A Comparative Historical Analysis of Three Forms of Collegiality: Teacher Teaming, School-Based Management, and Peer Coaching as a Response to School Reform

Jeff Wallis

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations

Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Recommended Citation


http://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/58
A COMPARATIVE HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF THREE FORMS OF COLLEGIALITY, TEACHER TEAMING, SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT, AND PEER COACHING AS A RESPONSE TO SCHOOL REFORM

BY

JEFF WALLIS

Dissertation Committee

Daniel Gutmore, Ph.D., Mentor
John Collins, Ed.D.
Necé Hunt, Ed.D.
The Rev. Ellen M. Sloan, Ph.D.

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education
Seton Hall University
2006
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## I  INTRODUCTION
- Background of the Problem ..................................................... 1
- Statement of the Problem ....................................................... 5
- Purpose of the Study .............................................................. 7
- The Research Question .......................................................... 8
- Subsidiary Questions ............................................................. 8
- Significance of the Study ....................................................... 9
- Definition of Terms ............................................................... 10
- Limitations of the Study ....................................................... 13
- Organization of the Study ..................................................... 13

## II  REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE ..................................... 15

### Part 1  Collegiality and School Reform
- School Restructuring ............................................................. 15
- Effective Schools and Teacher Effectiveness ............................. 16
- Professional Learning Communities ....................................... 17
- School Administration .......................................................... 25

### Part 2  Collegiality
- Definition Studies and Historical Development ..................... 29
- Preceptor Teaming ............................................................... 32
- Site-based management ....................................................... 30
- Peer coaching ................................................................. 38

## III  METHODOLOGY ............................................................... 42

### Historical Methodology ..................................................... 42
### Comparative Historical Analysis ......................................... 42
### Conceptual Framework ...................................................... 44
### Method of Analysis .......................................................... 45
### Sources of Evidence .......................................................... 48

## IV  HISTORICAL NARRATIVE OF TEACHER TEAMING .................. 50

### The Decade from 1960-1969 .............................................. 51
### Ishikawa Diagram 1960-1969 ............................................ 62
### The Decade from 1970-1979 .............................................. 65
### Ishikawa Diagram 1970-1979 ............................................ 68
### The Decade from 1980-1989 .............................................. 70
### Ishikawa Diagram 1980-1989 ............................................ 80
### From 1990 to Present ...................................................... 82
Ishikawa Diagram 1990 to present .............................................. 111
Compilation Ishikawa Diagram .................................................. 113
Summary of Causal Factors ....................................................... 114

V HISTORICAL NARRATIVE OF SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT .......... 117
School-based Management Prior to 1980 .................................. 121
Ishikawa Diagram Prior to 1980 ............................................... 125
The Decade from 1980-1989 .................................................... 126
Ishikawa Diagram 1980-1989 .................................................... 161
From 1990 to Present ............................................................ 164
Ishikawa Diagram 1990 to Present .......................................... 182
Compilation Ishikawa Diagram ................................................ 184
Summary of Causal Factor ....................................................... 184

VI HISTORICAL NARRATIVE OF PEER COACHING .................... 188
The Decades from 1960-1979 .................................................... 189
Ishikawa Diagram 1960-1979 ................................................... 195
The Decade from 1980-1989 .................................................... 197
Ishikawa Diagram 1980-1989 .................................................... 205
From 1990 to Present ............................................................ 206
Ishikawa Diagram 1990 to Present .......................................... 239
Compilation Ishikawa Diagram ................................................ 238
Summary of Causal Factors ....................................................... 239

VI. COMPARATIVE HISTORICAL ANALYSIS ................................. 243
VIII CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ............................ 294
IX REFERENCES .................................................................. 303
CHAPTER I

Introduction

Background of the Problem

Our nation's school systems have launched numerous school reform initiatives in the past 45 years, many of which have embraced the tenets of collegiality. The concept of educators working together critically in formal ways to improve instruction has been the centerpiece of a number of teaching programs and educational models, most with the specific purpose to improve school effectiveness. Starting in the 1960s and continuing to the present, the conceptual framework of collegiality has been utilized to address a variety of educational issues in activities such as teacher teaming, school-based management, and peer coaching.

Collegiality is valued when schools are viewed as communities rather than only places of work; and when a school's culture is considered an important variable for defining schooling. An underlying assumption of collegiality is that the nature of adult relationships within a school is one factor that determines the quality of a school (Barth, 1990). For the districts and educators who ascribe to this assumption, collegiality has been the structure on which a number of school improvement initiatives have been based. In Improving Schools Within, Barth (1990) writes:

The literature suggests that a number of outcomes may be associated with collegiality. Decisions tend to be better. Implementation of decisions is better. There is a higher level of morale and trust among adults. Adult learning is energized and more likely to be sustained. There is even some evidence that
motivation of students and their achievement rises, and evidence that when adults share and cooperate, students tend to do the same. (pg. 31)

Evans (1996) went further with this argument and suggested that school improvement is embedded in an ethos of empowerment and collegiality. It is for all of these reasons, and others, that collegiality has remained a favorable concept in school reform for the past 45 years.

The literature is also clear that collegiality does not come easily to a school environment. "The case for collegiality and collaboration rests on three core beliefs: tightness, effectiveness, and transfer" (Evans, 1996, p. 231). Experience with such collegially based reforms as peer coaching, school-based management and teacher teaming has shown that collaborative arrangements and their potential benefits to students and teachers are not always realized. Evans (1996) suggested that the kinds of problems encountered with implementing any collegial initiative could be categorized under two headings—resistant and complexity. For some faculty, collegiality relationships do not offer obvious rewards, and in fact “swim against the tide of life and career”. As for complexity, collegiality and collaboration are “very sophisticated innovations that demand far more of participants than their advocates acknowledge” (Evans, 1996, p. 232). Despite these challenges, collegiality holds promise and remains a workhorse of school improvement initiatives.

School reform movements of the past 45 years have been shaped by a combination of historical, societal and legislative factors. Some of the major influences on education that led up to the reform movement of the 1980s were the launching of Sputnik I in 1957, the liberalization of societal norms in the 1960s and passage of the first
Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965 (Levine & Lezotte, 1990). In the flurry of reforms during this period, collegiality was one concept that came to the fore of such movements as the open classroom, the open space school, and the British infant school model. The tearing down of the walls of American schools, figuratively and literally, called for a new era of teacher collegial cooperation. This era was followed by the reforms movements of the 1970s, which focused on collaborative teaching arrangements such as team teaching, in part attributed to Lortie (1975) who identified teacher isolation from colleagues as endemic to teaching. Important research at Stanford University and the University of Oregon (Charters & Packard, 1979) studied the effects of team teaching on teacher isolation.

The publication of Judith Warren Little’s study (1982), considered to be one of the classic studies on collegiality, illuminated and gave structure to the complexities of collaboration in schools. This seminal study found that a school’s success with collegiality was related to the norms that defined its acceptance for teachers. Further work by Little (1991) helped educators to understand that collegial relationships vary in quality and strength, and these variations affect collaboration, the exchange of ideas, and ultimately school improvement.

Concurrent with Little’s research, the nation’s interest in innovative school restructuring became a theme during the last two decades of the twentieth century. With the publication of A Nation at Risk, commissioned by President Reagan in 1981, the Commission on Excellence in Education offered a critical look at American schooling. The report concluded, “declines in educational performance are in large part the result of disturbing inadequacies in the way the educational process itself is often conducted” (p.
9). In its harshlest, and famous, assessment it stated, “the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people” (p.1). The starting flag had been lowered for the race to achieve excellence in America’s schools, and once again, collegiality and collaboration through teacher teaming and peer coaching were at the forefront of change.

In *A Nation Prepared* (Carnegie Corporation, 1986) the Carnegie Task Force’s primary recommendation was to change the traditional hierarchical structure of schools. A second Carnegie report, *Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century* (Carnegie Corporation, 1989), focused on restructuring middle schools so more appropriately and adequately meet the needs of America’s preadolescent students.

Further government commissioned reports and legislation kept the issues of educational reform in the spotlight. *Goals 2000* and *The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, the most recent reauthorization of the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act, continued to focus the nation on the education of its children. Learning from the business world, educators’ efforts to “professionalize” teaching in the United States was seen in such collegial activity as site-based management.

School reform has been a major theme in American education since the 1980s. A review of the literature on collegiality has led this researcher to notice a recurring pattern: collegiality has been a consistent response to calls for school reform. This observation raises several questions: Why is this so? What are the qualities of collegiality that make it appropriate to reform efforts? How and why did colegiality succeed or fail when it was implemented as a mode for reform?
For the past 45 years, boards of education and their administrative teams have been confronted with mandates from their communities, and/or from different levels of government to improve the quality of their schools. In response, a vast array of programs has been developed, many of which have incorporated the tenets of collegiality.

"Teachers, administrators, and other staff members now must work together as members of school teams to assess data, define mission, allocate resources, and make decisions. Undertaking such activities without first building a supportive and nurturing climate for collaboration often results in frustration and failure" (Lynnman, 1991 p. 3). However, the implementation and efficacy of many national and local initiatives have met with varying degrees of success.

The history of education in the United States for the past 45 years reveals the evolutionary nature of collegiality and informs educators as to the successes and pitfalls of collaboration to addressing school reform. In Chapter II, a review of the literature uncovers the relationship between school reform and collegiality, as one purpose of this study is to expose their tie and present an analysis of the symbiotic nature that these two topics have in nurturing successful schools.

Statement of the Problem

Research has shown that collegiality among school faculty does have a positive impact on the educational process (Levine & Lezotte, 1990; Little, 1990; Purkay & Smith, 1983; Rosenholtz, 1989). The relationships that exist among staff members and between staff and administration are factors that determine the culture or climate of a school. Emerging from the effective schools research is the understanding that a school's
climate is a contributing factor to its success or failure as a place of learning (Brookover & Lazoitte, 1979). Another compelling finding is that when staff members have collegial relationships, these in turn enrich the school climate and contribute to school productivity (Little, 1981).

More recent research connects collegiality to positive school outcomes (Fullan, 2001; Keddy, Winter, Gordon & Newton, 2000; Lambert, 2002; Louis & Kruse, 1995; Marzano, 2003; Villani, 1996). Ongoing research of school culture, organizational change, and school improvement has found that success is more likely when teachers are collegial and work collaboratively on improvement activities (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991).

Our nation’s legislators, policy makers and educational leaders have taken this research seriously and have incorporated the concepts of collegiality into a number of major school improvement initiatives over the past 45 years. The development, implementation, and support of these programs have been at great cost, both in time and money. Unfortunately, they have achieved varying degrees of success. These programs have included the innovations that are the focus for this study: teacher teams, school-based management, and peer coaching.

Only three forms of collegiality will be examined in this study because this number provides a large enough sample for cross-case analysis, but small enough to be manageable within this analysis. The three approaches, teacher teams, school-based management, and peer coaching were chosen because each fits five specific criteria:

1. The approach is recognized as a legitimate educational practice by a wide range of educators, theorists and practitioners.
(2) The approach has a significant body of research and literature that defines it as well as critiques its use.

(3) The approach contains elements of joint work, identified through research as the highest and most significant form of collegiality.

(4) The approach was developed and/or used significantly throughout schools and school districts in the United States since 1960.

(5) The approach has origins within school reform efforts.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to investigate, trace and analyze the historical development of collegiality as a response to school reform in the United States for the past 45 years. Collegiality has evolved over that time period and this study will examine three of its distinct manifestations: teacher teaming, school-based management and peer coaching, and the events that precipitated their use. The study will trace their origins, and investigate the link between school reform policy and collegiality.

In this report, collegiality will be defined in general terms as teachers and administrators working together critically for continuous renewal of instructional methods and curricular offerings (Little, 1981). School reform will be defined in general as programs and strategies that require a thorough reexamination of all parts of school life in order to improve student achievement in which all stakeholders of a school community are involved (McChesney & Hertling, 2000).

This study will examine the history and development of education reform policy by analyzing government documents and mandates, state and federal legislation, research
studies, commissioned studies, transcriptions of interviews with educational leaders, and other historical documentation, and then trace their association to the development and/or implementation of collegial programs and innovations. In addition, this study will present an analysis of effective and ineffective uses of collegiality as evidenced by the data.

The Research Questions

Why has collegiality been used as a response to school reform initiatives in the United States? What are the cause and effect relationship patterns between collegiality and school reform? What has been the effectiveness of collegiality in meeting school reform objectives for the past 45 years?

Subsidiary Questions

1. What are the major causal factors—governmental/political, societal/cultural, educational, economic and contingency issues that precipitated or directly resulted in the use of teacher learning from 1960-2005?

2. What are the major causal factors—governmental/political, societal/cultural, educational, economic and contingency issues that precipitated or directly resulted in the use of school-based management from 1970-2005?

3. What are the major causal factors—governmental/political, societal/cultural, educational, economic and contingency issues that precipitated or directly resulted in the use of peer coaching from 1960-2005?
4. What shared causal factors led to the initiation, development and implementation of these collegial practices from 1960-2005?

5. What are the shared qualities of these practices that made them effective or ineffective responses to the call for school reform from 1960-2005?

Significance of the Study

This study will contribute knowledge and insight about the relationship between two complex aspects of American schooling—reform efforts and collegial practices. Because of a variety of influences and events that have emerged in the past 45 years, school administrators, policy makers, government officials, business leaders and others have initiated an array of reform practices based on the tenets of collegiality. An examination of the relationship between school reform and collegial practices will offer insight and understandings about school reform efforts and their effectiveness.

Why a historical survey? Leedy (1997) tells us "historical research deals with the maelstrom of life. It looks intensely at the currents and countercurrents of present and past events and at human thoughts and acts and seeks to trace them, with the hope of discerning dynamics that add rationality and meaning to the whole" (p. 173). This study, therefore, can add to our knowledge of the evolution of collegiality, and deepen our understanding of its complexity. In addition, this research will add to the body of knowledge and research relating to school reform practices. Aiming to inform practitioners, theorists and policymakers, this study will focus on the cause and effect relationship between collegiality and school reform by highlighting its importance in positively affecting student achievement.
This historical survey and analysis of the relationship between school reform initiatives and different collegial practices will consider political, social and economic factors that had consequences for the successes and failures of collegiality. The analysis attempts to answer some of the questions, raised in research literature, about its effectiveness. Without historical perspective "we are in danger of falling into the mistaken and perhaps arrogant notion that the problems we face and the solutions we propose are unprecedented and bear no relationship to human problems of the past" (Furchy & Salevouris, 1988, p. 1). These words carry an important message to today's school administrators, one that can easily be overlooked by educators who view their challenges too myopically. The significance of this study is in its attempt to reveal significant patterns in addressing America's educational problems, allowing school administrators and education decision-makers to learn from the past without having to have lived it.

And finally, Krathwohl (1998) believes that an historical analysis gives "perspective so that we may better judge progress" (p. 572). The findings from this study should help school administrators to judge the progress of school reforms and to weigh their benefits and costs.

**Definition of Terms**

School reform has been central to American education for the past two and a half decades. Because school reform and collegial practices are germane to this study, and because their complex nature can summon various understandings, the following definitions are offered for the purpose of clarity and consistency.
Collegiality describes the working together critically for continuous improvement of instructional methods and curricular offerings. Specifically it involves teachers and administrators talking together about students’ growth and students’ needs, working together to develop curriculum, observing one another teach, teaching one another, and working together on faculty committees to reflect on current practices and plan for the future (Little, 1982; Hoerr, 2000). It is a process in which everyone works together critically for the improvement of schools and instruction. It should be noted that frequently the terms collegiality and collaboration are used synonymously in the literature. Although it can be argued that they describe different activities, for the purposes of this study (and following the practice of Barth, 1990; Evans, 1996; Little, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1991 and others), the term collaboration is used interchangeably with the term collegiality.

School reform as defined by The National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform (2004) refers to a “systematic approach to school wide improvement that incorporates every aspect of a school—from curriculum and instruction to school management” (p. 1). One intent of reform is to provide a unified and comprehensive approach to education, displacing multiple and/or fragmented educational programs. It is seen as “a product of the long-term collaborative efforts of school staff, parents and district staff” (National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform, 2004, p.1). Therefore, school reform is frequently viewed as synonymous with school restructuring. A restructured school is “one that has undergone changes that reflect second order or fundamental changes in school philosophy and practice, and where those changes are driven by a collaborative process and clearly defined goals” (Feuts, 1999, p. i).
Teacher teaming in its simplest form is when two or more teachers work together to develop, plan and teach a lesson. In its more extended forms it includes such configurations as interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary teams, clustering, and co-teaching. It is seen as a way to reduce teacher isolation, to promote collegiality, and to improve student achievement primarily by providing students with opportunities to have contact with many different teachers and a variety of teaching styles (University of North Carolina, n.d.).

School-based management, also known as site-based management, is a form of decentralization. It shifts authority from the district-level to the building level. Its purposes are to reduce the management hierarchy and to relocate decision-making to the people who are most closely connected to the life of the school such as teachers, parents, and building level administrators. “Site-based management is defined in a variety of ways but typically incorporates the same components: a delegation of authority to individual schools, a shared decision-making model involving various stakeholders, and facilitative leadership at the school level” (Levey & Acker-Hoeveve, 1998 cited in Holloway, 2000). Control over school finances and the educational curriculum are the two areas of decision-making most frequently relegated to school-based management (Sturm & Barcelona, 1996).

Peer coaching can be defined as an exchange between two colleagues for the purpose of support, advice or encouragement, which enables them to solve problems, to make decisions or to improve practice within the classroom (Ackland, 1991). Robbins (1991) broadens the definition by characterizing it as a “process through which two or more professional colleagues work together to reflect on current practices; expand, refine,
and build new skills; share ideas; teach one another; conduct classroom research; or solve problems in the workplace' (p. 1). In most instances and applications, peer coaching is not a process for evaluating teachers; nor is it hierarchical or prescriptive in nature. Other names used for this activity included peer support, peer mentoring, consulting colleagues, or peer sharing.

Limitations of the Study

The scope of this study is limited to the concept of collegiality and its applications when used to address the challenges of school reform initiatives from 1960 to 2005. The analysis includes a historical perspective on the assumption that all events in the history of a subject can be examined for root causes that reveal the origins of particular developments that evolve over time. It is important to note that different analytical methods and perspectives that are applied to understanding a subject may yield different conclusions. In point of fact, this study reflects this researcher’s judgments about material relevant to the study that have been excluded from this discussion, as well this researcher’s own viewpoints on the various issues that are being analyzed and reported.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I contains the statement of the problem with supplemental background information. The purpose of the study, research questions and significance of the study further support the study’s scheme. The definitions of terms that are central to the study are included.
Chapter II presents a thorough review of the research literature on collegiality and school reform.

Chapter III outlines the methodology, including the conceptual framework, method of analysis, and sources of evidence.

Chapters IV through VI present the historical narrative, and Ishikawa diagrams for each of the three collegial practices: teacher teaming, school-based management, and peer coaching.

Chapter VII presents the cross-case comparison and analysis of the three diagrams, and answers the three main research questions: Why has collegiality been used as a response to school reform initiatives in the United States? What are the cause and effect relationship patterns between collegiality and school reform? What has been the effectiveness of collegiality in meeting school reform objectives for the past 45 years?

Chapter VIII presents the conclusions and recommendations for future study.
CHAPTER II

Review of Relevant Literature

The review of relevant literature is divided into two parts. Part I establishes the connection between school reform and collegiality and examines educational literature and research data to understand their relationship. Part II reviews the literature and research studies pertaining to collegiality in general, and then specifically three of its forms that have evolved during the past 45 years: teacher teaming, school-based management and peer coaching.

Part I—Collegiality and School Reform

The last two decades of the twentieth century introduced a number of reform initiatives into schools. The business community concluded that the nation was losing its competitive edge (McLaughlin, 1990). Responding to such national reports as A Nation at Risk (1983), A Nation Prepared (1986), and Turning Points (1989), the country experienced several waves of reform. The first wave involved school effectiveness initiatives, which focused on school improvement and teacher effectiveness but also had the effect of marginalizing teacher participation in the process. During this period, there was a plethora of initiatives where "state policies about the way teachers were prepared, credentialled, supported, evaluated and compensated constituted a central focus of educational policy making and reform agendas" (McLaughlin, 1990, p. 12).

"Whereas teachers were seen as part of the problem in Wave One, Wave Two cast teachers as central to the solution of increased educational excellence and called for increased support for teachers' development and an increased role in decision about
classroom and school practices" (p. 15). These developments and a change in the nation's collective thinking provided the basis for current programs such as teacher teaming, school-based management, and peer coaching.

**School Restructuring**

Most of the literature and research on collegiality, and its related subject collaboration, relates to the issues of school restructuring. In more recent literature, the subjects of collaboration and collegiality appear with increased frequency and are discussed in relation to a new framework for school community that was emerging (Sergiovanni, 1992). While Lieberman (1988) called for shared decision-making, extensive staff development and collaborative leadership models, the focus in the literature turned to restructuring schools. Breaking down the isolated nature of teachers' work and increasing opportunities for substantive collaboration were central features of restructuring schools (Murphy, 1990). Louis and Kruse (1995) pointed to the widespread agreement in the educational reform literature about the need for strong professional communities and their value, and for the benefits of teacher collaboration in schools.

A review of the literature did not reveal a consensus for a definition of school restructuring. However, in most restructuring efforts, the school systems, district offices, or the state legislatures initiated a massive reorganization of their educational institutions, making fundamental reforms in their staffing patterns, and their governance structures (New York State Department of Education, 2004). The purpose of restructuring was to improve student academic achievement. In fact, many of the more recent efforts to restructure were related to a school's efforts to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) as
mandated by the latest reauthorization of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), familiarly known as No Child Left Behind.

Restructuring has been referred to consistently in the literature on school reform since the 1980s (Boyer, 1995; Cotton, 2001; Keedy, 1991; Lieberman, 1988; Murphy, 1990; Newmann & Wehlage, 1995). Synthesizing the early literature on restructuring, Murphy (1990) concluded that it fell into four broad areas: (a) the redistribution of authority from district level to school level; (b) teacher empowerment, including improved school climates; (c) parent and student choice; and (d) teaching for understanding, the shifting from teacher-centered to student-centered classroom instruction. Later studies supported the idea that schools should become true communities of learning in their efforts to restructure. Newmann and Wehlage (1995) compiled the results of four major studies on restructuring and found that the level of professional community in a school had significant effect on student achievement whether achievement was measured as authentic performances or tested in more conventional ways. “If schools want to enhance their organizational capacity to boost student learning, they should work on building a professional community that is characterized by shared purpose, collaborative activity, and collective responsibility among staff” (Massachusetts ASCD, 2004, p. 5).

**Effective Schools and Teacher Effectiveness**

In the late 1970s and early 1980s a body of research emerged that focused on effective schools (Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer & Wisenbaker, 1979; Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Edmondson, 1983; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, & Ouston, 1979). This
research responded to the landmark study *The Equality of Educational Opportunity* Survey (EEO) that concluded, "schools bring little influence to bear on a child's achievement that is independent of his background and general social context..." (Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland, Mood, Weintfeld & York, 1966). Trying to address the concerns of a nation that was struggling with racial, social and educational inequities, the Coleman Report achieved an unanticipated result: it spawned the Effective Schools Movement. Leading the efforts to identify effective schools that ran counter to those studied by the EEO Commission, Edmonds (1983) and other researchers aimed to disprove the major finding of the Commission's report. As a rule, the effective schools research represents one of the "major cornerstones in the broader school reform movement" (Lezotte, 1986, p. 11).

Comparing successful schools with similar but unsuccessful schools in like neighborhoods, researchers were able to identify common characteristics (Association for Effective School, Inc. 2004). These characteristics became known as the Effective Schools Correlates because they correlated with high levels of student achievement. The correlates are obvious to today's educators, but they were revelatory at the time of their formation. Edmonds (1983) identified the five characteristics of an effective school as:

1. Strong leadership by the principal.
2. A pervasive and broadly understood instructional focus.
3. An orderly, safe climate conducive to teaching and learning.
4. Teacher behaviors that convey the expectation that all students are expected to obtain at least minimum mastery.
5. The use of measures of pupil achievement as the basis for program
The research on school effectiveness was complemented and reinforced by research on teacher effectiveness (Edmonds, 1983). Student mastery of basic skills as evidenced by standardized test scores was the first-generation barometer for teacher effectiveness. This was broadened in the second-generation research to other achievement objectives, including, higher order skills such as problem solving, analysis, creativity and the ability to communicate clearly both through speech and in written expression (Edmonds, 1983). But early on Edmonds called for schools to be evaluated on at least two individual measures: student achievement and “observable change in the institution and organizational nature of a school” (p. 5). Improvement in learning and teaching were advocated. The studies on school effectiveness pointed out and emphasized the important relationship between student achievement and collegial or collaborative school cultures.

One important finding revealed that schools that are especially effective are characterized by a deep commitment to academic achievement (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Levine & Lezotte, 1990). Another crucial finding was that a student’s chance for success in learning cognitive skills was heavily influenced by the climate or culture of the school (Brookover et al., 1979). The research has also provided evidence that a school’s climate is enhanced by collaboration among its teachers (Barth, 1990; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996; Johnson, 1990; Little, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1991).

