attention and recognition that she received. These last two, however, were causes of concern because of her firm belief in the group nature of the project and the importance of sharing the credit. In the end she decided to remain for a second year as chair in order to finish things she had started, but she was not certain that the rewards offset the costs.

CHAPTER 8 CONCLUSIONS

In this study I have tried to find the types of changes one would expect to find in a teacher during the first year of leadership in a building-level school improvement project. Taking Rachel's comments as a starting point, I used three broad questions:

1. What kinds of changes should we expect to see in a teacher who takes a leadership role outside of the classroom?
2. What are the social tasks of leadership when it is exercised by teachers within the culture of today's public schools?
3. What does this leadership mean to the person involved?

These questions have guided a review of the literature and the analysis of Rachel's journals, the events of the year, and our interviews; and these have provided some insight into the nature of the changes and the process through which they came about. This study has focused on Rachel in her position as Steering Committee chair. It was set in the context of the Adams School staff and community, MILP, and school reform in general; but these served only as background for the story of Rachel's leadership -- they were not the subject of the study. The conclusions presented here continue that focus on Rachel.

In this chapter I will first review briefly the

findings of the study and then address the questions raised at the beginning. Following that, I will highlight some of the interesting connections between the findings and the literature reviewed in Chapters 2 and 3, and at the same time I will discuss some of the implications for change within schools and for future work among researchers and others who are trying to increase our understanding of this change process. There are some other suggestions for additional research that will be discussed, and finally, there are implications for school improvement through changes in current conditions and through the recruitment and preparation of new teachers.

REVIEW OF THE FINDINGS

Before discussing the questions it might be helpful to briefly review the findings. I have presented my report and analysis of this example of teacher leadership in three parts: Rachel, the events, and understanding leadership.

Rachel

The first component is the teacher herself. Rachel's family placed great value on education, and she and her sisters all obtained college degrees in preparation for professional careers, although none of them went outside the careers traditionally thought to be appropriate for women in the 1960's. She earned a BA in sociology and education, and

an MA in early childhood education. Rachel continued her education with computer science and special education courses until she had completed 30 hours past her master's degree. She said, however, she learned more about teaching during a semester of substituting than in the first four years of courses.

Rachel has strong feelings about the importance of teaching as a career to which she was dedicated. She planned to teach throughout her professional life. She began her teaching career optimistic that she would "save the world," (I-10/14/87) but was confronted with the realities of inner city schools. Over the next 15 years she developed what she thought was a healthy cynicism about non-teaching aspects of public education, but she continued to believe that teachers play an important role in the lives of students; she took the accompanying responsibility very seriously.

Rachel was active within the staff of her school, but she had not taken a leadership position before. She pressed for change, and she was always willing to be involved in pilot projects or other special programs. The school's principal encouraged that kind of participation on the part of the Adams staff. As Rachel combined her dedication to teaching with her new leadership role in this project, she was determined to continue providing the best program,

including new art activities, for her students.

Events

The second component of the findings is the major MILP events of the school year. These provide the context within which Rachel's leadership took place. This chronology of events showed Rachel, Dr. Haslett, the Steering Committee, and the rest of the staff moving through a series of events, many of which involved differences of opinion or tension among the participants as they dealt with new issues and developed new ways of working together. They began with a complete analysis of their school as it began its participation in MILP. As a part of that process they developed seven topics of concern that served as the project's initial goals. At the same time they prepared a presentation for a state-wide conference in December and determined who would participate. This proved to be much more difficult than had been anticipated.

After the holidays the Steering Committee was ready to present their report and suggestions to the Adams School staff. The staff members were generally supportive and joined subcommittees established to address the objectives the committee had identified. Management of the project became more complex, and the Steering Committee had to reconsider its function in relation to the new subcommittees that had been formed. They also established procedures to

guide the operation of the project. The operation of the subcommittees and two presentations Rachel made during the spring presented challenges and tensions with which she had to deal.

Understanding Leadership

The third component of the findings is an analysis of Rachel's reaction to her involvement in these events. Her dedication to the philosophy and goals of MILP formed the basis of what she did as a leader, and it sustained her through many of the conflicts she dealt with as a leader. There was, however, a period of time when this dedication was not sufficient. She had to reevaluate her hopes for what the project would actually accomplish and realize that the project would not accomplish the types of change she had envisioned. This dedication to MILP was always present, but its most visible form was what Rachel called cheerleading. She spent a great deal of her time and energy talking to people about the benefits of the project and encouraging their participation.

The people involved in the project developed a number of new routines, roles, or patterns of interaction to allow them to complete the work of the project. There was no history of a formal teacher leader in this group, nor had they, as a group, had experience identifying concerns within their building and developing solutions. As was true with

other aspects of the leadership role, these new routines were socially constructed by the people participating in a situation in order to meet their need to accomplish some set of tasks.

Team building was an important part of Rachel's leadership role, and it took on several forms. The first was improving communications, which was also identified as an objective by at least half of the other MILP schools. She worked at keeping all of the staff informed about MILP activities as a way of avoiding the formation of "insider" and "outsider" groups. She also worked at developing a new pattern of communications with Dr. Haslett, the principal. In the past their relationship had been one of teacher and supervisor, but now they added a relationship that was, in MILP's philosophy, supposed to be more collegial.

Another aspect of communications as part of team building was conferring with others. Rachel seldom made decisions without discussing the options with others. This was especially true at the beginning of the year; as the year progressed she relied less on others. Throughout the year, however, she recognized the value of widely discussing issues and incorporating as many views as possible in the decision-making process. This helped build the MILP team while, at the same time, improving the quality of decisions.

