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ABSTRACT

As members of the general public lament the lack of success in America's public schools, those responsible for the educational program begin to look to teachers for improvement in student outcomes. Blending teachers with leadership in this enterprise presents special challenges to governing boards and administrators.

The research asks these questions: 1) How do teachers exercise leadership? 2) What roles do teachers assume when leadership opportunities are presented? 3) What constraints prevent teachers from achieving success in leadership roles?

This qualitative research looks at a team of six teachers and a principal who were hired by the governing board of a suburban school district in a southwestern state to plan the program for the first high school in the district. The planning was to include decisions about administration, budgeting, curriculum, personnel and school culture.

Basing their plans on ideas from Systems Thinking and Coalition of Essential Schools, the Planners attempted to incorporate concepts such as teacher-as-facilitator, student as manager of learning, less is more, personalization of student contact with adults, and authentic assessment, including portfolios and performance based competencies.
The eighteen month participant observation provided the researcher with interview opportunities, a complete set of planning documents and nearly a thousand pages of script from meetings attended. Coding the data by behavioral characteristics outlined in the literature on Effective Schools, the researcher found that teachers do not assume leadership roles in the same way that principals fulfill that role. When teachers leave the classroom to assume administrative functions, they are constrained by ambiguity from supervisors, lack role definition, negative community influences, and gender biases. More importantly, their inability to communicate either a decision-making process or the political language necessary to overcome these constraints forced them to retreat to the comfort of their teacher roles.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

AREA OF CONCERN

As the level of satisfaction with education in the United States declines, reformers once more turn their attention to teachers and their roles. Educators and the general public are realizing that it is not enough to adjust all the parts of the machine surrounding the engine without looking at the engine itself. After looking at textbook utilization, length of school day, length of school year, curriculum, class size, and other variables, reformers are beginning to accept the emerging reality that the teacher in the classroom is an integral part of the machine called school. There is also an acknowledgment that the environment in which the teacher works must be considered and needs of teachers met, if teachers are to have a positive effect on student learning, (Little, 1987).

Andy Hargreaves, in the foreword to the book, Understanding Teacher Development, (1992), concludes:

We have come to realize in recent years that the teacher is the ultimate key to educational change and school improvement. The restructuring of schools, the composition of national and provincial curricula, the development of benchmark assessments—all these things are of little value if we do not take the teacher into account. Teachers don’t merely deliver the curriculum. They develop, define it, and re-interpret it too.
It is what teachers think, what teachers believe, and what teachers do at the level of the classroom that ultimately shapes the kind of learning that young people get. Growing appreciation of this fact is placing working with teachers and understanding teaching at the top of our research and improvement agendas. (Hargreaves, 1992).

The needs of the teacher and the environment in which the teacher works are very much dependent upon the leadership in place in any particular school or district. In recent years, information about leadership has been produced in abundance. Hargreaves, (1992), states:

As we are coming to understand these wider aspects of teaching and teacher development, we are also beginning to recognize that much more than pedagogy, instruction or teaching method is at stake. Teacher development, teachers’ careers, teachers’ relations with their colleagues, the conditions of status, reward and leadership under which they work -- all these affect the quality of what they do in the classroom. (Hargreaves, 1992).

Books about leadership, management, and the business model, which have made the best-seller lists (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Moss-Kanter, 1983; Peters and Waterman, 1982) all stress the importance of leadership to the success of the organization. Literature on Effective schools stresses the invaluable role of the principal in increasing the educational productivity of a school. State departments of education have successfully marketed leadership academies as one of the most important service functions to be provided by a government entity. Professional organizations as well have increased the number and availability of
services designed to increase the leadership capabilities of individual members and school districts.

In the last decade, however, more democratic operation of schools has shifted focus from leadership as exemplified in the business model to participatory leadership in local operation of schools. Today, participation in site-based decision making may include community members, parents, students, and most certainly teachers. Addition of these new players has blurred the once clear image of "who's-in-charge-of-schools". As a result policy makers and researchers look to the total environment supporting the schooling process to determine what restructuring might mean to the future of education, and to teachers who work in schools. In particular, this new focus causes us to look at the role teachers are beginning to play in restructured schools. What has not occurred, however, is a blending of these two important ingredients: teachers and leadership.

Blending teachers and leadership is central to the discussion of productivity in schools since it is teachers who at the most basic level determine what happens with an individual student and that student's learning.

There is growing evidence that the development of collaborative school cultures, where teachers routinely support, learn from and work with each other, is related to successful implementation of educational change, a strong
record in school-fostered improvement, good practices in professional development, and positive outcomes in pupil achievement. (Hargreaves, 1992).

Using a case study, this research examines the phenomenon of teacher development in roles outside the classroom. Educators acknowledge that leadership has been seen as both problem and solution among recent offerings in staff development, training courses, graduate study programs, and best-selling leadership books published to date. When analyzed for success-in-practice, however, none of these media produces the magic formula that would enable educators to increase learning productivity.

Away from the spotlight of innovative projects among ordinary teachers in countless ordinary schools, the daily reality of teachers' work is far removed from the rhetoric of professionalism and empowerment that are often used to describe it. For most teachers, the context of teaching and teacher development is not one of cooperation and collegiality but of centralization, standardization, and rationalization. Teachers are not so much the empowered vanguard of change and improvement as the embattled victims of bureaucratic and technocratic control. (Apple and Jungck, 1992).

Teachers currently function in an environment that contributes to a perception by the general public that schools are a failure and that teachers may be responsible for that perceived lack of success. What is needed then, is a focus on a broader area of concern.
The environment is representative of society's larger problems and concerns.

Schooling practices are inseparable from class and social conflict, passing as they do through the prism of school bureaucracies the administrators and teachers who represent formal authority to both students and their families. School bureaucracies are part of the State, which forms the larger context in which class and social conflict are related to school practices... The historical struggle between schools (can be) seen as sources of the reproduction of workers on the one hand, and of the expansion of democratic rights and egalitarian outcomes on the other (Carnoy and Levin, 1992).

As members of society pass judgment on schools, they filter that judgment through prisms of the environment in which they were reared and currently exist. Conflicting values in support of one view (reproduction of workers) or another (democratic and egalitarian outcomes for all of society's citizens) produces an environment in which teachers have little chance of succeeding. Educational leaders are expected to negotiate these societal stresses and produce student citizens who meet the expectations represented by both views.

Conceding that educators may not ever be able to meet the expectations of critics representing either view, we must at least look at the additional demands placed upon teachers to meet the expectations of critics who focus on social relationships and the effect these social relationships have on teachers.
How principals relate to teachers, how teachers relate to parents and students, and to principals as supervisors and how students are seen by teachers are relationships that affect how teachers mediate their leadership positions. These interactions may suggest contextual patterns that will enable us to better understand the dilemmas faced by teachers. These interactions might also center attention on the collective interest all stakeholders have in questioning our current educational practices and programs.

Research studies analyze leadership, popular literature touts sure-fire strategies for producing successful leadership, and professional organizations attempt to meet the needs of members with workshops and seminars on leadership. Unfortunately, the leadership literature is disembodied from the real-life problems teachers and administrators face when they attempt to establish relationships which in concert, might improve schools. Bridges et al. (1982) reminds us that researchers who study school administrators show little interest in the practical problems of administrators.

Faith in the certainty of educational research findings is both exaggerated and misplaced... The 'hard' research knowledge of experts is deemed superior to the 'soft' practical wisdom of teachers (Hargreaves, 1992).
SUMMARY

Successful restructuring of schools depends on administrators, teachers, parents, and students all having a role to play in the process. My overriding interest is in teachers as leaders. In this dissertation I develop and apply a framework for teacher leadership. I look at social and professional relationships of teachers within the school organization in order to understand more clearly why a school organization is or is not successfully meeting changing needs and expectations of its constituency.

Never before has the significance of teachers’ leadership roles received so much emphasis in the educational literature. How we as educators and as a nation respond to the timeliness of this opportunity will have great impact both on student learning and on the economic and political strength of the country.

An odd combination of forces has led to this situation. Economic modernizers, educational efficiency experts, neo-conservatives, segments of the new right, many working and lower mid-class parents who believe that their children’s futures are threatened by a school systems that does not guarantee jobs, and members of parts of the new middle class whose own mobility is dependent on technical and administratively oriented knowledge have formed a tense and contradictory alliance to return us to ‘the basics’, to ‘appropriate’ values and dispositions, to ‘efficiency and accountability’, and to a close connection between schools and an economy in crisis... There is immense pressure currently not only to redefine the manner in which education is carried out, but also what education is actually for. (Apple and Jungck, 1992.)
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

A number of observers are calling on teachers to exercise greater leadership roles in schools, roles that teachers may not be prepared to assume (Bacherach & Shedd, 1986). However, there is a dearth of literature on teacher leadership in schools. The literature that does exist tends to focus on fairly circumscribed leadership roles, such as teacher mentoring. Research has not focused on more comprehensive teacher leadership such as when teachers assume administrative responsibilities. Very few studies have examined what happens when teachers are responsible for major management functions including budget, facilities planning, curriculum development and school culture issues.

This research study examines the experiences of six teachers and a principal who were responsible for start-up of a four-year high school in an affluent Southwestern suburb. Situational insights provide information about the phenomenon of teacher leadership and its consequences.

The research draws on Effective Schools literature, socialization literature, and teacher/administrator conflict literature to ask these research questions:

1. How do teachers exercise leadership?
2. What leadership roles do teachers assume when given leadership responsibilities?
3. What are the constraints to teacher leadership?
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND DEFINITIONS

While it is always with caution that one studies subjects from a single site, the availability of all the participants for interviews, accumulation of large amounts of notes from eighteen months of participant/observer reflection, and availability of a complete set of artifacts of the planning process allow the researcher to subject personal notes, records, and observations to the same rigorous scrutiny as one might scrutinize data collected from many sites.

A close relationship which developed over eighteen months is reflective of the

humanistic approaches to teacher development (which) can become self-indulgent, involving teachers, developers and researchers in relationships that are intensive and ultimately rewarding yet not easily replicated across other teacher groups. At the extreme, an intensive full-time collaborative relationship of the kind described by Louden (in Hargreaves and Fullan’s Understanding Teacher Development, 1992) is not at all applicable to other work settings. What Louden’s case provides,

(and what this research emulates, therefore),

is more a beacon for our intellectual understanding than a model for our professional development practice. (Hargreaves and Fullan, 1991.)

This research will contribute to our further understanding of the humanistic relationships that teachers must develop in order to be identified as leaders. Where inconsistencies may occur, this substantive collection of
data gathered from this long-term relationship enables the researcher to recheck the analysis to further verify assumptions and conclusions.

**DEFINITION OF TERMS**

The research is dependent upon an understanding of the following terms:

**LEADERSHIP:** Leadership refers to the ability "to direct the operations, activity, or performance of" an organization. (Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary, 1967)

**EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS:** Effective Schools are those schools which produce "high student academic achievement as measured by standardized achievement tests, usually in reading and math. This is not to suggest that such outcomes are the only objectives we should consider but rather that they are, for the moment, the only variable with which we can easily compare schools." (Joyce, Hersh, and McKibbon, 1983).

**PROFESSIONALIZATION:** Professionalization refers to the process whereby an individual learns the conduct, aims, and/or qualities that characterize the arena in which one works.
SUMMARY AND ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This research on teachers as leaders describes a collaborative relationship among six teachers and a principal who attempted to reshape the hierarchical arrangement of power and authority. The research looks at the relationships to better understand how authority and power are derived. Relationships are determined to a great degree by the social and professional interactions teachers and administrators are exposed to. How teachers and administrators navigate these new roles, new language, new decision-making processes, and new structures of working in schools will provide the basis for a qualitative look at the six teachers and their principal as they collaboratively planned the program for the first high school in a suburban school district in the Southwest.

The study will look at the way in which one school district restructured the development and planning of a high school curriculum and program to meet the needs of the community. Interactions of the teachers were systematically studied as they attempted to blend social and professional relationships into roles they constructed, resisted, and ultimately filled. The study will trace a year of planning meetings, presentations, and interactions with superintendent, principal, and community members.
Chapter II, the review of the literature, will look at teacher leadership literature to the extent that it addresses teacher professionalism in effective schools. An understanding of professionalism is necessary if one is to understand the effect of organizational hierarchy on the teacher/administrator relationship as this relationship becomes a source of disempowerment for teachers. An understanding of how teachers become professionals is also necessary if we are to make any inferences about the usefulness of frameworks for planning or even the advisability of enabling teachers to become leaders in the planning process of restructuring schools.

Chapter II will look at literature describing the role of social relationships between and among teachers and principals and how that new role emerges as teacher preparation programs, site-based management systems, and societal expectations for effective schools place new demands on teachers. Chapter III describes the procedures used for collecting and analyzing the data. Chapter IV reports the findings of the study. In Chapter V, the findings of the report are summarized with implications for further study. An analysis of the issues surrounding the importance of teacher leadership is provided in order that school communities might benefit from the experiences of this school district and its teacher planners.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Assessing the impact of changing roles teachers play in a collaborative model requires that one have an understanding of the prevailing theories and research which describes the ways teachers identify the values and ideology of the profession. This includes ways in which teachers are "professionalized" into relationships with other teachers, administrators, and community members in conjunction with how they see themselves in the Effective Schools tradition.

Effective Schools literature is used as the context of this research because community expectations of the teacher planners were filtered through lenses which focus on student outcomes as an important part of the Effective Schools definition.

Emerging roles of teachers as leaders are important as we consider the relationships teachers must develop in their journey to becoming leaders. This is particularly important when the responsibility for positive student outcomes are almost entirely attributed to the teacher by the community. An understanding of power relationships which result in negotiations of attributing and accepting responsibility enables us to better comprehend the difficulties teachers experience when they attempt to define their leadership role in a collaborative model.
Acknowledging there are difficulties in this negotiation also requires that we have an understanding of the organizational structures that provide the environment in which this role must be negotiated.

EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Figure 2.1 illustrates the dilemma of teaching and administration in the educational organization. The prevailing ideas about education as an organization pits principal against teacher. This illustration uses descriptors of teachers' work as a simple, routine, day-to-day, unchanging list of tasks requiring little or no independent thought as one end of a continuum. Contrast this list with another complex task description that lies at the other end of the continuum in a horizontal scope of work from simple (routine) to complex (non-routine).

In the vertical strands, Morgan's (1989) range of conditions depicts the administrator's role in providing a workplace environment that ranges from organic to mechanistic. This matrix defines the scope and boundaries from the least ideal organizational environment where work is mechanized and controlled, to the most ideal where the professional is nurtured and supported in an organic environment. An organic environment provides the optimum conditions for shared decision making, collaboration, and choices.
Fig. 2.1 The Dilemma of Teaching and Administration in Educational Organizations.

As reformers look for new models of organizational structure and new ways of restructuring schools, integration of teaching and administration represents one model that portrays teachers as leaders and administrators as partners in the learning organization. Unfortunately typically configured school organizations rarely exhibit integration of teaching and administration. Schools tend to emulate one of three organizational models: (1) the classic hierarchical model (Timpane, M., 1984), which is also portrayed in MacGregor's Theory X, (2) a slightly more cooperative model reflected in MacGregor's Theory Y, or (3) a description of an organizational system where
collaboration is fostered as Ouichi’s Theory Z. These three theories are outlined in figure 2.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Responsibility</th>
<th>MacGregor Theory X</th>
<th>MacGregor Theory Y</th>
<th>Quicho Theory Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical; Principal tells teachers, manages what to do, when they do it, and how they do it.</td>
<td>Managers have input into decisions and work together laterally. Final decisions still by management. Worker seeks responsibility and chooses to act responsibly.</td>
<td>Democratic with collaboration among levels of employment. Reach consensus regarding division of labor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive. Policies made by Superintendent and Governing Board. No input permitted to policies. Employees told of decision.</td>
<td>People are an important link in organization and establish policies which set future guidelines. Formal policy still established at District level.</td>
<td>Democratic process permits stakeholders to reach consensus on organization’s values and structures by a negotiated process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established at district office by Superintendent and Assistants. Principals told what their share of resources will be.</td>
<td>Takes place at district office with input from stakeholders. Final decisions still made by management.</td>
<td>All stakeholders have input both internal and external. Process is negotiable to determine best use of resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring done at district level. No input as to placement of principal or teachers.</td>
<td>Personnel direction flows laterally. If administration is weak, strong subordinates may have greater input. Decisions still made at District level.</td>
<td>Members delineate organizational needs. More time spent determining qualitative characteristics of employees to be hires. Stakeholders take part in the interview process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paycheck is the reward for work. Workers have to be watched to make certain they stay on task. Climate is controlled and frigid.</td>
<td>Work is more satisfying; some self control when the employee is committed to organization’s goals. Management makes employees feel more valued.</td>
<td>Interdependent nature of goal-setting and involvement in decision-making fosters interdependence among individuals and groups in the work environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 2.2 Organization Theory in Schools**
In some further instances, schools may appear as loosely coupled systems with bureaucracy still the dominant feature, giving only an appearance of less bureaucracy. (Weick, 1989).

Irrespective of the potential integration in these organizations, problems remain: (1) coordination and control have not always led to the successful operation of the organization, and (2) theories have neglected the importance of rules, understandings and meanings that are attached to institutional social structure. "The success and survival of an organization is dependent upon factors other than efficient coordination and control of activities. Success depends upon the capacity of the organizational leadership to mold the environmental process" (Meyer and Rowan, 1989). Often teachers have not had an opportunity to play a part in molding the characteristics of the environment.

**THE ENVIRONMENT AND EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS LITERATURE**

There is no question but that some schools are more effective than others. In a variety of studies over a period of time, similar conclusions about what constitutes an effective school are being reached.

"Three important generalizations have emerged. First, people run schools. How teachers, administrators, and students behave in a school setting matters and accounts heavily toward determining a school's effectiveness (Edmonds, 1979). The social climate of the school is extremely important. Second, quality and not just quantity of effort, materials, and time is what
counts. However big the school library, however much is spent per child, and however experienced the teachers, without a high quality of effort those factors alone make little difference. Third, the curriculum of the school, which includes what is taught, how it is taught, and the social climate within which it is taught, is very important." (Joyce, Hersh, and McKibbon, 1983).

The research also delineates those characteristics we might find. (See Figure 2.3.)

Attributes of Effective Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Organization</th>
<th>Instruction and Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear academic and social behavior goals</td>
<td>High academic learning time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order and discipline</td>
<td>Frequent and monitored homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Expectations</td>
<td>Monitoring of student progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher efficacy</td>
<td>Coherently organized curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervasive caring</td>
<td>Variety of teaching strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public reward and incentives</td>
<td>Opportunities for student responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.3 Attributes of Effective Schools

The Social Organization consists of common sets of values, norms, beliefs, expectations, rules, and sanctions which are important to the learning environment. Rutter (1979) refers to this as the school's ethos. Wynn (1980) calls it coherence. Glass (1981) uses tone. "We prefer community." (Joyce, et al., 1983).

Clear Academic and Social Behavior Goals are a clearly defined attribute of the Effective Schools literature. Teachers, parents, and students share the same understanding of the school's goals (Brookover et al., 1979).
An orderly and disciplined school climate is also another Effective Schools attribute. "Effective schools seem to find a happy medium between strong discipline and respect and support for growing students (Joyce, et al., 1983). "Effective schools recognize order as a social necessity, not a rigid order that snuffs out spontaneity and individualism, but a strong norm to keep on with the business of learning. ...Rules are clear, not capricious." (Edmonds, 1979).

"Teachers and administrators in effective schools hold higher academic and social behavior expectations for their students than do teachers and administrators in less effective schools. In a high-expectation environment, the students achieve in a manner that surprises them." (Joyce, et al., 1983).

"Effective schools have teachers who have a strong sense of teacher efficacy--a belief which says, 'I know I can teach any and all of these kids.' A sense of efficacy combined with high expectations for one's students communicates powerfully to students that they can learn and that they will learn." (Joyce, et al., 1983).