If the culture of a school can raise student achievement levels, then two important questions arise. What is a desirable school culture? How can it be developed?
Schein (1992) defined organizational culture in general as:

A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 12)

McLaughlin and Yee (1988) operationalized Schein’s definition of schools. Their research, which also identified qualities that characterize the culture of an effective school, found that teachers thrived in settings that possessed adequate resources, shared a unity of purpose, provided opportunities for collegial interaction, were focused on problem solving rather than problem-hiding, and rewarded risk-taking. Research by Nias, Southworth and Yeomans (1989) confirmed and expanded the understanding of the complexities of positive school cultures. Developing case studies of five primary schools in England, they found that the foundation of a collaborative school culture consisted of helpful, supportive, trusting and open staff relationships that pervaded the entire organization. Speaking directly to the point, Fullen and Hargreaves (1996) stated, “Collaborative cultures create and sustain more satisfying and productive work environments. By empowering teachers and reducing the uncertainties of the job that must otherwise be faced in isolation, collaborative cultures also raise student achievement” (p. 49).

With research providing the definition of a desirable school culture, the literature outlined the strategies that best develop this culture—collaborative planning, collegial work, and a school atmosphere conducive to experimentation and evaluation. There is compelling evidence in the research literature on successful schools that collaborative
planning and collegial relationships typically characterize a productive school environment (Barth, 1990; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996; Little, 1982; Little, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989). Additionally, Sizer (1995) brought to light the fact that many reforms never questioned basic assumptions about how schools are organized; and his research also emphasized the importance of collaboration: "Our research suggests that you're not going to get significant, long-term reform unless you have subtle but powerful support and collaboration among teachers..." (O'Neil, 1995).

The literature and a body of research began to show how collegiality was the strategy for building professional relationships to enhance teacher effectiveness and advance student achievement (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Bruce & Singh, 1996; Marzano, 2003). Many researchers and analysts pointed to collegiality as an avenue for improving cohesion, communication, problem identification and resolution, and to supporting other aspects of effectiveness (Levine & Lezotte, 1990; Little, 1990; Purkay & Smith, 1983; Rosenholtz, 1989).

**Professional Learning Communities**

Much of the literature supports the notion that collegiality and collaboration are strategies that are critical to the process of school reform and educational innovation (Ellis, Jensen, Piel & Smith, 1987; Fouts, 1999; Lambert, 2003; Little, 1981, 1982). At the same time, there is evidence to suggest that there are challenges to instituting these strategies. Many educational reformers had assumed that professional collegial arrangements would "enhance teachers' capacity for learning and problem solving, build solidarity and cohesiveness within schools and satisfy teachers' needs for affiliation"
(Rowan, 1990, p. 374). However, Legters (1999) offered a cautionary and insightful observation when she wrote, “Very little is known about how changing the organizational structure of schools actually affects the frequency, form and content of communication and collaboration among teachers, especially in restructuring high schools” (p. 7).

Another theme of caution is presented in the literature: collaboration cannot be imposed and be effective. Sorensen (1998) noted that collaborative structures can’t be imposed. Instead, participants must learn the skills of collaboration and teamwork.

Dewey (1916) posited the premise that the basic purpose of schooling was to understand democracy and that schools should model that purpose. As a result, schools as democracies had a higher purpose. He explained that “A democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience” (p. 87). Furthermore, he advocated that teachers be active participants in schools, jettisoning a commonly held view that teachers are passive purveyors of information. Walker and Lambert (1995) synthesized Dewey’s views when they wrote that he “believed that teachers should have a determining role in the structure of school. His early notions of shared decision-making shaped evolving notions of schools as communities of learners and leaders...” (p. 19).

Barth (1990) proposed that a school should be a community of learners, with collegiality as the foundation. “Key to improving schools from within lies in improving the interactions among teachers and between teachers and principals (p. 28). He stressed the role of collaboration by stating collegiality was integral to the task of improving schools. Expanding upon this idea, Boyes (1995) called for teacher empowerment and for faculty to become teacher-researchers. He stressed the importance of a vision shared
by all members of the school community and suggested that time be regularly set aside for professional collaboration. Both Barth and Boyer presented works that coincided with the development of the national movements of school-based management and peer coaching.

Barth (1990) has been credited for being one of the first to call for schools to become learning communities—places of learning that embrace collegiality and collaboration. Schools that are learning communities "seem to value and honor learning, participation, and cooperation above prescription, production, and competition" (p. 43). His concept of the school as a community of learners describes a place where all participants—teachers, principals, parents, and students—engage in learning and teaching, the desired net effect being that "school is a place where students discover and adults rediscover the joys, the difficulties, and the satisfactions of learning" (Barth, 1990, p. 43). Boyer (1995) understood the importance of community in schools in a slightly different way. When developing his model of the Basic School he wrote, "After completing our research, we concluded that the most essential ingredient of a successful school—the one idea that holds it all together—is best described by the simple word 'connections.' An effective school connects people, to create community" (p. 8).

McLaughlin and Talbert (1993) revealed that when teachers participate in a professional community with like-minded colleagues, these interactions have a powerful effect on their success in the classroom. Furthermore, their research found that teachers had more positive views of teaching and the profession, and taught more effectively when they felt part of a learning community.
Despite the compelling evidence that collegiality and collaboration are important to school success, Barth (1990) argues, "they find all too little following. Collegiality is eclipsed by other goals that appear more closely related to the fundamental purposes of schools" (p. 31). Barth's conclusions lead to a brief review of the literature that identifies the obstacles to developing collegiality and collaboration in schools.

Why was collegiality and collaboration so absent from schools if numerous well-respected educators had spoken forcefully and persuasively about the importance of collegiality in schools, and a body of research supported it? Evans (1996) outlined several reasons, one of which is that most educators seek "external" changes (that is, changes external to themselves) that will help them do better what they have traditionally been trying to do (p. 81). This is in sharp contrast to the goal of many reform initiatives, which "includes a heavy emphasis on defects within teachers and schools and seeks in a variety of ways to get teachers to perform and think very differently, to unlearn what they know" (p. 81). Collegiality falls into this category. Teachers were being asked to work together in ways that were alien to their current work structures. Pointing to the foibles of human nature, Evans (1996) pointed out that to change the way one actually approaches the world or characteristically behaves is difficult, and unfortunately, rare.

Sergiovanni (1994) further illuminated this subject with his focus on the tensions that develop when teachers value their autonomy in the classroom and the school is asking them to work in teams or in other ways that connect them to one another. "This ambivalence between the value of individualism and the need for community accounts for our discomfort whenever someone suggests that teaching practice become more collective" (p. 149). "We want to maintain individuality, yet we yearn to create and live
a coherent, moral life with others” (p. 148). But despite the “natural” obstacles, leaders keep turning to collegiality and collaboration through approaches such as teacher teaming, school-based management, and peer coaching.

**School Administration**

In the literature this researcher reviewed, one theme dominated: the development of the norm of collegiality in a school is primary to its successful introduction and practice (Little, 1981; Little, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1992; Walker & Lambert, 1995). Little (1981) stressed this fundamental finding in her work when she observed that the norm of collegiality—expectations for shared discussion and shared work—were evident across professional development activities that succeeded. A decade later, Walker and Lambert (1995) again stressed that a school that defines itself as a community of learners must develop new norms that foster collaboration and shared inquiry. Sergiovanni (1992) counseled that schools are defined by their centers—“repositories of values, sentiments, and beliefs that provide the needed cement for bonding people together in a common cause ….and they provide norms that guide behavior and give meaning to community life” (p. 47).

The research literature about creating learning communities, and specifically the norm of collegiality, focuses much attention on the importance of the school principal (Little, 1981). It is within the power of this one individual to create the atmosphere and to cultivate the culture that embraces the tenets of collegiality and collaboration. In early work, Little (1981) astutely observed:
By virtue first of office and then of performance, principals are in a unique position to establish and maintain the important norms of collegiality and experimentation, and to promote and foster the critical practices of talk about practice, observation of practice, joint work on materials, and teaching each other about teaching. (p. 11)

Little (1981) identified specific behaviors that principals engaged in that promoted the norm and practice of collegiality. They were: (a) the principal explicitly announced the expectation for collaboration among the faculty and described collegiality in concrete terms to them; (b) the principal modeled collegiality, working collaboratively with the faculty to improve the school; (c) the principal sanctioned collegiality by granting release time to faculty and the resources necessary to pursue collaborative activities; and (d) the principal defended faculty who engaged in collegial behavior from countermovements within the school, as well as from impositions from outside the school from parents and/or the district.

Sergiovanni (1996) campaigned in his writings for schools to become norm-based communities. Examining more recent school improvement efforts, he characterized most of the formal and structural approaches to improving teacher performance in the classroom as "rules-based". They dictated new directions, scripted teacher work, and standardized outcomes to the point of making them almost meaningless. He advocated, on the contrary, a norm-based approach to school improvement where collegiality was the mode of operation: teachers worked interdependently, the community adopted a set of shared values, and the faculty, administration and staff engaged in activities that developed a purposeful vision for the school. "Norms-based approaches are conceptually
more complex than rules-based approaches. But once they are understood, they do not require complex management systems for implementation in schools” (p. 167).

Responding to norms being mandated inappropriately, Hargreaves (1989) defined a practice in schools that he termed “contrived collegiality”. He faulted many schools for mandating collegiality that brought about a fulfillment of its form, without regard for its spirit or underlying assumptions. “It contrives to graft collaboration by administrative requirement on to what otherwise might be unsympathetic patterns of collegial relations within schools” (p. 3). Sergiovanni (1992) echoed similar words of caution. He suggested that rules and mandates are relatively ineffectual ways to change the normative structures of schools. He urges administrators not to promote collegiality, whether by altering organizational structures or by introducing such innovations as team teaching and peer coaching, without addressing the norm structure.

Sergiovanni (1996), and Walker and Lambert (1995) called for a “constructivist” approach to develop collegial learning communities. “Central to constructivist thinking is the transformation of classrooms and schools into learning communities” (Sergiovanni, 1996, p. 129). Lambert (2003) outlined the central principles. She stated that the qualities of a constructivist leader describe an educator who: (a) seeks and values teachers’ points of view; (b) structures the concept of leadership to challenge teachers’ belief systems; (c) constructs meaning through reflection and dialogue; and (d) structures the life of the school around the big picture, not a singular event or small piece of information (p. 2).

Some educational research findings suggest that the locus for change in high schools resides outside of the principal (McLaughlin, 1992). They identify the academic
department as the feature of schools that can influence the ability of collegial structures to thrive. McLaughlin (1992) offered a critical finding: teachers within the same school or department developed different responses to different students depending on the character of their collegial environment. She also claims that the “vision” of the educational program is the single most influential variable for academic departments. “Departments with high levels of collegiality and support for teachers’ growth had an express conception of what the departments were about, a vision” (p. 16). This indicates an increased importance of the role of the department Chair in high schools.

The literature also reinforced the importance of building capacity as well as strengthening relationships when creating learning communities (Deal & Peterson, 1990; Ellis, Jensen, Piele, & Smith, 1987; Johnson, Markle, & Arhar, 1988; Keedy, 1991; Liberman, 1988; Louis & Kruse, 1995). These features, accordingly, form the basis for a professional culture, which is at the heart of collegiality and collaboration. Again the role of leader is paramount to the success of these efforts.

Smylie (1990) claimed that collegiality supports teacher efficacy, i.e. the beliefs that individual teachers hold about their own capacities or abilities to affect student learning. In the supportive environment of collegiality, teachers feel supported in their efforts to improve practice and therefore are more committed to the teaching process and so are more effective with their students. Smylie reported high levels of teacher efficacy when teachers were involved in decision-making that pertained to curriculum.
Part II—Collegiality

Definition Studies and Historical Development

Although collegiality has been frequently called upon in a variety of guises to address a number of educational issues, it maintains an amorphous quality. Collegiality has been described by terms such as collaboration or teacher professionalism (Louis & Kruse, 1995); it has been characterized as occurring under conditions such as tacit norms of professional behavior (Deal & Peterson, 1990; Little, 1982; Lortie, 1975); it has been defined by its expression as learning communities or teacher collegial groups (Barth, 1990; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996; Keedy, 1991; Sergiovanni, 1992). Breaking it down to basics, Villani (1996) noted, "Collegial behavior is demonstrated by teachers who are supportive of one another. They openly enjoy professional interactions, are respectful and courteous of each other's needs" (p. 44). The literature over the past 45 years delivered form to its definition, even though its application as a concept remained multifaceted. It is a basic assumption of this study that through viewing and analyzing collegiality's use in a historical context that patterns arise which provide the greatest understanding to its meaning and best applications.

The teaching profession gained national focus following the launching of Sputnik I in 1957. Viewing Russia's success in space as a failure for the United States, the following decade produced a period of national introspection and examination during which time one goal was to improve the American educational system. The literature of the 1960s and 1970s reflected the newfound national priorities by examining ways to attract high quality teachers to the profession (Dornbush, Deal, Plumley & Roper, 1976; Lortie, 1975; Meyer & Cohen, 1971). From the early 1980s to the present, there has been
a groundswell of support from educators and an expanding body of knowledge which indicate that the power for making change in our schools rests with the practices of collegiality and collaboration (Barth, 1990; Boyer, 1995; Lieberman, 1988; Little, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1992; Schmoker, 2001). Several works form the critical mass for defining collegiality.

Little (1982) in her classic study on collegiality developed a working definition for the term. Her work discovered that the norm of collaboration is an essential element necessary for the success of professional development programs; and her research established the primary connection between successful schools and collegiality. She suggested that genuine collegiality involved four types of interactions (a) teachers and administrators talking together about students' growth and students' needs, (b) teachers and administrators working together to develop curriculum, (c) teachers and administrators observing one another teach, and (d) teachers and administrators teaching one another. Her work brought insight that provided depth and complexity to an elusive subject. Reflecting further, Hoerr (2000) added a fifth type of interaction—teachers and administrators working together on faculty committees to reflect on current practices and plan for the future. The work of Little (1982) and others brought a working definition to the elusive concept of collegiality.

Building upon her earlier work, Little (1990) identified a hierarchical order of collegial relationships, which she explains will vary in quality and strength. She identified four types of collegial relationships found in schools:
1. Storytelling and scanning for ideas—teachers share incomplete anecdotes and complain and gripe about practice; interchange is neither deep nor focused on problem solving.

2. Aid and assistance—teachers help only when asked, offer little evaluation, and do not interfere with the other teacher’s work; deep relationships of exchange are seldom established.

3. Sharing—teachers share much about themselves, use an expanded pool of resources and knowledge, and frequently share ideas and suggestions that can lead to change in the other teacher’s practice, but teachers undertake little or no actual work together.

4. Joint work—teachers pursue a course of action together involving such practices as team teaching, collaborative planning, peer coaching, mentoring or action research.

Little (1990) placed a hierarchical value on the levels of collegiality that were defined in her research. The first three levels were considered weak forms of collaboration, as she found that they lacked the depth to produce the complex relationships critical to true collaboration. Joint work, the fourth level, was considered the highest and most “extended” form of collegiality. Recognizing the importance of her work, Fullan and Hargreaves (1996) noted that joint work “implies and creates stronger interdependence, shared responsibility, collective commitment and improvement, and greater readiness to participate in the difficult business of review and critique” of their colleagues’ work (p. 47).
In sum, Little's (1982) research on collegiality and collaboration uncovered the norm of collaboration as an essential ingredient necessary for successful professional development and her research created the first connection between successful schools and collegiality. An expanding cadre of educators called for its inclusion (Barth, 1990; Lieberman, 1988; Lieberman & Miller, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1996; Walker & Lambert, 1995).

**Teacher Teaming**

The practice of teacher teaming has evolved over the past 45 years. The literature discusses various configurations for teacher teaming, but also examines how the organization of the school itself can be restructured around teaming. Teacher teaming may be fundamental to the organization of an entire school, may be practiced within some portion of a school, or by only a few teachers. The literature discusses the following teaming types: interdisciplinary teams, multidisciplinary teams, teacher collaboration, team teaching and partnering teams (Spraker, 2003).

Teacher teaming gained prominence during the 1960s and 1970s with the discovery of the deleterious effects of teacher isolation (Lortie, 1975). Isolation had been found to (a) reduce teacher access to new ideas and better solutions, (b) drive stress inward, (c) limit recognition and praise, (d) permit incompetence to exist and persist, and (e) promote teacher resistance to innovation (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996; Lortie, 1975).

With research that was initiated the early 1960s, Lortie (1975) identified teacher isolation as endemic to the experience of teachers. The origin of this phenomenon is that America's schools essentially evolved from the colonial model of schooling with its
emphasis on the value of the individual. During the preceding formative decades
"schools were organized around teacher separation rather than teacher interdependence"
(p. 14). Lortie described the evolution of the organization of schools as egg crate
architecture. Using data from 94 interviews around the Boston metro area in the Five
Towns Study, and questionnaires filled out to all employees of the Dade County Florida
school district, Lortie detailed not only the history and development of teaching, but more
importantly the attitudes and issues which affected teachers. His work was particularly
insightful about the demands of teaching, which informed reformers (Fullan &
Hargreaves, 1996).

As a result of these new understandings, innovative organizational patterns such
as team teaching were introduced to counter classroom isolation and its negative effects.
Two related studies, one at the Stanford’s Center for Research and Development in
Teaching (Meyer & Cohen, 1971) and the other at the University of Oregon’s Center for
the Advanced Study of Educational Administration (Pellegrin, 1970) studied the effects
of team teaching on teacher isolation. To this date, empirical studies of “the implications
of the team structure for organizational processes and staff relationships in school were
sparse” (Charters & Packard, 1979, p. 4). The two studies found three kinds of
consequences likely to result from establishing a work-team structure in elementary
schools. They were (a) a reduction in the isolation of teachers from their colleagues, (b) a
shift towards collegial groups having control over the design and operation of the
instructional program, and (c) an increase in teachers’ feelings of control over their work
and in satisfaction derived from their jobs. A follow-up study by Charters and Packard
(1979) came to a slightly different conclusion indicating that change in a school’s
structure increased the incidence of collaborative teaching and collegiality, but had no consistent effect on job satisfaction or work autonomy. These results led to the question of whether the conclusions of the Stanford and Oregon studies could be generalized to other times and places.

During the 1980s, the Middle School Movement used teacher teaming as a strategy to support adolescent development. With the publication of *Turning Points* (Carnegie Council for Adolescent Development, 1989), bureaucratically organized junior highs were urged to restructure for teacher teaming. “As an organizing strategy for instruction, learning enabled teachers to collaborate and share their knowledge and to create stronger relationships among themselves and their students” (Jackson & Davis, 2000, p. 3-4).

From the 1990s to the present, high school restructuring mirrored the development of the junior high. In *Breaking Ranks* (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1996), high school principals and administrators called for creating high schools with better social environments and climates more conducive to teaching and learning. Cotton (2001) explained their purpose:

The smaller learning communities movement currently taking place across the country in high schools is the result of the need to de-bureaucratize high schools and to create places where students feel relevant and as if they belong. Like middle school reform, organizational reform at the high school level includes teacher teaming as a significant restructuring strategy. (p.32)

Teacher collegiality, professional growth, and a positive school climate are essential elements for a school to nurture in order to insure improvement (Rotter, 2002).
Schools where staff members have no mechanisms for school-wide dialogue and decision-making are likely to lack both a unified vision and a focused agenda for moving forward to improve the school (Woods, 2002). The research literature supports the use of teacher teaming to change and improve school climates. Improved teacher professional growth and collaboration through teaming increased teacher perceptions of efficacy or sense of effectiveness in relation to students (Johnston, Markle, & Arhar, 1988). In teemed environments, improved student attitudes about school, and a greater sense of belonging to the school community, have been identified (Arhar, Johnston, & Markle, 1989).

More germane to the current national focus on student achievement is the effect of teacher teaming on student performance. The research is inconclusive about the effects of teaming on student performance. In a meta-analysis of over 200 research studies and publications, Spraker (2004) found that teacher teaming is as effective as non-teaming. She found some correlation studies and case studies suggesting a positive relationship, but was not able to document a strong cause-effect relationship between teaming and student achievement in the quasi-experimental research reviewed.

A number of researchers argue that the relationship between teaming, school climate, and student achievement cannot be dismissed (Bruce & Singh, 1996; Smith & Scott, 1990). Bruce and Singh (1996) in reviewing the U.S. Department of Education National Education Longitudinal Study data for 1988 found that the indirect relationship between teacher teaming, school climate and student performance was meaningful. They found that student motivation, which has a moderate effect on achievement, was enhanced by the professional climate introduced by quality teaming.
The researchers found that teaming improved the school climate for teachers and increased their feelings of efficacy through more meaningful relationships with students.

**School-based Management**

David (1995) suggested that school-based management (SBM) might be the most significant reform of the decade. He saw it as a potential force for empowering educators and communities. The Education Commission of the States (2001) reported that “many states and school districts have embraced school-based management as a strategy for empowering teachers, increasing efficiency and accountability, and creating greater energy at the school level for change and improvement” (p.3).

Although variously defined, school-based management typically incorporates the same components: a shared decision-making model involving various stakeholders, and a facilitative leadership at the school level (Levey & Acker-Hocevar, 1998). David (1995) found that between 1986 and 1990, fully one-third of all school districts nationwide had implemented some version of school-based management. This management system “may be instituted by state law, or by administrative action by a district or school. It may be linked to an accountability system with consequences tied to student performance, or it may not be” (David, p. 5).

The concept of school-based management is derived from corporate management theories such as Deming’s (1986, 1994) philosophy of management, which is commonly referred to as Total Quality Management (TQM). This approach found that employees performed best in an environment where they were actively involved in the on-going improvement of the organization and deeply committed to its success (Drury, 1999).
Schools have activated the principles of school-based management in the hope of duplicating the success attributed to participatory decision-making for corporations since the introduction of TQM.

One of the issues that complicates school-based management can be identified as the motivations for using it. David stated that it can serve three different functions: (a) it can be a governance reform designed to shift the balance of authority among schools, districts, and the state; or (b) it can be a political reform initiated to broaden the decision-making base; or (c) it can be an administrative reform to make management more efficient by decentralizing and deregulating.

Wohlstetter and Briggs (2001) reviewed findings from various research and evaluation studies of school-based management over the past ten years and identified key elements of the successful school-based management strategy. They include: a vision focused on teaching and learning, decision-making authority, mechanisms for collecting and communicating information related to school priorities, and shared school leadership among administrators and teachers.

In their research, Nobel, Deemer, and Davis (1996) observed several positive effects of school-based management. It increased collegiality and reduced teacher absenteeism. Leithwood and Menzies (1998) found in their review of 83 research studies on school-based management that teachers increased collaboration, made changes in classroom instruction, had a sense of increased control over their work, and had a sense of increased accountability. Parents expressed an increased satisfaction with their children’s schools. The research reinforced the impression that school-based management positively effects the overall quality of the educational environment.
Weiss's (1993) study of 12 high schools revealed school-based management's positive effects, but called into question its effectiveness for improving student achievement. He found that teachers in shared decision-making felt more professional and enjoyed the increased authority and collegiality, but that the results did not translate into increased emphasis on teaching. Corroborating these findings, Drury (1999) argues that the effects of school-based management decentralization on student achievement are still relatively unknown. Stakeholder resistance, lack of focus on student achievement, limited school authority, concentration of authority with administrators, and deficiencies in resources, were factors that limited the impact on improved student performance.

Drury's research found that stakeholder resistance affected the success or failure of school-based management more than any other variable. Odden and Wöhlstetter (1995) identified two characteristics necessary for school-based management programs to improve student achievement: Building level decision-making power must have real authority over budget, personnel and curriculum, and schools have to focus on changes that directly affect teaching and learning.

In an analysis of school-based management literature, Bauer and Bogotch (1997) suggested that "leaving the design issues ambiguous or ill-defined may have serious consequences. Districts must nurture and support teams by giving all team members a clear picture of the goals and processes of school-based management" (cited Halloway, 2000, p. 81).

**Peer coaching**

Peer coaching is discussed in the literature as an avenue for bringing quality instructional leadership to schools. Underlying this assumption is the belief that the
feedback teachers receive from the school principal fall far short of what is necessary to improve teaching performance (Ellis, Jensen, Piele, & Smith, 1987). The second assumption is that peers are a valuable resource to turn to for improving instructional practice. With these two assumptions in hand, advocates for peer coaching emerged.

Whether is it called peer coaching, peer mentoring, or collegial support, all refer to the same function—teacher to teacher feedback about classroom instructional practices. Peer coaching is a planned, collaborative interaction that involves a supportive, non-judgmental approach that teachers can use to analyze and build on their teaching skills (Prystash, 2003). Programs of this nature feature similar elements which are: (a) the collegial observation is removed from summative teacher evaluation, those processes that determine promotion, retention or dismissal; (b) the process is usually voluntary and teachers choose their own partners; and (c) program designs contain a degree of structure that include a goal-setting process, a procedure for observation, and a format for sharing information (Ruck, 1986).

Ackland (1991) identified two types of peer coaching—expert coaching and reciprocal coaching. Expert coaching refers to situations in which one partner's expertise is used for the purposes of support and improvement of the practices of the other partner. It is a mentoring relationship. Reciprocal coaching implies a mutually beneficial exchange where both partners offer feedback and support. These types of professional exchanges are at the heart of collegiality.