As the project became larger and more complex, Rachel had to watch more people taking over tasks that she had been doing. This was necessary as a part of increasing participation, but also because the project activities were growing beyond the capacity of one individual. This process of delegating and then letting go of large portions of the project was difficult for Rachel. She had to become confident that people would do the things they agreed to do. More than that, however, she had to learn to accept things as they were done by other people. Sometimes that meant accepting final outcomes that were different than she had originally envisioned.

Finally, Rachel found that no matter how much she compromised, no matter how much she tried to see things from other people's perspectives, no matter how much she gave up her views for the good of the group there were times when she simply could not please everyone. This realization was difficult from a personal perspective and also from an organizational perspective because she wanted as much staff involvement as possible.

All of this change and the process of becoming a leader were accompanied by costs and rewards. The costs were personal, involving Rachel's health, self-confidence, and relations with her friends. The rewards were both personal and material. The ones Rachel talked about the most and

found the most valuable were psychic rewards related to relations with other people and intellectual stimulation. She also found the travel opportunities of MILP rewarding, but questioned whether or not they were sufficient to offset the amount of difficulty involved in the position.

ADDRESSING THE QUESTIONS

The three guiding questions are broad questions about a complex social situation. They lend themselves more to developing an understanding of the situation than they do to specific answers that can be presented in a single paragraph or two. For that matter, any attempt to reduce a social situation like the one studied here to text results in over simplification and over generalization through the elimination of details of the situation that are important. With that in mind, I would like to draw some connections between these questions and the findings of the study.

It is possible to break the field of teacher leadership into three broad areas that overlap somewhat and interact with each other. The first area contains the tasks leaders perform and the philosophy of leadership. The second area is the cultural and historical context within which these tasks are performed. The third area is the personal meaning that each individual brings to the situation. The three questions about leadership that come from Rachel's comments

about change, or lack of it, during her first year as Steering Committee chair generally parallel these divisions. The first question concerns changes that we would expect to see in the new leader, and here we can look at the visible aspects of Rachel's leadership, which are founded upon her philosophy. The second area concerns the cultural context and if we extend that to include changes within the social group, or culture, in the school it is similar to the second question which is about the social tasks of leadership in the culture of public schools. Finally, the third area of concern is about personal meaning, and this is also the topic of the third question.

Rachel's leadership was visible first as an expression of her dedication to the philosophy and goals of MILP. She referred to this as cheerleading, and it took up a great deal of her time and energy. A second visible change involved the tasks of chairing the Steering Committee such as running meetings, preparing agendas, writing proposals, meeting with people, and giving speeches. Rachel improved her personal organization as she worked at managing the demands of the position which were added to her other personal and professional responsibilities. She was especially serious about fulfilling her professional responsibilities to her students. In order to continue to provide the best possible kindergarten experience for them, she had to do more preparation work at home because so much

of her time at school was devoted to the activities of MILP.

The activities of leadership also had a less visible side that involved working with people within the culture of the school. These are some of the social tasks of leadership alluded to in the second question. The activities were often visible, but there was, at the same time, another layer of activity that was not as visible. This involved the social arrangements among the school which were changing as a result of people's participation in MILP. Many of Rachel's efforts at team building were visible, at least in terms of what she said and did during meeting or other public events. The actual goal of the activity, however, was not so readily visible. To increase involvement in MILP, she did such things as work at improving communications between herself and other groups and individuals in the building and also among various groups inside and outside the building. She worked at spreading ownership and sharing credit as a way of reducing the likelihood of that "insider" and "outsider" groups would form. Team building was one of the things Rachel did to change the cultural norms of the social groups within the school. She wanted to increase their professional, collegial interaction, and their participation in the project as a way of focussing attention on school issues.

Another set of social tasks Rachel performed, often

intuitively rather than consciously, as a teacher leader was the development of new patterns of behavior within the staff. This was visible during the fall when it took the form of discussions about "Madame Chairman" and other techniques to accomplish the tasks of the Steering Committee within social contexts for which they had not developed patterns of behavior. These patterns of behavior became routines, and, eventually, several of them evolved into the group's norms for appropriate behavior. At the end of the year Rachel commented that the group had become very good at conducting meetings. This was because they had developed over the year a pattern of behavior that eliminated most of the tension and conflict they had dealt with in the fall. These social tasks related to the development of new norms were carried out, generally implicitly, with individuals or groups of people on the staff.

The third question concerns the meaning of leadership to the individual involved. This is also related to the third concern which can be seen as the individual's interaction with social groups and his or her reaction to that interaction. This personal meaning of leadership is, perhaps, the most difficult aspect to fully understand and describe. That is partly because it is the least visible, requiring a great deal of inference and interpretation. It is also the aspect most likely to change quickly. There were days when was helping her colleagues move toward an

improved school for the students and themselves. There were other days, however, when leadership meant fighting battles or running from meeting to meeting.