"Effective schools have a system of clear and public rewards and incentives for student achievement. (Joyce, et al., 1983). Public display of excellent student work, honor roll, convocations to honor student excellence, notes sent
home to parents, and statements and smiles serve to monitor and sustain students' achievement of a school's high expectations for them. (Brookover et al., 1979)

"Effective schools have administrative leaders, most often principals, who actively advocate and facilitate the above conditions (Joyce, et al., 1983). Most essential, with such leadership the administration is seen by both teachers and students as supportive, caring, and trustworthy, all of which helps create conditions for excellence (Edmonds, 1979).

Effective schools have been found to have more parent and community support than less effective schools. (Joyce, et al., 1983). Effective schools usually have more positive parent-initiated contacts than do less effective schools (Brookover et al., 1979).

In the area of instruction and curriculum, effective schools exhibit a set of characteristics that are consistent with what parents and community members in the 1990's believe was present when they attended schools in the 1950's and 1960's. Curriculum and instruction emphasizes High Academic Learning Time (ALT) (Joyce, et al., 1983), considerable variability in teacher efficiency of instruction (Berliner, 1979), and places an emphasis on time on task, the time a student actually spends on a learning
activity in which he or she is achieving a high rate of success (Berliner, 1979).

Teachers in Effective Schools require frequent and monitored homework. Students are provided with feedback about how well the homework was completed. (Joyce, et al, 1983).

Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress becomes the combination of more frequent classroom tests and quizzes, formal and informal, written and oral, on all levels. Student progress reports proceed from the classroom to the school to the district office, and serves as both diagnostic and reporting function in the communication between the school and the student and his parents (Joyce, et al., 1983).

Coherently Organized Curriculum is identified as a characteristic of effective schools. "Effective schools purposely link goals, curriculum, and evaluation devices in a tightly coupled way to avoid the common mismatch in testing and teaching." (Joyce, et al., 1983).

Several studies have found that teachers in effective schools use a greater variety of teaching strategies than do teachers in less effective schools. (Rosenshine & Furst, 1971). McDonald (1976) found that teachers who use a variety of teaching strategies can better meet curriculum objectives with the "educational treatment of choice."
Responsible behaviors by students can only be exhibited when opportunities for such behaviors are presented. Maintaining an "active community for learning" (Rutter et al., 1979) might include such activities as participating in student government, writing for the school newspaper, managing athletic teams or serving on student court review panels.

All of the above characteristics seem uniformly important, yet research clearly indicates that no one characteristic, but rather a combination of all of these characteristics must be present if a school is to be effective in achieving high student outcomes. (Lezotte, 1983).

The combination of administrative leadership, teacher empowerment, and community involvement and their importance in the effective schools research historically has been exhibited as a hierarchical power arrangement. In addition, power needs to be shared equally if teachers are to be leaders.

**POWER IN RELATIONSHIPS**

If dissatisfaction with education is a call for change, reformers must consider where change in the power structure and organization of schools has lead us. In the past, managers of organizations, including schools, needed to develop systems of control. Control mechanisms insured that
goals and objectives (long and short term) were carried out by subordinates (Toffler, 1990). Failure of multinational goal oriented corporations whose CEOs followed these plans is evidence that such systems were not sufficient... (Toffler, 1990)

"Bertrand Russell defines power as the fundamental social science concept in the same sense in which energy is a fundamental concept in physics. The laws of social dynamics...can only be stated in terms of power." (Muth, 1991). In discussing Russell’s definition of power, Muth concluded, "Essential to leadership and organizational life, power has gained national prominence as teachers seek 'empowerment.'" Expanding upon this notion in his model of the mutual empowerment of teachers and principals, Muth added,

Traditional views of organizational control reflect the belief that leadership capability in organizations is finite, that subordinates are less capable than others in designated positions, and that organizational effectiveness is increased by reducing individual discretion on the part of all but a few.

Within this framework, leadership is defined as control. The empowerment of teachers means loss of control. Principals lead and teachers must follow, just as military units follow their officers. Strong leadership is evidenced in quick, often unquestioning compliance. It is a protracted consensus, and leadership is not achieved by including teachers in decision-making, but by excluding them (Muth, 1991).

He continues,
To many, collaborative decision-making processes are time consuming, inefficient, and inconsistent with strong leadership. Many principals, for example, fear that allowing teachers to assume leadership will erode their own power and reduce their management prerogatives. Other principals also feel that sharing power with teachers contradicts expectations for their performance. Especially when they have been exhorted to provide 'strong instructional leadership,' they now feel mounting pressure to accept power sharing through collaboration and participative decision making. (Muth, 1991)

In a further discussion of power, Muth cites early works on power which defined five bases for social power: (1) reward, (2) coercive, (3) legitimate, (4) referent, and (5) expert. Reward power depends upon the leader's ability and resources to reward others. Coercive power depends primarily on fear. The person with coercive power has the ability to inflict punishment. Legitimate power stems from the internalized values of the subordinate that attributes the legitimate right to the power holder to direct the subordinate’s behavior. Referent power is based on an emotional connection between the leader and the subordinate. Expert power is based on the extent to which the leader conveys knowledge or expertise that is believed essential, beneficial or useful to the subordinate. In later years, Raven with Kruglanski (1975) added information power as a sixth point of reference. In 1972, Hersey and Blanchard added connection power that bases the leader’s linkage to influential or important people within or outside the organization as another source of power over a subordinate.
Using these power structures, Muth (1983) developed a continuum of power. The continuum incorporates a range of power "extending from its coercive aspects, situations in which force of some kind is used, to situations in which coercion is nonexistent, but the power recipient still does what the power wielder intended (Muth, 1983). In this model, coercion is "the ability of an actor to compel another to do as the actor intends, regardless of the others wishes."

Authority is at the center of the continuum and is defined as "the legitimation" of an actor's ability to affect another's behavior. Here, the actor who complies with another's wishes does so voluntarily.

Influence, at the opposite end of the continuum from coercion, is "the ability of an actor, without recourse to force authority, to persuade another to behave as desire." Influence comes into play when an actor cannot use, or chooses not to use, authoritative or coercive resources." (Muth, 1991)

The mid-point on the continuum places the relationship between principal and teachers in an ideal collaboration. As seen in the description of the roles defined by the principal and six teachers in this study, each must be able to reach a level where "legitimation" of an actor's ability to affect another's behavior is achieved (Muth, 1991).
Figure 2.4 illustrates this center point where power is in balance in an ideal collaboration.

Fig. 2.4 The Continuum of power in Educational Organizations.

PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS

In hierarchical models, a principal is in control. The absence of a finely tuned balance has produced the disequilibrium observed in schools. Using various mechanisms of control, the principal has wielded almost absolute power over teachers, in much the same way that managers in other organizations control subordinates.

In a principal’s world, "the rules, regulations, reporting procedures, and directives that generally characterize the hierarchy account for almost one half of the principal’s time" (Crowson & Morris, 1982). In 1982,
Crowson and Morris also found that the principal’s primary role was to achieve the system’s operative goals of (1) managing environmental uncertainty, (2) maintaining an organizational mythology, and (3) rewarding the organization’s employees. This is hardly an agenda reformers would currently choose as the primary shaping mechanism for a restructured school organization.

Catherine Marshall (1988) discusses the "chasm" between administrator and teacher cultures which was exacerbated by the creation of the elite profession of expert school managers after the reform movement of the 1920’s. Her micropolitical analyses of teacher/administrator interactions describes the ways in which the conflicting values, needs, and agendas are played out in the school site. When two cultures coexist and interact, there will be conflicts of values in the day-to-day interaction.

Marshall also details the different culture of school administrators whose demographics, recruitment, selection and promotion paths vary greatly from teachers. She documents the research that much of this culture is derived from the fact that white males with a bureaucratic maintenance orientation have dominated the ranks of school administrators (Abbott & Carcheo, 1988; Boyan, 1988, Corwin & Borman, 1988; Ortiz & Marshall, 1988; Valverde & Brown, 1988). Marshall further points out that previous work
experiences (e.g. years of teaching, being a counselor or a coach) and prior socialization (gender, ethnicity and race) processes affect the individual orientations of administrators.

In teacher culture, Marshall describes studies which document shared background, beliefs and values, informal rules of behavior, and rewards systems of teachers (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986; Lortie, 1975; Biklen, 1983). From a teacher's point of view, principals are seldom seen as experts on classroom practice; this undermines their assertion of authority (Biklen, 1983; Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980).

It has been documented that the behavior of the principal toward teachers has been the source of stress for teachers and affects the behavior of teachers (Biklen, 1982). It also alienates teachers (Knoop, 1982), affects the attitude of teachers (Goldman, 1991), eliminates the opportunity for teachers to assume responsibility, achieve decision-making power, and take more accountability for the results (Lieberman, 1988), and ignores the developmental needs of teachers (Krupp, 1986). If all these things are true, what can we say about the possibility that teachers might one day assume a balancing position in the mediation of leadership in a collaborative model?
TEACHERS AS LEADERS: AN EMERGING ROLE

"Little is known about how such (collaborative) cultures develop and whether or how school administrators can facilitate that process" (Leithwood, 1990). This dilemma is especially strong if "...a good many teachers seem to be doubtful about the desirability of significantly changing the relative authority they have vis-a-vis schools" (Bacharach & Shedd, 1986).

Historically, teachers have expressed a need for recognition and respect as equal partners in making decisions (Hoy, 1994; Hallinger, 1988), ownership, collegiality, mentoring, and nurturance, enhancement of professional image, and a need for being heard (Bredeson, 1989). What is not know is how the needs have been subjugated as teachers (as a group) are socialized and professionalized into roles which result in their containment within classrooms and removal from leadership positions.

As teachers are socialized into leadership roles which the school community and school colleagues shape for them, teachers experience a process that is common to all people who enter a new human group. Members of the group are attempting to socialize her (the teacher) to norms. Existing members give the teacher their own perspectives on the social situation. The teacher is told how the school is run, how the principal relates to the teachers, how teachers relate to each other, and how they regard the children. This introduction to the social system of the school as a work place
requires the teacher, as she receives more and more information, to make many choices about what kind of teacher she will be and what kind of satisfaction she will get out of the teaching role. The new information is related to how she handles herself in that social system. This socialization will have much to do with how the teacher will eventually see herself as a teacher and a person." (Joyce, Hersh, and McKibbin, 1983).

Consequently, the personal response the teacher makes to the stimuli she receives from the school environment eventually defines the teacher's "fit" in the profession.

PROFESSIONALIZATION

School literature on professions emerged in the post 1970-era (Torstendahl, 1985). Most of the sociological work on professions centers on the traditional professions of medicine, law, and engineering.

The limited body of knowledge about the professionalization of any group contains various ways of looking at the process: (a) trait theory, (b) stages of evolution, and (c) the cultural and political setting in which a profession operates. Education as a profession appears only in the late 1980s. Tyack and Hansot (1982) stressed influence of corporations in the formation and leadership of schools. Sockett (1989) listed key dimensions of teacher professionalism and steps necessary to achieve professional status. Sedlak (1987) summarized the Holmes Group's recommendations for teacher training. Hawley (1987) promoted the idea of internships for aspiring teachers, and
Culbertson (1988) traced the evolution of education, linking notions that science and its tenets should pervade administrative efforts.

In these literature sources, teachers have been recipients of well-intentioned efforts to "improve" them. Concerted efforts strived to have teachers meet society's demand for better public school educational opportunities for all children, and to make them responsible for solutions to society's problems.

Apple and Jungck (1992) argue the de-skilling of teachers' work at the elementary level is also primarily the de-skilling of women's work. Women often face considerable pressures and demands in their domestic lives as well as intensification in their professional ones. Gender issues in this sense form an important and inescapable part of the context of teaching. (Hargreaves and Fullan, 1992).

The context of teaching and teacher development, is not gender-neutral. Men's work, men's experience and stereotypically male characteristics and values are held in higher esteem. The male experience may be taken as the universal experience, making gender bias in the ways teachers must function an important ingredient of the process of becoming leaders.

The presence of gender influences affects the ways in which decision-making is carried out. Male ways of
certainty have, in almost all decision-making settings, replaced female ways of knowing which is the internal "voice" of teaching as opposed to the external "vision" of teaching. This conflict has played out in a conflict of skills-based teacher development as opposed to reflection-based teacher leadership development. Inescapably, the profession has responded to this ongoing conflict between voice and vision by blurring the potential of either men or women teachers to emerge as leaders in the profession.

**TEACHERS AS LEADERS: A CURRENT VIEW**

Conflicting views of teachers as professionals does not eliminate the need to continue to develop teachers as leaders. How teachers develop is a source of differing opinion among researchers. There are three possible views of how development might take place; (1) An individual approach to teacher development, (2) a humanistic approach, and (3) an ecological view (Hargreaves and Fullan, 1992).

The individual approach to teacher development encourages a self-understanding by the teacher in regard to the personal and professional "life cycle" in which he or she currently exists (Leithwood, 1992). Teachers are encouraged to develop their professional competencies according to where they are in the maturing of their professional life. Often this development has a direct relationship to the age of the teacher.
For example, many younger teachers may not have reached a level of personal maturity which combines a strong and integrated sense of self with an ability to relate to and work with others. This in turn may inhibit the development of collegiality, as certain teachers either resist being ‘swamped’ by their professional contemporaries or become overly dependent on them.

Second, the human life cycle also comprises characteristic phases of development that embody typical concerns. Younger teachers, like younger adults generally, characteristically have a great deal of physical energy, few domestic commitments, a somewhat untempered idealism and a willingness, therefore, to invest strongly in work and innovation. Teachers in the mid-life span have much life experience behind them, are more aware of their mortality, may be facing declining physical powers, are often more intent on establishing a balance between their work and the rest of their lives and are thus more cautious about change. Men usually discover these necessities rather later than women. Teachers at different points in the life cycle have characteristically different orientations to change and improvement as well as different needs in terms of professional development.

Third, there are personal development issues specific to the teaching career itself. Promotion brings its rewards and incentives. Equally the denial of promotion can create careers that become ‘spoilt’, leading their bearers to become disenchanted, even cynical, as they no longer feel valued by their organizations (Leithwood, 1992).

In support of this personalized view is Philip Jackson’s perspective of teachers. When left to their own devices, teachers experience at a very personal level activities and skills that are shared with current colleagues, and experiences that are passed down to younger, less tenured teachers (Jackson, 1992).

Christopher Clark (1992) also affirms the individual nature of teacher development as he attempts to change the
image of the teacher from one of "passive, needy, deficient, and homogeneous" to an image of the teacher as a "complex individual doing very complicated work in a sometimes stressful, sometimes rewarding, always uncertain and dynamic variety of settings." He describes his research findings in this way,

My simple message has three parts: (1) there is much more to teaching than meets the eye; (2) the enriched image of teachers as reflective professionals is a good place to start in rethinking professional development; and (3) experienced teachers can become designers of their own personal programs of self-directed professional development (Clark, 1992).

Similarly, Huberman's study of middle aged teachers concluded that this particular group of teachers had become "positive focusers." Not only had they found ways to avoid the conflict of the entire school culture, they had also developed keen insights into their own teaching and sought regularly to improve their professional practice. In ways of their own, they had become "craft persons" (Huberman, 1992).

The second approach is a humanistic approach to teacher development which aligns with the individual approach to teacher development. In these research findings, teachers are encouraged to increase effectiveness with self development which focuses on reflection. Antoinette Oberg (1992) encouraged teachers to develop journals which would give them a structure for determining what their "ground"
was, what roots they derived their "ground" from and what their future vision might become as a result of having taken their journal journey. Underwood, the student, described the professional journey in this way:

We were to keep a journal. We began by telling stories about our teaching and from these stories we were asked to interpret values and formulate questions. In 15 years of teaching, no one had asked how I viewed my practice. For several years I had been involved in professional development, establishing conferences, workshops, policies and projects for my school and district. The focus, however, was always on improvement, on 'updating', on implementation; in other words, I was always less current, less experienced, less knowledgeable than the 'expert'; I had been 'supervised', I had been judged 'satisfactory' as opposed to 'unsatisfactory'. But no one had offered to listen to the story of my practice. For someone to suggest that I speak, write about and reflect on my experience after 15 years of silence, opened doors that somehow I had not noticed were part of the wall (Oberg and Underwood, 1992).

One criticism of a humanistic view of teacher development is that it has become therapeutic to do something "to" teachers. "The term 'teacher development' is Orwellian. No one could be against teachers developing. But there is a critical difference between developing and being developed" (Hargreaves and Fullan, 1992).

The third type of teacher development is the most closely related to this case study: Teacher development as ecological change. Ecological change for teachers who are to become leaders forces administrators and community leaders to look at the environment in which teachers work. Planning
time for reflection, providing opportunities for teachers to become mentors for other teachers, assuring access to resources whether that be workshops where teachers can learn skills, or dollars for hiring substitutes--all these remain impediments to successful development of teachers. This is especially true if teachers are to become leaders.

With all the rhetoric about teaching and professionalism, about enhancing teachers' powers and about raising pay and respect, the reality of many teachers' lives bears little resemblance to this rhetoric. Rather than moving in the direction of increased autonomy, in all too many instances the daily lives of teachers in classrooms of many nations are becoming ever more controlled and ever more subject to administrative logic that seeks to tighten the reins on the processes of teaching and curriculum. Teacher development, cooperation and 'empowerment' may be the talk, but centralization, standardization and rationalization may be the strongest tendencies." (Apple and Jungck, 1992.)

The process and success of teacher development depends very much on the context in which it takes place. The nature of this context can make or break teacher development efforts. Understanding and attending to the ecology of teacher development should therefore be an important priority for teachers, administrators, and researchers alike (Hargreaves and Fullan, 1992).
SUMMARY

Managers of organizations have used power as a mechanism of control to insure that subordinates meet organizational expectations by structuring the goals and objectives of the organization. A review of the literature on organization theory, (specifically school organization, ) power and change theory, principal/teacher relationship theory, and the theory behind teacher leadership and the current state of the professionalization of teachers as they attempt to assume leadership roles is the focus of this chapter.

Studies in principal/teacher relations illustrate the dilemma principals face in setting up collegial environments where the emerging role of teachers as leaders might be nurtured. While the principal exhibits the need to control the activities of subordinate teachers, teachers see their opportunity to be heard and to be respected for their decision-making abilities thwarted. A further dilemma is illustrated. There also coexists a group of teachers who are uncertain about the desirability of changing the relative authority they now have in view of the pressures from both peers and society members in the community to respond as teachers have always responded.

Looking at the literature, certain observations can be made. Most of the literature portrays a functionalist
perspective. Organizational expectations deny teachers power to achieve a sense of self-confidence in their ability to make decisions, or to influence the decision-making process.

An analysis of the power structure argues that relatively few teachers would be able to resist the socializing pressures of the hierarchical arrangement of schools. The teacher is unable to rise to a position of power or even to a level of confidence where that teacher would see him or herself as one valued in the collaborative process. This description of leadership depicts school administrators as individuals who have reached the conclusion that teachers do not really value power or the opportunity to be a part of the decision-making process. The literature review has described the evolution of the profession to a moment where leadership is virtually non-existent, and educators are without credibility. Teachers are employees who work without society’s affirmation or belief in their ability to educate students. And finally, the literature review has focused on current views of teacher development. This includes perspectives that teachers must develop their capabilities individually or expose themselves to being developed by others who operate from a humanistic point of view. Lastly, teachers may depend on the ecology and environment in which they operate
to be the area of focus if the leadership capacity of teachers is to be developed.

The absence of a critical perspective causes one to ask some basic questions: What are the underlying assumptions about teacher leadership? What are the connections between these underlying assumptions and the ideologies of power? How have these assumptions shaped and constrained teachers' work? What are the relationships between the services teachers provide and society's and community members' expectations?