The literature on peer coaching raises some important questions about the principal's role as instructional leader. "During the last several decades, the role of the principal has become increasingly complex as society has made ever-greater demands on
the schools" (Herr, p. 380). However, the expansion of the role of principal left less
time for teacher supervision, which historically had been an important function of the
principal. Peer coaching programs had the potential to free the principal from direct
involvement of formative supervision while retaining the principal's role as summative
evaluator. "A peer supervision program is ideally suited to increase the frequency of
formative evaluation for the purpose of instructional improvement while reaping the
indirect benefits of increased professionalism and collegiality among teachers" (Ruck,
1986, p. 6).

Administrators have to be open to changing school structures to allow for peer
programs must develop a culture in which leaders understand how to create collegial
learning environments. The model of shared instructional leadership among professional
staff is state-of-the-art practice, but requires the principal to assume a new, and somewhat
unfamiliar, role. Lambert (2002) elaborated:

Today's effective principal constructs a shared vision with members of the school
community, convenes the conversations, insists on a student learning focus,
evokes and supports leadership in others, models and participates in collaborative
practices, helps pose the questions, and facilitates dialogue that addresses the
confounding issues of practice. (p. 40).

Peer coaching carries with it the advantages of collegial interaction. With its
focus on instructional practice, it builds relationships and strengthens the norm of
collaboration within an institution. Other advantages are that it enhances and reinforces
the notion that teaching is a professional activity, and it distinguishes the two main
functions of observation: formative evaluation to improve classroom instruction and summative evaluation for the purpose of job retention (Ellis et al., 1987).

Peer coaching is not without its complexities and difficulties. If schools are unable to break the obstacle of teacher isolation and autonomy, then peer coaching cannot emerge as a viable professional option. In addition, if the peer coaching is to succeed, the teachers have to overcome their reluctance to invite scrutiny of their work by others. In a quantitative study of New Jersey educators, Prystash (2003) found trust to be the most significant determinant of success in peer coaching. In the early years of peer coaching, Dornbusch, Deal, Plunsey and Roper (1976) identified the barriers to the implementation of collegial feedback: time, experience and norms. They all are obstacles deeply imbedded in the culture and the structure of school organizations. They found that tight, inflexible schedules worked against peer coaching. Concurring with their finding, Hoerr (1999) stated that most teachers are not trained to help peers grow professionally and find the role uncomfortable. But most importantly, if peer coaching is to succeed, the principal must provide a school climate conducive to collegiality (Ruck, 1986).
CHAPTER III
Methodology

Historical Methodology

One means of knowing and thinking about history is through historical analysis and interpretation. This approach includes: explaining issues; identifying historical patterns; establishing cause-and-effect relationships; finding value statements; establishing significance; applying historical knowledge; weighing evidence to draw sound conclusions; making defensible generalizations; and rendering insightful accounts of the past (National Assessment Governing Board, 2001). Researchers and writers who embrace these pursuits possess historical-mindedness. This state of mind includes three essential components: (a) awareness of the themes of continuity and change in human affairs, as well as the interplay of long-term and short-term causes; (e) sensitivity to multiple causation; and (c) sensitivity to context; how other times and places differ from our own (Furay & Salevouris, 2000).

Comparative Historical Analysis

Comparative historical analysis research methods were used as the mode of inquiry for this study. This methodology is rooted in social science research processes. The tradition, although not unified by one theory or one method, does share a concern with causal analysis, an emphasis on processes overtime, and the use of systematic and contextualized comparison (Mahoney & Rueschemeyer, 2003). Most basically, comparative historical researchers ask questions about specific sets of cases that exhibit
sufficient similarity to be meaningfully compared with one another (Pierson & Skocpol, 2002).

Mahoney and Rueschemeyer (2003) explained the history of comparative historical research:

Early comparative historical researchers found it essential to focus on comprehensive structures and large-scale processes that provided powerful clues to the patterning of social life, both at a macroscopic level and at the level of groups and individuals. Such big processes and structures were—and still are—most appropriately studied through explicit comparisons that transcend national or regional boundaries. In addition, these fundamental processes could not, and cannot, be analyzed without recognizing the important of temporal sequences and the unfolding of events over time. (p. 7)

The historical method involves identifying all relevant information about the historical event, examining sources for validity and bias, and selecting and organizing information into narrative form (Maxwell, 2004). In addition, the comparative historical researcher must find patterns among voluminous details describing the subject matter of study (Babbie, 2002).

Using a holistic approach, this study employed inductive inference from description. Patterns, trends, themes and syndromes over a period of time were identified, compared and analyzed to develop a deeper understanding of the qualities of collegiality and the value they lend to addressing school reform issues. Mahoney and Reuschemeyer (2003) extolled comparative historical research as part of a long-standing intellectual practice oriented toward the explanation of substantively important outcomes.
Conceptual Framework

Historians write because they see something that needs to be explained (Marius & Page, 2002). However, to give meaning to what is seen, a conceptual framework needs to be constructed. Conceived as artificial structures, conceptual frameworks have a pattern-making capacity, which impose structure to more effectively understand and manage reality (Maxwell, 2004). Because causal analysis is one of the fundamental functions of comparative historical analysis, this study uses a conceptual framework anchored in cause and effect relationship analysis.

History is a way of thinking about connections between elements of the past, but is also is a way of thought that ties together causes and results. It works with facts, but its essence is the effort to explain them (Furay & Salevouris, 2000). Leeby (1997) observed that "...events do crystallize into meaningful clusters. Just as cause and effect exist in the physical world, so are they equally present in the historical world—in the interaction between humans and their fellows and between humanity and the environment" (p. 174). However, cause and effect relationships are not simple or linear in nature. Their complexity lies in multiple causality, and it is because of their complexity that they warrant study.

The work of Furay and Salevouris (2000) emphasized the multiple nature of historical causation. Their analysis revealed four broad areas in which causation occurs: the ideas, customs and practices of participants; the actions of organized groups and individuals; existing technological and economic conditions; and the role played by contingency—the unforeseen and unexpected events that influence historical outcomes. Extrapolating from their work, this study correlates the four areas to five general causal
factorial categories: societal/cultural, governmental/political, educational, economic and contingency.

Method of Analysis

Comparative historical inquiry is distinctive because its practitioners engage in systematic and contextualized comparisons of similar and contrasting cases (Mahoney & Rueschemeyer, 2003). This form of inquiry is concerned with the explanation and the identification of causal configurations that produce major outcomes of interest. "In comparative historical studies, the causal argument is central to the analysis; thus, causal propositions are carefully selected and tested rather than introduced ad hoc as incidental parts of an overall narrative" (Mahoney & Rueschemeyer, 2003, p. 11). To facilitate this approach, this study will employ the cause and effect diagram, also known as the Ishikawa diagram (Figure 3.1) or the fishbone diagram.

Figure 3.1 Ishikawa Diagram

Named after its creator, Kaoru Ishikawa, the cause and effect diagram's purpose is to facilitate the thorough delineation and analysis of the causes for any one effect. It is
used when the root causes of an effect need to be determined. The final result represents all the factors relating to the effect being explored and even more importantly, the relationships among them. Although often used as a problem-solving tool, it also is beneficial in facilitating the analysis of issues. Some benefits of the cause and effect diagram are that it: (a) helps determine the root causes of an effect using a structured approach; (b) uses an orderly, easy-to-read format to diagram cause and effect relationships; (c) indicates possible causes of variation in a process; (d) increases knowledge of the process; and (e) identifies areas where data should be collected for further study (Department of the Navy, 1993).

A systematic four-step process was followed for developing a dispersion analysis type of cause and effect diagram for each of the four collegial practices. Those steps were:

(1) Identify and define the effect.

(2) Create the basic diagram including the five main causal factor areas: society/cultural; governmental/political; educational; economic; and contingency.

(3) Research and identify secondary and tertiary causes, using increasingly more detailed levels of causes and continuing to organize them under related causes.

(4) Analyze the diagram using analytical techniques.

The diagrams were drawn using SmarDraw software. From the data presented in the cause and effect diagrams, a descriptive historical narrative was written for each of the three collegial practices: teacher teaming, school-based management, and peer coaching. These narratives were then compared and analyzed in a cross case analysis.
using the specific analytical techniques of theme and pattern matching, explanation building, and logic model building.

For purposes of this study, the following definitions are offered for the analytical techniques that will be used. Theme and pattern matching compares patterns across several observations that typically represent different cases under study (Babbie, 2002). Patton (2002) clarified the distinction between pattern and theme by indicating that a pattern usually refers to a descriptive finding and that a theme takes a more categorical or topical form. Explanation building refers to building a general explanation that fits each of the individual cases, even though the cases vary in their details. In explanation building evidence is examined, theoretical positions are revised and the evidence is examined once again from a new perspective (Yin, 2003). The key ingredient of the logic model technique is the claimed existence of repeated cause and effect sequences of events, all linked together. A repeated cause-effect-cause-effect pattern where the dependent variable (effect) at an earlier stage becomes the independent variable (cause) for the next stage is at the heart of the logic model (Peterson & Bickman, 1992; Rog & Hubeiner, 1992 cited in Yin, 2003).

The methodology for this study involved developing each of the three collegial practices—teacher teaming, school-based management, and peer coaching—as individual cases with a corresponding narrative, then moving to a cross case comparative analysis to diminish the risk of tainting interpretation, as warned by Patton (2002). The cause and effect diagrams organize and display graphically the various root causes as identified through research allowing for the development of a description of the causal variables.

Most importantly, this methodology shows the relationship of the multiple factors
influencing the effect and reveals important relationships among the variables, as well as possible causes for each of the three collegial practices. The approach allows for cross-case analysis for the three cases. Mahoney and Rueschemeyer (2003) pointed out the benefit of employing a small number of cases. "...comparative historical researchers can comfortably move back and forth between new concepts, discover novel explanations, and re\(\hat{\text{a}}\)ne preexisting theoretical expectations in light of detailed case evidence" (p.13). This approach also allows for contextualized comparison, one of the three components of comparative historical analysis.

**Sources of Evidence**

Historiography is the method of doing historical research or gathering and analyzing historical evidence. The four types of historical evidence—primary sources, secondary sources, running records, and recollections—form the sources of evidence and data for this study. Primary and secondary sources include: government documents and records, research studies, recorded interviews, newspaper and journal articles, as well as books and commissioned studies. Documentary records maintained by private or nonprofit organizations were researched and included, such as minutes of meetings or transcriptions of speeches and/or commentaries. Recollections of major figures, policy makers and newsmakers including their autobiographies, memoirs, or oral histories rounded out the sources of evidence.

A variety of sources were used with the intent to minimize researcher bias by obtaining data representing different points of view. Also, since sources can be inaccurate, whether they are primary or secondary, official or unofficial, this study seeks
to identify patterns and trends in accordance with the guidance offered by Dabbié (2003):

"The protection for the researcher is replication. If several sources point to the same set
of 'facts', confidence in them can reasonably increase" (p. 333). Understanding that
historical documents and other kinds of written accounts reflect the point of view and the
biases of the author, the evidence presented in this study will reflect perceptions of the
past, and perhaps not the reality of the past (Maxwell, 2004).
CHAPTER IV

Historical Narrative of Teacher Teaming

The history of teacher teaming in the United States began earnestly in the late 1950s. The successful launching in 1957 of Sputnik I by the USSR propelled the United States into action with the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (NDEA). This significant reform package was designed to help the nation regain superiority in space technology and weaponry (Haggerty, 1995). As a major appropriations bill, it declared that an educational emergency existed and action was required by the federal government. Students in the United States were thought to be lagging significantly behind their Russian counterparts, and so Washington intervened on behalf of national defense. However, Congress still respected the historical and constitutional autonomy of education as a state function and included statutory prohibitions of federal involvement with the curriculum, instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system (United States Department of Education, n.d.). Although it would be difficult to characterize NDEA as a broad education support bill, it did place considerable attention on the college borend in math, science and foreign language. The American antidote to remedy the crisis, either real or imagined, was $575 million for education and low interest loans for college students.

A climate favorable to reform emerged, and as a result of the infusion of money, major new directions in American education were initiated. However, absent a clear federal blueprint for change, each of the initiatives developed its own enthusiastic
supporters and each was directed toward solving one or another of the identified major education problems (Shaplin, 1964). "The over-all pattern of change, as is characteristic of American education, is still one of diversity rather than one of uniform acceptance of a few basic solutions. The impression of confusion and controversy over fundamental goals remains, but new patterns are rapidly emerging" (Shaplin, p.26).

One of the new patterns to emerge was team teaching. A basic assumption of team teaching was that the 'whole' of the participants, working together, would make a greater contribution than the 'sum' of the participants working alone" (Davis, 1966, p.2).

Others, including Singer (1964), took an all-encompassing view of team teaching. He wrote:

It is an organizational device, which encompasses all aspects of the teaching-learning experience. Properly planned and executed, the team pattern invites a searching reappraisal of such factors as educational objectives, teacher role, school schedule, class size, curriculum development, staff morale, facilities design, staffing patterns, teacher-teacher, student-student, student-teachers and teacher-student relations, school-community relations, salary structure and accreditation procedures. (p. 13)

With the push from Spetnik to innovate and change education, serious efforts to reform practice started in the 1960s.

The Decade from 1960-1969

The literature of the late 1960s indicated that most of the nation’s educational leaders did not view team teaching to be a panacea. However, team teaching was looked
upon as an organizational schema which would address three priority issues of the country: individualizing instruction, utilizing teachers better, and addressing teacher isolation (Chamberlin, 1969; Lortie, 1975; Peterson, 1966; Singer, 1964). Because of the newness of the practice and because of the varied solutions needed to address the identified problems, team teaching took on various forms. In its most elementary version, team teaching was described as "a method of organizing teachers, children, space, and curriculum which requires several teachers, as a group, to plan, conduct and evaluate the educational program for all of the children assigned to them (Chamberlin, 1969, p. 16). So framed, team teaching was employed to address the emerging issues of individualizing instruction, using teachers better and making the profession of teaching less isolating.

**Individualized Instruction**

Individualizing student instruction became a focus of educational reformers in the post-Sputnik era (Peterson, 1966). Directly following the passing of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, educators turned towards revising curriculum materials. Textbooks were rewritten, courses of study were reviewed and a major revision of curriculum was undertaken, particularly in the areas of math, science and foreign language. "Furthermore, attempts were made to develop a complete 'packaged' course, with textbooks, teachers' guides, supplementary reading materials, sequential films, laboratory equipment and other materials" (Shaplin, 1964, p. 41). But educators around the country realized that changing curricula was not the only response needed to upgrade instruction. If math, science and foreign instruction were to be improved, they would
also have to meet the needs of different learners. In the utilization of team teaching, efforts to individualize instruction centered primarily upon two pedagogical arrangements: un-graded classrooms and grouping techniques (Chamberlin, 1969; Heathers, 1964; Peterson, 1966).

Much of the early interest in the team teaching movement centered around attempts to circumvent the obvious limitations of the elementary self-contained classroom (Chamberlin, 1969). Its rigid delivery of lock-step grade-level curriculum was antithetical to individualized instruction. Finley (1966) pointed out that one of the advantages to the team approach was that it encouraged un-gradedness in the elementary schools, although its evolution was not a given, particularly with teachers. He acknowledged that the problem with the un-graded concept, as with team teaching, was to get teachers to think that they were no longer teaching a grade, but were teaching individual children. Although un-graded classrooms did have a brief fling in the nation’s classrooms in the mid to late 1960s, the concept had enough inherent difficulties to make it untenable for most school districts. Hence, grouping techniques became the most widely used methodology for individualizing instruction (Finley, 1966).

By working with a smaller number of students, it was thought that teachers would be able to better identify and meet the needs of each individual child (Chamberlin, 1969). In Schools for the Sixties the National Education Association (NEA) stated “in order to provide individually planned programs for learners which permit flexibility in assigning pupils to groups that may range in size from one pupil to as many as a hundred or more, well-planned cooperative efforts among teachers such as team teaching, should be encouraged” (National Education Association Project on Instruction, 1963, p. 6).
The Easton, Pennsylvania school district took up the NEA’s proposition and instituted a school-wide team teaching program for a new multi-million high school that the district built in 1960. The educational leaders of the district set out to design the most effective and up-to-date instructional program based on current methodology, with the specific aim of individualizing instruction for students. “Easton operated under the typical ‘cellar concept’ of secondary school instruction, wherein teachers met briefly with 25 to 30 students within a daily schedule. Little opportunity was provided for them to supply the personal attention which a wide range of student abilities demanded” (Peterson, 1966, p. 3). For the next 10 years, Easton served as a nationally recognized model until its organizational structure of team teaching was discarded into the national trash heap of out-of-favor innovations.

**Teacher Shortage and Utilization Studies**

Others joined the team teaching bandwagon but their sights were set on tackling a different problem: the national teacher shortage. The rise in the national birth rate caused by the post World War II baby boom created a persistent shortage of teachers in America’s classrooms. In addition, the mounting crescendo of criticism directed against the schools in the post-Sputnik era threatened their capacity to recruit and retain teachers (Shaplin, 1964).

From this problem arose staff utilization studies, which examined how school districts could provide more attractive and satisfying career opportunities in teaching. Team teaching was one of a group of ideas that was proposed under the heading of staff utilization. The myriad configurations that team teaching could assume led it to be an
attractive alternative to enticing teachers to join and stay in the profession. Those configurations included: master teachers assuming responsibility for supervising other teachers and interns, the teaming of nonprofessional personnel with certified teachers, and the use of teams giving large-group instruction (Shaplin, 1964).

The elementary level took the lead in examining how best to use and support teachers. Perhaps as a function of the more nurturing nature of childhood programming, elementary schools actively sought to "secure better use of teacher strengths and talents, provide assistance to new teachers, and obtain greater faculty involvement" (Chamberlin, 1969, p. 122). In elementary schools it became an often-used practice to assign responsibility for all of the subjects offered in a particular grade to a team of teachers (Finley, 1966). These teams embraced one of two organizational approaches: hierarchical or cooperative (Chamberlin, 1969). In the former, one teacher was in charge of the team unit, and had several professionals or nonprofessionals working under him or her, and in the latter, members of the unit had no specific ranks officially designated and worked collectively to plan, teach and assess.

The National Association of Secondary School Principals' (NASSP) Commission on Staff Utilization, headed by Dr. J. Lloyd Trump, launched a study of various staff utilization techniques in over 100 high schools. Team teaching emerged as one of the most significant (Singer, 1968). Norwalk, Connecticut was one school district studied with its Norwalk Plan of Team Teaching. Although not offering any significant difference in the achievement of students when comparing teamed and single teacher classrooms, the Norwalk Plan did have a modest effect on teacher retention in a district that was rife with high turnover (Heathers, 1964). "After two years of the Norwalk Plan,
no one of fourteen team teachers has left the project" (p. 340). Although the study can be faulted for involving too few individuals over too short a time span, in view of the critical shortage of qualified teachers, the meager results encouraged others to look at the promise of team teaching.

Teacher Isolation

Joining the litany of problems with American education in the post-Sputnik era was the issue of teacher isolation. Lortie (1975) was one of the first to describe the isolation of teachers as well as the "egg-crate structure of schools" as prime factors contributing to teacher stress and unhappiness with the profession.

In his respected and widely quoted study School Teacher: A Sociological Study (1975), Lortie examined what teachers did and thought in the late 1960s. He compiled results from a variety of sources, including 94 interviews with teachers in the Boston area, as well as questionnaires from 6,000 teachers in the Miami area. He concluded that the cellular organization of schools creates privativism; the physical separation from colleagues whereby teachers are left alone to struggle with the difficulties of their profession. As a result, teachers did not develop a common technical culture. "The teacher's craft is marked by the absence of concrete models for emulation, unclear lines of influence, multiple and controversial criteria, ambiguity about assessment timing, and instability in the product" (Lortie, 1975, p. 136).

A decade later, in his book A Place Called School, Goodlad (1984) validated the debilitating effects of isolation on teachers. Reporting his findings from a national sample of 38 schools, he stated, "The classroom cells in which teachers spend much of
their time appear to me to be symbolic and predictive of their relative isolation from one another and from sources of ideas beyond their own background of experience" (Goodlad, 1984, p. 186). Research in the U.S. helped to lay bare the daily reality of teaching, gaining the attention of a nation seeking ways to improve its educational system.

Open Classroom Movement

The 1960s was a period of experimentation and revolution. During the decade, many Americans rejected the prevailing political, social and cultural norms of aggression, authoritarianism, sexism, racism, intolerance, and sexual repression (Braunstein & Doyle, 2001). A counterculture developed which received enormous publicity and popular interest, and changed American culture. Counter-culturalists were joined by a wide spectrum of citizens and together they challenged authority, advocated for greater social tolerance, created environmental awareness, and changed attitudes about gender roles, marriage and child rearing (Law, n.d.). The decade was one that nurtured the transformation of cultural norms; and the foment of challenge and change supported educational reform. Many educators challenged the way schools organized themselves, and in what subjects and how they taught the youth of America. This challenge was clearly evidenced by the experiment with open education during the 1960s.

Proponents of open education were gaining a foothold in the psyche of American reformers and team teaching has historically been associated with the movement imported from Britain (Cohen, 1976). Responding to those critical of American
education, the open education movement served as an antidote for those seeking a cure, and it served as a revolution for those rebelling against society's cultural norms.

The Open Classroom Movement, and the concomitant building of open space schools, originated in the British Primary School's model, popularized in that country in the 1960s. American educators came to see open education as an answer to the post-Sputnik attack on the United States educational system (Cuban, 2004; Silberman, 1973). "For more than a decade, United States schools had been subjected to withering attacks, blamed for everything from the launch of Sputnik to urban decay" (Cuban, 2004, p. 1).

Along with open education came its architectural trapping—open space schools. "Across the nation, school officials established open classrooms, knocked down the walls between classrooms, or designed new school buildings without walls" (Ravitch, 2000, p. 397). Although by no means exclusively responsible for the development of open space schools, the issue of teacher isolation supported the merits of and the necessity for open space schools. And in turn, open space schools fostered teacher teaming. "In the heyday of the building of open-spaced schools teams of five or six were not uncommon in large open-spaced pods (Meyer & Cohen, 1971 in Cohen, 1976). By literal tearing down the walls, the professed negative aspects of the traditional cellular nature of schools were removed. Open space schools broke down physical barriers to build psychological bonds between teachers.

By their very design, open space schools at best nurtured and at worst forced teachers to work together as teams because one teacher's decision affected another's (Fitzgerald, 2000). Successful open space schools were attributed to the fact that the teachers, administrators, and parents who participated in them did so out of choice and all
clearly understood the philosophy and practices of the school (Riedl, 2003). But unfortunately, most working in open space schools had the philosophy and its architecture thrust upon them. "The classic indicator of the failure of the Open Education movement to prepare teachers is clearly illustrated in the actions that they took when confronted with a school without walls: they immediately began creating walls by moving bookcases, chalkboards, and other furniture to mark off the space of their classroom" (Riedl, 2003, p. 3).

Except for a few outliers, those studying open space schools found that open space schools confounded students and teachers alike (Cohen, 1976; Cohen, Brodo & Duckworth, 1976; Silberman, 1973). Students found the space overwhelming due to its vastness; and since the open space lacked implicit structure in the form of walls and hallways, there appeared to be no clear and quick indication for teachers as how to generate specific spaces for different kinds of learning (Monahan, 2002). Costa (2004) studied an open space school in Canada several decades later and found that teachers felt that the absence of walls and doors in the school made it problematic for students to listen to one another and the teacher. The open design presented students with visual distractions, exacerbating their ability to concentrate.

Open space school design was controversial when it first appeared, and the debate never seemed to subside (Costa, 2004). Research on the effectiveness and efficacy of open space schools was conducted and published within a relatively short time span. The majority of available texts and research reports date from 1970 to 1975. After 1979, there appears to have been very little published on the topic of open area schools. This
cessation of published material corresponds to the fall from favor that the open space school trend experienced.

With the demise of open space schools came the demise in the interest in team teaching. Cohen, Brede and Dukworth (1976) found that although open space schools encouraged teachers to be interdependent at minimum, teachers had to collaborate to schedule quiet and noisy activities and on disciplinary problems. If they didn’t, they created as many problems as they solved, thereby making it difficult to survive in that environment.

In 1976, Stanford University researcher Elizabeth Cohen found that when administrative support for teaming waned, and/or when the task of teaming became difficult, teacher teams lowered their level of interdependence or dissolved altogether. After studying teacher teaming over an eight-year period, she realized that teaming structures were an unstable and informal arrangement and faced acute problems. “An obvious conclusion is that this innovation has been tried out despite little understanding by team members or administrators of the kinds of support required for its success and no understanding of the price of the extra communication and coordination required…” (Cohen, 1976, p. 49).