Perhaps the most important thing to learn about the individual's meaning of leadership is that it is, indeed, individual, and it cannot be generalized. It is found in at least two places: the individual's understanding of the philosophic foundation of the program, and in the day-to-day interactions with the other people involved with the program. Rachel's meaning was constructed through the interaction of her dedication to her students and their education, her understanding of and commitment to the philosophy of MILP, her current and historical relations with the people on the Adams staff, and the events of the day. The following quotes, taken from journals across the year hint at these components and show the variety meanings:

"And leadership -- what a joke -- all it means is that I get to fight everyone's battles for them" (J-10/22/87)

"I think maybe that's what being a leader is -- thinking about others as well as yourself." (J-10/30/87)

"Leadership is tiring -- someone always wants something even when you're busy." (J-10/30/87)

"No leader feelings today -- just tired teacher." (J-11/4/87)

"Being chair is being problem solver and buffer -- this week not a pleasant task." (J-11/5/87)

"Being a leader is lonely . . ." (J-11/9-13/87)

"Maybe that's part of leadership -- learning to talk and listen." (J-11/9-13/87)

"We're changing. I am changing. It's working. . . . I am beginning just a little to feel like a leader -- and I kind of like it -- with reservations." (J-1/6/88)

"It seems I'm always running off to a meeting." (J-2/8/88)

"Maybe I am becoming a teacher leader - whatever that is." (J-2/9/88)

"Today I feel radical, rebellious, and the need to stand up and demand recognition." (J-3/9/88)

RELATING THE FINDINGS TO THE LITERATURE, TO CHANGE WITHIN SCHOOLS, AND TO FUTURE WORK

In this section I will continue using the three components of leadership introduced in the previous section: the philosophy and visible activities, the social and cultural context within which the leadership operates, and the personal meanings of leadership. In the literature reviewed in Chapters 2 and 3, there is information about leadership tasks and philosophy, about contextual factors, and about how they all interact. The topic of personal meaning and its interactions with philosophy and context is not, unfortunately, as well described by the literature. In this section I will highlight some of the connections between the findings of this study and the literature that

provided the background for the study. In some cases these are examples of topics raised in the literature, and other cases go beyond the literature or fill in some missing details in the literature. In addition to relating these findings of this study to what is already known, I will draw some implications for those of us who are interested in changes in schools and offer suggestions for continuing work toward a better understanding of some of these leadership topics.

Leadership Topics

Rachel's experience provides examples of several leadership topics identified in the literature.

Philosophy and Commitment Hodgkinson (1983) referred to leadership as philosophy put into action. All of what Rachel did as a teacher leader was based on her dedication to the philosophy and goals of MILP. The democratic, egalitarian ideal of MILP and its goal of teacher empowerment directed her decisions about the organization and operation of the project within Adams School. Hodgkinson also criticized current research on leadership because it generally ignored the phenomenon of commitment. Rachel's journal offers an opportunity to study the effect of commitment on what she did as a leader.

In the past, reformers have brought issues they wanted

addressed by schools to teachers and attempted to develop within the teachers a sense of ownership that would lead, they hoped, to some sort of commitment. We have seen with Rachel that this commitment is crucial for several reasons, but I would question the extent to which teachers can be manipulated by outside reformers to develop the level of commitment Rachel needed to sustain her during this project. Even Rachel's attempts to spread ownership in MILP were not always enthusiastically received by her colleagues.

It would be interesting to study the types of issues to which teachers become committed. This would have to be done within situations that encouraged them to participate in activities of their own choosing that went beyond their immediate classroom responsibilities. This line of inquiry should be pursued to determine natural avenues for the improvement of teaching and learning rather than to develop more effective methods for reformers to use in manipulating teachers.

Types of Leadership A second leadership topic is the type of leadership Rachel used. Hodgkinson (1983) identified the politician as one of four types of leaders. The politician replaces his or her own self-interest with a genuine interest in the group's well-being. Rachel's leadership had many of the politician's characteristics, and it gives us an example of that type of leadership played out in the context

of teacher leadership in a public school. We often saw this in Rachel's leadership in the form of compromising and giving up her position for the larger good of the group. In her efforts at team building, especially through spreading ownership and sharing credit, she was genuinely trying to form a participatory democracy. She was an early advocate of including representatives of all parts of the Adams School staff and community on the Steering Committee, and she constantly looked for ways of increasing active participation by individuals and groups within the school.

The philosophy of MILP is in line with a Theory Y form of leadership, that people are generally good and will, if left to their own devices, do the right things. Rachel believed that was true and saw it as an important part of MILP's goal of empowering teachers, but, unfortunately, life does not always work out in these neat analytic categories. While Rachel was committed to the philosophy and goals of MILP, she had trouble trusting her colleagues to do the things they said they would do in the way she anticipated they should be done. It should be emphasized here that this was not a matter of trusting them personally; Rachel did not doubt the honesty or integrity of any of the staff. It was closer to a Theory X view of management that emphasizes the importance of supervising workers to ensure they complete tasks correctly.

This dilemma for Rachel was most clearly seen in the section on delegating, trusting, and letting go. Letting go is a topic raised by Murphy (1988) as part of what he called the unheroic side of leadership. He writes that leaders often find themselves in positions where the demands on their time and energy require they let go of parts of their job, and they are forced to live with the result. He does not, however, mention the trust involved in letting go. Perhaps he does not see it as a matter of trust but only as a matter of coping with the results of having let go under less than perfect circumstances.

The problem of supervision, trust, and letting go may be somewhat different for teachers because of the nature of their work. Teachers are accustomed to being completely in control in their classrooms and to being the person who sets and enforces the standards to which work will be done. It would be interesting to study how these characteristics of teachers' work interact with the patterns of behavior that are needed for the operation of school-wide, cooperative efforts such as MILP.

This dilemma of control versus letting go, Theory X versus Theory Y, is also an example of the danger of using generalized analytic categories to describe people operating in the real world. We see aspects of each at work within Rachel's leadership and her personal understanding of that

leadership. Although these categories may be limited in their ability to fully describe a real leader's behavior, they can alert us to a possible internal conflict for teacher leaders.