In trying to find answers to these questions and to the research questions of this study, the researcher cannot ignore the social issues revealed in the literature on the socialization of teachers. Gender, class, race, and sex are all social issues which shape the expectations communities have for teachers. These are issues with which teachers must cope as they determine their values, strategies, and beliefs in the early formation of their careers. To discuss these issues goes beyond the scope of this research, but leads one to the conclusion that while the expectations of each community group may differ, and the response of each teacher may differ, in each setting, the clash of these two sets of variables determines the kind of education and the level of success each community's teachers will enjoy.
CONCLUSION

This chapter describes the current state of affairs of teachers as they attempt to raise the stature of the profession and attempt to cope with their own relationships with administrators and among community members. This chapter looks at power relationships, the emerging new roles of teachers, and the conflicts within society and individual communities that work to inhibit personal and professional growth of teachers. In subsequent chapters, the researcher provides an explanation of the analytical framework and techniques that constitute the method of the study, a description of the collection and analysis of data (Chapter III), a report of the case study in Chapter IV, relevant findings which may reflect serious challenges for teachers who would be leaders and finally, implications for further study (Chapter V).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

This case study describes a collaborative process in which a principal and six teachers negotiate decision-making surrounding the planning of a program for the first high school in a suburban school district in a southwestern state. The study examines how teachers defined their leadership roles in the face of both hierarchical organizational constraints and community societal forces. The study will also assess the impact of these factors on the teachers' ability to define the leadership role for which they were hired.

This chapter outlines the research methods used to investigate the constraints on teacher leadership from relationships with administrators and from stresses in the community. The chapter will address the following areas: 1) Descriptions of the research structure used, 2) participant/observer notes referenced, 3) the documents analyzed, and 4) the rationale for the interview process.

RESTATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The profile of an alienated teacher (Knoop, 1982) is evidence of growing concern that while teachers may be seen as ultimate delivers/liberators of American education, they also suffer feelings of disappointment with career and
professional development. Teachers feel a lack of participation in decision-making, an absence of considerate leadership, job autonomy, task significance, job satisfaction, and satisfaction with supervision. They also suffer from a sense of powerlessness, and a lack of identification with the school or school board (Knoop, 1982).

The principal is equally disadvantaged in being able to provide the support necessary for the teacher to overcome these feelings of career alienation. The Man in the Principal's Office (Wolcott, 1978) might now more appropriately be entitled The Man in the Middle—caught between the need to control subordinates to meet district and state objectives and the need to yield to broader pressures for teacher leadership in a more collaborative setting.

This study will look at this balancing act by examining to three questions:

1. How do teachers exercise leadership?
2. What roles do teachers assume when leadership opportunities are presented?
3. What constraints prevent teachers from achieving success in leadership roles?

RESEARCH METHODS

The study uses qualitative data to search for meaning and to gain an authentic perspective about the social
interactions of six teachers striving to define their leadership roles. If schools are "human transformational organizations" (Mitchell & Spady, 1992), the social interactions on which we base our understanding can best be analyzed from a qualitative perspective. The far-ranging nature of these interactions experienced and observed over an eighteen month period cannot be adequately captured in a survey or other quantitative method.

Rarely do we see or hear school teachers. They do not appear in person, nor as authors, nor with the specifics of knowledge and day-to-day experiences that teachers use and have. Rather, school teachers are represented as numbers, or clusters of behaviors, or functionaries, or parts of a classroom ecology...So teachers within the academic culture that studies them and the research literature that reports on them, remain passive, manipulated, and silent (Travers, 1986).

To give voice to these teachers' reflections and to their experiences is an added and underlying goal of this research. "If teachers do not have the wherewithal to develop their own voices, then their professional speech will be the equivalent of lip synchronization (Romanish, B., 1991).

Donald Reed's paper (1987), "Social Control and the Qualitative and Quantitative Research Traditions," describes educational research's two purposes: (1) to develop understanding, and (2) to allow for prediction and control. "The qualitative approach is especially suited for describing and explaining social phenomena, whereas
quantitative research emphasizes prediction and control" (Reed, 1987). Reed’s paper treats social control mechanisms as employing either authority or power relationships. Using Mitchell and Spady’s concept, one might better conclude that this qualitative research approaches social phenomena from an authoritative (or authentic) perspective. Conclusions are formed based on individuals’ interactions in social situations. The search for an authentic perspective is based on individuals’ interactions in a social and collaborative setting that this research describes.

The hierarchical views of research strategies described by Robert Yin (1984) are also supportive of the qualitative nature of this research. He encourages researchers to consider three areas in determining what method they will use:

(a) the type of research question posed; (b) the extent of control an investigator has over actual behavioral events; and (c) the degree of focus on contemporary as opposed to historical event.

He continues,

The case study is preferred in examining contemporary events, when the relevant behaviors cannot be manipulated. Thus, the case study relies on many of the same techniques as a history, but it adds two sources of evidence not usually included in the historian’s repertoire: direct observation and systematic interviewing...Although case studies and histories can overlap, the case study’s unique strength is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence--documents, interviews, and observations. Moreover, in some situations, such as participant-
observation, information manipulation can occur (Yin, 1984).

He later describes the prejudices against the case study strategy by pointing out that the greatest concern has been over the lack of rigor of case study research and the concern that case studies provide very little basis for scientific generalization. His short answer to this criticism is

that case studies, like experiments, are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes. In this sense, the case study, like the experiment, does not represent a 'sample,' and the investigator's goal is to expand and generalize theories (analytic generalization) and not to enumerate frequencies (statistical generalization) (Yin, 1984).

Yin's definition then most clearly outlines the parameters of this research:

A Case Study is an empirical inquiry that:

1. investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when
2. the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which
3. multiple sources of evidence are used. (1984)

Any conclusions reached will be consistent with this definition and verified by triangulation using document analysis, interviews, and participant/observer notes as the three balancing sources of information (Guba, 1989). In the processes of completing the research analysis, notes and observations with other data are merged.
DATA COLLECTION

PARTICIPANT/OBSERVATION ACTIVITY

When the Principal and long-range planner spoke to a graduate class in which I was enrolled (December, 1991), it was immediately apparent that this was an important research opportunity. An appointment a week later with the long-range planner confirmed our mutual interest in documenting the details of this understanding (See letter: Appendix 2.)

On January 6, 1992, I spent the first two hours of what was to become an eighteen month participant/observer relationship. The two-hour interview allowed the teacher planner team to arrive at a comfort level that I would maintain an objective perspective on their efforts to step out of traditional roles, and that I would not attempt to impose ideas from my thirty plus years of experience in leadership positions.

In late January, my notes reflect that I was assigned to a sub-committee. Fortunately, the work was conceptual, not decision-making. We were to envision a competency for our subject area. Kandy, the mathematics planner, and I had no problem doing that. It was typical teacher work with no leadership issues. The operational mode for me was, 'be careful to observe- don't participate!.'

The on-going process of observing the team in their daily planning yielded volumes of information--both spoken
and observed in non-verbal interplay between and among planning team members. While the resources for taping and transcribing conversations were not available to me, it was possible to write the "gist" of interchanges and to indicate unusual intonations, body language, or eye contacts. While less than ideal, these notes were useful in reconstructing conversations and provided additional sources of information for formulating follow-up questions in both formal and informal interviews.

Because team members were willing to alert the researcher when last minute changes were made in their schedule of group meetings, consistency and thoroughness of notes were maintained. Audio tapes were provided for two meetings the researcher was unable to attend, but which team members felt important enough to record. Team members also provided a weekly calendar that listed all group and individual activities. More specifically, this calendar of individual and group activities provided valuable contextual information on what the group intended to do in a particular week. In addition, governance, houses, and staffing (all leadership issues,) as well as code of conduct, cultural issues, and the relationship between assessment and high expectations for students (parental and political involvement issues.) were stated
As the program was implemented, the researcher participated in the August, 1992, orientation activities where new teachers received information about how school was to be "done" as the school program was developed by the teacher planners. These sessions clearly depicted new staff members' perception of leadership as it was provided by the original team of teacher planners.

In short, the collection of artifacts, interview information, and notes from eighteen months of participant/observation provide a rich source for analyzing the role definition of leadership for teachers in the planning phase of program design.

DOCUMENTS AS ARTIFACTS OF THE PLANNING PROCESS

The artifacts of the entire planning process were made available to the researcher during an eighteen month participant observation, six months of planning, and a year of implementation. In each meeting, participants included the researcher in the distribution of any document regardless of its content. Because these artifacts represent the "working" nature of the process, they are rich in content and multi-faceted in scope. A document might originate with the superintendent, assistant superintendent, principal, teacher, community member, or student.

The team members used electronic mail as a daily alternative to more meetings-of-the-whole. A printout of
these messages was available. Video tapes of the initial interviews of the six teacher planners (as this researcher will refer to the six teachers) who were selected in a process that involved several hundred candidates were also available. Their statements contain revealing insights into their ideas of leadership in the Spring of 1991 before they were hired. Changes in perceptions about leadership were analyzed as the eighteen months between interviews and opening of the new school year passed.

Files maintained by the Long Range Planner play an important part in the objective analysis of teacher leadership. Since she was a key player in the initial development of the project, these files are an additional rich source of yet another perspective. They also provide much of the background information that was unavailable to the researcher except in anecdotal form since the participant/observation was begun starting January 6, 1992, four months after the team began its deliberations.

These documents provide information that, when analyzed, give insight into constraints the planners experienced as they attempted to define their leadership role. In addition, they provide contextual information for drawing conclusions about the usefulness of teachers assuming a leadership role.
INTERVIEWS

The availability of teacher planners, Long Range Planner, Principal, Assistant Superintendent, and Superintendent was a continuing source of support for this research. All team members consistently answered research questions in frank, cooperative, helpful ways—at times making additional suggestions about important perspectives and documents or events which might be accessed. This support proved invaluable.

The formal interview schedule called for an interview of the teacher planners and Principal in February and March, 1992, with an additional interview of the Principal in July, 1992. These interviews assessed the changing perception of leadership as the project evolved from planning to implementation. Because of the pressures of making decisions for the opening of school, and the researcher’s own personal schedule, the July, 1992, interview with the Principal was not held. Additional interviews, including ones with the Superintendent, (January, 1992), Assistant Superintendent (March, 1992), the Long Range Planner (January, 1992, and October, 1992), and with additional staff members in September, 1992, complement the perceptions of the leadership role gained by observation of the planning process.
METHODOLOGY

For case studies, five components of a research design are especially important:

1. a study’s questions
2. its propositions, if any
3. its units of analysis
4. the logical linking of the data to the propositions and,
5. the criteria for interpreting the findings.  
   (Yin, 1984)

This study will focus on the answers to these questions:

1. How do teachers exercise leadership?
2. What leadership roles do teachers assume when given leadership responsibilities?
3. What constraints prevent teachers from achieving success in leadership roles?

Some studies may have a legitimate reason for not having any propositions. This is the condition—which exists in experiments, surveys, and the other research strategies alike—in which a topic is the subject of ‘exploration.’ Every exploration, should still have some purpose. Instead of propositions, the design for an exploratory study should state this purpose, as well as the criteria by which an exploration will be judged successful (Yin, 1984).

Looking at the constraints to leadership, how teachers exercise leadership, and determining what leadership roles teachers assume when given leadership responsibilities is clearly an exploratory investigation. However, because there exists so much hard copy of meetings, interviews, documents, and extensive notes of observations, the researcher will
link the characteristics of effective schools with the characteristics of teachers leadership exhibited by the teacher planners. Linking these two, the researcher speculates, "If effective schools have within their culture these six characteristics, I should see these same six characteristics exhibited by the teacher planners in designing an effective school."

The unit of analysis is six teachers considered as a single unit because they were hired as a collaborative team to plan the curriculum and program for a high school. In this case, the most difficult part of the analysis was to define the case and the unit of analysis in terms of the available research literature. In spite of the increasing opportunities to look at teachers as leaders, very few investigators have had the opportunity to observe teachers in a leadership role which clearly contained administrative components. Therefore, this research will deviate in clear, operationally defined ways. Use was made of the characteristics of the leadership component as described in the effective school literature to predict what might happen when six teachers collaborate to manage the development, planning, and implementation of a high school program.

As Yin (1984) writes, "the fourth and fifth components have been the least well developed in case studies." Linking data to the proposition and establishing the
criteria for interpreting the findings proved to be the most difficult part of this research. Using time-series analysis (Yin, 1984), all the data collected was coded in terms of the characteristics of effective schools. Pattern matching is illustrated in a series of graphs (Appendix A) which facilitates the building of an explanation for the outcomes of the planning year and the TPT's continuing difficulties with collaboration in the decision-making process.

DATA ANALYSIS

Coding of interview tapes, notes, and observation reflections required a refinement of the definition of leadership into behavioral characteristics. It also required analysis of the use of language that reflected leadership as it is defined earlier in this research. Using the six characteristics of effective schools as a guide, the researcher coded each response for (1) staff development, (2) instructional leadership, (3) school leadership, (4) productive climate and culture, (5) assessment of student progress, and (6) high expectations. This coding provided clear direction for determining when the teacher planners were exhibiting characteristics that would not only define them as leaders, but should, theoretically produce an effective school organization that would meet the needs of the students and the community in which they lived.
Actual coding of the 932 pages of data which included observation notes, scripts of meetings, and program documents required using six colored pens, one for each of the six characteristics of effective schools. Each page of hand-written notes was counted as one page; each typed document as two pages. Each incident was counted as a single response regardless of the length of the response by an individual. Pages and incidents were organized on charts which corresponded to the week’s calendar of events. Meetings were similarly tabulated as to their major content. On many occasions, the content identified as the subject of the meeting is completely obscured by reference to an off-task behavior or topic. This off-task behavior may have been precipitated by pressures from outside sources, by conflicting views, or by lack of a clear decision-making process. Analysis of off-task behavior enabled the researcher to explain the results of the planning year.

Concluding the coding of observation notes and other documents, the six characteristics were summarized and total incidences charted by benchmark phases of the planning year. See figure 3.1
These phases were intuitively derived during the process of observation when there were two key events that had the effect of "driving" the planning process.

The first event was a presentation to the Governing Board of the District in November, 1991, before research observation had begun. The presentation, because of its serious requirements became a reference point for the Planners from that day forward and will be discussed in detail in Chapter IV.

The second event was a presentation to members of the Community in February. This event, too, held high
expectations for the Planners to meet performance expectations, and as the report on process will show, should have provided the Planners a warning that the process was not meeting community expectations.

The third and final period encompasses the weeks between the community presentation and the end of the planning period. The opening of the first year of the high school program effectively concluded the planning process and would be a basis of further research to determine how successful the teacher planners were at leadership role definition in the new school.

Finally, applying the criteria for judging the quality of any research design, Yin's chart of tactics for Four Design Tests was used and the process was subjected to his questions:

1. Were multiple sources of evidence used?
2. Was a chain of evidence established?
3. Did key informants review drafts of the case study report?

When the answers to these questions were "yes," I concluded that the investigation would have construct validity.

While Yin insists that internal validity is not for exploratory investigation, this research did use pattern-matching, explanation building, and time-series analysis for data analysis to establish internal validity.
The final two criteria, external validity, and reliability are, as stated earlier, much more difficult tests to apply to a case study.

The external validity problem has been a major barrier in doing case studies. Critics typically state that single cases offer a poor basis for generalizing. However, such critics are implicitly contrasting the situation to survey research, where a 'sample' (if selected properly) readily generalizes to a larger universe. This analogy to samples and universes is incorrect when dealing with case studies. This is because survey research relies on statistical generalization, whereas case studies (as with experiments) rely on analytical generalization (Yin, 1984).

Yin defends reliability in case studies by saying,

The general way of approaching the reliability problem is to make as many steps as possible as operational as possible, and to conduct research as if someone were always looking over your shoulder....A good guideline for doing case studies is therefore to conduct the research so that an auditor could repeat the procedures and arrive at the same results (Yin, 1984).

Unfortunately, in this instance, the likelihood that the circumstances of the planning year would ever be duplicated is very small. However, conditions described, and opportunities presented may be duplicated many times as teachers aspire to leadership positions and as administrators and community leaders see a need for providing an ecology where such research and investigation might be carried out.

This unique opportunity confirms Yin's conclusion that there is a firm rationale for single-case designs.
The single-case study is an appropriate design under several circumstances...when it represents the critical case in testing a well-formulated theory. The theory has specified a clear set of propositions as well as the circumstances within which the propositions are believed to be true. To confirm, challenge, or extend the theory, there may exist a single case, meeting all the conditions for testing the theory...A second rational...is where the case represents an extreme or unique case...A third rationale is the revelatory case. This situation exists when an investigator has an opportunity to observe and analyze a phenomenon previously inaccessible to scientific investigation (Yin,1984).
SUMMARY

A study of six teachers and their search for a clearly defined leadership role is well suited to a qualitative method. Using Robert Yin's criteria for research design, the researcher describes in this chapter the research setting. This chapter also describes the structure for coding the data to identify those behaviors exhibited by teachers that most closely modeled behaviors that leaders in effective schools use when demonstrating a successful program for students.

The chapter also divides the participant/observer's schedule into three distinct phases which enable the reader to identify the evolutionary process of pattern matching, time-series analysis and building of an explanation for how teacher leadership might have developed in this setting.

In Chapter IV, the researcher turns to a description of the project with both historic development and evolutionary process of teacher leadership.

In Chapter IV, the researcher gives details of the case study including a description of the School District, the philosophic basis for the planning process, a description of the basic commitment of the major players and a chronology of the research on the planning year.
CHAPTER IV
THE CASE STUDY

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Sunrise School District is an affluent suburb of a major metropolitan city in a southwestern state. The name is fictitious as are the names of the major participants in the research. With a population of just under 7,000 students, the district offers primarily a college-preparatory curriculum in its three elementary, two middle schools and the first high school described in this research.

The district's reputation for high standards, demanding work environment, and sophisticated organizational ecology attracts dedicated, heavily involved professionals and loyal parent supporters. While the perception of high quality education might be questioned upon further investigation, the district's reputation pervades the media. Local realtors' advertisements describing the value of the lifestyle among the district's residents, and enthusiastic descriptions of staff in reflecting on their working conditions and job satisfaction lends credence to these high standards.

School staffing reflects high expectations for employees. Student-teacher ratios of 1:27 at the Middle School and 1:25 at the elementary schools continue to be a
desired outcome in budget decisions. As parents demand individualized and personalized attention for each child they vote for additional taxes. While the ratios may seem low by some urban standards, the expectations for subject competency, Essential Elements of Instruction (EEI) training for each teacher within the first year of working in the district, and continuing professional development for each teacher places heavy work demands on teachers.

Each elementary school is served by a single principal; there are no assistant principals. Middle schools are administered by a Principal and an Assistant Principal. School counselors serve approximately 400 students and school nurses serve two schools each. Parents are represented in the organizational structure by active participation by a few parents in the Family-Faculty Association (FFA). The district also has a district-wide FFA where representatives of each school coordinate activities that affect individual school calendars.

Active community involvement brought about the passage of the Bond issue that would provide funds for construction of the first high school in the district. In previous years, students graduating from eighth grade in the two middle schools entered high schools in surrounding districts and private schools.
Most students, at the end of the four years of high school attend colleges of their choice. While this research does not address the socio-economic status of the community, it is clear that the presence of large numbers of college professors, successful professionals and affluent business persons in the parent body contribute to the success of the students in high school and college. This presence also reflects the high expectations placed on the teacher planners for the development of the high school curriculum.

At the District Level, the Superintendent administers the affairs of the District in conjunction with a Governing Board of five members. His administrative team consists of one Assistant Superintendent, a Business Manager and a staff of eighteen to carry out business and personnel functions. In July, 1992, the personnel roster contained names of 223 certified employees and 139 classified employees.

The budget of the school district for the 1992-93 school year included $13,867,191 in maintenance and operation funds and $789,763 in capital outlay provisions. The assessed valuation of the district for the same year was $188,670,322 and the bonded indebtedness of the district (including the twenty four million dollars ($24,000,000.00) for the new high school stood at $24,179,286. The District received special funding for K-3 academic improvement and Career Ladder for teacher professional development
activities. State-funded projects brought in an additional $589,763 to the District. For a district with 6,400 students, these financial figures represent a fairly typical district in this southwestern state. (This state's equity issues were resolved with finance legislation passed in 1980 which restricts the amount of funds a district may spend by establishing a Revenue Control Limit on total receipts, including taxes levied and tuition received from other districts. It also includes a fairly complex funding formula that precludes even the wealthiest districts like Sunrise District from exceeding these limitations.)