The impact and brevity of the open movement were equally dramatic. Ravitch (2000) explained:

Never before had an education reform movement risen to national prominence almost overnight, won the enthusiastic support of education leaders, dominated the national discussion, then disappeared within a few years. While the twentieth
century had seen the coming and going of many educational fads, this one had a brilliant beginning and an unusually short life cycle. (p. 395)

The 1960s proved to be a volatile decade in American education. Innovations, such as team teaching, were aimed at improving the quality of instruction: all with the national goal to return the United States to its preeminent position as a leading super power. But Goodlad (1970) and others studied 158 classrooms around the United States and found little evidence of these innovations. He wrote:

A very subjective but nonetheless general impression of those who gathered and those who studied the data was that some of the highly recommended and publicized innovations of the past decade were dimly conceived, and, at best, partially implemented in the schools claiming them. The novel features seemed to be blunted in the effort to twist the innovation into familiar conceptual frames or established patterns of schooling. For example, team teaching more often than not was some form of departmentalization. Similarly, the new content of curriculum projects tended to be convolved into the baggage of traditional methodology. Principals and teachers claimed individualization of instruction, use of a wide range of instructional materials, a sense of purpose, group processes, and inductive or discovery methods when our records showed little or no evidence of them. (pp. 72-73)

America was so preoccupied with funding promising programs such as open space schools and individualized instruction; it did not take time to evaluate many innovations (Haggery, 1995). "That world of innocent expectations came crashing down around 1970 when the first implementation studies surfaced. The problem crystallized
almost overnight in Goodlad’s (1970) major studies of failed implementation” (Haggerty, 1995, p. 25). A new era was shaping-up in American education.

Causal Factors of Teacher Teaming—1960-1969

The following Ishikawa diagram lays out the primary causal factors, which precipitated the implementation of teacher teaming from 1960 to 1969. Each factor is assigned to one of the five causal factorial categories. A narrative summary follows.
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Figure 4.1 Causal Factors of Teacher Teaming—1960-1969.

Summary of Causal Factors 1960-1969

The climate for educational reform was set into motion by a chain of events, beginning with the launching of Sputnik I. Following the success of the U.S.S.R.’s attempt to garner attention and become the leading world power, the United States
entered an intense period of introspection. With this close examination came extensive criticism from politicians, business leaders, and the media of American public schools, as well as an indictment of the methods and materials used to educate students. This contingency causal factor set into motion a number of responses, most notably the passing of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA).

The United States government and its Congressional members created the climate for educational reform with the passage of NDEA, which became a governmental/political causal factor leading to the implementation of teacher teaming. With the allocation of the first major infusion of federal funds into education, states, educators, and textbook publishers undertook a major effort to revise the curriculum and instructional materials used in America's schools. Reinforcing the call for educational reform was the societal/cultural causal factor of the change in cultural norms occurring in America during the decade of the 1960s. With the counterculture's growing influence on cultural norms, basic American institutions, such as schools, were called upon by a generation of Americans to reexamine their practices. The support for change in the ways schools educated their young contributed to the synergy for and acceptance of educational reform.

Realizing that curriculum revisions and new textbooks did not create sufficient change, educators focused their efforts to reform schooling by addressing three salient deficiencies—the lack of individualized instruction, a shortage of well-trained and qualified teachers, and the debilitating effects of isolation taught by teachers. All were educational causal factors that included numerous secondary causes.
To individualize instruction, educators first explored un-graded classrooms in elementary schools. Their intended outcome was to get teachers to change their orientation—from teaching a grade to teaching a classroom of students who have a variety of needs. Teacher teaming was used to direct teachers to this new pedagogical orientation. Employing a different approach to solve the same problem, schools experimented with grouping techniques, often using teacher teams to permit flexibility in assigning students to groups within a classroom.

The 1960s saw a national shortage of teachers, another educational causal factor. Fueled by the attacks on education, the recruitment and retention of teachers was affected by the perception of teaching as a low prestige profession. Team teaching was one of many ideas implemented to entice teachers to join and to stay in the profession.

As a result of the work of Lortie (1973) and others, the educational causal factor of teacher isolation was identified as a debilitating consequence of the profession. The cellular egg-crate structure of schools fostered stress and unhappiness within the profession, as well as stultified the exchange of ideas, which did not allow teachers to develop a common technical culture. As a result, educational leaders looked for ways to increase teacher communication to reduce isolating experiences, opening the door to team teaching.

Looking for ways to counter the attacks on American education, many educators turned to open education, originated by the British Primary Schools model. Numerous school districts built open space schools whose architecture was designed to create teacher interdependence, often in the form of team teaching.
The Decade from 1970-1979

Tumultuous is perhaps the best word to describe the period starting in the late 1960s and continuing through to the mid 1970s. There was unrest and rioting in America’s cities; there was a major civil rights revolution, and there was a war in Vietnam, which was unpopular and a source of divisiveness throughout the country. The next decade saw a number of changes, which profoundly altered America and the way its citizens viewed education.

The 1970s saw a property tax revolt which devastated many school systems. Major propositions in California and Massachusetts, as well as many lesser-known tax limitation measures adopted by state and local governments, sharply curtailed the flow of funding to public schools in many parts of the country. The onset of collective bargaining and teacher unionism in public education in the early 1960s led to scores of divisive and often protracted strikes in the 1970s. Public education was a major civil rights battleground in the 1970s, with school districts facing demands for desegregation and busing. It was a time when many were demanding equal opportunity for all students, regardless of race, gender, physical disability, or English language proficiency (Berube, 1991; Edmonds, 1983; Haggerty, 1995). Toch (1991) remarked on this period of time:

The actions taken by Congress and the courts on behalf of blacks, the non-English speaking, women, the handicapped, and others made schools much more responsive to many students. But the actions also produced an avalanche of rules and regulations that made public schools more bureaucratic; they shifted a substantial amount of policy-making power from local educators to the distant state and federal authorities who promulgated the regulations; they increased the
litigiousness of public education to the point where many educators became more concerned with dodging lawsuits than with the quality of instruction in their schools; and they made the broadening of educational opportunities rather than the quality of education the priority in much of public schooling. (p. 7)

Adding to the growing discontent with public education was the steady decline of tests scores for the college bound, which was intensely covered by the media during the decade. Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) average scores dropped to a historic low in 1979, reversing from the highest average in the early 1960s. Paralleling this decline, student scores on many other national and state tests also fell during the decade (Ravitch, 2000). “There were many likely reasons for the decline, including a weakening of families and communities and the distracting effects of television, but there was also the stubborn fact that students were not taking as many academic courses as they had before the mid-1960’s” (Ravitch, 2000, p. 410). The public was becoming disheartened with public schools and their efforts to educate American youth.

And if the litany of issues that overwhelmed public education in the 1970s was not enough, America’s education during this decade was deeply affected by two harmful if not contradictory indictments made against it in the 1960s, i.e. schools are undemocratic, and that schools in and of themselves have little impact on student achievement (Toch, 1991). Progressives in the 1960s pushed for radical reform because they saw schools as institutions that homogenized student populations and perpetuated a non-egalitarian social order (Goodman, 1964; Holt, 1964; Neill, 1960). “Their attacks led, in part, to a diminishment of the traditional authority of the teacher, to a de-emphasis of traditional academic subjects, and to the elimination of many graduation requirements” (Toch, 1991,
p. 7) In the 1966 study entitled *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, sociologist James S. Coleman and others concluded that family background was the principal determinant of the acquisition of basic skills (Edmonds, 1983). They emphatically argued that family background was not only a correlate of pupil performance but also the major determinant of achievement. Jenks (1972) reinforced this when he stated that "the character of a school's output depends largely on a single input, namely the characteristics of the entering children. Everything else -- the school budget, its policies, the characteristics of the teachers -- is either secondary or completely irrelevant" (Jenks, 1972, p. 250). Both assertions took a heavy toll on the public schools, and by the 1970s these positions had achieved a widespread orthodoxy, diminishing the nation's confidence in its schools (Toch, 1991).

Team teaching lay fallow during the mid 1970s, falling out of favor as an innovation. As the nation's educational leaders struggled under the weight of the social and political upheaval of the 1970s, President Ronald Reagan came into power with a conservative agenda for America and an indictment of its educational system that left its leaders on the defensive, if not on the run. Just around the corner lay the findings of the National Commission on Excellence in Education with its focus on the quality of education, setting the tone and agenda for the 1980s. Teacher teaming would reemerge, but for distinctly different reasons and under far different circumstances than in its last ephemeral appearance on the educational reform scene -- and with much more success.
Causal Factors of Teacher Teaming—1970-1979

The following Ishikawa diagram outlines the major causal factors for the diminution of teacher teaming during the decade of the 1970s. Each factor is assigned to one of the five causal factorial categories. A narrative summary follows.

Figure 4.2 Causal Factors of Teacher Teaming—1970-1979

Summary of Causal Factors—1970-1979

The 1970s was a decade of declines in American education and an increase in the public’s disillusionment with it. The following causal factors contributed to the decrease in teacher teaming during this period.

Diminishing confidence in public schools was a major societal/cultural causal factor for the decline of teacher teaming in schools. The public’s sinking confidence in its educational institutions was tied to the failure of earlier efforts to reform them, such as the Open Education Movement. The interjection of progressive and counterculture
values onto the national scene was blamed for the eventual diminishment of traditional authority structures in schools, as well as the de-emphasis of traditional academic rigor. Studies showed that textbooks were being dumbed-down with less content and simpler vocabulary. The educational causal factor of declining test scores for public school students was tied to this phenomenon. The 1970s saw a continuous decline of the average SAT tests scores for the college bound, reaching an all-time low at the end of the decade.

Society was demanding other changes in its schools. It was requiring equal opportunity for all students regardless of race, gender, physical disability or English language proficiency. This societal/cultural causal factor focused educators on systemic changes, deflecting their attention from more limited organizational and programmatic revisions such as teacher teaming. As a result of society’s demands for equality, a shift in the control of school policies making moved from the local to the federal level. The many rules and regulations legislating equal opportunities for all students created more school more bureaucracy, diminishing and/or replacing the flexibility of school structures that had appeared in the 1960s.

The decade saw a property tax revolt, an economic causal factor that significantly affected educational programming. Major propositions adopted by states and local governments greatly curtailed educational innovation. Funding for public schooling was cut or greatly diminished.

Unlike the causal factors of the earlier decade, the major causal factors of this period served to diminish collegial endeavors of schools such as team teaching.
The 1981 annual *Newsweek* survey on Americans' views of their country revealed some unflattering and unnerving perceptions of education: 47 percent of the public believed that schools were doing a poor or fair job. Two years later a Harris poll reported that only 29 percent of the public had "a great deal of confidence" in the nation's educators (Goldberg & Harvey, 1983). Confidence in America's educational system was at a low point at the start of the decade. Perceptions would only get worse.

*The Decade from 1980-1989*

A Nation at Risk

Responding to what he saw as a pressing national concern, Secretary of Education Terence H. Bell established in 1981 a department level task force: the National Commission on Excellence in Education. It was charged with delivering in eighteen months an assessment of the quality of education in the United States. However, its raison d'être seemed to be at cross-purpose with that of the President. Reagan did not hide his lack of concern for the state of public education. His election platform included disbanding the Department of Education, reducing the federal budget in education and omitting federal involvement in education (Berube, 1991). The White House and its advisors initially rebuffed Secretary Bell's suggestion for a report on the status of the nation's educational system, thinking that it was contradictory to the President's education agenda, but politics and the economy turned Reagan's attention full force once it was clear that the findings of the Commission had struck a major chord with the nation (Bell, 1993; Berube, 1991; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Haggerty, 1995).
The Commission issued its legendary report, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, on April 26, 1983. Using strident and alarming language, the Commission stated, "Our nation is at risk. Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 5). *A Nation at Risk* focused national attention on public education like no other single event since the Soviet Union’s launching of Sputnik in 1957 (Goldberg & Harvey, 1983).

But another reason—global competitiveness—became the fuel that jumpstarted and ran the engine of school reform. A severe economic recession took hold in the early 1980s. As a result of plant closings and an escalating unemployment rate, the nation awoke to the need to become competitive in a global economy. The nation badly needed its national pride shored-up. Competitiveness became a national concern and education was seen as a remedy for developing a more skilled work force. “This was the argument for a *Nation At Risk* and it was the principal reason that the country supported the push for excellence in education so strongly; more than anything else, it was the competitiveness theme that defined the educational crisis in the nation’s eyes” (Toch, 1991, p. 17).

To counter the “rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and a people” the report went on to make five general recommendations: (a) high school graduation requirements should be strengthened; (b) schools, colleges and universities should adopt more rigorous and measurable standards and have higher expectations for academic performance and student conduct; (c) more time, including a
longer day, should be devoted to learning the basics; (d) teacher preparation should be
improved; and (e) citizens of the United States should hold educators and elected officials
responsible for providing the leadership and funds to achieve the report’s recommended

The report touched a public nerve and triggered the Excellence Movement in the
1980s. Sensing the shifting political winds, President Reagan adopted educational reform
as a cause. He reversed himself on the abolition of the Department of Education, and
used his office to maintain a steady drumbeat for educational reform (Berube, 1991).

A Nation at Risk galvanized and indirectly spawned massive amounts of reform
efforts across the United States (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). Firestone, Fuhrman and
Kirst (1989) studied state level responses to the Commission’s report and found that
nearly every state joined in the movement to address the concerns that had been raised.
The responses fell into two major categories: upgrading the academic curriculum by
linking it to higher standards and achievement testing, and improving teaching through
changes in certification and compensation of teachers. As a result, 45 states further
specified or increased their graduation requirements, and 27 states instituted a minimum
grade point average for entering teachers (Carnegie Forum on Education and the
Economy, 1986).

Numerous reports followed which laid out a blueprint for the restructuring era of
the 1980s. Two major reports, the Carnegie Forum’s (1986) A Nation Prepared:
Teachers for the 21st Century, and the National Governors’ Association’s (1986) A Time
for Results rallied behind the mandate for revamping education. Dwindling coffers and
languid economies stoked the governors’ concerns. School reform became a bipartisan
issue with governors across the country supporting it. Lamar Alexander from Tennessee, Bill Clinton from Arkansas, Thomas Kean from New Jersey and Richard Riley from South Carolina were political leaders who became closely associated with school reform.

Both reports had a similar key recommendation. They advised schools to restructure to empower teachers by changing the hierarchical nature of schools. If this was not done, the reports warned, then able and ambitious teachers would not be drawn to or stay in the teaching profession. Now the question to be answered was: How could schools best be restructured?

School Restructuring and Teaming

To find an answer, many reformers turned to the world of business and more specifically—organization theorists. In the 1980s a new view of how businesses should be organized was developing. The call for quality swept across corporate America in the 1980s (Belman & Deal, 1997). Deming (1986) in his work on Total Quality Management (TQM), argued that quality was achieved through constant incremental improvement and that teams, including cross-functional teams, facilitated the communication and feedback needed for ongoing organizational improvement. Other organizational theorists like Senge (1990) argued that teams were essential to the development of more productive and vital organizations, because "teams, not individuals, are the fundamental learning unit in modern organizations. Unless teams can learn, the organization cannot learn" (p. 10). In the book Empowered Teams, Wellins, Byham and Wilson (1991) synthesized the two major assumptions made by the experts who advocated the use of teams in business and industry: (a) those closest to the work know
best how to perform and improve their jobs, and (b) most employees want to feel that they "own" their jobs and are making meaningful contributions to the effectiveness of their organizations.

Others looked elsewhere to find the answer to how schools should be restructured. Continuing to acknowledge the isolation of teaching, and the power of teaming, educational leaders looked to collegiality and collaboration as the keys to restructuring. As a result, the need for more collegiality among teachers was a major theme to emerge in the 1980s (Erb & Doda, 1989). Books, journal articles and research studies flooded the educational establishment. In one of the most compelling studies, Rosenholtz (1989) compared the results from competitive and cooperative school environments. She found that improved teaching and a greater sense of professional pride were associated with collegial arrangements, such as team organization. Roland Barth (1985) became the main cheerleader encouraging teachers and administrators to take the initiative to make their schools more collegial institutions by becoming learning communities. He made the case for more collaboration at the individual school level seeing it as a necessary step toward closing the gap between the realities of schools and the way educators would like them to be. Tye and Tye (1984) argued that schools couldn't be improved as long as teachers remained isolated from one another in their work settings. Their research demonstrated that collegial interdependence among teachers, which in turn can lead to shared school-wide decision making, was necessary for effective school reform.

Because it facilitates collaboration and collegiality, teaming was studied as a means for restructuring schools. Lipsitz (1984) discovered that successful schools provided small, stable reference groups for students and collegiality for teachers. Where
teaming was used, student alienation and teacher isolation were reduced. George and Oldaker (1985) found that interdisciplinary team organization was associated with improved student achievement, school discipline, student personal development, general school climate, faculty morale, and parental support. In addition, researchers Arhar, Johnston, and Markle (1989) found:

Not only do teaming arrangements improve the professional lives of teachers, but also a growing body of research points to the conclusion that teaming leads to improved student performance. The relationship between teaming and student outcomes is not a direct one. While teaming does not cause teachers to become committed to engaging in a teacher-student relationships that facilitate growth and individual student development, it is certain that teaming gives them the ability to translate this commitment into action. (p. 22)

As the 1980s unfolded, interdisciplinary teams became associated with the efforts of schools to become more professional by adopting a business model for their operations. Guided by the tenets of TQM, teachers experienced increased feelings of affiliation with their schools. In addition, their experience of mutual support and sense of individual responsibility for the effectiveness of instruction increased with the collegiality of professional learning communities (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Doda, 1977; Larsen & LaFaston, 1989; Louis, 1992). Teaming burgeoned and its potential benefits were discussed, studied and practiced, to which the abundant literature on the topic attests (Aalton, & Webb, 1986; Carnegie Council, 1989; Doda, 1977; Erb, 1987; George, 1982; Little, 1982, 1993; Rosenholtz, 1985).
With educators looking to teams and collegiality as part of the answer for how to restructure schools, it was no surprise that the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development (1989) in its report, *Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century*, advocated interdisciplinary teaming. “The Middle School Movement of the 1980s pioneered teacher teaming on a large scale in United States education, and sprang from the realization that young adolescents need an environment that attends to more than the academic to support their learning and growth” (Spraker, 2003, p. 4). The Carnegie Council urged bureaucratic junior highs to restructure as middle schools organized around teacher teaming. “Teaming allowed teachers to collaborate, share their knowledge, and to create stronger relationships among themselves and their students” (Jackson & Davis, 2000, pp. 3-4).

The Middle School Movement started in the 1960s, mostly because of dissatisfaction with junior high schools that were seen as mini high schools, replete with departmentalization, extensive athletic programs, and social activities that were inappropriate for the age group. Furthermore, it was thought that junior high schools were not providing students with a satisfactory transition into high school, nor were they meeting the uniqueness of early adolescents (Parkay & Hass, 2000). The new middle school model called for moving the ninth grade into the high school, placing grades 5-8 in the middle school, and developing curricula to meet the needs of ten-to-fourteen year olds. By 1970, almost 2,500 middle schools had been created, and by 1990 this number had increased to almost 15,000 (George, 1993).
During the 1970s and 1980s, the differences between junior highs and middle schools began to blur, thereby losing the innovativeness and distinctions that marked the nascent Middle School Movement (Parkay & Hass, 2000). "At first middle schools were quite different from junior highs—often middle schools had more interdisciplinary, exploratory curricula; team teaching; teacher/advisor programs; flexible scheduling; smaller athletic programs, and less ability grouping" (p. 376). With the publication in 1989 of Turning Points, a powerful movement was unleashed to reorganize middle schools and to make them more developmentally appropriate for young adolescents was supported. One of the major tenets of the reform movement was that middle schools should promote a mutual aid ethic among teachers and students, manifest in team teaching and cooperative learning; therefore interdisciplinary teaming became a mainstay of middle school practices (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1995).

*Turning Points*

The Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development zeroed in on a problem that it concluded was hindering the development of teenagers—the middle school years. The Council believed that preadolescents, 10 to 14 year-olds, were not receiving the supports they needed, and that neither schools nor other social institutions were meeting their particular needs. In specific, the report found a disconnect between middle school structures and curriculum, and the social, emotional, physical and intellectual needs of young teens (Norton, 2000).
primary recommendations that called for a reexamination and restructuring of schools.

The report proposed that middle schools should: (a) create small, respectful communities for learning, (b) teach a core of academic knowledge, (c) ensure success for all students, (d) empower teachers and administrators, (e) prepare teachers for the middle grades, (f) foster young adolescents’ health and fitness, (g) reengage families in the education of young adolescents, and (h) connect schools with communities (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989). These recommendations were consistent with suggestions for moving school organizations away from the bureaucratic toward a more communal organizational structure (Bryk, Lee & Smith, 1990; Lee, Bryk & Smith, 1993; Newmann, 1991). It was the interdisciplinary nature of teaching that attracted the Carnegie Council to this idea. Calling for the development of teacher teams to provide an environment conducive to learning, the Council wrote:

Teaming creates the kind of learning environment that encourages students to grapple with ideas that may span several disciplines, and to create situations to problems that reflect understanding, not memorization. Interdisciplinary teams also provide a much-needed support group for teachers, eliminating the isolation teachers can experience in departmentalized settings. Morale among teachers often increases significantly with team teaching. (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989, pp. 38-40)

In recommending interdisciplinary teaming in middle schools, the Carnegie Council argued that the practice reduced disciplinary problems and helped foster a sense of community among teachers and students. As a result of the collegial practice of
teaming, teachers' academic collaborations were found to increase students' engagement in academic tasks, to help clarify learning goals, and to lead ultimately to higher achievement (Arhar, Johnson, & Markle, 1989; Arhar & Kromrey, 1995; Lee & Smith, 1993; Flowers, Mertens & Mulhall, 1999).

With the demand for smaller communities within middle schools, the creation of interdisciplinary teams was seen as a way to accomplish this goal. The definition of interdisciplinary teams is a group of two to five teachers who represent diverse subject areas, but who share a common planning period to prepare for teaching a common set of students (Flowers, Mertens, & Mulhall, 1999). It was found that common planning time supports the interactive work life of teachers (Erb, 2000). Most often these teachers also share a common block schedule and adjacent classrooms (Erb & Doda, 1989). But what were the effects of teaming, and what was the evidence that it works? The next decade helped to answer these key questions.

Causal Factors of Teacher Teaming—1980-1989

The following Ishikawa diagram outlines the major causal factors, which precipitated the reemergence of teacher teaming during the 1980s. Each factor is assigned to one of the five causal factorial categories. A narrative summary follows.

The political and economic issues of the Reagan administration greatly influenced the major causal factors of team teaching during the 1980s. Although it wasn’t President Reagan’s idea, nor initially supported by him, the convening of the National Commission for Excellence in Education became a pivotal act of the Reagan presidency. The Commission’s report, *A Nation at Risk*, laid the foundation for many of the factors leading to the reemergence of team teaching and is identified as the main governmental/political causal factor of this era. The report established school reform as a national priority, and focused the country on education unlike any event since the launching of Sputnik.

Concomitantly and in tune with the message of *A Nation at Risk*, global competitiveness became a contributing economic causal factor leading to the re-
emergence of teacher teaming during the decade. The nation found itself in a severe economic recession marked with plant closings and escalating unemployment. Seeking ways to regain its global competitiveness and reclaim its economic dominance, the United States turned a critical eye to education, and sought reformation of America’s schools.

At the urging of the nation’s business leaders, school reformers were urged to investigate and replicate successful business models, hoping to duplicate the gains experienced by a number of the nation’s major corporations. Models such as Total Quality Management encouraged companies to form cross-functional teams. Teams were seen as the fundamental learning unit of organizations, facilitating communication, fostering empowerment, and cultivating commitment. Following the business models, interdisciplinary teams became associated with school efforts to become more professional.

National reports continued to be the main governmental/political causal factors. The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy’s report, A Nation Prepared, and the National Governors Association’s report, A Time for Results, both advised schools to restructure themselves to become less hierarchical, and served as standard bearers for teacher teaming in schools. More explicitly the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development’s report, Turning Points, re-energized the Middle School Movement urging educators to develop schools for this age student that were less bureaucratic. Among its recommendations were that schools should organize around interdisciplinary teams, creating environments that were more relevant for students and less isolating for teachers.
School restructuring and the Middle School Movement both became significant educational causal factors during the decade. In one way or another, each prescribed or supported teacher teaming as germane to school reform. Reformers who urged the restructuring of schools maintained that collaboration, as exemplified by teacher teaming, created stable reference groups for students and worked against the debilitating effects of isolation for teachers. Collaborative models also improved school climates, positively influenced student discipline, improved faculty morale, and generated more parental support. The Middle School Movement claimed interdisciplinary teaming as a linchpin for effective schools. Teaming in middle school fostered a sense of community among teachers and students, increasing student engagement in academic tasks.

From 1990 to the Present

As teaming became more prevalent, a number of studies reveal that educators felt the need to justify this new approach. They felt it necessary to explain its benefits and to validate them. Therefore, numerous studies in the 1990s, which examined the effects of teaming on teachers, students and school culture, followed.

Teacher Outcomes and Teaming

In the early 1990s two studies of teams examined how teachers view their work as members of teams. They found that teamed teachers viewed themselves as professionals to a greater degree than other teachers do, and as a result had a more positive professional image of themselves. They also discovered that teamed teachers felt less stress than other
teachers (Gatewood et al., 1992). In addition, teamed teachers felt less isolated in their classrooms (Mills, Powell & Pollak, 1992), although ironically their changed work lives could cause some teachers to feel isolated from staff other than teammates.