Teachers' Careers and Rewards Issues

In its philosophy and organization, MILP is similar to the model of teachers' career satisfaction coming through personal, professional growth (Delvany, & Sykes, 1988) rather than the model of career advancement through some sort of hierarchy. Rachel's position as chair of the Steering Committee was more a management responsibility than a form of promotion to some kind of supervisory position. Career ladder plans might have a position similar to Rachel's, but in those plans there would generally be an accompanying monetary reward or release time from teaching responsibilities.

The rewards that were the most important to Rachel involved interactions with other professionals and the intellectual stimulation that those interactions often included. She also appreciated being in situations where she and MILP were the center of attention. This kind of recognition was more rewarding than financial incentives. That is not to say that Rachel did not appreciate the money she received for after-school work or the opportunities to travel that came with the position, but she questioned

whether they were adequate compensation for her troubles.

This apparent devaluing of rewards related to money may be partly explained by her current financial condition. Her salary was over \$40,000 per year, and her husband was also receiving an above-average salary. They had gone through a period of financial difficulty, but now they had what they felt was a very adequate income. Although I understand the motivating power of money in the United States culture, I expect the reward value of stipends will continue to decline as teachers' salaries move higher. The topic of what teachers find rewarding is well worth pursuing. It may be that we are using the wrong carrot to encourage teachers to change their practice. Reconsideration of the reward structure, of course, is woven into considerations about the nature of teachers' careers.

Related to this discussion of the nature of teachers' careers is the focus on teaching that was raised in the literature. Rachel referred to it as being Super Teacher, her insistence that being chair would not affect her providing the best kindergarten program for her students. For most teachers, any expanded role will need to involve work that is in the service of teaching and minimizes the amount of time and energy that is diverted from their classroom focus. Rachel had turned down an opportunity to be the district's kindergarten coordinator because it would

take her away from the classroom too much.

School Reform Issues

Several authors call for viewing schools as ecosystems and emphasize the importance of working within the culture of the school when making changes. The results of this study support both of those ideas. The findings, however, go beyond demonstrating the importance of culture, and they describe the meaning that individuals construct as they live and work within the culture. This is important because it is the people enacting the culture who will have to change it. This study gives us some insight into how some of those cultural patterns of interaction are changed. With routines like "Madame Chairman," the group developed new, temporary roles or patterns of behavior that allowed them to experiment and find new ways of interacting as they worked on the tasks of MILP.

As we continue to think about ways of changing the relations among the people within schools and also changing their relations with others outside schools, it will be helpful to watch for opportunities to establish similar new roles that will assist in the formation of a new etiquette within the school community. The nature of this etiquette and ways of helping teachers and an expanded school community develop a new etiquette are important topics of inquiry for those of us interested in improving schools.

This brings us to the topic of school restructuring, a popular topic currently. This study points to some of the difficulties of restructuring the relationships within school communities. There are the issues of etiquette, the school culture, the school system and its inertia, and the larger culture within which the school exists. To further complicate matters, this study has only considered the perspective of a teacher. The entire situation would be quite different if viewed from the perspective of the building principal, and different again from the perspective of district-level administrators.

For efforts at restructuring to go beyond minor adjustments in the present system, I expect they will first have to attend to these issues of culture and etiquette. At Adams School this took time and patience for all concerned. As teachers became empowered to discuss issues of concern and make decisions regarding those issues, conflicts and tensions surfaced that the group had not dealt with previously. New patterns of interaction, new forums for discussion, and new support systems for change are called for in these situations. Because schools are, indeed, ecosystems these patterns, forums, and support systems will have to involve all the people in the school system, not just one or two groups.

ADDITIONAL RESEARCH

In addition to the inquiries discussed above, there are other studies suggested by the results of this one. First, there are other ways of analyzing the events of this first year and Rachel's reaction to them. One of my colleagues has been interested in an analysis based on changes in power relationships. The power relationships that exist between teachers and administrators are obvious topics of study, but the power relationships within the building staff and between the teachers and their union would also be well worth investigating.

Related to that would be a study of both the teacher leader and the principal in a school. There are a number of possible variations in the attitudes these people have toward changing to a more collegial environment and in the level of encouragement and support given by the central administration. I would think this study would be difficult for a single person to conduct, especially if the participants were not both enthusiastic about the proposed change. Negotiating access and establishing trust with both the parties might be difficult.

Another important study would be to see how wide spread these findings are among other MILP Steering Committee chairs and among leaders in similar projects. Based on the parallels between Rachel's experiences and the literature I

reviewed, I would expect to see similarities in other situations. But, a focus on individual meaning will, of course, product variations.

I would like to further develop the idea of etiquette as a way of thinking about the relationships within the school as they develop into centers of inquiry for everyone involved. I am especially interested in this in situations when the school community is expanded to include people from higher education or from the community. I am also interested in how we can best introduce prospective teachers and beginning teachers to this etiquette.

IMPLICATIONS

This study has implications for schools that want to change the roles teachers play. These include institutional and interpersonal arrangements and other types of support, including personal, needed by these teachers.

School Improvement & Professional Development

It may be that schools will eventually evolve to a structure in which teachers move easily into expanded roles and the situations Rachel encountered. But, for people who are interested in hastening that process, there are some things that might be helpful. To the extent existing school cultures resemble Adams', there will have to be periods of

adjustment for staff as they go through a learning process. For the people on the Steering Committee at Adams this process took the entire first year of the project. This could be shortened, and made less traumatic, by providing inservice education on such topics as organizational development, conflict resolution, effective communications, and negotiation. These should be designed to help people see their roles within the school differently, adapt to the new demands of these changed roles, and be tolerant of other people who are also trying to adapt to new roles. In April Rachel commented about this when she wrote, "We -- meaning participants -- need training in interaction. I guess it's like I said [at the December conference] -- we are not asked to have team skills as teachers, but in the new role as team members, we need them." (J-4/13/88)

For the most part, Adams School staff members felt they had no experience -- or at least none that seemed relevant -- for the collegial interaction needed to make MILP work. They were good at working on tasks assigned to them in the way administrators often assign tasks to teachers, but they had difficulties when asked to develop their own questions and procedures, which involved accommodating varying points of view and prioritizing values. This was, of course, complicated by the lack of a history of this kind of interaction. Because each of the active staff members was involved in the process of developing new patterns of

interaction, it is important that training and support be provided for all of them, not just the leaders. This, of course, does not necessarily mean that everyone needs, or would benefit from, the same training. Activities should be tailored to fit individual needs, interests, and abilities.