Historically, Sunrise District had enjoyed relative prosperity with its high assessed valuation and its attendant reputation for excellence. On the second attempt, a Bond Election provided this one-time opportunity to build a high school. The new high school would have to blend with the high expectations of the community by arriving with an established reputation based on an innovative plan for developing the curriculum and program for the high school (See figure 4.1.)

When bumper stickers began to appear on automobiles in the district proclaiming, "We can't wait for a high school!!", it was clear that community support was high. On the second attempt (a fairly common experience among this state's school districts), the twenty four million dollars
was appropriated not only for building construction, but also for a planning year for teachers. While the Bond itself contained salary dollars for only three teachers, community support grew rapidly for a full complement of six teachers and a principal to plan for the high school program. This high school was not to be just any high school, but one based on two very clear and distinct philosophical bases: Systems Thinking and Coalition of Essential Schools.

**Figure 4.1 HISTORICAL FLOW CHART**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 1989</td>
<td>First Bond Election: Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 1990</td>
<td>Second Bond Election: Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 1991</td>
<td>Third Bond Election: Passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 1991</td>
<td>Hiring:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New High School Planning Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 1991</td>
<td>Hiring:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Range Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Six Teacher Planners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**August 1991 to August 1992** The Planning Year

- August, 1991 Orientation for New Teachers
- August 20, 1992 High School Program Opens on Middle School Campus.

In the next section, I describe the involvement of individuals who propelled community thinking in support of these two complimentary philosophic bases for a school program development.
Within the Sunrise District, there was a growing interest in the organizational thinking behind Massachusetts Institute of Technology's (MIT's) Systems Thinking Model. This model of organizational structure requires each participant to be dedicated to continual improvement and the consideration that each decision made may seriously impact other parts of the organization. The "learning organization" became a guiding principle. This principle encouraged the six teachers and principal to develop structure for the new school in a way which would allow students to become facilitators of their own learning. It would also support the TPT's desire to develop the culture of the school supportive of a different approach to instruction, school organization, and meeting the needs of students in a more personal way.

Gordon Brown, former director of MIT's Servo-Mechanical Engineering Department, brought the overall philosophy to the community. When he engaged administrators, teachers, students, community members and other staff in conversations about the optimum conditions for learning in such an environment, his ideas were warmly received. The question
of funding such an organization was a continuing impediment to the further introduction of the principles of Systems Thinking in any broad-based adoption of the philosophy.

Mr. Brown approached Philanthropists, Jim and Faith Waters, about the possibility of funding the development of the principles in Sunrise District. Mr. Waters was the owner of a company which provided services in a chemical process which he had invented. His personal wealth, independence, and philanthropic nature allowed him to commit one million dollars in a grant to the district. This grant would support the process of enabling the new high school to become a learning organization in much the same way as one of the two middle schools had in the previous year with similar financial support from Mr. Waters.

Supported by adequate dollars for a year of investigation of the intricacies of developing the optimum educational ecology for a group of 250 ninth graders who would become the first high school class in Sunrise District, six teachers and a principal began their work in the Summer of 1992.

**COALITION OF ESSENTIAL SCHOOLS**

At the same time that interest in Systems Thinking was attracting many followers in Sunrise District, a similar base of support was growing for adopting the Principles of the Coalition for Essential Schools. The basic principles
under which the Planners would operate would come from Dr. Ted Sizer's five imperatives for better schools:

1. Give room to teachers and students to work and learn in their own, appropriate ways.

2. Insist that students clearly exhibit mastery of their school work.

3. Get the incentives right, for students and for teachers.

4. Focus the students' work on the use of their minds.

5. Keep the structures simple and thus flexible."

(Sizer, 1984, 1985)

The principles urged educators to question the basic assumptions about school structure. Should there be four years of English, three years of Math? Did "seat time" count for much? Is there a better way of grouping students than by age? Shouldn't thoroughness count for more than coverage of content material?

The TPT enthusiastically considered all the information they were accumulating about how students learn, how teachers can be most successful at collaboration and reflection, and how schools can be organized to reflect these concerns. Considering the possibilities of such restructuring, they were constantly faced with the realities of Ted Sizer's questions:

Can a new design for schools improve their quality—the standard of students' learning, the decency of students' life at school, the effectiveness and joy for teachers and principals and other school people? Can such a design, which will necessarily be comprehensive, be installed,
as a practical matter? Can it be adopted, even in experimental form, as a political matter? That is, will enough people, somewhere, want it enough to risk it, nurture it, be honest with it, give it time? Is there money available to buy the teachers' and principal's after school hours to plan and test and replan? Can designs be both true to some common standards and at the same time respectful of local traditions and of each faculty's need for a deep sense of ownership of its own school? (Sizer, 1984, 1985)

With the optimism of being hired as leaders the teachers set about the work of designing a high school that would positively reflect the nine principles derived from Sizer's five imperatives for better schools:

1. Focus. The school should focus on helping adolescents learn to use their minds well. Schools should not attempt to be 'comprehensive' if such a claim is made at the expense of the school's central intellectual purpose. That is, Essential Schools should not attempt to provide an unrealistically wide range of academic, vocational, extracurricular, and social services for adolescents.

2. Simple goals. The school's goals should be simple: that each student master a limited number of centrally important skills and areas of knowledge. While these skills and areas will, to varying degrees, reflect the traditional academic disciplines, the program's design should be shaped by the intellectual and imaginative powers and competencies that students need, rather than by 'subjects' as conventionally defined. That is, students' school experience should not be molded by the existing complex and often dysfunctional system of isolated departments, 'credit hours' delivered in packages called English, social studies, science, and the rest. Less is more. Curricular decisions should be guided by the aim of student mastery and achievement rather than by an effort to 'cover content.'

3. Universal goals. The school's goals should be universal, while the means to these goals will vary as the students themselves vary. School
practices should be tailor-made to meet the needs of every group or class of adolescents.

4. Personalization. Teaching and learning should be personalized to the maximum feasible extent. Efforts should be directed toward a goal that no teacher have direct responsibility for more than eighty students. To allow for personalization, decisions about the details of the course of study, the use of students’ and teachers’ time, and the choice of teaching materials and specific pedagogies must be unreservedly placed in the hands of the principal and staff.

5. Student-as worker. The governing practical metaphor of the school should be student-as-worker, rather than the more familiar teacher-as-deliverer-of-instructional-services. Accordingly, a prominent pedagogy will be coaching, to provoke students to learn how to learn, and thus to teach themselves.

6. Diploma by exhibition. Students entering secondary school studies are those who are committed to the school’s purposes and who can show competence in language, elementary mathematics, and basic civics. Students of traditional high school age who are not yet at appropriate levels of competence to enter secondary school studies will be provided intensive remedial work to assist them quickly to meet these standards. The diploma should be awarded upon a successful final demonstration of mastery for graduation—an ‘exhibition’. This exhibition by the student of his or her grasp of the central skills and knowledge of the school’s program should be jointly administered by the faculty and by higher authorities: the exhibition represents the latter’s primary and proper influence over the school’s program. As the diploma is awarded when earned, the school’s program proceeds with no strict age-grading and with no system of ‘credits earned’ by ‘time spent’ in class. The emphasis is shifted to the students’ demonstration that they can do important things.

7. Attitude. The tone of the school should explicitly and self-consciously stress values of unanxious expectation ("I won’t threaten you but I expect much of you"), of trust (until abused), and
of decency (the values of fairness, generosity, and tolerance). Incentives appropriate to the school’s particular students and teachers should be emphasized, and parents should be treated as essential collaborators.

8. Staff. The principal and teachers should perceive themselves as generalists first (teachers and scholars in general education) and specialists second (experts in only one particular discipline). Staff should expect multiple obligations (teacher-counselor-manager) and feel a sense of commitment to the entire school.

9. Budget. Ultimate administrative and budget targets should include, in addition to total student loads per teacher of eighty or fewer pupils, substantial time for collective planning by teachers, competitive salaries for staff, and an ultimate per pupil cost not to exceed that at traditional schools by more than 10 percent. To accomplish this, administrative plans will inevitably have to show the phased reduction or elimination of some services now provided to students in many traditional comprehensive secondary schools. (Sizer, 1984, 1985)

In addition to the nine Coalition principles, the TPT added three. Their first image-building brochure featured a desert scene with one large flower blooming in the middle with this language:

Imagine a high school settled into the desert foothills where students have a sense of belonging and purpose, where expectations are high and students demonstrate competence, where technology and community action are a part of school life. Imagine a high school built around the following principles:

1. The school will focus on helping all students to learn to use their minds well. The school will provide engaging activities requiring meaningful work. Critical thinking, disciplined inquiry, and discovery will characterize the coursework as students "learn-to-learn."
2. The school's academic goal is simple: Students will use and expand their abilities as learners through in-depth study in the areas of knowledge valued by the school. The school will emphasize significant growth and depth of understanding in all areas of study. Academic standards will be challenging and reachable; graduation requirements will meet and exceed state requirements.

3. The diploma will be awarded upon successful exhibition of readiness for graduation. The high school diploma will not be awarded for seat time or accumulation of credits but, rather, for demonstrations of achievement of clearly established and consistently applied standards. Readiness will be demonstrated through the development of a cumulative portfolio of work and final displays of cross-curricular knowledge and research.

4. The school will expect students to take responsibility for their own learning. Teachers will be coaches, facilitators, mentors, and guides so that students will be workers, active participants, and initiators in the learning process.

5. The school community will be personalized to ensure that everyone will have a meaningful place and a sense of belonging and purpose. The school will be organized so that each individual is known, listened to, respected and valued. Teachers will get to know their students well, both as individuals and learners.

6. The culture of the school will foster personal growth and responsibility by setting high expectations within a community of fairness, sensitivity and encouragement. The school's goals will convey respect for the potential of all students by applying to all students. The school will be committed to providing support, opportunities, and resources so that all students can become responsible, productive citizens.

7. The school will provide an exciting and invigorating environment that is emotionally and physically healthy and safe. Students and staff working in a safe and healthy school community will be able to create and respond to personal and academic challenges.
8. Staff members will perceive themselves as generalists committed beyond their areas of expertise to the development of the whole student and the whole school. Staff members will be actively concerned with all aspects of school and student life.

9. The school structure will provide ample time for teacher teams to collaboratively plan and evaluate student experiences. Interdisciplinary teams will design and assess a variety of integrated student learning experiences.

10. Staff members will be reflective practitioners who gather, analyze, and share information and concerns to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Time will be provided for research, reflection, and collaboration.

11. The school will broaden and deepen learning by connection with the larger community. Community involvement will help students gain insight, compassion, and self-esteem through the integration of knowledge, action, and experience. Students will experience two fundamentals of democracy--responsibility and rights.

12. All members of the school community will integrate a wide variety of resources, current technologies, and field experiences in their work. Technologies and resources that link the school with the larger world will be available to everyone for the purposes of constructing meaningful learning and gaining a more global perspective.

While a comparison of the two lists of principles reveals a striking similarity, closer examination of the public presentation of the principles for the new high school reveals an overarching need to promise a program containing not only high standards, but also a program bearing specific references to widely held expectations in the community: connections with the broader community, use
of a wide variety of resources, current technology and field experiences in student work, and teachers with a concern for improving the quality of teaching and learning.

Were the promises more than could be delivered? To answer that question, the discussion now turns to a description of the commitment level of the specific individuals who would be responsible for carrying out the planning of the plan.

**BASIC COMMITMENTS OF THE MAJOR PLAYERS**

**THE SUPERINTENDENT**

The search for the Superintendent and for the Principal were conducted almost simultaneously with both new staff members arriving in June and July, 1991. Both the Superintendent and the Principal and four of the six teacher planners were from Massachusetts. The only prior acquaintance was that Tom Hill worked with Ken Forest when both were social studies teachers in a high school in Massachusetts. While it is not the purpose of this research to look at this particular combination of circumstances, it is important to note that having so many individuals come from a region of the country that is vastly different in both educational philosophy and life style became a source of lively discussion among community members as they contemplated the successes and shortcomings of the planning team. Committee FFA members jokingly explained after a
particularly frustrating discussion about curriculum, "They should know things are different here- this is still the wild west!"

David Anderson had held Assistant Superintendent positions in school districts of a similar size and complexity in Massachusetts. His special area of interest, curriculum and his doctoral dissertation topic which examined programs for the gifted, were both strong characteristics. For a community which held very high aspirations for the strength of its curriculum and the number of gifted students among its school age population, his selection came as no surprise. (The percentage of gifted students was reported as high as 30% in some instances.)

Perhaps the most serious difficulty of stepping into the Superintendency in this community was that David Anderson followed a very charismatic, people-person in the former superintendent. The former superintendent was also heavily invested in the "learning organization," and highly committed to the personalization of instruction and the development of all staff—both certified and classified.

The new superintendent had no difficulty identifying with the personalization of instruction in view of his former involvement with the education of the gifted, but his personality did not allow him to engage in the same kinds of
personal support for staff as the former superintendent had. It was quickly apparent that he would have to work very diligently at developing relationships with the teacher planners as well as with the entire staff who would carry out the district mission in just two short months after his arrival.

Discussion in Chapter V will reveal that the conflict between his personal investment in the development of curriculum and his complete lack of knowledge of systems thinking and a somewhat luke warm endorsement of the principles of the Coalition of Essential Schools all contributed to some of the difficulties that the TPT members had in defining their individual and collective role(s).

It is unclear even after analyzing the data and conducting interviews what his level of commitment to the principles of collaboration, reflection, Coalition of Essential Schools or Systems Thinking was at the time of his interviewing and being hired for the position. What is clear that the Superintendent did not take part in the numerous opportunities for personal mastery of the principles of either the Coalition or Systems Thinking. He would use the language of both when it seemed to coincide with whatever he was trying to accomplish. For example, he would use the term, "Less is more" when there was a budget
discussion about athletics or any enrichment part of the program.

THE ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT

The Assistant Superintendent, Tilly Uppey, had earned the respect of District staff after successfully filling teaching and principalship positions in the preceding ten or more years. Her principalship included successful planning and opening of the latest middle school to be added to the district facility list. Her involvement and commitment to parent participation had earned her a reputation for knowing almost everyone in the entire district. She carried this intimate knowledge of the community into the planning process and, in the best of intentions to be supportive of the collaborative nature of allowing teachers to be leaders, left the TPT members to their own devices throughout more than three fourths of the planning year.

At that point, her frustration with their lack of progress, and her general knowledge that the responsibility for the effective operation of the schools on a day-to-day basis would fall to her, caused her to meet with the Planning Team. At this meeting, she presented them with a list of necessary completion steps (all of which were within her realm of supervision.) Even this drastic step did not increase the productivity of the Planning Team. If anything, it served only to increase the already high
frustration level of team members who thought they were functioning quite within the guidelines of the collaborative process.

In fairness to the Assistant Superintendent, she attempted to provide checklists, guidelines, budget information, statistical information that would inform their decisions, and, in general, whatever information and encouragement she could without violating her own interest in preserving the collaborative, reflective process for teacher leaders.

The commitment of the Assistant Superintendent to maintaining the high standards and impeccable reputation of the District could never be questioned. Her personal enthusiasm for the principles of System Thinking and Coalition of Essential Schools was only dampened when the productivity issues of the planning year threatened her own reputation for the orderly learning environment she had always been able to produce. In the past, she had made decisions in the traditional leadership model working with a Superintendent who also was a very capable leader. Her relationship with the new superintendent was cordial, but their personal philosophies did not always coincide.

The most vocal display of their differences occurred in a meeting to define more clearly parameters for the physical education program. Consistent with multiple-ways-of-
learning ideas, she advocated for a broad curriculum that would offer many different choices. The Superintendent, consistent with his curriculum background, advocated for specific broad-based semester long courses that all students would be required to take, whether it matched their personal interests or not.

Nowhere in the data does the Assistant Superintendent appear to be either lacking in commitment or unsupportive of the reflective, collaborative principles on which the planning year was based.

THE LONG-RANGE PLANNER

There are very few school districts in the country who have the luxury of employing a long-range planner. In this instance Sunrise District not only had the luxury, but obtained the services of one of the most capable and strategically experienced individuals available at the time.

Linda Southern had not only been a teacher in the District in the early years of her career, but was also returning with broad-based experience after serving as the Director of the statewide testing system for the Department of Education for this southwest state. In this role, she had seen the possibilities of nationwide interest in and development of competency testing and portfolio development. When the position came open, it not only gave her an opportunity to return to an area she was very fond of, but
also gave her an opportunity to assist in the positioning of assessment in a local school district. She recognized she would have the added opportunity of developing an assessment plan in an innovative approach to teacher development and student learning.

The District newsletter describes her experience with these words:

If she could be high atop one of Colorado's ski slopes, a down-hill ski on one foot, a cross-country ski on another, a pen and a pad of paper for writing poetry in on hand, and a good book in another, Linda Southern would be about as happy as she could be. 'I'd be even happier if I could ski an hour in Colorado, a couple of hours in Switzerland, and the rest of the day on Mt. Cook in New Zealand,' she says, 'because I also love to travel.'

Raised in Colorado, she taught there and at Lemonwood Middle School. In October, 1985, she joined the State Department of Education as the state's first writing specialist. She became Director of Curriculum and Instruction, and then, as codesigner of a new assessment program, served as Director of Curriculum and Assessment Planning. She's proudest of the performance based assessment the state has devised.

She graduated from Colorado State University with high honors and earned an M.A. and a Ph.D. from the Local State University. Her son, Michael, graduated from Lemonwood Middle School and from a high school in this urban center and is currently attending the local community college. (Sunrise High School Newsletter)

There is no doubt that her greatest commitment was to continuing the excellence not only of her former district, but also of implementing an assessment program for which she had a major design responsibility. What is less certain from the research is how she perceived her commitment to a
new superintendent who was so very different from the superintendent with whom she formerly worked. What is also very clear is that the role definition that would have occurred with the former superintendent never reached a state of clarity that would allow her to develop confidence that this was where she would spend any great length of time.

Faced with uncertainty and lack of support, she left the district in March of the planning year, assuming a national position in one of the agencies related to the Coalition of Essential Skills where her skills in working with state-level policy makers could better be used.

THE PRINCIPAL

The Principal, who was also in his first principalship, had served as Assistant Principal in a high school of similar size in Massachusetts. It is unclear in the information presented to the public as to the limits of the leadership opportunities which might have been performed by the Principal in his former position. In any case, it was fairly obvious that he had the ingredients for being successful in this community. He was Yale-educated, had children in a private school on their way to Harvard or Yale, a wife who was also a teacher in the district, and a family background that was similar to the families in the district. His ivy-league connections were seen as a
positive attribute, and his calm, warm personality fit the requirements for the personalization of instruction and the promise that every student would identify closely with the staff.

The public information newsletter described Ken Forest this way:

With roots in Colorado and West Virginia, high school Principal Ken Forest grew up near New York City. His high school class of 62 was the first to move fully through a new 7-12 high school.

The family values of education and service emerged strongly in Ken's senior year, when he captained two sports teams and was an active school leader as Student Council President. Upon completing his work at Yale, he decided to become a secondary educator and to study Modern History at Oxford, England. After returning for a brief stint at the Harvard School of Education, Ken began his career as a Social Studies teacher at Wayland (MA) high school.

Throughout his career, Ken has found his work to be occasionally repetitive and stressful, but always challenging and important. He has worked with scores of wonderful educators (one of whom is now his wife) and thousands of adolescents as a curriculum developer, class and club advisor, coach, teacher, department head, and Assistant Principal for Student Life. Among his pioneering professional contributions have been a Human Rights Committee; courses in Future Studies Legal issues and Urban Studies; a Spirit Week; a Teacher Evaluation Handbook; a staff team to support at-risk students; and a Peer Assistance Team.