In a study of 769 middle school teachers on 99 teams, Steffes and Valentine (1996) found several teaming practices to be related to positive outcomes for teachers. These practices included: (a) input into team member selection, (b) flexible scheduling, (c) adjacent classrooms, (d) autonomy and decision-making opportunities, (e) in-service related to teaming, and (f) common planning time.

Much of the research literature pointed to the necessity for and impact of common planning time. Warren and Muth (1995) investigated the differential impact of teaming with and without common planning time. Their study showed that teams with common planning time were superior to departmentalized classrooms, as well as teams without common planning time, on every measure of student self-concept and student perception of school climate. In their study of middle schools, Erb & Stevenson (1999) showed that common planning time of 180-225 minutes per week—in addition to individual planning time—increased not only curriculum coordination, but also contact with other building resource staff, and parent contact and involvement. The message to schools was clear, “if educators claim that they are teaming but haven’t been able to schedule common planning time in addition to individual planning time are mistaken in thinking that they will have much impact on school climate or student outcomes” (Warren & Muth, 1995, p. 12).

Although teaming was created to diminish the effects of teacher isolation and to build a sense of community within schools, research studies ironically revealed that
teaming could counter these benefits in ways not anticipated. Mills, Powell, and Pollak (1992) investigated interdisciplinary teaming’s effects on teacher isolation and collegiality. Their research confirmed the earlier findings of Gatewood, Green, and Harris (1992) that stress levels were reduced, and teachers’ images of themselves as professionals were enhanced for middle school teachers who were part of interdisciplinary teams. However, they also discovered that it promoted two other types of isolation—inter-team and subject matter. A team identity could become such a strong focus that inter-team exchanges would be limited, and teachers in schools that had departmental structures would feel isolated from their departments.

Kruse and Louis (1997) underscored this cautionary note about teacher teaming. Their research showed that despite the many positive effects of teaming, the development of strong interdisciplinary teams posed an obstacle to the development of community in schools. They explained:

Teachers, as they spoke about their teamed relationships, suggested that despite their advantages, teams also undermined the ability for the whole faculty to attend to the business of the whole school. They spoke of their struggle to balance the demands of being team members within the demands of membership in the larger school community. Interdisciplinary teams tended to cite those groups as their primary form of identification within the larger school community. They believed that the team, and the students the team served, deserved their primary loyalty rather than the larger school community. (p. 271)
Student Achievement and Teaming

The understood objective for restructuring schools was to improve student achievement. On this point the research on teaming were encouraging but not conclusive. In 1993, Lee and Smith (1993) published the results of their research which used the data from the National Longitudinal Study of 1983, a compilation of survey data from 8,843 eighth grades in 377 public, Catholic, and independent middle schools. Their work lends empirical support for one restructuring approach: making schools less like comprehensive high schools and more like small communities. The survey data indicated that students who attended less bureaucratic schools demonstrated somewhat higher achievement and more engagement. Corroborating these findings, Warren and Muth (1995) found that students in restructured schools expressed a greater satisfaction with school. They had a deeper commitment to classwork and more positive reactions to teachers. This last finding confirmed earlier studies that showed that students in teamed schools bonded with their teachers and their schools more completely than did students in non-teamed settings (Arhar, 1992, 1997).

Research showed that the Turning Points recommendations had impact if they were implemented well. The evidence showed that middle schools demonstrating a high level of execution of the eight Turning Points recommendations showed positive results across the core curriculum (Lee & Smith, 1993; Flowers, Mertens & Muffall, 1999; Buckes, Ralston, & Ingwalson, 1999). The Illinois Middle Grades Network, a consortium of 97 schools that underwent the process of restructuring from a more traditional organization toward the type of school envisioned in Turning Points, undertook a longitudinal study. They found data that showed that across the core subject
areas of reading, mathematics and language arts, adolescents in highly implemented schools achieved at much higher levels than those in non-implemented schools, and substantially better than those in partially implemented schools. (Felser & Jackson, 1997).

Despite all of the optimism that developed about teacher teaming across the nation in the 1990s, there were words of warning. Erb (2000) cautioned "just changing school structures by putting block schedules, common planning time for teams, and advisory periods does not lead directly to improved student performance" (p.1). Other data emerged that found that schools who used idea-driven implementation, characterized by attempts to reflect the basic concepts in the Turning Points report, as opposed to check-list method of implementing, were much more successful (Felzer & Jackson, 1997).

The importance of substantial change in the school culture, as opposed to the cosmetic appearance of change, was empirically clear. In their study of sixteen schools undergoing a Turning Points metamorphosis, Oakes, Quartz, Ryan and Lipton (2000) emphasized the difficulties of creating meaningful and lasting reform. They found that although the Turning Points approach to reform was laudable, it provided little support for the most difficult reform challenges the schools confronted. They wrote:

Churning away in what we, with due disrespect, call the reform mill, state reformers focused policy changes, technical assistance, and new resources on changing the organization and classroom practices of the schools. As is usually the case, little attention was paid to the profound cultural and political challenges that lay at the heart of the reform (p. 574).
Although the middle school interdisciplinary team model dominated the literature on team teaching, elementary and high schools were also employing it in the 1990s as an instructional methodology, or as a way to organize the school.

*Elementary Schools and Nevada Class-size Reduction*

In part, as a result of the Nevada Governor Bob Miller’s Commission on Educational Excellence, and in reaction to the positive research on reduced class size on student achievement from the STAR Project in Tennessee, the Nevada state legislature in 1989 mandated a fifteen-to-one student-teacher ratio for all first-grade classes beginning in the fall of 1990 (Achilles, 1999; Clearinghouse on Educational Policy Management, 2000). The Class-Size Reduction Act of 1989 created a trust fund for class-size reduction, which received monies from a variety of sources. The initiative was scheduled to unfold in several phases. The 1991 legislative session continued the momentum by mandating a 16:1 ratio in second and third grades by the 1992-1993 school year. Immediately school districts were faced with space problems when the number of first grade classrooms was doubled for the next school year (La Mont, 1994). Because public sentiment was against the construction of new classrooms, the school leadership opted to employ team teaching, assigning two teachers to a class of 30 students, as a response to the legislative mandate. Although districts made genuine efforts to orient teachers to team teaching, many teachers and administrators were left on their own to organize for the new teaching arrangements (Northern Nevada Writing Project Teacher-Researcher Group, 1996).
The Northern Nevada Writing Project (NNWP), a consortium of 12 Nevada educators, spent 3 three years studying the effects of team teaching on elementary teachers. Using standard research methodology, they interviewed and surveyed 84 teachers over the course of a pilot and primary study. Their research found that teachers used a variety of configurations of team teaching, both conventional and unconventional, to satisfy the pressing demand that teachers work together.

NNWP's work found that a few elementary teams literally divided the room in half with a physical partition. Each teacher had his or her own fifteen students. Others divided the room and responsibility for subjects—one teacher teaching certain subjects (language arts, science) to all the students, but fifteen at a time. Some teams divided the teaching time instead of partitioning the room. This structure eliminated the need for team members to spend a great deal of time planning together. The majority of teams in the study used a more eclectic approach than simply dividing the room or the teaching in half. Instead, they broke the day into different teaching/learning situations such as whole group and small group instruction, and learning centers. Special education teachers were part of the experiment, with a "push in" program where they divided their day among several classrooms, teaming with teachers to help students with special needs (NNWP, 1996).

In evaluations of the effectiveness of class-size reduction (CSR) in 1993, 1995, 1997 and 2001 the Nevada Department of Education found mixed results (Pollard, 1995; Snow, 1993, 1998, 2001). The 1993 evaluation found no exceptional results in terms of increased student achievement except for certain subgroups such as those with Limited English-Proficient (LEP) or from low socioeconomic backgrounds. The positive results
were that school districts reported fewer special education referrals and less teacher absenteeism (Snow, 1993). The 1995 evaluation concluded that some students scored higher in mathematics, but lower in the target area of reading. Confounding the picture, these results were reversed for other groups. By 1995, the number of classrooms with teacher teaming increased. The 1997 evaluation also showed mixed results mirroring the earlier appraisals. The evaluation also uncovered an unfortunate result of lowering student-teacher ratios in the first three grades--increased ratios of students to teachers in grades four and five (Nevada Journal, 1998).

From 1990 through to 1999, teams taught one third of first and second grade classrooms. As Nevada’s population burgeoned and more classrooms were built, the number of team-taught classrooms declined in favor of self-contained classrooms (Sturm, 2001). Along with mixed student achievement results, team-teaching also received mixed reviews. According to the 1993 evaluation report, although not large enough to be considered significant, there was a reliable and small difference in mean reading and math scores in favor of the self-contained classrooms as opposed to classrooms with teams (Snow, 1993). Student gains, in general, appeared to be more predictable based upon student socio-economic status rather than upon class size or teaching configuration, with this finding holding for the 1997 evaluation. This finding was greeted with disappointment in Nevada since class-size reduction programs were originally designed to help at-risk students. In the 2001 pilot study, the evaluation results showed no significant differences in test scores whether the student was in a team-taught or self-contained classroom configuration, with the exception LEP students who scored higher in
self-contained classrooms. It is not surprising that the most significant factor affecting student achievement was teacher experience (Snow, 2001).

During the 1995-1996 school year, the Nevada Department of Education surveyed teachers, principals and parents on their perceptions of the effects of the state’s class-size reduction program. In their 1997 report of the findings, many respondents stated that team-teaching was preferable to 30 to 1 ratios, but they believed that it was not as beneficial as each teacher having a self-contained classroom of 15 to 1 (Costa, 1997). When asked to name the most advantageous aspects of class-size reduction on students, teachers responded, “team teachers can share ideas and learn from each other” (Sturm, 2001, p. 16). When asked to name what aspects of class-size reduction interfered with success, principals and teachers named team teaching as one of the top two responses. Parents cited similarly, “team-taught classrooms were overcrowded and noisy” (Sturm, 2001, p. 16).

Despite the meager student achievement gains, and the lukewarm reception of team teaching from school personnel, Nevada remains committed to class-size reduction in the first and second grades. The latest legislative action was in June of 2003, when funding was continued to retain small class sizes, but allowed district superintendents flexibility in using the funds. March of 2005 saw the Nevada legislature again debating class-size reduction with the assembled legislators polarized on the subject. Assemblywoman Chris Giunchigliani was quoted by Channel Eyewitness News as saying, “In 1987, we were the first state in the nation to create a class-size reduction program and we never bothered to fund it. And here we are in 2005 and instead of funding what we know works, we continue to whittle away and lose the accountability as
well as the benefit for those kids in the smaller classrooms” (McCarty, 2005). Taking the opposite position, State Senator William Raggio pointed out, “over the last 15 years the legislature has spent close to a billion dollars on class-size reduction efforts that have yet to meet the requirements” (McCarty, 2005). With data to support opposing viewpoints, the debate on the benefits of class-size reduction continues in the state of Nevada.

*High Schools and Teaming*

Efforts to reform high schools in the 1990s rekindled interest in team teaching, most often in the form of interdisciplinary teaming (Syies, 2001). The call for high school reform came from many different corners of the country and from various political and educational organizations, but the message was consistent: America’s high schools were failing its students (Cawelti, 1994; National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1996; Sizer, 1992). The changing demographics of public schools and the challenges of educating the rapidly expanding numbers of minority and LEP students, as well as the problems such as student apathy and escalating student violence, were all factors that contributed to the clarion call to restructure high schools (Raywid, 2002).

In high schools across the country, interdisciplinary teams were implemented as one means for reforming schools (George & McEwin, 1999; Spies, 1995, 1997). Several national movements for change supported an increase in the use of teams: The Coalition of Essential Schools, the Annenberg Challenge, and the National Association of Secondary School Principals’ report. All shared a similar priority—make America’s high schools more personalized.
Professor Theodore R. Sizer was among the first to express the need for a greater connection between students and their school community. In reaction to "the shopping mall high school", which Sizer claims gives short shrift to the intellectual development of students, he started the Coalition of Essential Schools. Based on nine common principles outlined in *Horace's Compromise* (Sizer, 1992), Sizer admonished schools to "simplify, narrow, and focus" their curricular goals. Among other objectives, the common principles called for the creation of "personalized instruction to address individual needs and interests, and "small schools and classrooms, where teachers and students know each other well and work in an atmosphere of trust and high expectations" (Coalition of Essential Schools, n.d.).

Businessman, philanthropist and former Ambassador to Great Britain, Walter H. Annenberg, thought along similar lines. At a ceremony in the White House on December 17, 1993, President Clinton announced a "wonderful Christmas present to America's children". Annenberg was making a $500 million donation to improve public schools, which he characterized as a "Challenge to the Nation". In making his gift, Annenberg joined foundations and corporations already supporting American school reform, and he challenged other private donors like himself to "feel an obligation to join his crusade for the betterment of our country" (National Institute for School Reform, 1993). To strengthen the impact of his gift, he stipulated that the funds he pledged would become available only on a matching basis. As a result, over 1,600 businesses, foundations, colleges and universities, and individuals contributed an additional $600 million in private matching funds (Annenberg Institute, n.d.). One pet project of the challenge was the Annenberg Institute, which advocates for the development of schools as professional
learning communities. The Institute has been responsible for forging new leadership models and restructurings schools, insuring enduring gains in student achievement (National Institute for School Reform, 1993).

The National Association of Secondary School Principals issued its own antidote to remedy the ills of their schools. *Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution* (1996) outlined a series of recommendations for reshaping high schools, with the primary aim to improve student achievement. These supported the personalization of schools by promoting the division of large high schools into units of no more than 600 students. The report said that the smaller components would create a climate conducive to teaching and learning. It also recommended that the way that schools are organized and their scheduling programs need to be more flexible. American educators were becoming increasingly convinced that single-subject, single-teacher teaching was simply no match for the phenomenal knowledge overload and challenging school situations they are sure to sustain in the days ahead" (Doda, cited in Northern Nevada Writing Project Teacher-Researcher Group, 1996, p. v). Although smaller schools and interdisciplinary teaching clearly seemed to be an answer for many critics of schools, the remedy was not as certain for educators and other school practitioners.

During the 1990s, interdisciplinary team teaching in the high school became a practice touted for its potential to improve teaching (George & McEwin, 1999; Jacobs, 1999; McCracken & Sekicky, 1998; Murata, 1998; Spies, 1995, 1997). The approach was supported by research that confirmed that teachers valued the expertise of their fellow colleagues; and that teachers turned to them for professional guidance more often than they sought the help of members of the administration or outside experts who they
viewed as distant from the realities of the classroom (Choy et al., 1993; Rosenholtz, 1989; Sandholtz, 2000). Building upon the support for team teaching, reform efforts during this decade increasingly promoted methods that fostered collaboration among teachers and that created professional learning communities (Sandholtz, 2000). Team teaching continued to be viewed as a best practice with longevity and promise.

Interestingly, the literature at the same time suggests that team teaching flouted standard practice in most high schools. Therefore, high school professional greeted it with much more caution, despite the fact that many middle schools across America had embraced it as an effective and innovative practice. Team teaching conflicted with academic subject departmentalization that typically characterized high schools. All in all, this innovation was viewed as a direct challenge to the status quo (Bryke, Lee & Smith, 1990).

The practice of departmentalization of academic subjects is nearly universal in high schools, and for good reasons. It is sanctioned by certification regulations that stipulate only specialized teachers may teach in the secondary grades (Legters, McDill & McPartland, 1993). Research in the early 1990s (McPartland, 1990; Bryke, Lee & Smith, 1990) provided some support for the instructional benefits of departmentalization, but more importantly concluded that it also had risks. For example, this kind of structure sometimes defined an environment in which students did not receive enough care and support from teachers. It also found that specialized teachers adopted a different orientation toward their responsibility for student success of each individual in their class. Teachers in a departmentalized setting were more likely to assume a subject-matter orientation. These teachers tended to have an identity professionally with colleagues in their field. They also sought to maintain higher instructional standards, and greater
expectations for student performance that detracted from a sense of personal responsibility for student success (Legter, McDill, & McPartland, 1993). They elaborated:

A common way to offset the negative effects of departmentalized staffing is to implement interdisciplinary teacher teams that have specific team-member responsibilities for the success of each student. During regularly scheduled team planning periods, teachers can identify students who need special attention and follow through by providing extra academic help and coordinating problem-solving approaches with students and their families. (p. 2)

The Small Schools Movement, the Annenberg Challenge with its emphasis on personalizing the high school experience, and educational leaders such as Sizer presented the issue of interdisciplinary teaching for scrutiny by scholarly researchers. Their findings helped to understand when and how interdisciplinary teaming worked (King & Gunn, 2003; Murata, 2002).

A study of Cactus High School with 2,600 students in the Phoenix, Arizona area by Murata (2002) identified three principal themes related to the experience of teaming at the school. First, the role of choice for teachers when teams were formed seemed to be very important for the success of the team: compatibility made the teaming relationship stronger. Second, the opportunity for the team members to plan together strengthened classroom practice and kept the focus of instruction on student achievement. Third, and perhaps the most important theme contained in the data, was the sense of community that teaming encouraged. As a result of their close working relationships, teaming teachers developed a greater sense of trust and respect for one another. Feelings of trust also
resulted in reducing teachers' feelings of isolation. As they continued to work together, the teachers shared many experiences that often extended beyond the classroom, such as taking field trips or attending their students' activities or other school events together. They also had a great deal of out-of-school social interactions. Focus on the team members, rather than on each individual teacher, contributed to the strengthening of the team. These findings confirmed an earlier discovery by Mills, Powell & Pollak (1992) who studied the consequences of interdisciplinary teams in middle schools and found a similarly positive effect on teacher teams. Murata (2002) highlighted two areas that were essential to teaming and effective collaboration: teacher choice and scheduling accommodations. If teaming is to be successful in the high school, teachers have to be able to choose their partners, and to make decisions in respect to scheduling and curriculum.

In another study, Spies (2001) compared two high schools in the Chicago metropolitan area and identified the supports needed to insure the success of interdisciplinary teams beyond the implementation stage in a departmentalized high school. Because the survival of team teaching at these two schools could not be attributed to the types or numbers of teachers, subjects, ability levels, or grade levels, Spies investigated other explanations. His conclusion was that both schools developed a vision of authentic student achievement guided by district and state performance standards. The programs in both schools focused on lifelong learning skills that encouraged cross-disciplinary collaboration. Though the principals at both schools initiated the idea for interdisciplinary teams, it is significant that the administrators involved their teachers in the decisions that affected their own work.
Perhaps more importantly, the research indicates that when teams are improperly implemented and insufficiently supported, they can create even worse problems and challenges for students, teachers, and schools (Kruse & Louis, 1997). A compilation of research on teaming reveals that four kinds of support have to be present if team teaching is to succeed: (a) participatory (student and parent involvement, teacher willingness and commitment, teacher compatibility); (b) structural (block schedules, common planning time, common students, manageable class size); (c) leadership (administrative support, teacher leadership); and (e) environmental (district and state standards, financial resources, site-based decisions) (Hargreaves & Macmillan, 1996; Muncey & McQuillan, 1996; Spies, 2001; Vars & Beane, 2000; Wasley, 1994).

King and Gunn (2003) found that the work of high school teaching teams is complex and often contradictory. They explained:

Even in the best teams, hierarchies can emerge, tendencies toward individualism can persist, and genuine agreement can be elusive. The concern for pedagogy and student achievement can easily be thwarted by issues of control and political struggles for status and authority. Consistent with other research, they found that relations of power and influence at the school level have dramatic effects on the nature of teacher collaboration, professional inquiry, and curricular and pedagogical innovation. (p. 173)

The most recent literature continues to focus on the structural nature of high schools and its effect on reform. Murata (2002) claimed that the traditional structure of high schools favored teacher isolation over collegiality and subject autonomy over interdisciplinary collaboration. He proposed that the configuration of school structures—
primarily scheduling and departmentalization—had to be reexamined if interdisciplinary teaming was to be successful. Raywid (2002) discussed the responsibilities and authority of department chairpersons as other structural obstacles to teaming. She found a clash between the efforts to create smaller schools that are organized vertically by subject and grade level units, and the traditional high school structure that is organized horizontally by disciplines and grade levels. Raywid (2002) wrote:

Thus, if high schools simply add schools-within-schools while retaining department chairpersons and their prerogatives, they should expect ongoing tension between the old order and the new. For instance, if department chairpersons retain their old power regarding something as simple as the calling of meetings, they can conflict with teachers’ obligations within the new units.

(p. 51)

In sum, high school educators in the 1990s found that implementing and sustaining reform was a daunting task. Interdisciplinary teaming was part of the reform effort during this decade, mainly because it was considered a practice that enhanced the interpersonal relationships of students and teachers.

Emergence of accountability

The new millennium brought about another focus—standards-based accountability. A review of the literature from 2000-2005 leads one to conclude that team teaching slipped into near oblivion as the United States grappled with its newest wave of educational reform. A new interest in educational standards emerged during the last century. States embraced the work of developing their own measures of educational
success, and by the beginning of the 21st Century standards driven accountability was the prevailing state-level strategy (Berger, 2000; Elmore & Fuhrman, 2001; Gratz, 2000; Wraga, 1999). By the year 2000, 49 states had adopted K-12 content standards, with Iowa the sole holdout.

Several key developments during the 1990s led to statewide efforts to raise the achievement bar for American students. These included the establishment of the National Council on Education Standards and Testing in 1991, and Congressional action in the form of Goals 2000 passed in 1991 and Educate America Act enacted in 1994 (Wraga, 1999). “State policymakers have steadily moved toward a system that hinges on explicit performance standards, systematic testing, and consequences for results. They believe that this package of reforms will stimulate teachers and students to focus their efforts in the right direction” (Coffey & Lashway, 2002, p. 1). Seemingly disparate constituencies came together to support standards-based accountability. Government leaders and politicians were concerned about rising taxer and the economic inefficiencies in schools; business leaders were concerned about the country’s ability to prepare a globally competitive work force; and inner-city parents were concerned about the achievement gap for various racial ethnic groups (Orfield & Wald, 2000). A major paradigm shift was taking place in reforming schools with the new emphasis on outcomes rather than inputs. A solid group of important constituencies was now holding teachers, administrators and students accountable for results (Coffey & Lashway, 2002).

The issue of accountability was ratcheted to a higher level of concern following the presidential election of 2000. George W. Bush took office in January of 2001, and three days later he unveiled his plan to overhaul America’s schools. Aimed particularly
at the neediest children who he felt were being left behind, President Bush proposed a program that incorporated elements of accountability, flexibility and choice—and placed rigorous demands on the nation’s schools. Less than a year later, a bipartisan effort in Congress reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which was soon to be known as the No Child Left Behind Act. It required states to implement statewide accountability systems, the bedrock upon which school improvement would be built. The United States Department of Education (n.d.) guidelines stated:

These systems must be based on challenging State standards in reading and mathematics, annual testing for all students in grades 3-8, and annual statewide progress objectives ensuring that all groups of students reach proficiency within 12 years. Assessment results and State progress objectives must be broken out by poverty, race, ethnicity, disability, and limited English proficiency to ensure that no group is left behind. School districts that fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward statewide proficiency goals will, over time, be subject to improvement, corrective action, and restructuring measures aimed at getting them back on course to meet State standards. (p. 2)

The intense local, state and federal focus on standards and testing indicated that educational outputs over inputs clearly had taken a front seat in steering America’s reform efforts. As the interest in curriculum integration and teaming gained a following in middle and high schools, educators were subjected to increased pressures for accountability and standards-based reform. These somewhat paradoxical directions created a tension for advocates of team teaching and interdisciplinary teaming, who were a small but extant voice (Beane, 1997; Erb, 2000; Pate, Homestead & McGinnis, 1997).
"One deterrent to curriculum integration is the fact that most state standards and proficiency tests are set up in terms of conventional subject areas, such as reading, mathematics, science or social studies" (Vars & Beane, 2000, p. 1). To provide some guidance to meet this dilemma, three educational organizations—Alliance for Curriculum Reform, Center for Occupational Research and Development, and Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning—developed curricula that combined competencies that cut across disciplines. Efforts like these were designed to help educators meet the standards-based demands of their states, while incorporating best practices like teaming and interdisciplinary teaching (Vars & Beane, 2000).

Absent from the literature is any clear evidence that teaming in the form of interdisciplinary teaching positively affects student performance on state proficiency tests. However, evidence of a negative impact also does not exist. A meta-analysis of studies done in the late 1990s found that students in any type of interdisciplinary or integrative curriculum did as well as students in a conventional departmentalized program, and often better (Arhar, 1997). These results held steady whether the curriculum was taught by one teacher or by an interdisciplinary team (Arhar, 1997; National Association for Core Curriculum, 2000; Vars, 1997).

Advocates continued to give voice to the benefits of teaming despite the pressures exerted by accountability and the standards-based movement. "As sanctions associated with these systems kick in and as schools and students are penalized for their failure to achieve, a backlash is developing that includes some parents, teacher organizations, and child advocacy groups—a backlash that could reduce the pressure for more academic
rigor and achievement-oriented reforms such as standards-based instruction" (Norton, 2000, p. 4).