Teacher Recruitment and Preparation

Another way to bring about changes in schools is by changing the people who enter the teaching profession, both by recruiting different people and by providing different experiences during their preparation. As teachers' roles are expanded to include activities beyond classroom management and instruction, people can be recruited into the teaching profession who have talents and interests in working with adults as well as children. Teacher preparation programs should include students spending time in schools where teachers are interacting in the ways envisioned by MILP and other programs (Holmes Group, 1990).

Other Forms of Support

Collegial work among teachers will require new forms of support both during its formative stages and when it matures into the norm for teachers' work.

Institutional School buildings and districts that want to change teachers' jobs need to know this will require structural changes within the institution that range from providing more time and incentives for participation to such mundane things as clerical help to duplicate meeting agendas.

Rachel often wrote of the need for additional time for the activities of leadership. MILP does provide funds for release time, but many other projects do not. But even when release time is available, substitute teachers, unfortunately, do not provide the best solution. Something needs to be done to work out problems of instructional continuity caused by frequent use of substitutes. This problem is just part of the teachers' focus on instructional matters, which has been mentioned a number of times before. I suspect this is an issue that we are just beginning to understand, and it will take some time before we work out all its implications.

My analysis of what Rachel found rewarding implies sweeping changes in the reward structure of teaching. We need to provide opportunities for teachers to associate with other educators and, the literature suggests (Bennet, 1985), with professionals outside of education. In response to Rachel's need for, and at other times appreciation of, the attention that came with her leadership position, the

incentives for doing this must be increased by school districts, as well as within the informal culture of school buildings. It will not be easy to establish policies for rewarding the type of effort MILP eventually envisions teachers making. Because MILP calls for more teacher autonomy, judging what teachers are doing, and making comparisons among teachers, will become more difficult and will be more open to the perception of inequality.

Clerical Technical support in the form of typing, paperwork assistance, duplication, etc. would have eased the strain Rachel felt. She had to spend a fair amount of time learning how the "system" of the school district worked, and much of this could be handled by competent secretarial or clerical help. This is, of course, true of many tasks teachers are expected to do.

Personal

There may not, I fear, be much we can do here beyond trying to remove frustration through improvements in the institutional and interpersonal areas. Teachers will always be concerned when time and energy are diverted from their classrooms. There are institutional arrangements that can be made to minimize or eliminate that such as different school calendars or scheduling arrangements, or creative team teaching arrangements. But even those will not address all of the personal effects Rachel reported. In the best of

schools, teaching will be hard work involving ambiguity, risk, and change.

I think perhaps the best we can do is prepare teachers with the managerial and interpersonal skills they need, provide on-going support, and develop a culture in which collegiality, risk taking, and change are encouraged and rewarded. Change is never easy, it always creates stress in the personal life. But if we are all aware of its existence, and we develop an understanding of how it runs its course; it will be much easier to learn, as Rachel did, that "this too will pass."

EPILOGUE

Much has happened between June, 1988 and the completion of this dissertation. Some of it can bring closure to events that were on-going in 1988, while other things show that, no matter what we do, life goes on. Finally, the passage of time has given Rachel and me additional insights into the events of 1987-88 and their meanings. I would like to close this report with a brief update on the activities of Adams School and MILP and Rachel's ideas about teaching, leadership, and school reform.

ADAMS SCHOOL AND MILP

Rachel decided to remain as chair of the Steering Committee for Adams' second year in MILP. There was little or no opposition to this among members of the Steering Committee. The second year was smoother than the first. There was less tension, more cooperation, and fewer crises. People seemed to be more comfortable in their roles. Some of the teachers who were not involved during the first year decided to join committees or study groups and take active leadership roles, at least in terms of the institutional issues. Some of the people who, during the first year, raised concerns about issues of fairness and equity became less active, and less vocal, during the second year.

Finally, active teachers were looking more deeply into the complexities of the issues they began investigating last year. For example, the group trying to increase the instructional use of computers understood that although making machines and parent-volunteers available for teachers was a valuable first step, they needed to address problems of curriculum integration before computers would have a large impact on instruction.

At the beginning of the 1989-90 school year Adams School joined a site-based decision making program sponsored by the local district. The staff has maintained its connection with MILP and has converted the existing MILP structure to accommodate the site-base decision making structure. They are continuing to pursue the request for rescheduling planning time so that students will be dismissed at lunch time on Wednesdays. Although three other schools in the system have adopted similar schedules, the Adams proposal has not been approved.

The Mastery in Learning Project has now been merged with a number of other National Education Association projects to form the NEA National Center for Innovation, which is leading the development of learning communities through the design, implementation, and support of experimental school restructuring projects. Building on the experience of MILP, the center has projects at the program

level such as efforts in critical thinking and improving mathematics instruction, as well as building-level, district-level, and higher education projects.