An intermittent enthusiast of ballet and classical music, Ken continues to enjoy travel, varied cuisine, tennis, and when the knees are willing, basketball. Ken and his wife have two scholar-athlete sons. One is a freshman at the local private Catholic School and the second a senior in the local college prep high school with a current major in filling out college application forms. (Sunrise High School Brochure)
While all of this description would lead one to believe that this was a potentially successful candidate, the one apparent flaw in the process was that the principal to be hired should be an individual who had NOT been a principal before so that he or she would not come into the collaborative setting with preconceived notions about how a school should be planned from an experienced principal's point of view.

A second problem apparent in the hiring of the principal was also a lack of clarity in determining what the role of the principal would be. In speaking to a group of educators gathered for a conference on multi-age grouping and restructured schools at the end of March in the planning year, the principal said, "The Superintendent wants me to be a principal. I have to remind him I was hired as part of a team—not to speak for the team. Everyone is a stakeholder; everyone is a decision-maker. This is a high school for each—a high school for all."

As he attempted to carry out what he perceived as his responsibilities to the collaborative, reflective practice of the planning year, the conflict to determine his own role, and to be true to the process, was often apparent. Adding to the complexity of this uncertainty was the opinion of the members of the teacher planning team that the principal exhibited serious gender biases in his dealings
with the members of the team. In a formal interview (the subject of another paper in this graduate work), the Principal, in response to the question, "How do you see your relationship with the teacher planners?" enumerated them in exactly the same hierarchical arrangement that each of the teacher planners had described to me: the two male teachers first, and then, in descending order, the two teachers who exhibited those characteristics likely to be attributed to males. They were directive, assertive, and often forceful in their opinions about the planning year. At the end of the list were the two women who most feared strong men, who were most likely to be reticent in their assessment of a situation and most fearful that the Principal was unsupportive and likely to retaliate in his evaluation of them.

While this socialization process for the new principal is not a subject of this paper, when I present the analysis of the data in Chapter V, we will see that his inability to determine a certain, clear role contributed to a lack of purposeful direction for the planning and, ultimately, led to his replacement as the first-year principal of the new high school within three months of its opening.

This loss of status and stature in the community is a sad reflection on his obvious commitment to making the school plan a successful one. As the research will
indicate, commitment and competency are not the single most important ingredients in a collaborative planning process.

**THE TEACHER PLANNERS**

In spite of the fact that gender issues are not a subject of this research, I will describe the teacher planners beginning with the two male members because they consistently exhibited the characteristics of successful reflective collaborators. Their status in the Planning Team’s work did not come (as the data analysis will indicate) from their gender.

**TIM HILL**

Tim Hill, a colleague of the Principal when they taught together in Massachusetts, came with the personal characteristics of the model reflective, collaborative practitioner. He was accepting of others doubts, a careful listener, a meditative observer, and a willing participant in whatever process was necessary for decision making on any given day.

The newsletter described Tim this way:

Tim Hill comes to Sunrise District from Wayland (MA) High School, where he taught many different courses in science as well as worked with students as a coach and advisor. In addition to his teaching, his most recent work with students included working as the varsity ski coach, as advisor to the active Outing Club, and as advisor to SEA (Students Environmentally Aware).

Tim grew up in Massachusetts, studied chemistry at the University of Maine and then returned to Massachusetts to teach. After teaching at Wayland High School for seven years, Tim took a two-year leave of absence. During the
first year, Tim worked as a curriculum writer for the National Science teachers Association in Washington, DC, spent three winter months traveling with his downhill and cross-country skis around the rocky Mountains and mountains of Maine, and worked in a small business involved in building "ropes" courses and in setting up outdoor education programs for schools and camps.

During the second year, Tim returned to Wayland High School. Over the last eight years, in addition to his work with students, Tim has been involved in staff development and workshop presentations in three areas: working with computers in the classroom, integration of special needs students and teaching about complex science/technology/society issues. For several summers, Tim worked as the head instructor of the Maine Mountain Leadership School, a five-week program for at-risk high school students that combines wilderness skills with academic work. He is experienced in teaching backpacking, introductory rock climbing, and both flatwater and whitewater canoeing.

Tim and his wife are enjoying the change in climate and look forward to exploring our area on bicycles, on skis, and on foot (Sunrise High School Newsletter.)

Reading between the lines of this description, one finds the characteristics that best fit Tim Hill to the assignment of developing a program responsive to the differing needs of adolescents. His commitment was based on complete confidence that he had experiences necessary to plan a program that would be personalized, and that would challenge the weakening resolve of any high school student.

The only impediment to his success as a collaborator was attempting to see his former colleague and now principal, struggle to define a role that would allow all of them to collaborate. This constant conflict found him trying to be honest and forthright in maintaining the old
collegial relationship and yet, struggling to develop trust with the entire team that would allow them all to become leaders.

Never did any of this conflict interfere with his commitment to the collaborative process.

**BOB LIGHTCUP**

Bob Lightcup, the other male on the team, brought to the planning process a quiet sense of humor that always brightened team efforts and lightened their despondency when decision-making was not proceeding smoothly. The newsletter describes him in this way:

Bob Lightcup brings to the high school planning process a great interest in building a school that values each individual. 'In too many large high schools, many students get lost in the shuffle. The challenge for us is to create personalization in a large structure.' Bob's most recent work as a social studies teacher and Assistant Headmaster at a small independent school was centered around ways to ensure that all students are valued, have a voice, and are a vital part of the community.

Though Bob's area of expertise is in history, much of his scholarly work has been interdisciplinary. His advanced degree is a Masters of Liberal Arts. His program encouraged in-depth study of ideas that cross many disciplines. Bob majored in American Studies, a combination of history, politics, literature, art and culture. In creating this new high school, Bob believes that it is important that students begin to look at knowledge and content as a complex web of overlapping ideas rather than isolated bits of information called disciplines.

Bob also has had considerable experience working with students transitioning to post secondary institutions. His work as Director of College Guidance will help the new high school plan for our own articulation with colleges and universities and help students work toward that
transition. His wife also has over 11 years experience in college admissions on the East Cost, and is a constant source for information and support in Bob's work in this area. His son, Matthew, now attending the district pre-school, helps Bob balance his interest in life after high school with a view to the development of each individual before formal schooling. (Sunrise Brochure)

Bob's commitment to the culture of the school was the strongest evidence of his overall investment in the program's development. Unfortunately, his growing family responsibilities (a second son was born during the planning year), his growing conflict with the Superintendent over curricular differences and the developing antagonism toward the Social Studies curriculum, contrived to make his place in the planning process ever more difficult.

The sincerity of purpose and his personal resolve to do the best possible job kept him involved throughout the planning process and the implementation year. At that point, community members ceased questioning his commitment to the process.

KANDY BURNHAM

The first woman mentioned by the Principal in his listing of teachers, was surprisingly the least experienced teacher among those selected to be a part of the planning team. Although inexperienced, she assumed the dutiful role of calendar-scheduler, time keeper, and task master in some of the most traditional behaviors for members of the collaborative process.
However, she was seen as an integral part of the process because of her ability to ask the "innocent" question of the novice teacher. The other planners never saw this as incompetence, welcomed the opportunity to be very explicit in their response, and valued the contributions she made with her competence in the teaching of mathematics. Because she felt the pressures of having less experience in the classroom, she worked more diligently, more purposefully, and with more careful attention to detail than any of the other planners. Her final results were her reward when the math program experienced no negative responses from the community and she had to make virtually no changes in the program she developed in the planning year.

The newsletter describes her this way:
Ms. Burnham looks at education through the lenses of the athlete, the student, and the teacher. Her involvement in soccer has played an important part in her growth as a leader (she was captain of the club and varsity teams) and a team player (she earned league recognition). Also, she met her husband (a soccer player) during her freshman season, and she became head coach of her team after graduation.

After spending most of her life in California, she completed her B.S. in mathematics at Occidental College where she appreciated the accessibility of professors and the sense of community. After graduation, she and her husband moved to Pennsylvania where he worked as a salesman for scholastic products and she in special education and at the local YMCA. Their next journey took them to Massachusetts where Kandy spent a year at Harvard Graduate School of Education earning an Ed.M. She liked the invigorating environment there so much that she
assisted in the summer seminar with the next year's group of students.

Through her experiences, Kandy believes that an ideal learning environment is challenging and it combines a balance of questioning and listening closely to what people are saying. Role models and people who are supportive are also critical to her. 'These conditions have fostered creativity and growth in me and others,' she says. These are the values she brings to building collaboratively a school where students, staff and community are inspired and energized to do their best.

She and her husband enjoy outdoor activities such as running and swimming. They also enjoy traveling and taking ski trips with her family (Sunrise High School Newsletter.)

JAN NEILSON

To have two science specialists on the Planning Team was an example of the abundance of good fortune that the process allowed. Jan Neilson, the second of the science specialists, and the second woman mentioned by the Principal in his ordering of the Planning Team, brought to the team an analytic ability that was not always used to the greatest benefit of the process. Her questions could be seen as requiring too much research for carefully guided answers and her ability to cut to the heart of any matter did not endear her to members of the team. There was never any doubt about her professional abilities, however, or her ability to carefully think through a situation with all of its ramifications.

The newsletter described her in this way: Jan Nielson comes to our district with 10 years of secondary science teaching experience in a wide range of school settings, including one of the
Coalition of Essential Schools. Jan is a member of the Coalition’s National Faculty, and has experience consulting with schools working towards implementing the Coalition’s Principles. She received her B.A. degree from the College of Wooster and her M.S. from Boston College, specializing in biology.

As an educator, Jan finds her greatest reward when students learn to believe in themselves and ask important questions that lead to their own discoveries. She looks forward to collaborating with other teachers so that students will be able to make important connections between traditional subject areas.

Jan’s experience growing up and attending schools overseas is a part of her desire for students to have a more global perspective in their learning process as well as a greater sense of community responsibility.

Jan continues to pursue her interest in science through informal courses and fieldwork; in 1989, she received a summer fellowship to participate in research sponsored by Earthwatch in Yellowstone National Park.

Aside from her enthusiasm for science, Jan enjoys vocal music and hopes to join a performing group in Tucson. When she isn’t keeping tabs on her two children, Eric (3) and Vanessa(7), she loves to swim, read ‘whodunits,’ go biking, or throw a baseball around with her husband (Sunrise High School Newsletter.)

Cecelia Kemper

Of the six planners, Cecelia expressed the greatest commitment of the entire team because she was the only member of the District staff selected to serve on the Planning Team. In her role as librarian, she expressed the hopes and dreams of the entire community because she perceived those expectations from her previous experience as the Librarian at Lemonwood Middle School and as a devotee of Systems Thinking as it was developing at the Middle School.
Her personal commitment, however, was overshadowed by her intense feelings that she was being discriminated against on a fairly regular and systematic basis by the new Principal. Her strongly worded opinion that the intent of the Grant Proposal was not being carried out in the planning process also caused her to be both vocal and silent—strategies which she employed regularly and strenuously. When it became clear to her that the situation was not changing as it related to her working relationship with the Superintendent and the Principal, she took another position with a national company representing library technology.

The newsletter described her contribution to the team effort this way:

The Teacher Librarian for the High School Planning Team has found that being a school librarian is a perfect niche for a teacher who is not only interested in learning, but who also has eclectic interests ranging from horseback riding to traveling to telecommunications that she can share with students.

She says, 'Teaching all the students in a school at some time during the school year, along with the social interactions that occur daily in open library hours, is immensely satisfying. It gives me the big picture about the diversity and individuality of our students and enables me to create an environment that meets their research and recreational needs.'

Her personal background is as diverse as her interests. Raised the daughter of an Air Force pilot, she has lived in ten states, seen most of the historic monuments and sites in the United States along the way, and has traveled in Europe and Mexico. She attended ten different schools (including three high schools, a riding school, and two different colleges). Her first college experience was at California Polytechnic University at San Luis Obispo where she studied
animal science and agricultural business for two years. After pursuing her interest in horses for several years, she returned to college where she graduated with a degree in education with an English major and psychology minor. After graduation, she landed a teaching position at a high school--on the second day of school! 'It was definitely a here's-your-textbooks--now teach-situation. When I look back now, I can't believe I survived! I had to constantly study as I was teaching all of American Literature, nine writing modes, and World and English Literature 800 b.c. to the present. In those days, there were not teaching teams, and like in many traditional systems, no real support system for new teachers.' She worked in that district for four years, teaching English at all grade levels, as well as summer school and night school.

The next great professional challenge occurred at the end of her first year of teaching at Lemonwood Middle School. The Principal was looking for a librarian to open the new Middle School Library. She applied for the position and has been learning about technology, information access and research skills and young adult literature ever since.

In her leisure time, she enjoys riding her Arabian gelding, reading and going to Mexico with friends (Sunrise High School Newsletter.)

THE SCHOOL SECRETARY AS PART OF THE PLANNING TEAM

JANE WILSON

Support services for the Planning Team were to be provided by a full-time secretary. As well as gaining a competent support staff member, the Planning Team also added diversity by selecting a young black woman as the Secretary to the Planning Team. The newsletter used this description: Jane Wilson who serves as high school secretary is a diverse individual whose main goal is to be of service to others. Her varied secretarial positions, both in private industry and University settings, coupled with a B.S. degree in Education and her experiences with students at all levels of education (through practicum experiences, volunteer work and art teaching experiences) give
her an interesting perspective and varied skills to share through her position.

Her husband is a psychologist at the University, along with her daughter who is a first semester sophomore. Her son is an 8th grade student.

Jane's time is balanced between her family, secretarial responsibilities, and her love of visual communication—she is an artist (Sunrise High School Newsletter.)

Jane contributed personal enthusiasm, continuing support and a deep understanding of the social dynamics of being responsive to all the team members while attempting to support the growing stress evident in her primary supervisor, the Principal. While there was never any doubt about her personal commitment to the collaborative process, there were many times when it was obvious that she did not feel included in the process.

THE FIRST YEAR ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Formerly called the Transition Team, the First Year Advisory Committee was made up of a group of parents who represented students from both middle schools. Parents who wished to participate in the FYAC represented primarily the parents who were active in the Family and Faculty Association (FFA) of the two middle schools. In addition, parents of Special Education students were recruited to assure that the interests of these students were recognized and honored. At any meeting, there would be between ten and fifteen members present. They met on a regular basis (about once a month) to advise the planning team on reactions to
the team’s work to date. Since most of the meetings were
appeared by only the principal, and since his perceptions
may not have been accurate, the feedback so necessary to
good Systems Thinking processes, was missing from the
Planning Team’s work.

More often than not, the Planning Team members would
get first hand information from a chance meeting with a
parent or community member in the local grocery store line
or at another community function. Each Planning Team member
took on the personal commitment to solve that person’s
individual problem, usually relating it to the Team the next
day and explaining how they had resolved the issue. As a
result, the Team’s unity of purpose was split into seven
different perspectives of how any problem should be solved.
SUMMARY

The commitment of the individual members of the Planning Team, the District Administrators and community members who chose to participate in the process began with clear statements of purpose, served the process well through the winter months, and began to disintegrate in the early months of 1992. This chapter has attempted to portray the key players and the level of commitment of each as a function of the planning process.

We turn now to a description of the research hypotheses and a description of the relationship between commitment to the collaborative process and a commitment to producing a school program that would be viewed as both successful and adequate in the eyes of the community. Chapter V begins with a description of the six characteristics of Effective Schools which, when applied to the Planning Process, reveal the discrepancies between the expected behaviors and the outcomes of the planning process.
CHAPTER V
RESEARCH FINDINGS

PREDICTIONS

To analyze the degree to which the Teacher Planning Team produced an effective school, I selected those characteristics by which the interactions, conversations, and activities of the members of the team could be judged. I consolidated the fourteen attributes delineated by Joyce, Hersh, and McKibbin (1983) and described in Chapter II, into six characteristics. These characteristics succinctly describe a successful leader of an effective school, clearly the desired outcome in the thinking of this district’s leadership. When coded and analyzed for their presence in the data, these characteristics allowed me to draw conclusions in the form of six predictions also deduced from the Effective Schools literature.

These hypotheses are:

1. SCHOOL LEADERSHIP. Teachers can assume leadership roles in the planning and operation of a school and when they do, the results will be similar to those exhibited when a traditional principal is in the leadership position.

2. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP. Teachers can assume instructional leadership role and when they do, instructional program will be consistent with the
Effective Schools literature and with community expectations.

3. CULTURE. Teachers can develop a school culture which will support both academic and social behavior goals.

4. ASSESSMENT. Teachers can develop an accountability system for student expectations which will meet or exceed community expectations.

5. HIGH EXPECTATIONS. Teachers can support the high expectations of community members by planning and implementing a program that clearly delineates what school standards for academic success are.

6. PARENT AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT. Teachers can expect positive community support when the first five assumptions are in place, and conversely, teachers can expect to lose community support almost immediately upon violating any of the first five assumptions.

FINDINGS
I now explore each of the characteristics and its related prediction.

1. SCHOOL LEADERSHIP. Teachers can assume leadership roles in the planning and operation of a school and when they do, the results will be similar to those exhibited when a traditional principal is leading the school.
In the early weeks of the planning process, the teacher planners were presented a scope-of-work plan which included all the facets of designing and implementing a high school program. The program had been designed by the Assistant Superintendent, The Long Range Planner and the newly hired Principal in a week-end retreat setting in Colorado. Their plan was very straightforward and fairly typical of organizational plans. It contained areas of focus and a calendar for smooth completion of the project.

Had the Planners assumed responsibility for the plan in its entirety, they would have duplicated the schools currently seen in any middle to upper class neighborhood. The Planners thought they had been hired to fill a different role. In their minds they came with a high degree of confidence that they had been hired for something very special.

The interview scripts contain this description from the Long Range Planner.

In the bond election, they had certainly described a Coalition kind of school. They talked about personalized education, they talked about high expectations, they talked about alternative assessment, they talked about integrated learning. It was interesting. It wasn't so much that they had communicated to me what this high school would be like, but that they knew me and my philosophy and they knew the work that I had done in the district and I knew the work they had done in transforming their junior high into a middle school. I had no doubts that they would build an innovative high school.

The least experienced teacher said,
There was no job description. To me it was...I was excited about being a generalist, being able to contribute to the whole school...But again, I didn’t really know what that would mean. And it wasn’t defined beyond that. Just that we would be...Ken said we would be having coffees with the community. To me that meant really relaxed conversations. I didn’t think it would mean presentations necessarily. Other than that, the role wasn’t really defined. And actually as the year went on, I asked a few times. Do we need to have a curriculum document because to me that’s what was in my old school. We had one. I was told no. I kept typing things just thinking gosh, we should have something. Sort of knowing what was expected of us at the beginning of the year, we probably could have gotten more done. And if we knew more about decision making...

When I asked Jan Nielson how her role was defined, she said,

I don’t think it was ever defined. The part of the role that was messy was two fold: One, the coalition piece and my expertise as a City Banker. I had anticipated that would be taken advantage of and that I would be one of a number of people with a particular piece of expertise and I would be called upon from time to time to share that expertise with my team and in fact, it only happened once and never again. The second piece was that there were two science teachers on the team and that was a very difficult relationship to try to establish a role for myself because everything hinged on the other person. And that was complicated by the fact that the other science teacher was also a friend of the principal. So that relationship was always kind of a roadblock and I was never quite sure of where I stood. I thought I was going to be researching some of the exemplary science and interdisciplinary kinds of programs. I knew that I would be working with other people so I expected to collaborate both within and across disciplines with people in my field. I expect to take on a role as facilitator and as consultant...not exactly...as a process-observer. By midyear, I saw that we had to get more products to the public and what I saw happening, was a lot more of the curriculum writing and identification of the
school structure and policies that needed to be gotten done than we had worked on before. We never really got very good at decision-making as a group and I have a lot of ideas about why. ...The work we did in the first half of the year was productive when we had an agreed-upon set of structures within which to work. We weren't productive where individuals would bog everything down with objections or some kind of barrier that would prevent us from going any further...We were trying to formulate a team and trying to move forward as a team. And it really didn't happen."

I felt leadership would come form all of us— but particularly from our principal. That's where I expected it to come from.