Research in the past ten years has generated empirical data on the effects of teacher teaming. Outlined below are four significant studies from the past decade that help to explain the complexities of teaming.

_Cincinnati Public Schools_

Cincinnati Public Schools employed teaming structures within its schools as part of a major effort to reform its school system with the goals of raising academic achievement, improving school safety, and reducing the dropout rate for all the district’s students (Cincinnati Public Schools, 1996). For four years from 1996-2000, Supovitz (2002) studied Cincinnati’s top-to-bottom restructuring efforts in a comprehensive reform plan called Students First. The district leadership fashioned a strategic plan that incorporated team-based schooling. The thinking was that it would improve the culture of Cincinnati’s schools, thereby enhancing the instructional practice of groups of teachers with the residual effect of creating higher levels of student achievement. Supovitz (2002) observed:

The crafters of team-based schooling posited that teachers would increase their instructional focus if they were organized into more intimate educational environment. Through these smaller group structures, teacher teams would develop more collaborative and collegial communities. Grouping teachers in this manner, the theory goes, will not only maximize their collective knowledge and skills but also facilitate their learning of new knowledge and skills because adult
learning is as much, if not more, of a group activity as it is an individual act. (p. 1592)

Team-based schooling was adopted with the cooperation of the Cincinnati Federation of Teachers and the district schools. In 1998, eight schools adopted team-based schooling and by the 2000-2001 school year, 41 schools were team-based. Teams were organized by grade groupings (K-3, 4-6, 7-8, 9-10), each containing 3-5 core subject academic teachers who stayed with a group of students for at least two years. Allowing substantial leeway, the plan called for teams to develop a curriculum and select instructional methods and materials consistent with their school's program. Additionally, each team decided how to schedule and group their students, and they developed a curriculum and selected instructional methods and materials. To gain maximum benefit from the new collegial structures, teams were to stay together for several years to ensure more lasting relationships between teachers and students, and other positive results from collaboration.

In anticipation of the demands and new structures that teaming would present teachers, the district organized three-day summer workshops for schools initiating teaming, as well as provided on-going professional development and support. True to the broad parameters afforded them, teams organized themselves in myriad configurations. All teams had formal meeting time built into their schedules, but this differed widely by building and even within buildings. Typically teams met once or twice a week for between 45 and 90 minutes. Other teams met informally far more frequently.
Using surveys, interviews and district documents, Supovitz’s research probed three key questions: Did teaming influence the culture within which teams operate? Did teaming change teachers’ instructional practices? Did teaming improve students learning, as measured by standardized test performance? The research results indicated that Cincinnati’s initiative seemed to have had a positive effect on the culture of schools. “Teachers in the team-based schools felt more involved in a variety of school-related decisions and reported higher levels of interaction and collaboration with their peers than did teachers in the non-teamed based school” (Supovitz, 2002, p. 1614).

However, the changes in the school culture did not translate into a greater focus on instruction, either for individual teachers or for teams. Within the team-based schools, only about a quarter of the teams across the district were frequently practicing the three dimensions of group practice—academic preparation strategies, collective teaching practices, and student grouping strategies—that were measured by the research. Supovitz (2002) explained further:

The low levels of group practice within the team-based schools may explain why there was no clear pattern of statistically significant differences in student achievement between the team-based and non-team-based schools. Further exploration of the variations in performance of students on teams with different levels of implementation of group instructional practices indicated that the students on teams with higher use of group instructional practices performed better than did students on teams with low levels of group instructional practices, after controlling for the background characteristics of students. This result
suggests that widespread achievement effects may become apparent if more teams are able to use groups instructional practices more frequently. (p. 1614)

Interviews overwhelmingly conveyed teacher pleasure working in teams, and the research data verified that team-based teachers collaborated more than their peers in non-team-based schools did. Unfortunately, non-instructional issues such as paperwork for the district office and for the school itself, as well as other requests, distracted the members of the majority of teams. "Although there were many teams that did have sophisticated and effective group instructional practices, the evaluation data indicated that only about a quarter of teams were able to reach high levels of group instructional practice" (Supovitz, 2002, p. 1615).

Cincinnati's experiment with teaming ended in the early 2000's as a result of the change in superintendents, and budget constraints that required program cuts.

Research on Teacher Attitudes and Teaming.

Shaw, Stratil and Reynolds (2001) researched the effects of team teaching on teacher attitudes. They started with the assumption that teachers' attitudes toward teaching and toward educational practices play an important role in determining a teacher's behavior and, in effect, the teacher's success in the classroom. They found that schools reported that faculty started the year with high expectations and positive attitudes, but that these both dropped precipitously as the pressures of the year, such as parent complaints and student misbehavior, accumulated. As a result, teachers became less positive about teaching and more inclined to emphasize subject-centered practices. Therefore, Shaw, Stratil and Reynolds (2001) concluded that recommendations for
maintaining desirable teacher attitudes throughout the school year would be beneficial to school districts. They wrote:

These considerations lead to the hypothesis that team teaching should provide social support for the teacher's initially favorable attitude toward teaching as a career and toward child-centered educational practices. It was predicted that the initial attitudes of teachers would be maintained to a greater extent in teaching teams than in self-contained classrooms. (p. 296)

The introduction of the team teaching approach into three elementary schools in a system of traditionally self-contained classrooms made it possible for the researchers to design the study using experimental and control classrooms. In the three experimental classrooms, six teams of 3 to 6 members were given responsibility for the academic program of from 90 to 120 pupils. Classrooms were in close proximity with a common area between them, which allowed teachers to be in constant contact with one another during the school day. By contrast, teachers in the control schools spent most of their time in their self-contained classroom isolated from other teachers in the school.

Using a pre-test and post-test design, the researchers studied the effects of teacher attitude toward educational practice and toward teaching as a career. The sample size was 141 teachers—71 in experimental schools, 70 in control schools. Mean pretest and posttest scores measuring attitudes did not differ significantly in September, but were significantly different in May. Examination of the data revealed that attitudes became more negative toward teaching as a career during the school year, but the change was much greater in the control than in the experimental schools. Results supported the hypothesis that attitude maintenance depends upon social support.
Again, the evidence supported the opinion that collaboration and teaming had positive effects on the culture of the school, but it did not offer proof that student achievement also was affected positively.

*Middle School Research*

The embrace of teaming by middle schools for the past two and a half decades afforded Flowers, Mertens and Mulhall (1999) the opportunity to document research-based outcomes of interdisciplinary teaming. Using 155 middle schools in Michigan that were part of the Middle Start Initiative funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the researchers were able to compile, examine and analyze the results from school surveys completed by staff, students and administrators during the 1994-95 and again in 1996-97. The self-study surveys were instituted to provide schools with quantitative data to document and track the changes in their schools. "It also provided schools with a way to establish dialogue about school improvement, setting priorities, determining goals, and most importantly, assessing and measuring the outcome of new programs and practices." (Flowers, Mertens & Mulhall, 1999, p. 57). Five empirically-based findings were discovered: (a) common planning time is critical to the success of teams, (b) teaming improves work climate, (c) teaming increases parental contact, (d) teaming increases job satisfaction, and (e) teaming is associated with higher student achievement.

Perhaps not surprisingly, it was found that in order for teams to be effective, they must have time to plan and work together as a group. Validating other research, the study also found that teaming schools have a more positive work climate and therefore create more job satisfaction. "Teachers in schools that are engaged in teaming feel a stronger
affiliation and support network with their fellow team members and thus are more satisfied with their working climate" (Flowers, Mertens & Mulhall, 1999, p. 59). The researchers implied this indirect benefit by indicating that "a school that puts a priority on fostering respectful relationships among students and teachers, as well as encouraging positive interactions between students, is one that will succeed in creating an environment that is supportive and engaging for student learning" (Flowers, Mertens & Mulhall, 1999, p. 58).

Another result to surface was that teaming increased parental contact. The study found that team-based schools reported more frequent contact with parents. This was precipitated by the fact that teams were able to capitalize on their coordinated efforts by dividing up the contacts with parents among all teacher members of the team.

The crux of the matter for many reformers is the effect that any reform has on student achievement. Flowers, Mertens and Mulhall (1999) found a tangible connection between teaming and higher student achievement. They wrote:

The achievement data used for this analysis is the student MEAP (Michigan Educational Assessment Program) for reading and mathematics that is given every year to seventh grade students in the state of Michigan. Schools that are teaming have higher achievement scores than non-teaming schools. Further, schools that are teaming with high levels of common planning time have the greatest two-year gains in achievement scores. Taking this analysis one step further, schools that have been teaming for five or more years have the highest MEAP scores. Interestingly, however, schools that have been teaming for only one or two years show the most noticeable gains in achievement scores,
suggesting that teaming, even in the first few years, has a significant impact on student achievement. (p. 61)

Meta-analysis of Teaming Literature

Spraker (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of more than 200 publications and studies on teacher teaming from the past 50 years. The two key questions answered by her research and analysis were: To what extent is teacher teaming related to student performance? What major factors are associated with effective teaming?

Answers to these questions derived from the literature surveyed by Spraker revealing a variety of ways that teachers team, and different ways that schools are structured around teaming. Teaming could be central to the organization of an entire school, practiced within some portion of a school, or by only a few teachers. Spraker (2003) isolated five prevalent teaming structures: (a) interdisciplinary teams (three to five teachers shared their talents, and knowledge of disciplines, to provide integrated or thematic curriculum or instruction); (b) multidisciplinary teams (teachers shared instructional responsibilities for particular content as a team, but assumed responsibilities and took assignments from their disciplinary specialty); (c) teacher collaboration (teachers came together in job-embedded professional development focused on learning together as colleagues to improve instruction and student achievement); (d) team teaching (several teachers came together for short periods or an entire year to share some instructional responsibilities); and (e) partnering (two teachers shared co-teaching responsibilities).
Consistent with other findings, the meta-analysis found that teacher teams were as effective as non-teams for improving student performance, but could not prove or show cause-and-effect. There were some correlations and/or case studies suggesting a positive relationship, but research to-date had not documented a strong cause-effect relationship between teaming and student achievement. Echoing the findings of Flowers, Mertens and Mulhall (1999), Spraker found that teaming improved school climate for teachers and increased their feelings of efficacy through more meaningful relationships with students. The development of a more positive school climate led to the positive results.

To determine the factors that are associated with effective teaming, the analysis identified the following: (a) administrative support to accommodate teaming, (b) training about effective teaming processes, (c) clarity in team organization, (d) longevity of teams and of team membership, (e) time for ongoing team planning and discussions, (f) teacher focus on integrating content and instructional practices, and (g) teacher responsiveness to students (Spraker, 2001, pp. 15-20). Additionally, Spraker (2001) alluded to the complexity of the factors that are associated with effective teaming:

Teaming can allow opportunities for teachers to focus together on improving curriculum and teaching practices where they are known to affect student achievement. But conflict within teams or team time spent on routine school matters may divert the team’s attention from areas where its members can have an impact on student outcomes. School context and support for teaming are other critical factors that appear to link to successful teacher teaming. (p. 19)
Causal Factors of Teacher Teaming—1990-present

The following Ishikawa diagram outlines the major causal factors for the practice of teacher teaming from 1990 to the present. Each factor is assigned to one of the five causal factorial categories. A narrative summary follows.

Figure 4.4 Causal factors of Teacher Teaming—1990-present

Summary of Causal Factors—1990-present

The dramatic change in school demographics was a major societal/cultural causal factor leading to the implementation of collegial structures such as team teaching. Increasing numbers of minority and limited English proficient students called for a reassessment of traditional school instructional practices. Concerns about school safety and high school drop out rates were also societal/cultural causal factors, which caused school districts like the Cincinnati Public Schools to reevaluate how their schools were structured and organized. Looking for ways to minimize the impersonalization of
schools, educators proposed team teaching because it usually strengthens connections between students and their schools.

A number of governmental/political interventions were causal factors for the use of team teachers during the 1990s. The state of Nevada turned to team teaching as a remedy for mandated student-to-teacher ratios in its early elementary classrooms. On the national level, the demand for high school reform during the decade rekindled interest in instructional alternatives. As a result, interdisciplinary teams were implemented as one instrument for reforming schools. The press for high school reform was related as well to the national concern about student achievement levels, and particularly the gap between socio-economic and racial groups. The research indicating that less bureaucratic schools had a positive effect on student achievement led many educators to explore collaborative models such as team teaching.

Two movements, The Coalition of Essential Schools and the Small Schools Movement, were educational causal factors that contributed to the expansion of team teaching in school districts across the United States. Both called for schools to provide a more individualized approach to instruction to address the different needs and interests of students. The movements advocated for the creation of small schools where teacher and students got to know one another well. Supporting this position, the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) issued a report advising schools to organize into smaller units, and to think beyond the departmental structure of traditional schools by implementing integrated curricula. Interdisciplinary teaming was proposed as a method to offset the negative effects of departmentalization, which in research studies illuminated during the 1990s (McLaughlin, 1992).
The Annenberg Challenge, and its offshoot the Annenberg Institute, was a
contingency causal factor that provided increased publicity and substantial financial
resources to the cause of school reform. The Institute was responsible for introducing
new schooling models, some of which incorporated interdisciplinary teaming.

Summary and Ishikawa Diagram of Teacher Teaming

Compilation of Causal Factors of Teacher Teaming—1960-present

Figure 4.5 Compilation of Causal Factors of Teacher Teaming—1960-present
Summary of Causal Factors of Teacher Teaming—1960-present

The launching of Sputnik I by the USSR propelled the United States into a period of introspection and educational reform. With a large infusion of federal funds from the National Defense Education Act, educators began the process of reviewing curriculum materials and instructional practices. A climate favorable to reform emerged and teacher teaming was implemented in the 1960s to address three issues in education: individualizing instruction, utilizing teachers for more effective teaching, and addressing teacher isolation. Efforts to individualize instruction gained popularity, in part, because educators understood that changing curricula was not enough to create change in student achievement levels. They realized that if learning was to increase, then teachers had to meet the needs of various learning styles. The post World War II baby boom caused a teacher shortage, fueling the necessity to utilize teachers more efficiently. Associated with the teacher shortage was research indicating that the isolation felt by classroom teachers had a debilitating effect on morale and performance, adding to the difficulties of finding sufficient teachers to fill America's classrooms.

During the late 1960s and into the early part of the next decade, team teaching progressed as schools developed new cultural norms, and with the embrace of the Open Education Movement. The Movement and its centerpiece, open space schools, were met with limited acceptance and limited success.

The 1970s were a decade of a declining educational system in America, and demands for reform. Americans voiced their lack of confidence in public schools, which was reinforced by the continuous decline in standardized test scores. In addition, American citizens were demanding equal access and opportunities in all of its social
institutions regardless of race, gender, physical disability or English language proficiency. As a result, policy making shifted from local school districts to the federal level. Declines in school funding resulted from a property tax revolt during the decade, which in turn decreased financial support for educational innovation.

The Reagan administration placed education in the national spotlight and connected its demands for school change to the nation's ability to remain globally competitive. With the publication of the national report A Nation at Risk, the United States again turned its attention to reforming its educational system. During the 1980s, a number of other reports, including A Nation Prepared and A Time for Results, urged schools to undergo systemic restructuring to improve student achievement. Using models from business, reformers advocated that schools reduce bureaucratic management structures and replace them with participatory models.

Continuing to explore effective ways to restructure schools, the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development issued its report Turning Points. To minimize feelings of anonymity and alienation that many students often experienced during their middle school years, the Council recommended interdisciplinary teaming. The use of teams burgeoned during the 1990s as schools across the country embraced the Turning Points recommendations, revitalizing and expanding the middle school movement. The state of Nevada joined the movement towards teacher teaming when its legislature passed the Class-Size Reduction Act of 1989, mandating a fifteen-to-one student-teacher ratio for all first and second grade classes. Faced with the immediate problem of classroom space, many schools teamed two teachers with 30 students in one classroom.
Changing school demographics, the country's concerns about declining student achievement, student safety, and increasing dropout rates, strengthened the argument for high school reform. Several national movements for school reform supported the use of teams. These included the Coalition of Essential Schools, the Annenberg Challenge, and the National Association of Secondary School Principals. Countering negative effects attributed to high school departmentalization, interdisciplinary teaming became a practice touted for its potential to improve teaching and personalize instruction. Reform efforts during this decade increasingly called for the creation of smaller schools that embraced collaborative structures such as teacher teaming.

As standards-based accountability gained momentum at the end of the 1990s, interest in team teaching waned. Local, state and federal interests in standards and testing shifted the priorities in schools from inputs to outputs. As a consequence, team teaching was pushed out of the picture of educational reform.
CHAPTER V

Historical Narrative of School-based Management

Although not a new concept, and indeed already practiced in a number of America’s school districts, school-based management (SBM) burst onto the national scene in the later half of the 1980s. In its simplest form, it involved the transference of the power and authority to operate a school from the district level to the building level (Levey & Acker-Hocevar, 1998). The underlying premises are: professionals closest to children and schools will make the best decisions; the people responsible for carrying out decisions should have a voice in determining those decisions; and change is most likely to be effective and lasting when it is implemented by people who feel a sense of ownership and responsibility for the process (Bauer, 1992). School-based management was a widely touted catalyst for reforming the nation’s schools in the mid-1980s, but its journey since then has not been a smooth one. Else (2000) observed:

School-based management has been applauded and criticized; met with exceptional success and disappointing failure, been hailed as the new leadership paradigm to rescue schools and labeled as one more desperate but poorly conceived attempt to resurrect America’s schools. These divergent views are, in part, a result of the degree of preparation for moving from a highly centralized system with lingering strands of autocratic management, to a decentralized, participatory system. (p. 1)
The reasons that propelled the implementation of SBM were as varied as the reactions to it. School-based management was initiated as a governance, political or administrative reform. As a governance reform it shifted the balance of authority among schools, districts, and the state. As a political reform it expanded the decision-making circle, and as an administrative reform it held the potential to make management more efficient by decentralizing and deregulating it (David, 1996). States have used school-based management to increase school accountability; school boards have endorsed it as a way to improve student achievement; teacher unions have embraced it as an avenue to teacher empowerment; and community groups have advocated it to increase parental involvement (Mullen, Ogawa & Kranz, 1990; Briggs & Wohlstetter, 1999). Others have adopted SBM to increase cost effectiveness, time effectiveness and/or the motivation of school personnel (Sinton, 1957). Whatever the underlying reason for its use, participatory decision-making at the building level was at the heart of this widely used reform (David, 1996; Oswald, 1995; Vincent & Johnson, 2000).

Definitions of School-based Management

Various terms have been used to describe this approach: school-based management (SBM), site-based management (SBM), shared decision making (SDM), decentralization, or some combination thereof have been used. Cotton (1992) counted eighteen names for it, each with its own definition and formula for operation. "It has almost as many variants as there are places claiming to be 'site-based'. And they differ on every important dimension—who initiates it, who is involved, what they control, and whether they are accountable to an outside authority" (David, 1996, p. 5). As a result of
these vague and sometimes conflicting definitions, confusion and misunderstanding about SBM emerged during the early years of implementation. (Lindquist & Mauriel, 1989).

To sort through this muddle of terms and labels, scholars and practitioners developed definitions to bring more clarity and focus to school-based management. Although the expressions and methodologies of site-based management have varied, it is generally agreed that school-based management involves three basic features: (a) the delegation of authority to individual schools to make decisions about the educational program, (b) the adoption of a shared decision making model at the school level by a management team that can include the principal, teachers, parent, and community members, and (c) a facilitative leadership at the school level to ensure follow-through of decisions (Murphy & Evertson, 1991). “Control is decentralized from the central district office to individual schools as a way to give school constituents—principals, teachers, parents, community members, and in some schools, students—more control over what happens” (Odden & Wohlstetter, 1995, p. 32).

Some scholars have developed categories to describe school-based management models; the categories are defined as administratively controlled, professionally controlled, or community controlled. Leithwood and Menzies (1998) explained:

Administrative controlled site-based management focuses predominantly on the effective use of resources; it gives local school administrators aided by site councils authority over budgets, personnel and curriculum. Professionally controlled site-based management makes teachers the primary decision-makers and asks them to use their experience to guide decisions over budgets and
curriculum. Community controlled site-based management allows parents and
local community members the opportunity to align local values and preferences
with curriculum. (p. 341)

Although there are three forms, a survey of the literature and studies indicated that
the majority of SBM schools were administratively controlled, with authority
concentrated at the level of the school principal and/or site councils. Indeed, in many
school districts site councils became important functionaries in the implementation of
school-based management programs.

Site councils are usually made up of 6-10 members drawn from various school
constituencies, but the composition and the responsibilities of its members vary from
district to district, and/or state to state. Most include the principal, teachers, parents, and
in secondary schools, students. Some include business representatives and community
members. Decision-making authority also varies. Councils may share authority with the
principal or be merely advisory. Some councils have the power to hire principals, some
to hire and fire, some do neither (David, 1996; Kubick, 1988; Odden & Wohlwillerter, 1995).
The most successful school-site councils have a well-organized committee structure that
enables leadership. The most successful councils were found to have a focus on student
and adult learning, and held a school wide perspective in the approach to problem
solving. David (1996) admonished that site councils are effective only when school
leaders are able to encourage the participation of different members of the community;
and when they are able themselves to model the kind of reflective thinking that they will
expect of the council's members.
The complexities of school-based management created many obstacles to those who tried to implement it. Oswald (1995) noted that the most frequent barriers to its successful implementation included lack of knowledge by stakeholders of what SBM is and how it works, as well as lack of decision-making skills, poor communication, and distrust among stakeholders. Complicating the landscape further were statutes, regulations, and union contracts that restricted teachers' decision-making authority and the time that they could devote to the administrative responsibilities of SBM.

However, Drury (1999) pointed out a bottom line issue:

More than any other limitation, stakeholder resistance may affect the success or failure of site-based management attempts. In order for schools to move forward in the change process toward site-based management, it is imperative to have buy-in from school board members, central office administration, building-level administration, teachers, and teachers unions. (p. 3)

In addition, researchers indicated that in order for school-based management to be successful, it must be given time to succeed. Studies have shown that SBM takes anywhere from three to fifteen years, as a minimum commitment, to be successful. (Briggs & Wohlkinder, 1999; Oswald, 1995; Vincent & Johnson, 2000). In short, school-based management is a complex and time-consuming process. Therefore it is interesting to ask why did SBM become such a force in the movement to reform schools?

School-based Management Prior to 1980.

The practice of school-based management in the public schools can be traced to the decade of the 1970s, while the movement toward decentralization can be traced to the
early part of the 20th Century. Prior to 1920, schools were fairly decentralized institutions: small in size and operated at the local level with the principal as the central authority figure (Callahan, 1962; Cuban, 1990). “Unfortunately, these provincial structures spawned considerable favoritism, nepotism, and corruption” (Cuban, 1990, p. 4). Employing the scientific management approach as espoused by Taylor and Weber (Bolzman & Deal, 1997), school systems became more centralized after World War I. Reformers called for the consolidation of smaller districts into larger and more centrally controlled entities. Decision making power moved from the principal to a district superintendent, thereby instituting a more bureaucratic management mode. From the 1920s to the 1960s, centralized school governance solidified and became the norm of operation; as a result, school leaders became more isolated from their constituencies and communities (Levey & Acker-Hoeveer, 1998; Lindelow & Heyderickx, 1989).

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1964 chipped away at the notion of centralized control. The Coleman report, issued in 1966, underscored the influence of the home on student achievement, and the importance of parents and community members. In many schools, the participation of community members in school decisions was encouraged and made the schools more responsive to the needs of the community. Although it never became a nationwide phenomenon, decentralization defined a considerable number of school systems during the 1960s (Cuban, 1990; Spear, 1983).

Responding to the mandate of civil rights legislation for educational access, the pendulum of educational change swung back to an interest in centralization during the 1970s as state and federal governments passed legislation that indirectly resulted in
reinstating a top-down management structure. "Like centralized arrangements generally, it was intended to foster equal and uniform treatment of clients, standardization of products or services, and to prevent arbitrary or capricious decision making" (Darling-Hammond, 1988, p. 11). Despite this national trend towards centralization, Ogawa and White (1994) pointed out that during the 1970s school-based programs were adopted by many school districts across the United States. Most often they were offered as solutions to a variety of management problems including budgeting and accountability.

Moving more aggressively to decentralize its schools, Florida passed the 1973 Educational Accountability Act that authorized school-based management in the form of school advisory committees (Peterson, 1991). Concerned about the lack of accountability in the state's school systems, Florida legislatures enacted a number of educational reform packages, all with the word "accountability" notably in their titles. The main thrust of the legislation was to require state curriculum standards for all core subjects, and for tests at every grade level (Herrington, 2005). But Florida legislators also wanted their schools to be more accountable for the funds that they spent. In a bold reform move, the Florida legislature restructured the ways their schools operated. Herrington and MacDonald (2001) explained how the issues of accountability and school-based management became entwined in Florida in 1973:

...cold war tensions, burgeoning enrollments, student unrest, court-mandated desegregation, and high state contributions to public schooling, then-Governor Ascow commissioned a two-year study of Florida's public education system. The committee issued a comprehensive report, which included recommendations to establish fiscal equity, school-based management, short-and long-term planning
and an ongoing program of research and development at the state and district level. (p. 13)

Advisory committees decided the re-allocation of resources for the Florida schools. It was believed that the committees could make better resource allocation decisions than the central office in terms of meeting the schools’ and the students’ needs (Odden & Bosch, 1998). Because the focus for the advisory committees was accountability, and more specifically, accountability in school spending, Florida’s experiment with school-based management was viewed more as an experiment with school-based finance systems than with the broad restructuring of the decision-making process defined by SBM.