RACHEL

In order to complete Rachel's story, I visited with her recently, and we discussed what she has done since the end of the second year of MILP. We also used the advantage of hindsight to discuss what MILP accomplished and her current thinking about the potential for school reform and the challenges it faces.

Teaching

At the end of the 1988-89 school year, Dr Haslett told Rachel that due to declining enrollments there would be only one full-time kindergarten position at Adams School the next year, and because of seniority he would have to give it to another teacher. He was not certain what position would be available for her at the school, and she requested a transfer to another school where she could teach kindergarten. Two days before the 1989-90 school year started, she was called to teach kindergarten at Langdon school. After a half year of kindergarten she was moved to the building's new pre-K program, "and I love it!" (I-11/4/90) The person who replaced her at Adams school is teaching kindergarten in the morning and sixth grade in the

afternoon.

By the spring of the 1989-90 school year "I got real bored. The slow down was too much. It really bothered me. I really missed being involved. I'm involved at Langdon, but it's different. . . . I was on a couple committees . . . and, as I said, in the spring I got kind of restless. So this year I decided I needed to do a little more." (I-11/4/90) She became involved in a pilot program for pre-K that the district is doing, and became one of a group of teachers trained by the NEA to act as consultants for schools involved in reform efforts.

The assistant principal called me and asked me to be involved with effective schools. So now I'm going to go to a meeting each month for that as well as for [the pre-K program]. And I'm chairperson of the social committee and I'm on the Langdon Magnet School committee, and now I'm back to being involved again. . . . Apparently, it's not going to be enough for me just to teach. I'm going to have to be involved. (I-11/4/90)

MILP Results

We also discussed Rachel's thoughts on a number of topics related to school reform and her experience with MILP. Some of these have become clearer to her now that she is out of Adams School and some time has passed since her involvement with the project. Much of her time and energy devoted to the project during the first two years was spent on organizational issues and on determining the roles people would play. This report describes some of the conflicts

within the staff and Rachel's efforts at resolving them. These and other conflicts continued into the project's second year, and they kept people's attention focused on organizational and procedural concerns. There was little time or energy to address concerns such as classroom organization or instruction.

The project had broadened communication among the staff through committee participation and by raising issues for debate. It had increased the school's communication with the community through a monthly newsletter it published and distributed to the entire Adams School community. Looking back, however, it seemed that the project had accomplished little.

That's so sad. [We spent two years] putting out a news letter and writing a single proposal [for planning time which still has not been approved]. . . . That's the hardest thing for me about the whole thing. We fought so hard and worked so hard and went through so much turmoil and accomplished nothing. That's really hard to admit, that in two years we accomplished nothing. Some people will admit that at least after two years the staff started talking. The staff didn't just roll over when they were told to do this or that. But that really was the only thing we accomplished. That is really hard for me to admit. I'm a real product oriented person, and I had no product to show. (I-11/4/90)

The experience Rachel had in MILP has given her some insights into school reform from the perspective of a classroom teacher. Looking back over three years of involvement, she is struck by the difficulty of changing the

patterns of interaction between teachers and administrators, especially in elementary schools. Earlier in this study she commented about the difficulty of changing a system in which one group has become accustomed to giving directions and another group has become accustomed to taking directions. Her experiences since the 1987-88 school year have reinforced her belief that without change in these interactions school reform will be superficial, that these patterns of interaction have developed over long periods of time and will not change quickly or easily. "It's easier to keep on going the way you are." (I-11/4/90)

Power and Influence

If significant change is to come about in schools and teaching, "it is going to have to be [at the] grassroots level." (I-11/4/90) This grassroots change would come through teachers who feel they have the power to become involved in changing their classrooms and their schools.

Involvement in the project built my confidence level to the point that I see [that] instead of sitting in my classroom and saying that we need to make changes, I see that if those changes are going to be made we have to go out there and do it. Mastery in Learning showed me that teachers can have power if they choose to take it. We would have influence if we choose to take it. . . . But, if I sit in my classroom and wait for someone to make those changes for me, they're not going to happen. . . . I think the project focused me, it gave me some direction, and I don't think I realized that until I got out of the project. . . . I think I've gotten more vocal because of the confidence I've built [through participation in MILP]. (I-11/4/90)

Rachel reiterated that the power she was referring to was not the power to give directions to others, but rather the feeling of power that she gets when people listen to her and take her ideas seriously.

There's a real enjoyment in having the power. Not the power to tell people what to do. . . . The power that comes from having people listen to you. The power that comes from having people say you really are an intelligent professional who knows what you're talking about. The power that comes from having influence. That feeling that came the first time I went in and sat with the little "in group" in Minneapolis with Bob and Sylvia [MILP director and assistant director] and the others. And I realized these are important people who are listening to what I have to say. . . . I think the power is an important part of it. . . .

Because you're in the forefront and you're doing these things. People recognizing you and your ability. It's real nice; I can say that! . . . But I'm still not comfortable telling people what to do. That's why I wouldn't consider going into administration.

Gender

Rachel sees the difficulty of teachers having the power of influence over school decisions and changing the patterns of interactions with administrators as related to gender. At the elementary school level, she sees the continuation of a tradition of men in administrative positions and women in teaching positions working together in a way that perpetuates many of the problems of teaching in elementary schools.

It's still male dominated. Women are still considered baby sitters at the elementary level. . . . That gets you into the paternalism thing with [elementary principals]. . . .

I don't think you are going to see school

reform truly implemented at the elementary level until . . . we stop behaving as ladies and we start behaving as professionals. . . . At the elementary level women make do. And that's the problem; we've made do for too long. . . .