The teacher who shared the Science responsibilities with Jan Nielson said:

When I was hired, I didn't think there was going to be any kind of...I thought there was going to be a Principal who was going to be a leader of the team and that the rest of us were members of the Planning Team. I didn't think there was going to be any promise of any particular formal position of leadership for anybody. I felt like it was a pretty democratic situation and that there wasn't necessarily going to be a hierarchical structure, but I also felt that the Principal was the Principal so...I think we didn't do very well in establishing how decisions were going to be made and relied too much on thinking we could reach consensus...I believe the way collaboration works is to have a clear process for how decisions are to be made. If you don't have a clear process, then collaboration gets muddy...messy...not much fun stuff. It's not collaboration at all.

He also added,

I think I defined my role by finding things I felt I could do for the team and doing them. I think that happened a lot and was the source of some friction on the team. There were certain paces at which people felt they needed to do something so rather than having a set who-was-responsible, the responsibility came on to the people who were ready to take it on and the people who were ready
to take it on had some degree of resentment and so did the people who didn’t take it on.

The Planner who expressed most concerns about her relationship with the group described her leadership role in this way:

I anticipated that I would be charged with curriculum mostly and then accountable to somebody who would be responsible for constructive feedback and support in that form and most of my job I would teach English. That was not actualized for me. Most of my work was circular conversations early in the year and then immediate occasions that had to be planned. There was a shift to that and there’s virtually no effect between most of us at that point and what was needed. It almost became a waste of time.

When I asked her how she defined her role, she responded:

Troublemaker. Really. Questioning instead of going on. Way too much metanalysis on my part. Not enough of what needs to be done right now. I felt... I suppose this was a wrong assumption, but I thought I was being hired as a technical expert. Partly because that’s what the interview consisted of and that’s how I viewed myself. I came in differently from other members of the team who were geared to Coalition Schools. I came in really thinking about English.

When I asked her who tried to structure her work, she replied:

More or less the Assistant Superintendent and the Principal. And I didn’t get on the boat of what I call technical as opposed to curriculum work. If I could just have gotten on the boat at that point and said, "These are my supervisors. This is how this system is going to work. If I could just have said to myself, 'Do it,' I would have been in much better shape.
"Doing it" lasted through the early months of the school year as the Planning Team struggled with the conflict among them to define their roles, define the culture of the school and to determine what product was expected of them.

In November, the Principal and the Long Range Planner spoke to a University Curriculum Class in which I was enrolled. They described the vision of the school, integrated curriculum, student as worker, teacher as facilitator of learning and coach and personalization that would be central tenets of the culture. Nowhere in the presentation did they allude to the high stress level of Planning Team members who were struggling with their own inner turmoil about getting the work done.

The day after this presentation, I spoke with the Professor of the class to ascertain the possibility of observing the process as the content of this dissertation. In the conversation, he and I agreed that curriculum would be an obvious focal point of my research.

The conversation the following week with the Long Range Planner, however, summarized very concisely the differences between the presentation and the reality. The process of teachers becoming leaders would surely be more interesting and challenging to document than any curriculum that might be developed. She also shared with me her concerns that for the previous three and a half months the team had been
"mucking around in Jello attempting to define the culture." Leadership, for her, was yet to be defined.

The defining moment in the first half of the school year was a presentation demanded of the Team by the Superintendent. When he realized that the entire first semester was slipping by, no agreement was in sight on the definition of the culture of the school, and little leadership was being exhibited by either the Principal or any individual members of the Planning Team, his solution was to require a product. All of the responsibility to date, he had placed on the shoulders of the Long Range Planner.

She, on the other hand, had made no small personal commitment to her own point of view that the process was to be collaborative. In spite of her waning confidence level that the members would ever reach agreement on a decision-making process or on how leadership was to be exercised, she continued to encourage them in collaboration.

The presentation to the Board was a complete disaster. Planners made the mistake of assuming that Governing Board members would want to see how they were working. To demonstrate this process, they attempted to involve Board members in collaborative exercises during the evening's agenda. Board members were incensed that the Planners did not realize they were disappointed in the lack of progress,
disappointed in the lack of product that they could present to their constituency, and doubtful that the team would have a program ready for school's opening the following September.

I met with the team for the first time on January 4 and began the process of observing their meetings. They interviewed me for two and a half hours about my beliefs, my philosophy, my interest, and the process I would use. There were questions designed to reveal my level of personal integrity and the level of confidentiality they might expect from me. There was no doubt that they individually and collectively were bruised by confrontations with Governing Board members prior to the Winter Break and were now ready to begin the second half of the year with renewed dedication and energy. They were also very cautious that anyone who might work with them be dedicated to preserving the integrity of the collaborative process and the integrity of the individual Planners themselves.

They had hoped that I might provide them with a transcript of each day's proceedings. When I explained that I did not have the time or financial resources to provide that service, they agreed that my scripting their conversations would be acceptable. We also agreed that I would not take part in their discussions. (On rare occasions, they would turn to me for an opinion and on two
separate occasions, I felt compelled to talk with the Planners after particularly emotional and personally challenging sessions involving gender bias exhibited and felt by both male and female members of the Team.)

The analysis of the data relating to the remaining five characteristics is based on not only my personal recollections, but also on an analysis of graphs of almost a thousand scripted pages of information generated by the team. The graphs also represent the number of references to the five characteristics (in addition to leadership) in the scripts of the meetings held from January to the end of the planning process. This is not to say that there was no leadership exhibited by the Planning Team members during the second half of the year, but that the remaining five characteristics depend on leadership if they are to be developed in the Effective Schools tradition.

We can summarize the difficulty of developing the program for the school by saying that the disastrous first semester which resulted in an ongoing discussion but no resolution of leadership issues resulted in a second semester of work that was driven more by parent and community expectations and whims than by any semblance of ordered, careful, reflective and collaborative process.

2. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP. Teachers can assume instructional leadership role and when they do,
instructional outcomes will be consistent with the outcomes listed in the Effective Schools literature.

The least experienced of the Planners said,

When I was interviewed, I told them I had no curriculum experience. I had lots of ideas, but I would need lots of support. I was arriving expecting to work very closely with someone else in terms of Math. I felt we were going to be starting from scratch and trying to create something we thought as professional educators in our best professional opinion would be in the best interest of education for kids.
Figure 5.1 High incidence of Instructional Leadership and School Leadership (Instruction and Curriculum).
The graphs show that upon their return from Winter Break, the Planners began their work with high numbers of responses regarding instruction and curriculum and the culture in which the program would be offered. (See figure 5.1. See also the first two graphs in appendix 1.) As parent involvement rose, the attention necessary to deal with community conflict outweighed their interest in and references to curriculum and instruction.

Their meetings, their involvement in small groups and the focus of their conversations during this time were solely on meeting the demands of parents for a particular kind of curriculum, for a particular kind of assessment, and for a particular kind of culture—not always in line with the vision they brought to the process.

3. CULTURE. Teachers can develop a school culture which will support both academic and social behavior goals.

Establishing the culture was the first task of the Planners. Rejection of the standard program envisioned by the Assistant Superintendent, Principal, and Long Range Planner brought with it the responsibility to come up with a working plan or framework for the year’s work and for the school’s culture. Their inability to accomplish this goal in the early weeks and months of the project disadvantaged the team in the eyes of the community, the Governing Board, and their immediate supervisors. Daunted by the magnitude
of the task, they turned their efforts to the first presentation to the Governing Board. This presentation was designed to persuade Governing Board members that they (the Planners) were indeed capable of producing a program for the new high school.

The graphs indicate that the Planners referred often to culture from January to March, but produced almost nothing on culture that would be a part of the school program. From March to June, for the first time, there was a high level of productivity in the development of culture. (See figure 5.2 and the first two graphs of appendix 1.) From the incidence chart in Appendix 1, culture has the highest or nearly the highest number of incidences from January 6 to June 1 (10 to 100.) Parent demands and requirements which had to be met far outweighed their commitment to culture from January to March. In the week of April 27, there were 99 pages of discussion on culture for the new school.
Figure 5.2 High Incidence Rate for Culture and School Leadership for Week of 3/2-6
4. ASSESSMENT. Teachers can develop an accountability system for student expectations which will produce high academic student outcomes.

While the basis of community and parent discontent was often couched in terms of curriculum, graphs of activities show a relationship between parent involvement and assessment. (See figure 5.3). As parent complaints and questions consumed much of their daily work in January prior to the Community Presentations at the end of February, references to assessment rose with community involvement. Only the graph of the week immediately preceding the actual presentation shows any decline in references to assessment. At that time, Planners were intent on designing program transparencies and brochures which would be the first tangible presentation of their program to the community.

Immediately following the presentation, the graphs indicate that parent involvement diminished and with it, the emphasis on assessment. (See figure 5.4).

5. HIGH EXPECTATIONS. Teachers can support the high expectations of community members by planning and implementing a program that clearly delineates what school standards for academic success are.

Without stating the obvious, community members, parents, and educators all expressed an interest in maintaining high expectations for students achievement. The difficulty in the planning process was that there was never a clear vehicle for determining what those standards and expectations were.
Figure 5.3 The Relationship between High Parent Involvement and High Assessment.
Figure 5.4 The Relationship between Low Parent Involvement and Low Assessment
The Planners came in with a vision of a success-oriented curriculum for every student including Special Education students. The community members' perceptions of success delineators rested almost entirely on test results and college admissions processes. The scripts of meetings reveal Planner discussions of conversations with parents of eighth graders who were already having their students coached for the SAT exams they would not be taking for another three years. It is not surprising then, that difficulties experienced by the team were in delineating which community expectation were to be honored.

High expectations for Special Education students were represented by total inclusion in the regular classroom with paraprofessional support of these students. High expectations for the 30% of the students whose parents were certain were gifted meant Advanced Placement classes and Honors credit on transcripts. These dilemmas were never fully resolved in the planning year and continued to plague the entire faculty into the middle of the first semester of implementation.

Graphs also reveal that references to assessment diminished after the February presentation to a level of least importance in the discussions from March to June. (Please refer back to figure 5.4.) As might be expected, pressures for registration materials, course descriptions,
6. PARENT AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT. Teachers can expect positive community support when the first five assumptions are in place, and conversely, teachers can expect to lose community support almost immediately upon violating any of the first five assumptions.

Rejection by the Governing Board of their presentation in November put the Planners into a tailspin of questioning their processes and responding to the depression of the questioning process with an ever increasing amount of energy on productivity issues. They had only a short time to rebound from the effects of sharp criticism from Governing Board members. The immediate challenge was to present something to the community which would be convincing that a program would indeed be in place in September which would meet parental expectations. They set the February 24, 1992 date.

In the intervening weeks, individual members would meet with First Year Advisory Committee, and with members of the Community Task Force groups on Athletics, Foreign Language, and Physical Education. The resulting reports to the larger group became a source of discouragement as each meeting revealed a growing interest in fairly traditional, rigidly-structured community demands for testing, Honors
classes, and league teams for every sports (in spite of the fact they would have only ninth graders the first year of operation and that there would be a de-emphasis on sports).

To support the Planners with details of these curriculum areas for which no Planner had been specifically designated, an Administrative Assistant was hired expressly to order uniforms, rent playing fields, and engage in scheduling team competitions through Athletic Directors in the region. To placate the demands of parents that foreign language was an important part of preparation for college, a Foreign Language Specialist was added to the Planning Team.

The coherence of the Planning process was rapidly dissipating as Planners and support staff struggled to put something on paper which would resemble a carefully thought-out curriculum.

Community support never materialized. The presentation was well thought-out as evidenced by the Curriculum folder that delineated a four-year plan. The language was carefully worded to comfort parents of special needs children and parents of gifted children. None had any doubts that the Planners had put forth a tremendous amount of effort and thought into producing the document. What was less clear was whether or not the document had any real basis in reality of what could be delivered as a high school program.
In the weeks prior to the presentation, parents used television interviews, telephone calls to newspaper reporters who covered education news, telephone calls to individual Governing Board members and visits to the office where the Planners worked.

The Planners listened, filtered information, and tried to respond to the conflicting voices which were coming through. Individually and collectively, they had no way to know which voices were the real voices representing student needs.

It is clear from the record that there was community support for a high school. Whether there was community support for an innovative high school is not clear from the data, from interviews with the planners or administrators.

What is clear is that there was an immediate loss of support when the Planners attempted to put a vision in place where equity issues were not in line with the thinking of community members. Without ability grouping, the Planners lost the support of community members and, in fact, aroused great opposition to the entire program.

Graphs reveal a growing number of references to parents and work related to parent expectations from January to March. (See figure 5.5)
INCIDENCES
Week of 2/17-21

Figure 5.5: High Parent Expectations
After the presentation, the activity reflects continued references, but a total absence of work related to responding to parents. It would appear that the Planners resigned themselves to a reality that program had to be in place whether it was in line with community members’ wishes or not.

**SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH**

How do teachers exercise leadership? What roles do teachers assume when leadership opportunities are presented to them? What constrains teacher leadership? If these teachers are typical of teachers in classrooms across this country, teachers struggle with the reality that the management of schools needs to restructured. This restructuring includes teacher environments, their perceptions of how schools are organized, and their relationship with parents and community members. We can look at teacher leadership by answering the second question first.

**RESEARCH FINDINGS**

When teachers are seen as both the problem and the solution to student lack of success in American schools, the dilemma remains: must teachers remain in isolation and the security of the classroom or can they leave the classroom to assist in the restructuring of the management of schools? When they leave the classroom, what roles do they assume?
To answer this question, I established a participant/observer relationship with six teachers and a principal who were hired to manage the planning and implementation of a program for the first high school in a suburban city in a southwestern state.

Teacher leadership literature led me to focus on teachers as leaders in traditional technician roles, but what I found was that when teachers are asked to leave this role, there are many constraints to their success. From a research perspective, non-traditional assignment of teachers presents an opportunity to assess not only the possibility that teachers can assume roles outside the classroom, but also that many constraints exist which may preclude their success.

I divided the planning year into three time periods, intuitively determined by two major presentations by the Teacher Planning Team. The first occurred in late November. Governing Board members were increasingly more demanding that the team produce a product: visible evidence that the program would be in place for the opening of the school year ten months later.

The team had rejected an earlier plan put forward by the District’s Assistant Superintendent, Principal, and Long range Planner before their arrival on campus. They chose instead to spend the fall semester trying to determine what
the culture of the school would be. Their attempt to engage Board members in collaborative exercises and their lack of specificity enraged the board members. Conversations with individual members confirmed that Governing Board members were "confused," frustrated," and "angry." "They want to see something--anything."

"We were surprised. We thought they would appreciate what we were trying to do. We expected them to understand that we were hired to collaborate. We had to get to know each other, to learn to work together."

They returned after winter break with renewed energies to produce a product. That product would be a curriculum presentation to the community in February, the specific assignment from the Governing Board through the Superintendent following the Board presentation in November. This second presentation would also define the end of the second phase of the planning year.

In each phase of the planning year, there were opportunities for leadership--and there were major constraints. Consistent with the Effective Schools literature, I coded those behaviors and activities which a typical principal might exhibit or be engaged in. I thus inferred that if, among the six teachers and the principal (who saw himself as "just one member of the collaborative team," ) an individual assumed responsibility for any given
task, the work of the team would be equal to and as effective as the work of a principal in an effective school. Overall success, however, would be transformational since the decisions made would be reflective of a collaborative process.

Unfortunately, the research indicates otherwise. In January, despite renewed energies, complications began to erode confidence levels once more.

**JANUARY TASKS: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT**

With renewed energy and commitment, Team members began the task of putting together a specific curriculum in each of their subject areas. Bruised by stinging criticism from the governing board members, each retreated to isolated work. Each felt the responsibility to have a program in place which would not only meet their individual and collective need for a different curriculum, but would also meet the high expectations of Board members and community.

Community members—especially those who were members of the First Year Advisory Committee (FYAC) were beginning to elicit information regarding how the TPT saw gifted students, special needs students, and curriculum which could support both groups. Perceptions of TPT members and the FYAC members differed greatly. A conversation with the President of the FYAC revealed strong feelings in support of Advanced Placement courses for gifted students. "I want my daughter
to be challenged. We moved to this community from Plano, Texas, where there were Advanced Placement courses in every subject. And they don’t have Special Education students in the classes there."

Full inclusion of Special Education students was a valued goal of the TPT and, with the integration of courses, they hoped to see success for each student within the same class. The subject area receiving most of the heat was a course to be called World Cultures. Bob Lightcup, the Planner in Social Studies, spent many hours in discussion with the Superintendent about the course. The superintendent and the Principal were both very interested in Social Studies. Each felt he had special knowledge to bring to this subject area. Bob Lightcup was the recipient, therefore, of both support and stress as his two superiors attempted to shape the ninth grade course to meet their personal preferences—all the while appearing to give him decision-making authority about the course.

"I don’t know where we are with this course," Bob reported one day to the Planners. "The Superintendent wants the course to be integrated, but he also knows the parents want Advanced Placement. They also want a World History course with a textbook. That’s not the way I envision the course. I want to use primary source documents and
integrate the course with literature so the English course and Social Studies will be coherent."

Science teachers experienced similar stresses. "The ninth grade course called Human Organism should encompass some biology and some chemistry. How we get the parents to understand the need to integrate the two is going to be very difficult." Jan Nielson's voice trailed off. "I wish they understood what we are trying to do."

Kandy Burnham, the mathematics planner, understood very clearly the stresses the other planners were experiencing from parents and the Superintendent. In January, she began work with the math teachers at the middle schools. She knew early in the semester the exact number of students who were already accelerated in Math and those for whom additional support might be necessary. She knew that she had to plan two ninth grade math classes to accommodate students who were already ability grouped in many ways at the middle school level. Her task, therefore, was easier in many ways. Decisions made earlier in the student's educational experience required that there be alternative opportunities for student placement in the ninth grade. Parents were already accustomed to advanced placement in concept. This also meant she had twice as much work to do.

"Would you be willing to work with me?" she asked me one morning. "I know you were a Math specialist when you
worked at the state office of education. I just need someone to talk with as I make choices about textbooks and topics to be offered in the two different courses."

Shortly thereafter and on several occasions during January, she and I had conversations about Math curriculum and textbooks. She also arranged to meet with university math instructors and other math teachers in the area. Her need for reflective thinking and the support of other teachers was evident as she developed her curriculum. In spite of the fact that she had the least teaching experience, she used this lack of confidence to motivate herself to seek the assistance and feedback of others who were more experienced. Her success at the opening of the school year reflected her careful planning.

The relationships between the Planners and the community members whose presence was ever increasing during the month of January produced a level of anxiety and stress among the Planners that was not easily overcome. The high expectations of both groups were in conflict; there was no basic agreement about the culture of the school. The overall effect was that the Planners level of confidence was once again being eroded in the one area where they should have maintained the highest degree of confidence: curriculum.
Assessment also related to curriculum. Inexorably related, meetings about portfolios and other facets of authentic assessment became heated. "Will the community accept the fact that a student may not graduate in four years?" "Can we sell the idea that all students can succeed given enough time?" "Can Special Education students get to a novice level in a Foreign Language?" The discussions in meetings, at lunch, and informally among the Planners centered on these and similar questions. Behind each question was a lingering doubt that no one was very certain what the community wanted or would accept. Analysis of field notes would also indicate that no one was making any serious attempt to determine what the community would accept. Neither was anyone putting forth a plan to bring the community to a level of agreement with any of these important concepts.

The third part of the curriculum that brought stress to the planning process in January was the need to make critical decisions about "minor" subjects including foreign language, art, music, and most importantly athletics and physical education. The competitive nature of athletics in the region and the high expectations that parents held that their children would compete in all areas placed considerable stress on the Planners to interject this area into their discussions. Subject-area specialists they were,
and their lack of interest or enthusiasm for athletics made it very easy for them to ignore this discussion. The Superintendent, however, was fielding serious questions from community members who were ready to establish a boosters' club for parents of students who were athletic. The conflict was apparent and growing almost before the discussion started.

The school culture surrounding athletics was a culture that seemed inconsistent to the planners who were stressing the college-preparatory curriculum they believed every parent in the community would want for his or her student. The student-athlete had not appeared in their discussions. "We don't want students to be so involved competitively, that they won't see the value of the education we're trying to provide," Tom Hill said to me one morning when I asked about athletics. "We want to turn out well-rounded students, but we just don't see the need to put so much energy into athletics at this time in the planning year. We have so many other things to do. We know they're important, too, but we just can't do everything and do them well."