Cuban (1990) wrote that the history of American public education is typified by alternating periods of centralization and decentralization. According to Cuban, the reins of power and authority change hands in cycles for reasons that are well intended, but with consequences that often are not anticipated. Cotton (1992) explained further:

The problem is that highly centralized educational systems simply do not engender the desired outcomes. For one thing, they tend—like bureaucracies generally—to be impersonal and maddeningly slow moving. An equally significant concern is that repeated failure of centralized structures to inspire in school personnel the prerequisite attitudes and behaviors for bringing about educational improvements. (p. 5)

English (1989) elaborated on this problem and offered SBM as a solution:

"Highly centralized systems are easily clogged with trivia. The result is inertia, pessimism, inefficiency, cynicism, and long delays for decisions of any kind on the
smallest of matter. School-based management is an excellent antidote to "bureaucracy" (p. 2).

**Causal Factors of School-based Management—Prior to 1980**

The following Ishikawa diagram lays out the primary causal factors that led to school-based management programs prior to 1920. Each factor is assigned to one of the five causal factorial categories. A narrative summary follows.
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**Figure 5.1 Causal Factors of School-based Management**

**Summary of Causal Factors—Prior to 1980**

The decades prior to the 1920s were not instrumental in the historical development of school-based management, but several causal factors did emerge which helped to support its later development. As a governmental/political causal factor, the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1964 challenged long-held notions of centralized school management by underscoring the importance of parental and community involvement in the educational process. The ESEA supported the broadening of participation in the educational decision-making process. It also gave legitimacy to the idea that school authority should be decentralized, as an educational causal factor. Both of these endorsements validated the concept of school-based management and loosened the hold of traditional school structures.

Grasping with ways to improve their schools statewide, Florida mandated school-level decision-making in 1973 as a way to improve accountability. Although the mandate served more as a school-based finance system than a shared decision making mechanism, this was one of the earliest uses of school-based management that cut across the spectrum of school management.

The Decade from 1980-89

With the beginning of the decade of the 80s, America began to feel that its public schools were in failing health and so plea from all regions of the country called for their improvement. Several emerging trends fueled this concern: the changing demographics of American’s school population, the changing social fabric of the nation, and the evolution of educational thought to a post-industrial perspective on politics and organizations (Murphy & Beck, 1995).

The demographics of public schools were beginning to shift significantly. Statistics showed that 30 percent of students in public schools were of minority background, and it was predicted that the number would grow to nearly half within ten years. Many immigrant students with limited English language proficiency contributed
to the change in demographics. Also, schools were compelled to evaluate their programs and to explore models of teaching and learning that might produce better results because they were dealing with students and families who were impacted by different problems including poverty, drug addiction, and unemployment. In addition, because children and their capacity to study and learn were being influenced negatively by divorce, single parenting and dual working parents, schools were pressed to reevaluate their programs and explore more effective educational models (Murphy & Beck, 1995). On a larger scale, the evolution of American society from an industrial to post industrial era forced educators to seek new directions in teaching and learning. Lewis (1993) explained:

We are in the midst of a revolution in the organization of human services. The reliance, in the nineteenth century, on institutions is being replaced by a new service ideology, which emphasizes community programs and client choice. The monopoly of the state on service provision has been broken. The revolution is fueled by a critique of bureaucratic institutions that legitimizes the privatization of care, control, and now education. (Cited in Murphy & Beck, 1995, p. 78)

These changes, in turn, "created a particularly hospitable climate for school decentralization efforts" (Murphy & Beck, 1995, p. 58). Three separate entities paved the way for school based management — school restructuring, the Effective Schools Movement, and new models for business. Although different, each laid the groundwork for education's embrace of decentralized decision-making.
Restructuring and School-based Management

The tremendous impact of *A Nation at Risk* (1983) on education in the United States has been fully documented (Berube, 1991; Beyer, 1995; Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Cuban, 1990; Fristone, Fuhrman & Kirst, 1989; Goldberg & Harvey, 1983; Haggerty, 1995; Levine & Lezotte, 1999; Ravitch, 2000; Toch, 1991). The report resonated with the American public’s widespread concern about education and school reform became a national campaign. The media joined the bandwagon and soon politicians, educational leaders and ordinary citizens alike debated how to improve education. Reform advocates had found a platform and an audience (Tyack and Cuban, 1995).

The seeds of school reform were planted by the authors of *A Nation at Risk*, National Commission on Excellence in Education, and then bloomed in the restructuring of schools and districts (Conway & Calzi, 1995). The nation’s politicians, business establishment, and educational leaders took to heart the alarming words of the report, and set about to fortify America’s preeminence as a world leader. Mediocrity in education was to be eliminated and replaced with excellence. The reform of America’s schools was taken on with a vengeance.

The first wave of reform “was characterized by the imposition of top-down reforms that essentially asked us to do more of the same but to do it better” (Petrie, 1990, p. 19). Although harsh, this commentary summed up much of the literature describing the initial efforts to change schools in the early 1980s. Educational historians also concur that the first wave of reform focused its changes on the issues of accountability. State
legislatures and state departments of education responded to the call for reform by
making graduation requirements more strenuous, standardizing curriculum, increasing
teacher and student testing, and increasing certification requirements. But the research
showed that these efforts did little to increase student learning (Elmore & Associates,
1996; Fuhrman, Elmore, & Massell, 1993). Carvin (n.d.) summarized:

The studies suggested that changes in professionalism and administration did not
always trickle down to effective education strategy implementation. Teaching
guidelines became more complex and less coherent. Reform, therefore, had to
tackle the bureaucracy of the administrative structure, as well as curricular
planning, assessment and teacher empowerment. (p. 1)

The initial wave of response was quickly followed by a second wave of reform
called restructuring, which took on the status of a national movement (Firestone,
Fuhrman, & Kirst, 1989). Restructuring involved systemic change—change that was long
term, comprehensive, and guided by a conception of schools as stimulating workplaces
and active and engaging learning environments (Apodaca-Tucker, 2004). Undetermined
by the critiques of educators and other stakeholders (primarily businesspersons and
politicians) the mandated strategies that had dominated the reform agenda in the early
1980s fell into disfavor (Elmore & Associates, 1996; Murphy & Evertson, 1991). The
critics argued that a more comprehensive approach to school change was necessary.
Therefore, restructuring came into favor, significantly broadening the first wave’s focus
on academics and teaching. Harvey and Crandell (1988) helped to define the term
restructuring when they wrote:
The second wave of reform, which lagged only slightly behind, goes by the label of "restructuring". It takes many forms, but usually involves school-based management; enhanced roles for teachers in instruction and decision making; integration of multiple innovations; restructuring timetables to support collaborative work cultures; radical reorganization of teacher education; new roles such as mentors, coaches, and other teacher leadership arrangements; re-vamping and developing the shared mission and goals of the school among teachers, administrators, the community and sometimes students (p. 28).

Reformers quickly realized that their efforts to change teacher behavior with top-down decisions were not working. As an important part of the reform equation, the people who are closest to the classroom, namely teachers and school principals, needed to be brought into the business of reform in more meaningful ways. It was recognized that reform must begin at the building level. From the late 1980s and onward, the literature discussed and analyzed the topic of teacher empowerment (Lieberman, 1988; Johnson, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1991; Smith & Scott, 1990). Sirotnik (1987) observed, “Teachers as repositories of first-hand experience are the primary agents of change. People who live and work in complex organizations like schools need to be thoroughly involved in their own improvement efforts, assuring significant and enduring organizational change” (p.2).

Educational reformers started to question basic assumptions about teaching, learning and the organization of schools (Petrie, 1990). Before attempting to establish a direction for change, many scholars and researchers analyzed existing educational structures (Klaske, 1989). They found was a factory model based on the management principles first developed during the early part of the 20th century. The model was that
the school board and superintendent pronounced edicts and then the principal, as
foreman, and teachers, as production line workers, carried them out. Petrie (1990)
commented:

It is in questioning these assumptions that some reformers have begun to develop
a new vision of teachers and teaching, one that at least suggests, if not demands, a
new concept of the role of teachers in schools. In turn, this new role for teachers
has profound implications for our concept of educational leadership (p. 20)
As the efforts to reform expanded and matured, school-based management
became the new concept that defined the role of leadership for many schools.

Effective Schools Movement and School-based Management

The search for solutions to the problems confronting education led reformers to
examine current theories about successful schooling (Murphy & Beck, 1995). One body
of information emerged from the Effective Schools Movement. Begun in the late 1970s
and early 1980s, these research studies were developed by Ronald Edmonds of Harvard
University. Edmonds (1983) defined "effective schools" as those in which student
achievement levels did not necessarily correspond to the socio-economic status of its
families. He identified numerous characteristics of effective schools, which included a
clear and commonly held vision, strong leadership, high expectations, time on task, an
orderly and safe environment, and frequent monitoring of student progress. The literature
also hinted that developing these characteristics meant moving away from bureaucratic
school structures, and moving towards decentralized systems of governance,
organization, and management. (Murphy & Beck, 1995). "With the emergence of the
effective schools literature, research attention was directed to the organizational properties of schools and the larger institutional structures in which schools are embedded" (Bryk, Lee & Smith, 1990, p. 136).

Researchers observed that school climates were similar in successful schools, there was a professional work environment and collaborative spirit (Purkey & Smith, 1983). Others noted that there was considerable staff involvement at the local school level in designing the schools. They also noted that improvement occurred on a school-by-school basis (Davidson, 1992; Merphy, Hallinger & Mesa, 1985). Caldwell (1990) summarized:

...highly effective schools or schools that have shown outstanding improvement have been given a high level of responsibility and authority to make decisions about staffing and the allocation of resources and, within these schools, teachers have been empowered in a variety of ways to make a contribution to planning and decision-making process. (p. 17)

Endorsing this portrait, Chapman and Boyé (1986) stated, "the effective school literature shows that a collaborative process is central to successful school reform" (p. 54). As a result, they urged American educators to give greater attention to the "democratic quality of the management process". Goodlad (1984) was one of the first to call for schools to become "...largely self-directing" (p. 276). Others felt that schools should be provided with substantial autonomy so that collective decision-making could be developed at the individual school level (Batth, 1985; Chubb, 1988).

As the effective school evidence increased and the understanding of the complex nature of successful schools evolved, school researchers began to focus on the topics of

Empowered employees apparently provided a two-fold benefit: they were able to make operational decisions about how the organization functions, and strategic decisions about why the organization should take a particular course of action (Wohlsetler & Smyer, 1994). Blust, Firestone and Richards (1991) fortified this awareness, “It seems clear that culture and leadership are critical; that improvement and renewal are continuous; that restructuring, site-based management, and decentralization may be key elements of improvement” (p. 136).

But the portrait of effective schools also had a hazy quality to it. Hallinger and Murphy (1986) revealed that effective school characteristics were not identical when their student populations were at different social and economic levels. They found that effective principals in lower social class schools exercised more direct control and authority over school operations, particularly with respect to expectations and achievement, than did effective principals in higher social class schools. Wood (1993) studied site-based management schools and worked in one that was practicing effective school correlates. Surprisingly, he found that site-based management had little impact on educational practice and in some cases inhibited improvement. Wood also found the correlates of effective schools ineffective for fostering improvement because they lacked a theoretical purpose. Furthermore, Wood observed avoidance of conflict, behaviors which reinforced a teaching culture that minimizes any hint of interference from colleagues. The consequence was that professionals undermined and eventually actively did not support efforts to restructure the school.
Perhaps the severest criticism of effective schools is in the works of Malen, Ogawa and Knaiz (1990) who countered that argument in the effective schools literature that school autonomy nurtures, in turn, the characteristics of successful schools. They wrote:

...there is no clear evidence in these sources that the provision of greater autonomy, or the delegation of formal decision making authority will produce these characteristics. In fact, proponents of this theory of action explicitly acknowledge the tentative nature of this relationship. They acknowledge that the creation of these characteristics may require different strategies in different settings, and that there are circumstances in which less autonomy rather than more probably better promotes effectiveness. (p. 322)

Despite the reservations of many reformers, but supported by the effective schools literature, the country bought into the notion that schools would have to be restructured in order for them to become successful. School leaders, politicians, and business leaders supported school-based management and the restructuring of governance structures to embody all educational stakeholders most affected by them (Apodaca-Tucker, 2001). With the clarion call for change, school-based management, with its emphasis on collegiality, collaboration, and shared governance, became a national trend starting in the mid-1980s. At the same time, Murphy and Beck (1995) cautioned:

Unencumbered by historical insights free from previous efforts at decentralization, thinly tethered to the available research base, and armed with an unassailable belief that this time, for a variety of reasons, shared decision-making
would produce dramatic results, SBM began to take root throughout the nations, and indeed, around the world. (p. 133)

*Business Models and School-based Management*

In the early 1980s America’s industries and corporations were seeking ways to become more efficient and competitive in the face of expanding markets due to globalization (Tach, 1991). The business world adopted management strategies such as Total Quality Management (TQM) and high-involvement management, both of which are based on the premise that “employees perform best in an environment where they are deeply involved in the ongoing improvement of the organization and are committed to its success” (Drury 1999, p. 3).

The search for solutions to the problems confronting education led analysts to learn about organizational restructuring in the corporate sector (Murphy & Beck, 1995). Politicians, policy setters, and the business community urged, and sometimes demanded through legislation, that educational leaders embrace business models in the hope of replicating the positive results that major corporations such as General Motors and Toyota experienced. Many saw these shared decision-making models as a reform initiative that would strengthen the nation's schools and give America a competitive edge on the world stage (Haggerty, 1995).

TQM and high-involvement management were participatory decision-making techniques that the corporate world had been experimenting with for 30 years, but they became prominent in the American psyche with the publication of *Out of the Crisis* (Deming, 1986). Deming (1986) and others (Crosby, 1989; Ishikawa, 1985) argued that
participative leadership offered a variety of benefits including the higher quality of decisions, greater acceptance of decisions by participants, more satisfaction with the decision process, and more development of decision-making skills. Apdoaca-Tucker (2001) pointed out how business and education started to intersect when she wrote:

The concept of school-based management (SBM) and shared decision-making (SDM) basically fell under the theoretical umbrella of participative management. School systems began to acknowledge the need to reform traditional hierarchical structures and to experiment with participative management styles to meet the needs of students who are falling behind acceptable academic standards. (p. 47)

Major educational organizations such as the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), and the National Association of Secondary Schools Principals (NASSP) jumped on the school-based management bandwagon and formed a task force in 1988 to study its philosophy and operations. Urging their collective membership to adopt SBM, the task force identified nine advantages for schools. It stated that school-based management: (a) formally recognized the expertise and competence of those who work in schools; (b) gave teachers, other staff members, and the community increased input into decisions; (c) improved morale of teachers; (d) focused decisions on accountability; (e) brought both financial and instructional resources in line with the instructional goals; (f) nurtured and stimulated new leaders; and (g) increased both the quantity and the quality of communication (American Association of School Administrators, National Association of Elementary School Principals, and National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1988).
School-based management was a minor player in the reform movement in the middle 1980s. However, that changed with the rapid-fire publication of a number of national reports. The era of national reports put school-based management solidly in the line-up of reform initiatives.

Era of National Reports

A chain of events can be traced to explain how school-based management was catapulted into the national spotlight in the late 1980s. Because of the plethora of government and foundation sponsored studies calling for participative management styles and local school autonomy, the period from 1986-1990 became known as the Era of National Reports (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Weighing in were such heavy weights as the Carnegie Corporation, the National Governor’s Association (NGA), the National Education Association (NEA), the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), the Education Commission of the States (ECS), and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). All endorsed and touted the importance of individual school decision making (Lewis, 1989).

The central message from reformers was that change had to begin at the building level. They argued for restructuring that would permit teachers and principals to shape and manage schools at the local level (Httl, 1990); and to enable the collaborative efforts of administrators, teachers, school board members, superintendents, parents and business and community leaders to accomplish this Herculean task (Funelt, 1989; Murphy & Evertson, 1991). A closer look at four of the reports of this era illuminates the role they played in launching school-based management as a national agenda.
In the midst of the national call to reform American public schools, the Carnegie Corporation, with its finger on the pulse of America, connected with the concerns of the nation. The report of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) stated:

The 1980s will be remembered for two developments: the beginning of a sweeping reassessment of the basis of the nation's economic strength and an outpouring of concern for the quality of American education. The connection between these two streams of thought is strong and growing. (p. 11)

The choice of topic for the Carnegie Commission was not serendipitous. Ogawa (1994) reported that in 1985, the President of the Education Commission of the States (ECS) suggested to the President of the Carnegie Corporation that the foundation should study the linkages between education and the economy. ECS had already published its own report, but the Chairman of the ECS task force was resigning and was concerned that the report would have limited impact. He shared his concern with the new President of the Carnegie Corporation, who then established the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, which in turn established the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. This task force conducted a comprehensive and exhaustive study of teaching and published its findings in a 1986 report entitled A Nation Prepared.

Many of the best and brightest talents in education, public service, business, and the foundation world were brought together through the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, with the sole purpose to motivate the country's leaders to action. The Forum appointed the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession that convened early in 1985. The Task Force's mission was "to explore the link between economic growth and
a well-educated citizenry" (Carnegie Corporation, 2003, p. 1), and comprised a
distinguished panel of headliners including John W. Gardner, former U.S. Secretary of
Health, Education and Welfare; Lewis M. Branscomb, chief scientist and vice president
of IBM corporation; four-time Governor of North Carolina, James B. Hunt, Jr.; Donald
Kennedy, president of Stanford University; and Fred Hechinger, President of the New
for the 21st Century* in May of 1986. The report called for sweeping changes in
education policy. Concluding that "America's ability to compete in world markets is
eroding," the Task Force emphasized that America's pursuit of excellence could not be
faint-hearted. "Such a pursuit—the very foundation of economic growth would depend
on achieving far more demanding educational standards than we have ever attempted to
reach before (Carnegie Corporation, 2003, p. 2).

Focusing on the main topic of teacher education and preparation, the report
emphatically recommended that the United States raise the bar for teacher recruitment
and training. Their suggestions included the establishment of a National Board for
Professional Teaching Standards, the abolition of the undergraduate major in education,
and the creation of master in teaching degree program.

But the Task Force also was concerned about the ability of schools to attract and
retain talented teachers. The report also called for increased pay for teachers and a
change in the way schools are governed. The Carnegie Forum on Education and the
Economy (1986) delivered this message:

One of the nation's goals must be to increase professional autonomy by having
teachers control the management and the instructional programs of schools.
Schools should be organized so that teachers have more authority to make important policy decisions, including the use of instructional methods and materials, the staffing, structure, organization of the school day, the assignment of students to grade or class, the hiring and use of support staff and consultants, and the allocation of resources available to the school. (p. 68)

Continuing with this theme, Wiggins (1986) observed:

The Carnegie Task Force went so far as to describe a scenario in which teachers effectively assume control of the management and instructional programs of schools. In one version of this development, a teacher committee would replace the principal in running the school. A Lead Teacher would be a managing partner of the team. Another prospect would be for teachers to hire their principals rather than the other way around. Details were unspecified. (p. 57)

The Carnegie Forum is credited with shifting the focus of reform to teacher professionalism (Marsh, 1994). The professionalism movement gained energy after the publication of *A Nation Prepared*. "Its most notable feature was a subtle yet profound change of focus: from teachers as instruments of school improvement to teachers as shapers of school improvement" (Finn, 2003). True to its word, the Task Force offered sweeping changes and the report immediately began to exert influence on educational policy.

_National Governors Association._

The National Governors Association (NGA) weighed in on the national debate on school reform. Located in Washington, D. C., NGA positions itself as a bipartisan
organization that "promotes state leadership, shares best practices, and speaks with a unified voice on national policy" (National Governors Association, n.d.). Seen as the collective voice of the nation's governors, it is an organization that exerts influence on the development of public policy. Because of the implied powers doctrine of the U.S. Constitution, education is a statutory responsibility of the states. Therefore, the National Governors Association has always actively disseminated best practices in education to each of the state governors.

With the publication of *A Nation at Risk*, the governors in particular were criticized for the declining school performance of America's youth. As a result, several governors stepped forward including Clinton of Arkansas, Kean of New Jersey, Alexander of Tennessee, and Riley of South Carolina. They took the lead in making educational improvement a priority. "In the 1980s, the 'entrepreneurial states' made improving schools their principal target for policy innovations. Their intense and pervasive activism, building on previous decades of more gradual state involvement resulted in the full-fledged emergence of state educational leadership" (Mazzoni, 1991, p. 115).

In the watershed year of 1986, the NGA published its report *A Time for Results*. Exhorting the nation to rally around its public education, the governors made numerous recommendations for improving student achievement. Fulrman (1990) characterized their response as follows:

The nation's governors have proposed 'an old-fashioned horse-trade', in which states would set standards and provide freedom from regulatory controls, particularly those related to educational processes. Schools and districts would be
accountable for results through public report cards; states would reward success and take over districts that ‘don’t make the grade’ (p. 264).

Key among the recommendations was support for school-based management.

The Carnegie Forum made a similar suggestion, and this was not a matter of happenstance. When the Executive Director of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, Marc Tucker, heard that NGA was also planning to publish a report on education and the economy, he marshaled both groups’ efforts to make similar recommendations with Governor Thomas Kean of New Jersey as a pivotal player.

Governor Kean was the lead education Governor for NGA, and also served as a member of the Carnegie Forum Task Force. He was greatly respected in both organizations, and as a result was able to rally the NGA membership to vote to endorse A Nation Prepared, an action unprecedented for the independent minded NGA (Ogawa, 1994).

The influence of the NGA continued past the publication of A Time for Results. Ogawa (1994) recounted:

In its efforts to gather and disseminate information about restructuring, NGA sponsored a meeting in 1988. The meeting was funded by a grant from the Carnegie Foundation. At that meeting, NGA gathered representatives of a variety of groups—including the Coalition of Essential Schools, Schools for the 21st Century from Washington state, the NEA’s Mastery in Learning, and the Carnegie Schools in Massachusetts—that were involved in efforts to restructure the organization of public schools. (p. 542)
Both the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy and the National Governors Association were two of the most prominent groups to shape and promote school-based management; but, they were not the only voices in the chorus.

*National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education and The Holmes Group.*

Although not as widely read, two reports, *A Call for Change in Teacher Education* by the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, and the Holmes Group report *Tomorrow's Teachers* continued the drumbeat for strengthening professional training for teachers. The National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education Task Force had seventeen members comprised of a governor, congresspersons, deans and presidents of colleges and a state superintendent. More importantly, the Task Force also included NEA President Mary Futrell and AFT President Albert Shanker. The Holmes Group was composed of seventeen education deans from notable universities with doctoral programs in education.

American Association of Colleges initiated the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education's (1985) report. *A Call for Change* highlights five themes: teacher supply and demand, content of teacher education programs, accountability for teacher education, resource requirements, and conditions to support quality teaching (Valli & Rennert-Arie, 2000). Joining the many who felt that the bureaucratic culture of schools was not attracting or keeping good teachers, the report called for the nation's schools to create a more professional environment. The report envisioned "a professional teacher who can lead to the transformation of the schools and
enrich the lives of young people" (p.4). In order to accomplish this the report exhorted schools of education to educate prospective teachers in the process of change and how to enact change.

Named in honor of a former Harvard graduate education dean who advocated strengthening teacher education, the Holmes Group report was similarly pitched. Although focused on the topic of teacher education, both reports excoriated bureaucratic authority in the schools, and stressed the need to increase professional autonomy in school (Wiggins, 1986). Furthering the call for professionalizing education in general, and teachers in particular, the reports based their thinking on the premise that professionalism would strengthen three important variables of teaching: commitment, efficacy and satisfaction (Murphy & Beck, 1995).

The call for change was gaining traction, and the teacher unions, the AFT in particular, were instrumental in capturing the national spotlight for school-based management. But it was clear that more than just teacher unions had to be involved in the campaign to secure school-based management as a reform measure.

The Promotion of School-based Management as a Reform

An unofficial and informal group of policy makers of teacher union members, and academics formed a network of supporters to promote the acceptance of school-based management programs (Fowler, 2000; Ogawa, 1994). The network was successful because it could facilitate communication and coordination among an eclectic alliance, thereby developing the ability to shape institutions (Scott, 1987). Ogawa (1994) "traced the basic SBM idea back to a group of individuals who had worked at the National
Institute of Education in the 1970s, several of whom had ties to Harvard University. They had seen school-based management as a way to improve education in the United States by professionalizing teaching" (p. 536).

Interest in school-based management coalesced as a major educational reform in 1986. Subsequent to this watershed year, three developments signaled the adoption of the decentralization of school administration. First, there was a marked increase in the number of school districts initiating school-based management plans. Second, numerous workshops on school-based management were sponsored and presented by national organizations, and third the publication of articles on the subject of school-based management increased dramatically (Fowler, 2000; Ogawa, 1994). These events were attributed to the publication in that year of *A Nation Prepared* and *Time for Results*.