I think that is part of the problem of school reform, at least on the elementary level. We have to break down all these little social barriers that have been built up. The man is the principal, and he tells the staff what to do because he knows what's best -- let's go back to "Father Knows Best." . . .

I think part of the problem is that nobody -
- at the local level, at the national level, at the college level -- listens to teachers because they're still seen as a female profession. (I-

11/4/90)

MY THOUGHTS NOW THAT IT IS OVER

As this project draws to a close there are four points I would like to make as a way of summarizing what I have learned in the process. The first three relate to school reform, and I offer these comments fully aware of the fact that in doing so I am oversimplifying extremely complex situations. The third has to do with the personal difficulty of doing this research.

First, the situation at Adams School demonstrated the importance of involvement and leadership by both the administration and teachers, including the union, in order to make significant change. That leadership for change probably implies a certain level of dissatisfaction with the current situation or at least a feeling that some aspects of

the school could stand to be improved. Too often there is leadership at the administrative level for change in some aspect of school or teaching, or there is a concern among teachers about aspects of the school and instruction, but these two, differing concerns each remain unmet. Leadership and concern from both sides is necessary, and a consensus must be formed early on about the broad outlines of the change effort.

This support for change has to include a broader view of the nature of teachers' work than is often the case now - - a view of teaching that is often formalized in the teachers' contract. The assignment of teachers, for example, must be made on the basis of more than just covering classes with a person who has the proper credentials. Teachers and administrators should continue to see classroom practice as the center of teachers' careers, but this has to be combined with opportunities within buildings and districts for long-term growth and the development of collegial relationships. Reassignments such as Rachel's that are based solely on seniority and contractual enrollment limits raise questions about the best criteria to use when assigning teachers and students to classrooms.

The second point about school reform is the difficulty of moving past a consensus about the necessity of change and

actually making changes in the culture of schools, the norms of interaction, and the personal and professional lives of teachers and administrators. The only significant, long-term change in schools and teaching and learning is change that is made at this level. These are changes that involve norms that have been developed within the school and the surrounding community over long periods of time, and they cannot be changed quickly or easily. This is not to say, however, that there will be universal resistance to these changes. Too often when we discuss this difficulty we imply a sort of homogeneity among teachers and administrators that is not accurate. The difficulty of change may be consistent, but there is great variation in individual's willingness to attempt change, deal with ambiguity, and take risks.

The third point has to do with power and gender relations in elementary schools, especially at the lower elementary level. My experience at Adams School, and in other elementary schools, leads me to agree with Rachel's assessment of the position of women and support her call for change. I know there are many schools that do not fit the traditional pattern Rachel described, but there are far too many situations in which that is the case. As we rethink the roles of teachers we need to work aggressively at removing the subtle, and not so subtle, barriers that women in elementary school face as they attempt to increase the

]

influence they have in school decisions and in shaping their own professional lives.

The final point has to do with the personal difficulty of this study. Rachel and I both found it painful to revisit the 1987-88 school year. It had been a period of tension and conflict, and looking at it again in this distilled version brought back much of the frustration we had both felt during that year. As Rachel said early in our last interview, "I think you did a great job. . . . It outlines pretty well what I went through. In some places a little too well. . . . I think it was painful for you to write, it was painful for me to read, it was painful for both of us to live through." (I-11/4/90)

One should not take lightly the problems related to looking this closely at one's own situation. Nor should one take lightly the act of putting someone else in the position of having to look at themselves this way. I believe I have told an important story in this paper and have done it accurately, but there are many others stories in the 1987-88 school year that will go untold. I have learned a lot in the process, but I expect it will be quite a while before I put myself and a friend into the position of having to relive an experience like this.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

- American Educational Research Association (1988). Annual Conference Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.
- American Educational Research Association (1989). Annual Conference Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.
- American Educational Research Association (1990). Annual Conference Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.
- Bennet, C. (1985). Paints, post or promotion? Art teachers' attitudes toward their careers. In S. J. Ball & I. F. Boodson (Eds.), Teachers' lives and careers (pp. 120-137). London: Falmer Press.
- Bennett, W. J. (1988). Sex and the education of our children. Curriculum Review 27(3), 7-12.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Blackman C. (1989). Issues in professional development: The continuing agenda. In M. L. Holly & C. S. Mcloughlin (Eds.), Perspectives on teacher professional development (pp. 1-15). London: Falmer Press.
- Blackman, C., & Hatfield, R. (1988, November). Professional empowerment and leadership for educators. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of States on In-Service Education, New Orleans.
- Brickley, D, & Westerberg, T. (1990). Restructuring a comprehensive high school. Educational Leadership, 47(7), 28-31.
- Campbell, D. (1988). Collaboration and contradiction in a research and staff development project. Teachers College Record, 90(1), 99-121.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century: A report of the task force on teaching as a profession. New York: Carnegie Foundation.

- Castle, S. (1988, April). Empowering teachers through knowledge. A paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Cawelti, G. (1989). Key elements of site-based management. Educational Leadership, 46(8), 46.
- Conley, S. C., & Bacharach, S. B. (1990). From school-site management to participatory school-site management. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 539-544.
- Cornett, L. M. (1985). Trends and emerging issues in career ladder plans. Educational Leadership, 43(3), 6-10.
- Cuban, L. (1986). Teachers and machines: The classroom use of technology since 1920. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, and again. Educational Researcher, 19(1), 3-13.
- Devaney, K. (1987). The lead teacher: Ways to begin. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.
- Devaney K., & Sykes, G. (1988). Making the case for professionalism. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools (pp. 3-22). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Diercks, K., Dillard, S., McElliott, K., Morgan, J., Schultz, B., Tipps, L., & Wallentine, K. (1988). Teacher leadership: Commitment and challenge. Seattle: Medina Group Project, Puget Sound Educational Consortium, University of Washington.
- Edmonds, R. R. (1983). An overview of school improvement programs (O.P. 67). East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.
- Eisner, E. W. (1981). On the differences between scientific and artistic approaches to qualitative research. Educational Researcher, 10(4), 5-9.
- Eisner, E. W. (1988). The ecology of school improvement. Educational Leadership, 45(5), 24-29.
- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching, third edition (pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillian.