Without any discussion with the Planners, an Administrative Assistant to the Principal was hired who also reported to the Superintendent. Her sole responsibility that spring would be to arrange the schedule, equipment, and rental spaces for practice for the athletic teams which
would be fielded in September. The list included: football, track, tennis, swimming, golf, baseball, softball, and basketball.

"Who said we were going to have an A.D. (Athletic Director)?" Bob Lightcup asked one morning when he heard of the hiring.

"We're not going to have an A.d." Tom Hill replied. His strong sense of disapproval was evident in the tone of his voice.

As the others joined the meeting, it was clear this would be the source of ongoing debate in the coming weeks. The culture of the school as the parents saw it and the culture of the school as the Planners saw it did not contain enough space for athletics and the kind of curriculum and program the Planners desired.

A report of the Focus Group on Athletics, which was the substitute process for hiring a specialist in this area, indicates that there was strong support for athletics among community members. Field notes indicate that Planners were resistant to the heavy emphasis on athletics that was coming form the Focus Group meetings. The overall effect on their leadership capabilities was that in the highly important area of curriculum, they were already losing a sense of control they hoped to maintain as athletics gained more and more importance. As leaders of the planning process, they
were unable to resist strong community involvement in this area because they had no subject specialist assigned to shepherd the process, the Focus Group was outside their realm of influence, and community efforts in this area were stronger than they had expected.

On the other hand, they were unable to provide alternative solutions to the growing program interest as they attempted to concentrate on their own subject area of assignment. Their leadership even in the area of curriculum was diminishing at a time when they needed most to reestablish their credibility.

The final area of concern during January was a growing elitism among parents both as it related to curriculum and as it related to athletics. Parents at Lemonwood Middle School, the western middle school, had experienced heavy involvement in participation at the school level. The culture at this school was very different from the culture at the middle school in the eastern region of the district. Student scores were higher at Lemonwood. The elitism that the Planners encountered in January would increase in seriousness as they began working on school organizational issues.

FYAC members began asking questions about lockers, student government, and other student safety issues since the first year's classes would be held on an expanded site
at the eastern middle school. Lemonwood parents were concerned. Not all students from Lemonwood were gifted. Some would need vocational and special education services. Therefore, the Planners were coping not only with the demands of parents of gifted students from this school population, but also with the demands of parents of special needs students from Lemonwood. The conflict was obvious, visible, and a constant challenge. No single curriculum, no single program would ever meet the needs of these highly educated, affluent, and demanding parents. The Planners continued their struggle into February.

In effect, their leadership was challenged on all sides as they attempted to meet the needs of many diverse voices from the community. They were unable to deflect the growing requests of the small group of parents who were most vocal in the presentation of demands.

**FEBRUARY TASKS: PRESENTATION TO PARENTS**

A rehearsal before supportive members of the community brought changes to the February presentation particularly in the area of how they would describe the level of challenge in the curriculum. Increasingly stressful and confrontational exchanges between the Planners and the Superintendent brought increased fear that the presentations would not go well enough to regain the confidence and credibility that the Planners needed to complete their work.
A.R. expressed it this way, "I don't know what to expect. I've never been in a position where what I would teach was an issue. I've always known that what I prepared for my classes would be okay. This does not feel good to be challenged on everything we try to do."

As the date for the presentation approached, A.R. found it necessary to be out of town for the two weeks preceding the presentation, arriving back in town the day of the presentation, not in time to participate or hear the presentation first hand. She later commented to me near the end of the year, "I'm glad I never had to present my program to the community. I could not have handled that."

Documents produced by the Planners at this time in the process indicate several changes of particular note in meeting the demands of the community for increasing rigor. The language of the course content in particular took on new directness in promising "Advanced Placement courses will be available after the initial two years of the program."

As a practical matter, the changes necessary to meet community expectations further thwarted the efforts of the Planners to exhibit or practice leadership in the development of the program.

Comments from one parent at the rehearsal presentation included these words, "I don't know why they're having such a difficult time responding to our need for challenge for
our kids. All they have to do is have Advanced Placement courses in the plan and that will take care of everything."

The night of the presentations arrived. Complete with hats and basketballs representative of the student graduates they were portraying, the Planners bravely presented the program they had worked so hard to develop. For students in the audience, there was a sense that these teachers were willing to take risks on their behalf; for the parents, some of the costuming and presentation style was lost on the seriousness of their personal investment in rigor.

One parent commented, "They don't have to act like kids to let us know they understand kids. What we want to see is that they understand the need for these kids to do well on the SATs." Of the twenty two adults who came to the microphone to ask questions, only three were completely positive in their comments. While almost all began their comments with a positive phrase, "I congratulate you on the effort you have put out to understand our kids," "I like the fact that you want to personalize the program," and I appreciate the fact that your job is a very difficult one," most of the parents came to the microphone expressing dismay that the program would not meet the needs of their individual son or daughter in one way or another. The conflict continued.
Upon arriving at the planning office the morning after the presentation, the Planners were greeted with a large bouquet of cut flowers from members of the Governing Board. The note of appreciation lost its positive effect when the Planners completed their meeting with the Superintendent later that morning. His words were optimistic, but guarded that they had brought the community to a point where parents were comfortable with the program.

In fact, the Planners were being brought to a level of understanding that almost nothing they could do would convince the community that the needs of all the students would be met with the program they were proposing. Individually and collectively, the Planners were faced with accepting the fact that they had little access to community power and coverage in the media that was so damning to their process. Their ability to lead was further diminished by the fact that the pressure from parents was unrelenting. Not one day passed without at least one call from the small group of very vocal parents who continued to pressure for increased influence in the process.

As a practical result, the Planners turned to what they knew best: teacher behaviors in isolation. The presentation was over, they could retreat to complete their planning of individual curriculum offerings, their own individual summer
activities, and the opening of school. Their teacher habits replaced their temporary practice of leadership efforts.

**MARCH TASKS: PLANNING THE OPENING OF SCHOOL**

In March, efforts turned to practical tasks which did not engage the hearts of the Planners, but served to fill their needs for productivity. Their visual appearances were more relaxed, their conversations easier, their interactions lighter. Their work centered on group activities related to tasks which involved them both collectively and individually.

The most obvious of these was setting up procedures for hiring the additional staff members who would be needed for the opening of school. Group meetings focused on calendar, interview protocol, and screening processes for narrowing the list of candidates from 750 to a manageable number. An advertisement in a national paper described the environment in Coalition of Essential Schools terms stressing personalization, teacher as facilitator and student as worker. The Planners were enthusiastic about the process, but had not anticipated the frustration of having to hire inexperienced teachers. Budget limitations placed stringent requirement not only on the total number of staff who could be hired, but also on the level of experience they could hope to add to their numbers. More years of experience consumed available resources. It became apparent very
quickly that they would end up with a cadre of first year teachers and that the selection process would be much more difficult than they had envisioned.

The Planners expected to receive support from the Superintendent. That support never materialized as the Superintendent attempted to establish his own leadership position in the district. His style was to allow all parties to engage in conversations about needs and priorities and work for consensus in decision-making. The additional negotiations necessary for the Planning Team to access resources was not something for which he felt the necessity to provide additional support. In fact, Ken Forest reported to the Planners, "The Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent are beating me up over this budget process. They say I've got to be more like a Principal. This is my responsibility."

Acting more like a Principal became a problem for Ken Forest in early spring of the Planning year. Increasingly, he exhibited frustration and irritation with Planners for what he saw as a need to "be more like a Principal" and their need for him to allow them to collaborate. On several occasions, he slammed a sheaf of papers on the conference table, and uttered some explosive sentence usually expressing his frustration with lack of role determination. His most frequent complaint would contain some reference to
the team's request for him to do something. "You ask me to come up with this and then when I do, you resent what I've done." "This is something I have to do as the Principal." You've got to understand, the Superintendent has expectations of me, too." In each situation, he would then remain quiet for the rest of the meeting, contributing nothing to the deliberations, and offering no solution to their lack of process for making decisions, or lack of progress in selecting decision-making processes.

At the same time, Ken increasingly looked to the two male Planners for support when he was at the height of his frustration level with the team's lack of progress. Bob and Tim would usually respond with some level of discomfort in a non-committal way. It was clear that they, too, sensed a growing gender conflict among the team. Ken encouraged female members of the team less and less and would, on occasion, completely ignore an idea presented by the women on the team.

The Planners saw the principal as having a "different mental model." J.P. suggested "we have to have the female point of view expressed for students' sakes" and added, "if there's going to be an assistant principal, it should be a woman, but none of us have any interest in it." C.K. used the strongest language of all. After describing the "awful" experience of the first three months, she concluded, "I knew
in October I would not subject myself to any further degradation." She resigned in March to assume a position in business at the end of her contract year.

What was more surprising, however, were the interviews with the two male planners.

CR: Where's leadership going to come from, Bob?

BL: "I don't know. We all have different models of our roles in the school. Ken's (the Principal's) is very different from mine."

CR: "In what way?"

BL: "I had no value at all with Ken. He treated me like one of the women because he's in Social Studies and so am I. It was a real problem until I started having conversations with the Superintendent about my ideas for the Social Studies courses. As soon as the superintendent validated my work, I could do no wrong."

C.R. "What do you mean?"

BL. "Ken always looks to Tim first and then to me."

C.R. "Is that because he knew Tim in Massachusetts?"

BL. "No, it's because we're men!"

Tim was equally descriptive.

C.R.: "Has it been easier for you because you knew Ken before?"

T.H.: "No, that's been a burden. I've become the mouthpiece for the team when they can't deal with him."

C.R.: "How does that role play out?"

T.H.: "I float an idea--try it out, or go in for a long conversation. Then we work from there."

C.R.: "What are the stress points?"

T.H.: "There are real gender differences. He keeps
looking at B.L. and me every time there’s a decision—or he wants affirmation."

C.R.: "How about the administrative function for next year?"

T.H.: "It’s going to be hard. I am interested in some administrative work because that’s a professional goal of mine, but I don’t want the teacher planners to think I got it because I knew Ken before—or because I’m a man."

To see if any of these views conflicted with his own opinions about leadership qualities, I attempted to bring the interview conversation with the principal to questions that would give him an opportunity to probe his inner thoughts and the team’s process of becoming. It would be revealing if he could, in fact, come to grips with his own human condition which to others reflected a serious case of gender bias. All my attempts were futile.

C.R.: "Tell me about the fall process of becoming a group."

K.F.: "It was very painful. The administrative team had gone to Colorado to do the initial planning. When we came back with a plan, the team rejected the plan. We were behind. We decided to tackle school culture, but we all came from different mental models. It was very difficult."

C.R.: "What came out of that?"

K.F.: "Nothing. We’re still trying to deal with school culture."

C.R.: "What do you consider the individual strengths of each member?"

K.F.: "T.H. has a real sense of leadership."

"B.L. is our time-keeper. He’s task-oriented. Adds a real sense of personalization. He’ll do that for students next year, too."

"K.B. is a real trooper. She’s inexperienced, but she is the right person for the team."

"J.P.’s connection with Ted Sizer and the Coalition is a real plus. That will be very important next year."

"C.K.’s connection in the district is very important. She’s the only one who was in the district before."

"A.R. is best recognized for her subject area skills. She is our resident authority on the writing process. She has very good work habits."
His listing of the Planners duplicated the exact order that each of the Planners had given when I asked them to place themselves in the position that the Principal would see them in terms of leadership.

Of equal concern to the planners was that the culture of the school they were trying to establish would also include serious consideration that Ken Forest would be the Principal of the school and that they would have to build in some administrative component to assure that young women students on the campus would not also feel the same gender biases they were experiencing. Anger and frustration over this additional burden began to take its toll on members of the Planning team. The Long-Range Planner had attempted to work with both the Superintendent and the Principal in a collaborative manner that would be a credit to any organization. Her skills were in bringing out the best in the all members participating in a group process. When it became clear to her that her ideas were not appreciated by the Superintendent and that the Principal may have begun to see her in a competitive way, she began to make plans for leaving the team. She completed the month of March’s work and assumed a position with a national organization affiliated with the Coalition of Essential Schools.
For much of the month of March, C.K. also absented herself from the deliberations. Her work with ordering technology equipment ostensibly allowed her to spend most of her time off campus with vendors or in her cubicle planning the opening of the Library and Technology section of the program. The more significant reasons for her absence was that she was planning her departure from the Planning Team. She announced her resignation and left the Planning Team at the end of April.

Such attrition cannot solely be attributed to gender conflicts, but certainly these stresses added to the difficulties the Planning Team had in developing a sense of community and a sense of team cohesion. Attempts to confront the issue of gender bias drained the energies of the team and in some ways solidified the cohesion of the three remaining women members of the planning team.

The last activity of an evaluative nature required the Team to assess their own professional development activities of the year. The three women chose to report on their journey as a team. They were incisive, forthright, and very direct that the Planning Year had been a learning experience for them as educators and also as women.

March also was filled with activities related to establishing the culture of the high school in areas other than gender. When the Planners worked with students, their
energy level was higher, their mood lighter. Two students came to the Planners with a proposal for student government and its embryonic formation. The presentation was very businesslike, the Planners responses very positive. The two young men who presented the organizational structure had met with students on the campuses of both middle schools and had developed a plan where each school would be represented. They also presented a plan for decisions about school colors, school mascot, and school officers for student government.

During this presentation and in meeting with students thereafter, the Planners exhibited renewed energy and enthusiasm for the program. They were in their traditional teacher roles—working with students and reinforcing and supporting student activities. Their opportunities for leadership were less evident, but their effective involvement with students was very satisfying. Field notes reflect well-planned opportunities to give positive feedback to the students, engaging them in respectful conversations. (Field scripts also note that these two students were sons of leaders in the parent organization whose support and enthusiasm for the planning process waxed and waned over the planning year. It is also important to report that these two students were the first of eleven academically gifted
students who left the school at the time of the first report card in the implementation year.)

Leadership with students did not translate into leadership with the parents of these students.

The remainder of the month of March was filled with curriculum work in isolation for the most part. A count of meetings held in March shows less than half the number held in February. Increasingly planners left the campus to meet with colleagues at the university or in district and local schools where subject area counterparts could reflect on their plans for curriculum. Graph (Figure 5.1) indicates the reduction in group activity as well as the reduction in the amount of parent involvement with planning team members. One might conclude that parents were at this stage of the planning process resigned to the fact that the Planners were mindful of their concerns, but not responsive to their requests to develop a curriculum and program around parental ideas.

Leadership in March was restricted to fairly confining teacher roles: curriculum and student activity. Field notes reveal no attempts to influence public opinion or gain public support for the program they were developing.
In April, the hiring process was in full swing. As the 750 applications began to accumulate, the Planners had to develop a separate process for screening and interviewing. This was one task that I thought I could participate in without influencing the direction the research would go. I read, sorted, and organized packets of applications to assist the Planners in managing the huge amount of paperwork associated with the process of hiring staff.

They chose to interview teachers from within the District only as they were able to compete in the regular process. In other words, no special considerations was given to local teachers. That decision once more placed the Planners in jeopardy of isolation as they separated themselves from the very colleagues from whom they had expected to receive support and positive responses.

The hiring process was demanding, exhausting, and time consuming. Candidates had been requested to complete a district application, a resume, and in the case of finalists, a video tape responding to classic classroom situations. Each Planner served on two of the four subject area selection teams, and several were also reading applications from music, art, drama, physical education, and foreign language applicants as well. It was a daunting task.
When the committees had narrowed the selection to three candidates for a position, all of the Planners watched the videos and gave input to the subcommittee. When there was a consensus, candidates were notified. The most difficult step in this process was that there were three candidates for whom an exemption needed to be requested from the minimum experience category. This would enable the Planners to hire a teacher with higher levels of experience or unusual qualifications. The three teachers for whom such exemption was to be requested were in mathematics, physical education and librarian categories.

(It is interesting to note that in spite of all the efforts to keep athletics in perspective, the experience of one of the finalists as an Athletic Director put her in the same desirable category as a math teacher with 18 years experience and a librarian who had built a library program complete with technology and integrated curriculum as part of its special areas.)

The most difficult selection process occurred in the English department. When A.R. was unable to make a decision about the candidates, a time was set aside when the finalists for these two positions came to the school for a weekend. The personal interviews provided the planners with enough information about the individuals to assist A.R. in making her final recommendations.
Before the Planners left for the summer, a complement of thirty staff members had been hired, including teachers, paraprofessionals, custodians, library staff, counseling staff, and secretarial support. They were confident that the best people had been selected and that the new team members would adapt easily into the culture of the new school program.

What they did not contemplate was the political capital they expended on the selection process. In the final analysis, no certified staff members were selected from existing faculties in the district. Only one teacher was selected from the city; all other teachers were selected from out-of-state. They had replicated the process of the original selection team when they were hired.

The hiring process presented an excellent opportunity for the Planners to exhibit leadership. Unfortunately, their lack of understanding of budget and the political process surrounding the budget prevented them from operating confidently. The Principal as the chief spokesperson for the Planning Team to the District budget process meetings returned one afternoon after a five hour budget session. The meeting had included principals from all the schools as well as district and Federal program administrators.

"I can't believe they don't understand that our needs are special," he began the report. "They seem to think that
we can operate without extra personnel, and with no help in the principal's office. Instead of 14.5 FTE positions in certified, they want to cut us down to 11.0. I really got upset in the meeting and I probably said some things I shouldn't have, but they've just got to understand!"

When later budget meetings were held, Tim Hill attended with Ken Forest. The Planners realized Ken was as inexperienced as they were. The district's leadership was unsympathetic to their lack of experience and in view of the fact that the high school staff was seen as draining resources, their budget and lack of experience was of no more importance than any other school's needs.

Concurrent with hiring teachers, the Planners had to think about the students with whom the teachers would work. Registration was an important part of that process. Decisions regarding the kinds of forms students would complete required some group meetings of the Planners in April. Graphs of data indicate increasing productivity in terms of the numbers of pages of information collected during this phase of the research. (See Figure 5.2)

Leadership in this area came primarily from one Planner: Tim Hill. Tim's prior experience in a high school program in New England allowed him to develop a block schedule where students could get individual attention, counseling, and academic help in an extended lunch period.
He presented several schedules to the Planners with ideas about registration. It was particularly difficult to schedule and hire for foreign language, art, music, and physical education, since these were elective and without complete registrations, numbers of the students who would sign up for a particular course were difficult to determine.

The initial registration packets went out and it appeared that their projections of 250 students would be fairly accurate. The district budget process had been completed by this time and they now knew they had resources for this number. Tim’s projections were that each teacher would have two periods a day for planning the second year’s curriculum, another luxury few districts can accommodate. The Planners were thrilled with the possibility that they would be able to have planning time again.

Serious disagreements arose, however, as it became clear they now had to accommodate the needs of 30 staff members, including an additional eight certified teachers, all of whom would want to plan the curriculum for the following year. Once more their ability to lead was questioned as they jockeyed for position in the planning hierarchy. Field notes reveal pages of discussion about the planning process for building program for subsequent years.

Tim Hill remained the quiet voice of reason. He also hoped to be a school leader in some role. How that decision
would be made was a question for the team also. Requests to their benefactor produced additional funding for planning during the first year of implementation. They had been spared the stresses of making decisions about how limited resources might be stretched to accommodate the necessary long range planning that completing the program for the school would require.

When the registrations were received, Tim Hill began the preliminary scheduling, knowing that the final schedule could not be completed until mid-summer when new arrivals to the district would be registered. The Planners would leave for the summer not knowing what their schedule would be, but satisfied that they had preserved the integrity of the planning process by requesting additional monies and receiving them.

The presence of registration packets, student get-acquainted activities, and anticipation of school activities including the falcon mascot, the blue and silver school colors and a logo for stationery and publications all served to reduce tensions in the community. These teacher-like activities served the Planners well as they attempted to bring the Planning year to a close, their personal integrity, if not their leadership intact.
MAY TASKS: SUMMER PLANNING

May contained a flurry of activity, all related to teacher activities. Course development was completed and staffing decisions were finalized. Planners looked at student schedules, envisioned academic advisory and discussed informally the culture they had otherwise avoided in their formal discussions.

Discussions turned to summer plans and how the opening of school activities could be completed. Few formal meetings were held which would assure that the opening of school and teacher orientation would run smoothly. Even in the absence of constraints (i.e. no parental interference and little administrative interference), planners chose to engage in teacher tasks.

It is clear from this summary of the research on tasks and roles that teachers want to assume leadership roles and when given the opportunity, do assume roles in some areas and avoid other roles.

The teachers in this case study assumed roles which were consistent with their previous experiences: They worked diligently at developing curriculum and courses. The graphs shown earlier indicate high productivity where curriculum and specific activities related to the classroom were concerned. They avoided leadership areas requiring them to leave the classroom setting and become involved in
stresses of coping with community and parent pressures. They were unable to resist parent pressure and unable to persuade the community that there were alternatives to standardized assessment, inclusion for students with disabilities, and Advanced Placement and/or Honors classes.

These teachers were able to confront the issues of establishing a school culture that would be different from the traditional culture, but they were not able to bring the culture from a contextual understanding to a reality on the campus. Their three month adventure in the fall of 1991 into the demanding discussions about culture led them to a position where they had to be told they had to end this journey in order to produce tangible, concrete products that would represent a school program less than a year later. From this research, we have no way of knowing whether, left to their own devices and struggles with culture, would they have been able, with culture in place, to quickly devise the program that might have functioned in the culture they would have agreed upon.

Teachers have high expectations, certainly a desirable quality for leadership. Throughout the graphs is a strand of concern for high expectations for themselves and for student outcomes. There is no evidence in interviews, documents, or observation that they made any attempt to transform high expectations into reality in the last six months.
Did the Planners become leaders in the administrative sense of leadership? It is difficult to conclude that a process so well supported by financial and material resources could be less than successful. The Planners did not become leaders in the Effective Schools tradition. Individually, each Planner dealt with frustrations of trying to develop leadership. Each came to grips with the leadership role and in the interview process of this research, placed him or herself in a hierarchical position borne out by all the others and by the Principal. None talked about teachers as leaders even when given multiple opportunities with different kinds of questions.

In the final analysis, this group of teachers saw themselves as technicians who were called to do something extraordinary. But when placed in the position where the extraordinary could be nurtured, however, they were overcome by the ordinary, routine, and yet complex issues of dealing with community and parental involvement which overshadowed the potential of the extraordinary.

To cope with the onslaught of community pressure, each retreated to what he or she knew best: individual, isolated work with subject content and course lessons, only to be brought to the work of the larger group when the demands for group production forced them to work together.
What constraints kept them from achieving success? From graphs, interviews, documents and six months of careful observations, it is clear that there are at least six areas in which the teachers met resistance or were constrained. The first and most obvious is the ambiguity of role definition not only among the Planners, but also in the offices of Superintendent and Principal. Ambiguity of specific assignment if not role definition kept the Planners constantly wondering about the among of power they had in any given situation. For each, there was a continuous process of questioning: "Is this what I should be doing?" "How are we to know if we can decide this issue?" At no time did either the Superintendent or the Principal address in any concrete way the issues surround power, authority, role or leadership expectations.

Role definition, the second area, is more ambiguous, and also more complex. As each Planner looked for leadership, (perhaps expecting and in one case identifying), the Principal became the focus of their role ambiguity. "If a Principal will not tell teachers what to do, who will?" was the unspoken but emotionally exhibited response of each of the Planners at one time or another in the process.

Regional differences may have contributed to the lack of clarity in role definition, although nowhere in field notes, or observation is there any evidence that the
Planners saw regional differences as having any impact on their definition of role. If anything, Planners could not have ignored the comments from community members that regional differences did matter to community members. Planners saw it as only one more complaint from community members.

The lack of specific assignment would have clarified roles for the Planners. It is to their credit that the Assistant Superintendent and Long Range Planner maintained the integrity of the collaborative process by allowing the Planners to engage in an entire semester of discussion and inquiry into the definition of culture. Unfortunately, it is not to their credit that the Planners were further constrained by their lack of productivity which resulted from this freedom to collaborate.

The freedom to collaborate did not excuse the Planners from making decisions which would have produced a viable program for the opening of the school year. Collaboration, in this case never reached the point of making a decision or even the point of deciding on a decision-making process. Without a process for decision-making, the group relationship deteriorated into fairly predictable differences between males and female styles of communicating, a major step in decision-making. These differences might have been overcome had the Planners
realized that they could have asked for help earlier in the process when they first realized that there were serious gender bias questions and issues between them and the Principal. Perceived or real, the effect was the same: lack of progress, lack of decision-making process, and little success in reaching conclusions about serious topics of discussion. This third constraint, lack of a decision-making process is perhaps the most serious constraint on the Planners ability to make administrative-like decisions.

The fourth constraint relates to the communication of the Planners with community members. Interviews indicate that the Planners saw themselves from the same socio-economic background as community members, yet their style of interaction and their lack of success in producing positive interactions would lead us to believe that a rapid socialization process did take place as they attempted to define the administrative leadership roles they would absolutely have to have to complete the task assigned to them.

Whether they felt the elitism of parents is only hinted at in comments the Planners made during the observation. At no time did they address (as a successful leader must) the serious implications of failing to communicate on some level with parent constituents. Those communications with constituents representing the needs of gifted students and
those with special needs are particularly relevant to this area which became a very serious constraint on the leadership capabilities of the Planners.

To say that the Planners did not communicate or project their positive involvement into the community is to discuss another serious constraint that impacted their success. At no time did the Planners or their supervisors directly address the problems of the political climate that was building up around the planning process. There are no discussions, no documents, no field notes which reflect any concern for directly dealing with the problem of lack of credibility of the process or the political nature and seriousness of failing to provide a program which would meet the expectations of the community. Should this have been the Planners responsibility? Where was leadership to be derived?

The politics of the community was not the only politics involved which impeded the process. The politics of grantsmanship was an area that the Planners had virtually no experience with in any prior experience. The Systems Thinking part of the program became not only a source of empowerment as it bought services, time, and resources, but a sense of disempowerment for the teachers as they realized they were often violating the very tenets of Systems
Thinking in their deliberations and decisions—a double impact on their sense of success and failure.

The politics of the budget process was the other political area where the Planners and the Principal had little experience. Each had an idea about how the district’s processes worked, but each had a separate interpretation of that process. None had a clear picture of how to portray the needs of a developing program in a politically astute manner that would enable them to negotiate the budget process.

The last and very serious constraint was the personal preferences of the Planners. As technicians, the Planners knew individually and collectively that there was a program to be developed. To each that conveyed something related to students, to curriculum, to the classroom. There was a long journey to be travelled before the classroom would be in sight. At every opportunity, the Planners left that journey to retreat to a comfort zone of individual work on curriculum, or program area related to students.

This personal retreat allowed them to escape the need to define leadership, to define roles, to determine a decision-making process, to communicate their differences and their agreement with the community and to engage in the give-and-take of the political involvement so necessary to the change process.
There are no graphs which indicate their isolation; the observation, however, is clear. At every opportunity, the Planners would return to their own curriculum. Can one say that they were wrong in doing so when so much of school is about students and curriculum and what goes on in the classroom?

The fact is that in doing so, the Planners missed the opportunities to indicate that teachers can become serious contributors to the management of school processes and change. They missed the opportunity to show that teachers can express both the voice and the vision of the classroom as it should be reflected in administrative processes. They missed the opportunity to actualize an opportunity to truly lead a school.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

What can be learned from the experiences of this team of six teachers and their principal? For teachers, the process of becoming leaders requires them to accept the process of change. That process may take them from the classroom. These teachers, while attempting change, did not accept change for themselves easily.

Of particular interest from a research perspective would be to inquire about the superintendent’s perspective of the collaborative planning process for change before that process is initiated. Does it make sense from the
Superintendent's perspective to involve teachers in roles outside of the classroom or are they suited only to technical roles related to students and the classroom? What are the risks and responsibilities of a superintendent or community leaders when they take positions of offering leadership roles to teachers?

Where do principals fit in the picture? Leadership literature abounds on the effects principals have on teachers. How can principals share leadership positions? Is it possible for principals to derive the best of teacher vision and voice for the improvement and restructuring of schools without losing a sense of the role of the principal. Can a principal determine a way to blend teachers and leadership with his or her own sense of status?

In a related issue, can a principal contribute to group processes by identifying appropriate leadership positions for teachers that extend beyond the classroom? Can a principal be a part of a collaborative group. Research into the thought-processes a principal entertains in trying to collaborate would be challenging to develop. Can a principal encourage teachers to lead in an administrative sense without losing sight of his or her responsibilities?

Another area of concern which might be derived from this research is an answer to the question, "Are there regional differences in perceptions about power, or
leadership, or the role of the principal or superintendent? While this research did not concentrate on this regional issue and no startling findings came out of this research, comments were made too many times by too many people to completely eliminate the possibility that there are implications in the area of regional origin.

Gender differences, too, seemed to play an important, but subjugated role in the deliberations of the Planners. Gender issues in collaboration among teacher leaders would be another area which would perhaps give us more insight into the lack of identifiable success among members of this group.

What is the best way for teachers who want to be leaders to express these gender differences or any other important idea in the face of very serious power imbalances? This is another possible area for further research. Are there further implications in the area of the socialization process that these teachers underwent? While the Planners expressed confidence that there were few differences in their backgrounds and the backgrounds of community members, were there experiences in the backgrounds of these teachers or any teachers one might study, that would suggest that the socialization process was and is far more important than I was able to attribute in this research.
Where do parents fit in the collaborative process that must go on if teachers are to be leaders in the holistic sense of this research? Is a collaboration complete without parental involvement? Further research could be conducted to determine appropriate and contributing ways in which parents can be productively involved in the collaborative process.

Parent involvement in the Effective Schools literature is usually seen as a positive contributing influence. In the case of Sunrise District, quite the opposite was true. As Chubb and Moe (1989) point out in their research on high performing schools, high performing schools are allowed to perform their duties without interference from parents. This "chicken and egg" scenario complicates the work of educators in that when schools are low performing, parents become involved in an effort to improve the performance. Their pressures are negative and demanding. Their presence in the environment further complicates the administration and workings of the school which further impacts the performance of the school in a negative ways.

Conversely, in high performing schools, parents become the supportive fans which further enhances the performance of the organization. Furthermore, the administrators and staff of the school are uninhibited and faithful in continuing to meet these high expectations and are
therefore, unencumbered by the demands of parents who would be physically present on the campus were their expectations not being met.

Research in this area might determine what behaviors of parents contribute to high performance of schools and what behaviors are warning signs to administrators that the collaborative process may not work here because these negative behaviors are present?

Where parents are involved, are there differences in roles for parents of special needs students as opposed to parents of regular academic students? Since much of the negative parent involvement in this research setting was carried out by parents of gifted or special needs students, one might imply that these parents have more to gain--or lose if they are not intimately involved in the process. Is there a more successful way to involve parents who will admit to having an average child?

If teachers in administrative roles are to work with parents in a different relationship than they would otherwise in classrooms, how best can we develop political involvement skills in these teachers? Additional research in this area would surely accrue to the benefit of any district that attempts a process such as this.
Another area of concern for researchers might be a study of the environment which will support collaboration. If indeed, collaboration is seen as a 21st Century Skill, it is important that this skill be developed both in adults and students in the educational environment. How collaboration is supported by environment, however, is a major area of uncertainty for those who work in school settings. Research might inform educators about conditions in the environment necessary for successful collaboration and involvement of teachers in political positions of leadership.

Role definition is of critical importance in the collaborative process. Teachers can lead, but it is evident that clarity of role definition for those involved in the process is critical to carrying out the collaborative process of developing leadership.

In this case study, the lack of role definition extended from the teacher planners to the Principal and even affected the performance of the Long Range Planner, the Assistant Superintendent, and the Superintendent. Further research might address the issues of how roles are delineated in a collaborative process.
Finally, do teachers want to be leaders outside of the classroom? Would additional research enable us to convey to teachers the importance of their expressing both the voice and the vision of the teacher’s experience—exposing their vulnerability and their wisdom to the public scrutiny of leadership positions? This is perhaps the most important possibility that exists for additional research in this area.

The areas just described do not all directly address research about teachers as leaders. They do, however, bring us to the conclusion that if teachers are to become leaders, it will be because a supportive environment for leadership development is in place. This environment has several aspects: Commitment to change defined, role definition in place, positive community involvement encouraged, and a commitment to collaboration clearly described. This research has shown that these four characteristics are the minimum essential ingredients for allowing teachers to try out their leadership skills in areas outside the classroom.
CONCLUSIONS

Trying out leadership skills is not the same as becoming leaders. Hearing the voices of teachers will enable school administrators and community members to realize that teachers do have a vision which can be expressed through their developing leadership roles in administrative functions.

Vision v. voice. Leader v. follower. Principal v. teacher. Teaching v. learning. Male v. female. However we phrase the relationship, observing, studying, and attempting to clarify the process of negotiating roles which will lead to collaboration can only enhance the performance of all those who would be leaders in the educational environment.

In this case study, I have looked at relationships in a collaborative process that was designed for teachers to assume leadership positions outside of the classroom. We have had to acknowledge their overall failure to achieve that leadership pinnacle as a coherent leadership unit while at the same time, we have cheered their individual successes at demonstrating their leadership capabilities in technical areas.

I have described political realities that exist for few teacher units operating outside the classroom milieu. Planners portrayed in this research went beyond the boundaries of teacher literature and administrator
literature to attempt to combine the two: teachers and leadership. The research has indicated that the attempt to exercise leadership outside of the classroom is perhaps more important than our ability to define the characteristics of successful leaders.

Using the behaviors, characteristics, and activities of successful leaders as defined in the Effective Schools literature has given me only a skeleton upon which to hang the more important contributions of a group of risk takers. Their experiences offer extended opportunities to find other research settings where teachers and school leaders are invited to make that initial move to have teachers step out of the classroom to share a wealth of insights, practical impressions, and rich experiences which will have serious impact on the ways in which we restructure schools.

The research has focused on the impact the community can have in both positive and negative ways in reshaping the school environment. It has shown us that special needs students and their parents, while representing a small percentage of the total population can consume vast amounts of political and physical capital in the collaborative process.

The importance of decision-making processes in involving all components of the community has been a major focus of this research as well. When decision-making
processes are ambiguous or absent, little productivity will result. When tax payers are also an important part of the equation, there is little room for errors in judgment about productivity as this research has indicated.

Finally, the research has attempted to portray the ambitions, perceptions, and perplexing thought processes of six teachers and a principal who left the comfort of their past classroom experiences and attempted to make a contribution to a restructured environment. The environment they attempted to provide would have been student-centered, with teachers as learners and the environment a part of the support system for both teachers and students. Only by adding this picture to the gallery of other teachers who attempt to leave the classroom will the voices and vision of teachers contribute to restructuring schools as we only dream they might be.
EPILOGUE

A complete staff of thirty welcomed 237 students to the ninth grade class. Housed on a middle school campus expanded with modular classrooms to accommodate them, students and staff tested the limits of the new culture.

Minor student discipline problems escalated to major incidents of vandalism. The student personalization part of the program deteriorated as teachers neglected to supervise campus areas and the Academic Advisory program during lunch period.

Curriculum offerings underwent major alterations. By October, the Human Organism course became Biology. A separate section of Advanced Biology attracted thirty "gifted" students. World Cultures students struggled with teachers to find resources for the 1492 unit. A successful "exhibition" of student competencies in early October preserved the course for an additional month. By November, the teachers scrambled to select a World History text when the Japan and China units faltered for lack of resources and community support.

In November, I was asked to be a resource consultant, one of a six-person support team. Support Team members each had a subject area whose teachers needed coaching, some direction, support, and more importantly, encouragement. As the only full-time support team member, I also assumed
responsibility for acquiring resources, assisting in text selection, and general problem-solving on a day to day basis.

After two weeks of support, it was clear support was not enough. The Principal's last day was November 12 when he moved to the District Office. T.H. and B.L. became co-administrators, but without certification, issues such as suspension, expulsion and other administrative roles had to be managed by the counselor.

Collaboration, the key ingredient, was replaced with hierarchy by the new Acting Principal. Teachers, by now accustomed to fending for themselves, were not willing to accept the management style of the Counselor as Acting Principal. In February, the Counselor resigned under both personal and professional pressure and I became Acting Principal for the remainder of the school year.

B.L. and T.H. struggled to teach their classes while together, we attempted to provide leadership and to retain whatever semblance of collaboration, personalization, and student-centered culture we could.
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SUNRISE HIGH SCHOOL PLANNING OFFICE*

TO: DAVID ANDERSON                DATE: DECEMBER 18, 1991
FROM: THE HIGH SCHOOL PLANNING TEAM
SUBJECT: UNIVERSITY-SCHOOL COLLABORATION

We enjoyed a conversation today with Cinda Russell, a graduate student working on her Ph.D. in education at the University of Arizona. She heard about our efforts to design the high school when Ken and Linda addressed her graduate class in October. Her enthusiasm about our work prompted her to do some preliminary discussion with Linda, who suggested that she meet with all of us.

During our two-hour meeting today, she proposed a January, 1992 through January, 1993, research partnership that would benefit us in terms of a consultancy and access to research and would benefit her in terms of her doctoral work. Specifically, she proposes to do a case study on our progress as a planning team and our transition next year to a system that included additional teachers.

We were impressed with Ms. Russell's methodological and personal standards and the depth and breadth of her experience. After exploring concerns and issues related to the proposed partnership, we reached consensus that we would like to pursue the collaborative project she proposed.

Thus, we recommended that Cinda talk with you before we go any further in formalizing our interaction. Cinda will call you tomorrow to make an appointment to see you; perhaps we can meet after she speaks with you.

* Memo re-typed to reflect fictitious names.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>SUN</th>
<th>MON</th>
<th>TUES</th>
<th>WED</th>
<th>THURS</th>
<th>FRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDDIE</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>7 - 5</td>
<td>7 - 5</td>
<td>7 - 5</td>
<td>7 - 5</td>
<td>7 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>3 - 11</td>
<td>3 - 11</td>
<td>3 - 11</td>
<td>3 - 11</td>
<td>11 - 4:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEREMIAH</td>
<td>10 - 6</td>
<td>10 - 6</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>3 - 11</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>7 - 3</td>
<td>7 - 3</td>
<td>7 - 3</td>
<td>7 - 3</td>
<td>7 - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>7 - 3</td>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>OFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM</td>
<td>10 - 6</td>
<td>10 - 6</td>
<td>9 - 5</td>
<td>9 - 5</td>
<td>9 - 5</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>10 - 7</td>
<td>10 - 7</td>
<td>10 - 7</td>
<td>10 - 7</td>
<td>OFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERNIE</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JODIE</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>3 - 11</td>
<td>3 - 11</td>
<td>3 - 11</td>
<td>10 - 3</td>
<td>OFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>3 1/2 HR</td>
<td>7 HR</td>
<td>2 1/2 HR</td>
<td>7 HR</td>
<td>3 1/2 HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENE</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Schedule Effective 5 - 15 -94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eddie</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>7-5</td>
<td>7-5</td>
<td>7-5</td>
<td>7-5</td>
<td>7-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>12-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>10 - 6</td>
<td>10 - 6</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>12 - 7</td>
<td>12 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>7-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>8-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>10 - 6</td>
<td>10 - 6</td>
<td>10-4</td>
<td>10-4</td>
<td>10-4</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>12-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodie</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>11-5</td>
<td>11-5</td>
<td>11-5</td>
<td>11-5</td>
<td>Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>AM/PM</td>
<td>AM/PM</td>
<td>AM/PM</td>
<td>AM/PM</td>
<td>AM/PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rene</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>AM/PM</td>
<td>AM/PM</td>
<td>AM/PM</td>
<td>AM/PM</td>
<td>AM/PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>