- Feiman-Nemser, S. & Floden, R. (1986). The cultures of teaching. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching, third edition (pp. 505-526). New York: Macmillian.
- Futrell, M. H. (1986). Restructuring teaching: A call for research. Educational Researcher, 15(10), 5-8.
- Futrell, M. H. (1989). Mission not accomplished: Education reform in retrospect. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(1), 8-14.
- Geisert, G. (1988). Participatory management: Panacea or hoax? Educational Leadership, 46(3), 56-59.
- Getzels, J. W., & Thelen, H. A. (1971). The classroom group as a unique social system. In A. H. Yee (Ed.) Social interaction in educational settings (pp. 6-25). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Goodlad, J. (1987). Structure, process, and an agenda. In J. Goodlad (Ed.), The ecology of school renewal Eighty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 1-19). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (1987). Change in schools: Facilitating the process. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hawley, R. A. (1987). Schoolchildren and drugs: The fancy that has not passed. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(9), K1-K8.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1983). The Philosophy of Leadership. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher Limited.
- Holmes Group (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.
- Holmes Group (1990). Tomorrow's schools: Principals for the design of professional schools: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.
- Jackson, P. (1968). Life in classrooms. New York: Holt.
- James, W. (1899). Talks with teachers: And to students on some of life's ideals. New York: H. Holt and Company.
- Joyce, B., Murphy, C., Showers, B., & Murphy, J. (1989). School renewal as cultural change. Educational Leadership, 47(3), 70-77.

- Kearns, D. T. (1988). An education recovery plan for America. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(8), 565-570.
- Lampert, L. (1988). Staff development redesigned. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(9), 665-668.
- Lee, N. J., & Obermeyer, G. L. (1986). Mastering school reform. Educational Leadership, 44(1), 64-66.
- Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1984). Teachers, their world, their work. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19(3), 325-340.
- Little, J. W. (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.
- Livingston, C., & Castle, S. (Eds.). (1989). Teachers and research in action. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Maeroff, G. I. (1988). The empowerment of teachers. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Mastery in Learning Project. (1984). Notebook for School Profile. Washington, D.C.: Mastery in Learning Project, National Education Association.
- McClure, R. M. (1987, October). Overview. Speech presented at the NEA Symposium on School-Based Reform, Minneapolis, Minn.
- McClure, R. M. (1988). The evolution of shared leadership. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 60-62.
- McClure, R. M. (1989). Practicing theory: The knowledge base and school reform. In C. Livingston & S. Castle (Eds.), Teachers and research in action (pp. 7-12). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- McGregor, C. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- McLaughlin, M. W., & Yee, S. M. (1988). School as a place to have a career. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools (pp. 23-44). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Mehan, H. (1980). The competent student. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 11(3), 131-152.
- Murphy, J. T. (1988). The unheroic side of leadership: Notes from the swamp. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(9), 654-659.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Education Association (1984). An open letter to America on schools, students, and tomorrow. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- O'Neil, J. (1990). Piecing together the restructuring puzzle. Educational Leadership, 47(7), 4-10.
- Ponder, G. A. (1976). Schooling and control: Some interpretations of the changing social function of curriculum. In Perspectives on curriculum development 1776-1976 (pp. 139-167). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Rackliffe, G. (1989, March). Facilitating school reform: the role of a committee chairperson. A paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Rackliffe, G., & Castle, S. (1989, March). Sources of information used by teachers for site-based decision making. A paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Reed, S. (1988). Children with AIDS: How schools are handling the crisis. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(5), K1-K12.
- Rosenholtz, S. (1985). Political myths about educational reform: Lessons from research on teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 66(5), 349-355.
- Sarbin, T. R. (1953). Role theory. In G. Lindzey (Ed.) Handbook of social psychology (pp. 223-258). Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Sarason, S. (1971). The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn Bacon.

- Schleety, P. C. (1987). The JCPS\Gheens professional development academy: Present status and future prospects. Louisville, KY: Jefferson County Public Schools.
- Seidel, J. V., Kjolseth, R., & Clark, J. A. (1985). The ethnograph [Computer program]. Littleton, CO: Qualis Research Associates.
- Shulman, L. S. (1981). Disciplines of inquiry in education: An overview. Educational Researcher, 10(6), 5-12, 23.
- Sizer, T. (1984). Horace's compromise. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.
- Sizer, T. (1987, October). An essential education. Speech presented at the NEA Symposium on School-Based Reform, Minneapolis, Minn.
- Spring, J. (1984). Education and the Sony war. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(8), 534-537.
- Timar, T. (1989). The politics of school restructuring. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(4), 264-275.
- Tucker, M. S. (1988). Peter Drucker, knowledge work, and the structure of schools. Educational Leadership, 45(5), 44-46.
- Turner, R. H. (1962). Role-taking: Process versus conformity. In A. M. Rose (Ed.) Human behavior and social process (pp. 20-40). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Urbanski, A. (1988). The Rochester contract: A status report. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 48-52.
- Yee, S. M. (1987). Teaching as a career: Promotion versus development. Stanford, CA: Stanford University School of Education.