"Both reports proposed SBM as a way to professionalize teaching, and both cited the three AFT locals who had negotiated SBM as positive examples" (Fowler, 2000, p. 176). Following the lead of the Carnegie Forum and of the National Governors Association, educators, union officials, politicians and reformists adopted the idea and issued a national call for decentralized decision-making. All had slightly different agendas, but collectively they saw school-based management as the means to improving schools, enhancing the status of teachers, and/or as an avenue for making America more competitive (David, 1996; Johnson & Kardos, 2000; Murphy & Beck, 1995).

Ogawa (1994) pointed out that school-based management "did not simply and suddenly appear on the American educational scene in the late 1980s" (p. 537). His research confirmed that during the 1970s and early 1980s several school districts had adopted SBM programs. Hammond, Indiana had implemented school-based management
in one school as part of a school improvement pilot program in 1981 (Ogawa & White, 1994), following Florida’s much earlier lead in 1973.

Ogawa (1994) identified three other precursors that made the late 1980s receptive to school-based management: school effectiveness reports, the relationship between education and business, and state-level politics of educational reform. A report by Elmore (1988) published by the National Governors Association highlighted the possible link between school-based management and school effectiveness. Additionally, restructured corporations were viewed as models for school improvement, and school-based management was seen as a way to make schools more competitive (Cotton, 1992; Cuban, 1990; Haggerty, 1995). Lastly, because of *A Nation at Risk*, a number of high profile governors took on the issue of school reform in their respective states and as a result, propelled it onto the national stage. Keach of New Jersey, Clinton of Arkansas, and Alexander of Tennessee proposed groundbreaking state initiatives as a follow-up to the National Governors Association report *A Time for Results* (Ogawa & White, 1994). All of these events paved the way for the national embrace of school-based management. But leading the parade were the teacher unions, with Albert Shanker of the AFT as the Grand Marshall.

The leaders of teachers unions were instrumental in shaping and promoting school-based management as an avenue for improving public education (Johnson & Kardos, 2000). Both the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) were involved, but Albert Shanker’s commitment to the idea and high profile as an educational leader made the AFT more influential. “Shanker, then president of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), had been intrigued by the
idea and had persuaded three AFT locals to negotiate school-based management into their contracts in the early 1980s" (Fowler, 2000, p. 176). Not surprisingly, Shanker was also a member of the Carnegie Task Force that had recommended shared decision-making in public school districts. As a result, he and the AFT promoted school-based management at every opportunity. An anonymous interviewee in Ogawa’s (1994) research observed, “Shanker has been out there. He has been putting his ideas every week in the New York Times. He has been traveling extensively preaching this doctrine” (p. 528).

With the demands for school reform, unions quickly understood that if their activities weren’t consistent with the best educational practices, then their efforts to create a greater role for collective bargaining would be indefensible (Johnson & Kardor, 2000). Although it might be likely to interpret union support as self-serving, Shanker and the unions were also seen as being interested in school-based management for the same genuine reasons as policy makers and politicians. It was seen as a vehicle for improving the performance of schools, and it was a way to enhance the professional status of teaching (Ogawa, 1994). Teacher unions were feeling the heat of the school reform debate. The highly publicized 1986 reports by the CFEE and NGS only intensified the debate. Unions did not want to be left out of the decision-making loop; therefore Shanker and others became vocal proponents of reform, and of school-based management in particular. Wiggins (1986) reported:

In their 1986 conventions, both the NEA and the AFT took official stands on portions of the Carnegie Task Force Report, and the AFT has issued its own report, “The Revolution That is Overdue”. The AFT has made a creditable effort to put the interests of the union in fine tune with the needs of the schools. We
may see the reform movement in teacher education and the teaching professions reach a new peak in 1987 as the American spotlight focuses on it. (p. 56)

Interest in SBM burgeoned after the banner year of 1986. Most telling were the number of educational leaders and school districts which embraced school-based management.

*Early State and District Participation*

Ogawa and White (1994) surveyed state departments of education and found that between 1986 and 1990, one third of all school districts in the United States had adopted of some form of school-based management. By 2000, over 20 states had passed legislation that allowed for site-based managed charter schools (Holloway, 2000). And excluded from these statistics are the many individual schools that implemented some form of SBM on their own. Studying Memphis, Tennessee's efforts to implement school-based management, Etheridge and colleagues (1994) astutely observed that when the bureaucratic paradigm shifts to a more democratic mode, the district, the school and all of the players have to realize that the change is not likely to be tidy, linear and/or sequential. The truth of this observation is illustrated when looking at four large school systems that joined the school-based management procession—Dade County, Florida; Rochester, New York; the City of Chicago; and the state of Kentucky. Two districts to quickly implement school-based management as a direct result of *A Nation Prepared* were Dade County, Florida and Rochester, NY. Each of these district's school-based management plans was based on contracts negotiated with local affiliates of AFT;
leaders in both districts attributed their adoption of decentralized decision making to the publication of that report (Ogawa, 1994).

_Dade County, Florida and School-based Management_

In Florida, the Professionalization of Teaching Task Force was formed with Superintendent Joseph Fernandez and the Dade County teachers union to investigate "ways to improve, [and] professionalize education to achieve restructured environments district-wide in which teachers and administrators could continually work together to improve educational programs" (Dade County Public Schools/United Teachers of Dade 1985-88, p. 2). The union contract specifically outlined steps the district and teacher unions would take to implement a pilot program in school-based management and shared decision-making. Dade County gained national attention and garnered accolades for being "...progressive, far-reaching, and precedent-setting" (Fernandez, 1990, p. 228).

Based on the success that Fernandez achieved in Florida, he was recruited to become Chancellor of the New York City Schools, where the efforts at decentralization would not meet such universal accolades. "The method of 'school-based management', brought from Miami to New York in the early 1990s by Chancellor Joseph Fernandez, was hailed nationally as a panacea, because it was supposed to bring the expertise of individual teachers to bear on school administration. But it changed little, except for making the teachers unions even more powerful" (Freedman, 1997, p. 2).

Decentralization efforts in New York never came to fruition and died completely when Fernandez left his position in 1993. School-based management remained an integral part
of Florida’s reform through the late 1990s, when issues such as school choice and meeting the mandates of No Child Left Behind eclipsed it.

Rochester, NY and School-based Management

Rochester, NY responded with similar alacrity to institute SBM. Written into the union’s 1987 contract was a single sentence, "The Board and the Superintendents and the Association agree to cooperatively participate in the development of school-based planning at each school location" (City School District of Rochester, NY, and the Rochester Teachers Association, 1987). The swiftness with which the city bureaucracy was able to react to A Nation Prepared was because of a strong, cooperative relationship between the president of the teachers’ union and the district superintendent (Koppich, 1993). "The New York Times saluted the Rochester superintendent and the union president as saviors of education and implied that there was national interest in what they had accomplished" (Geisert, 1988, p. 58).

School-based planning teams in all Rochester schools were put into practice in the fall of 1988. Teams were composed of five teachers, the building principal, and two to three parents. By contract, principals chaired the teams, which were empowered to be decision-making bodies, and decisions were to be made by consensus. Each school team negotiated with the district to set targets for student performance and to secure the resources necessary to achieve the goals (Koppich, 1993). Reviewing progress three years after the institution of school-based planning in Rochester, Keppich (1993) wrote:

...school-based planning, with its emphasis on student outcomes, looks good on paper but seems shaky in operation. Few schools are making substantial changes.
It simply is not clear that teachers or administrators have the same appetite for risk and tolerance for ambiguity as do their leaders. (p. 155)

**Chicago and School-based Management**

In 1988, the Illinois legislature enacted the *Chicago School Reform Act*. Initiated by Mayor Harold Washington, its major intent was to weaken the centralized bureaucratic control of the Chicago Public Schools, which was responsible for creating a failing school system in the nation’s second largest city (Bryk, Sebring, Kerbow, Rollow & Easton, 1998). Unique to other forms of SBM, Chicago’s approach ceded power to parents, community members, and others who were not the educators. The legislation called for each public school to form a local school council (LSC), of six elected parents, two appointed community representatives, two appointed teachers, and the principal. Chicago’s LSC’s constituted “the largest concentration of non-white, female, and economically disadvantaged elected officials in the nation” (Wade, 2004, p. 30).

The LSC’s were invested with considerable decision-making authority including:

(a) adopting and monitoring a school improvement plan that included decisions about curriculum and pedagogical approaches; (b) approving a budget and controlling the use of resources; (c) determining school staffing, through selecting the principal, evaluating his or her performance and deciding whether to fire or continue the principal’s contract at the end of a four-year term (Weiss & Ziebarth, 2001). Aware of the weaknesses of other attempts to empower local constituencies, the Illinois legislature sought to give local constituencies the genuine authority to make decisions, with the local school councils as
the legitimate source of power in school affairs (Bryk, Sebring, Kerbow, Ro
dow & Easton, 1998).

Considerable research followed in the steps of Chicago's bold experiment in
decentralization. A study by the Chicago Consortium on School Research (CCSR)
showed that 50% of low performing elementary schools attributed significant change to
the LSC's, and that another 25% made some progress towards that goal (Wade, 2004).
Yet these percentages did not hold true for all levels of schooling, as Wade explained:

....it would be an overstatement to call decentralization a ringing success—a
'work in progress' would be more apt. Most schools moved ahead under local
control, but many did not, especially at the secondary level. While the stereotype
of conflict-laden LSC's was overblown, 12 percent of LSC members identified
conflict as a problem. More common is the problem of ennui, with low
participation in biannual LSC elections, inadequate training, minimal working
structures, and/or co-optation by principals who hand picked or simply ignored
their councils. (p. 31)

By the mid-1990s, the independence afforded LSC's was reevaluated by the
Illinois legislature. In 1995, it enacted the Chicago School Reform Amendatory Act,
which "required a number of changes in district governance, including granting authority
over the district to the mayor. The act also gave the school board power to hold LSCs
accountable to district-wide standards, essentially diminishing LSC's ability to operate
independently of school board policy" (Weiss & Ziebarth, 2001, p. 4).

Despite the difficulties that were encountered, and with its goal to engage parents
and community members along with teachers and principals as major decision-makers in
school change, Chicago’s foray into SBM was recognized as the most comprehensive version of community involvement in school-based decision-making (North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 1993).

**Kentucky and School-based Management**

Alleging that Kentucky’s school funding was inadequate and inequitable, 66 of the state’s school districts filed a lawsuit in 1985 against the state and its leaders. Upheld by the Kentucky Supreme Court, the state’s entire system of public schools was declared to be unconstitutional. In swift and dramatic fashion, the state legislature enacted the **Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) of 1990**, which put into place a comprehensive approach to improving the state’s public education system. As part of this groundbreaking piece of legislation, every school in the state was required to engage in School-based Decision Making (SBDM). The implementation was through Councils that were comprised of three elected teacher representatives, two elected parent representatives and the principal. The teachers and parent members of the SBDM’s were elected for one-year terms, but were eligible to seek reelection (Kentucky Department of Education, 1993).

KERA was comprehensive and gave the Councils the authority to make policy decisions about curriculum, instructional methods and materials, assignment of students, daily schedule, discipline and classroom management, staff positions at the school, assignment of staff time, school budget, and extracurricular programs and their policies (Kentucky Association of School Councils, 2002). Training to operate as a Council was
required and was provided to members of SBDM Councils both from within the local school district and from outside the district.

Several studies (David, 1994; Logan, 1992; Kentucky Institute for Education Research, 1995) analyzed the effectiveness of the SBDM Councils. Klecker, Austin and Burns (1999) studied the decisions made by the Councils and documented their strengths and weaknesses. By interviewing and surveying 344 SBDM Councils, these researchers found that most members of the Council were relatively inexperienced; and that they made many more decisions in the areas of budget, Council procedures, and personnel consolation than in any other areas where they had mandates. Klecker, Austin and Burns (1999) also deduced:

The inexperienced Council members may have focused on those areas of decision-making that are absolutely required for the survival of the school, budget, Council procedures, and personnel management. It is also probable that they may have felt these areas were more important than the nine categories of policy making mandated in KRS 160.345. With the almost constant turnover of members, the Councils may not have matured to the point of considering the areas of curriculum, instructional procedures, etc. (p. 12)

Because of the short one-year terms for Council members, several studies recommended that Kentucky consider changing the law to require two-year terms of office with staggered elections, to insure continuity. With the desire to improve student performance, a further recommendation was that the state should provide technical assistance to bolster a Council's capability and confidence with the aim of focusing it
more on curriculum and instructional practices (David, 1994; Klecker, Austin & Burns, 1999).

Early Studies and School-based Management Effectiveness

With the dramatic increase in the use of school-based management as a tool for reform, anecdotal and research data were generated. Scholarly journals and professional magazines began to disseminate this body of information to help educators, policymakers, and communities to better understand school-based management. Observations and formal research data both corroborated findings, but they also brought to light some contradictions and the complexities of this approach. The following highlights some of the early results from SBM programs.

School-based management had a number of positive effects. School leaders and staff members reported that it increased their ability to use resources and personnel more efficiently, and that it increased their sense of professionalism. Parents and students reported higher levels of satisfaction in SBM schools (Peterson, 1991). Parents reported their appreciation of increased community involvement (Drury & Levin, 1994). Surveys of principals revealed their high deep satisfaction with school-based management, despite an increase in their workloads (Peterson, 1991).

School-based management seems to have had its greatest impact on school climate. Teachers collaborated more and were absent less (Nobel, Deemer & Davis, 1996). These findings were supported by Leithwood and Menzie's (1998) meta-analysis of 83 research studies on the subject. They reported:
Positive effects for teachers include increased collaboration, changes in classroom instruction, a sense of increased control over one's work, and a sense of increased accountability. Principals are found to take on a more managerial role, to become information resources, and to have increased accountability. Parents show an increased satisfaction in their schools. Although none of these results indicates a change in student achievement, the effects seem to increase the overall quality of the educational environment. (Leithwood & Menzie, 1998, cited in Vincent & Johnson, 2000, p. 6)

Similarly, Conley (1993) observed that "genuine participation in decisions that affect the lives of the participants leads to interdependence, trust, and a sense of ownership, which helps to build commitment" (p. 8). Clearly, school-based management improved the quality of life among professionals and subsequently improved the overall climate and effectiveness of a school (Apodaca-Tucker, 2001).

However, at the same time there was extensive data that identified the obstacles to success and/or failures of school-based management. The data suggest that one problem was that many practitioners possessed a fundamental misunderstanding: the failure to recognize the difference between decentralization and shared decision-making (Lipham, Rankin & Hoeh, 1985). The former simply transferred authority from the district office to local schools, while the latter extended more meaningful leadership opportunities to other stakeholders. Bimber (1993) wrote that too often a district's plan for decentralization was ill-defined. School district players often disagreed over its purpose. Some saw it as a process to draw a wider group into the decision-making process, while others saw it as a plan to make schools more independent from the central office. Often
the result was fragmented decision-making authority, which complicated how the school organization functioned. Similarly, districts and schools often rushed into school-based management, which resulted in poorly defined site teams, little or no training for its participants, and debilitating frustration for school personnel who lacked real authority to make meaningful decisions. The researchers concluded that educational leaders didn’t recognize the difference between decentralization and shared decision-making, and therefore didn’t plan for the transition from traditional structures to the more innovative ones (Halloway, 2000).

Despite many positive results for teachers and school cultures, school-based management was often ignored or undermined by school personnel. Because school initiatives frequently came from the principal but were opposed by teachers, Weiss (1993) found that teachers “acted as a brake on the pace of school reform” (p. 69). They saw shared-decision making as just another fad, taking their time and draining their energy. Additionally, SBM required them to assume new roles and relationships that could be ambiguous, uncomfortable and time-consuming (Lashway, 1996).

Research frequently cited the increased workload for SBM participants. Noble, Deemer and Davis (1996) documented its consequences:

Already burdened by regular teaching duties, teachers who experience the increased workload associated with site-based management may feel overwhelmed. This situation may accelerate teacher burnout and turnover rates. Research also has shown that site-based management slows down the decision-making process and leads to increased frustration by participants working hard to implement changes in the best interest of students. Rather than increasing morale
and effort, poorly planned site-based management efforts may have an opposite effect on schools. (cited in Vincent & Johnson, p. 12)

Many researchers noticed that teachers became disenchanted with SBM over time. Initial enthusiasm waned as the practice continued because teachers frequently saw little or no improvement in working conditions or student outcomes (Peterson, 1991). Another recurring theme was that teachers were disillusioned with the kinds of decisions on which they had impact, or which they were allowed. The research data established “that teachers’ desires to participate in decision-making centers on the school’s technical core—its curriculum and instructional program. Unfortunately, districts are often unwilling to delegate real decision-making authority to schools in these areas” (Cotton, 2001, p. 9).

From 1986 to the mid 1990s basic lessons were learned about school-based management. Comparing successful and not successful SBM schools, Odden and Wohlstetter (1995) isolated two conditions necessary for success: (a) school personnel had to have real authority over the budget, personnel, and curriculum, and (b) the school’s focus had to be on curriculum and teaching. Researchers also identified a phenomenon that plagued school-based management: too often site councils and school staff were concerned about their own power, and unfortunately focused on marginal issues such as parking, bus supervision, and handbook revision rather than on instructional practices (Bimber, 1993; Briggs & Wohlstetter, 1999; David, 1995; Griffin, 1995). “It is evident that while teachers may be closest to the classroom, they do not automatically zero in on substantive instructional issues. Because the reasons appear to
be rooted in the overall culture of schools, steering the discussion to productive agendas is not a simple task (LaRosway, 1996, p. 3).

Other obstacles in the implementation of SBM surfaced. School personnel often complained about unrealistic expectations, lack of clarity about roles, and incongruence between decisions desired and decisions allowed (Clune & White, 1988; Lindquist & Matriel, 1989; Malen, Ogawa & Kranz, 1990). Insufficient support for site councils emerged as an issue for their members, as well as for principals. Too often councils were given extensive responsibilities, but lacked the capability and skills to carry out those responsibilities. Typical problems included lack of knowledge of school operations, lack of group process skills, and lack of clarity about roles (Cotton, 1992). Another frustration for site councils was the fact that many school-based initiatives became modifications of traditional hierarchical models rather than actual restructuring of decision-making power (David, 1995). Additionally, many councils found themselves constrained by existing federal, state, school board, district, and teacher union regulations, leaving very few decisions over which they had control. Research showed that flexibility and selective waiving of these constraints were associated with the more successful school-based management efforts (Cotton, 1992).

The allocation of time emerged as the most frequently mentioned barrier to successful implementation. The additional hours required to implement SBM produced stress. This led to feelings of pessimism and burnout, particularly on the part of teachers (Ceperley, 1991).

Importantly, the research pointed to the need for patience and persistence when tackling a complex organizational structure such as school-based management. To deal
with all of the above issues and the many others that surfaced, school districts had to be committed to the long haul if they intended SBM to succeed at creating positive change. The research on school-based management made it abundantly clear that full institutionalization of a school-based process takes a long time—as long as five years or more (Bryk, Lee & Smith, 1990).

As the initial period of school-based management, 1986-1990, came to a close, educators saw that they were not making the gains they had hoped, and the public saw that America’s schools were still failing many of its youth. Malen, Ogawa and Kranz (1990) observed that SBM could actually impede school improvement efforts when it diverted attention from teaching and learning. Therefore, learning how to implement it became crucial. Newmann and Wehlage (1995) analyzed this predicament:

Restructuring initiatives, by definition, introduce substantial departures from conventional practice. New configurations of power and authority challenge educators, students, and parents to perform new roles that require new skills and attitudes. The more that new practices and structural tools depart from conventional practice, the greater the difficulties of implementation. Overcoming these difficulties, then, becomes a dominant concern of reformers, practitioners, and researchers. The prevailing issue often becomes, how do we implement the new practice or structural tool? (p. 2)

What was the best line of attack for the implementation of school-based management? The research was clear: the success of SBM depended on the willingness of educators to focus decision-making on positively influencing student learning rather than on other issues. "Considerable time and energy will be required to negotiate the
details of new responsibilities and relations. There is a tendency to place inordinate
attention on the technical aspects of school-site management and forget the goal: an
improving school where students learn at their potential" (Mojkowski & Fleming, 1988,
p. 14). SBM practitioners, aided by solid research, came to understand these
complexities. As they moved into the decade of the 1990s with newfound insights,
educators readjusted their implementation strategies to mirror these understandings.


The following Ishikawa diagram lays out the primary causal factors for the
emergence of school-based management for the decade from 1980 to 1989. Each factor
is assigned to one of the five causal factorial categories. A narrative summary follows.

Figure 5.2 Causal Factors of School-based Management—1980-1989

Two societal/cultural causal factors during this decade that created the need for change in America’s educational system were the dramatic change in student demographics of those attending public schools, and the impacts on children of societal changes during the decade. The increase in minority and immigrant children along with the impacts of poverty, drug addiction, unemployment, and changing family structures, forced schools to reevaluate the process of schooling and to seek more effective solutions to problems related to increasing academic achievement.

The evolution from an industrial to post-industrial era is a societal/cultural causal factor for the movement of schools toward decentralized models of decision-making. New viewpoints emerging from the information and service economies fueled the acceptance of stakeholders to participate meaningfully in relevant decisions. With the increasing concern in the 1980s about the quality of public education, society supported the significant restructuring of education, which as an umbrella issue was another major societal/cultural causal factor for the implementation of school-based management.

Numerous governmental/political causal factors came to bear on the development of school-based management during the 1980s. *A Nation at Risk* set the stage for school reform, and for the Era of Reports (1986-1990), which preceded it. Four reports, *A Nation Prepared, A Time for Results*, The Holmes Group report, and *A Call for Change in Teacher Education*, all called for sweeping changes in education policy and specifically advocated for participative management in school governance.

An ambiguously defined, yet potent societal/political causal factor for change was the informal network of policy makers, teacher union members, and academics that
formed during the decade. The network supported school-base management as an educational reform and succeeded in promoting its interests through effective communication and tight coordination of their efforts.

State-level politics, teacher unions, and school funding challenges were governmental/political casual factors that advanced school-based management. The direct involvement of high profile state governors and teacher union officials made them significant forces for introducing educational structures that incorporated shared decision-making. Contentious debates about how best to fund schools, and the allocation of school finances, contributed to the movement to evaluate and to reorganize the public schools. States such as Kentucky adopted a comprehensive approach to improving the state’s education system. The Kentucky Education Reform Act mandated the use of school-based decision making in every school in the state.

Three interconnected economic causal factors were responsible for promoting school-based management: the perceived economic crisis of the 1980s, global competitiveness, and corporate restructuring. With an economic recession in the early part of the decade fueled by corporate downsizing, plant closings, and rising unemployment, Americans realized that their country was in an economic crisis. This spurred a concern that the country was losing its ability to compete globally, so corporations and businesses across the country started to look for ways to restructure to meet the new demands of a global economy. A number of large corporations turned to high-involvement management models such as Total Quality Management, whose tenets were later replicated in school districts across the country.
Three large and pervasive movements, school restructuring, effective schools, and professionalization, were the major educational causal factors that led to school-based management in public schools. School restructuring's first wave focused on accountability but it was found to be ineffectual in improving student achievement. The second wave proposed systemic change, i.e. eliminating top-down decision-making structures, and encouraging a sense of collective responsibility for the reform efforts that a school had initiated. The Chicago school district's implementation of local school councils represents an expression of this kind of radical change. The Effective Schools research supported the benefits of teacher empowerment and stakeholder involvement in school decisions. These findings, in turn, offered compelling evidence that schools needed to be more professional environments. This conclusion was equally supported by the numerous high-profile national reports issued during the later part of the decade.

From 1990 to the Present

At the start of the 1990s, school improvement remained a national focus. With the urging of state and district policymakers, SBM efforts increasingly became focused on improving student achievement (Newmann & Wehlage, 1995). Federal legislation, state regulations, district mandates, and local school and community interests, all continued to demand change and improvement in America's public schools. "These voices have vigorously exhorted school administrators and teachers to respond to the challenges of producing a more technologically prepared citizenry and to the needs of various student populations designated as at-risk" (Apodaca-Tucker, 2001, p. 39).
This researcher’s evaluation of school-based management programs reveals that during its early stages reformers viewed SBM as the end result. SBM was adopted and implemented as a stand-alone reform to remedy a variety of school problems—a “magic bullet” in the form of shared-decision making. But because of increased workloads for school personnel, and intensified pressures from disgruntled politicians and parents, it became apparent that school-based management would have to have a greater purpose if it was to withstand public demands for improvement (Weiss, 1993). “Schools have failed to address improvements in curriculum and instruction and also have failed to keep focusing on improving student outcomes. Working toward clear district goals and standards helps school-site councils keep this focus” (Cotton, 1992, p. 10).

Conley’s (1993) views were insightful. Noting that the term restructuring was ambiguous, he made three distinctions between three levels of change, which he termed renewal, reform, and restructuring. Renewal refers to activities that help an organization to do a better job of what it is already doing. Reform activities are ones that alter existing ways of operating so that an institution can adapt to new situations. Restructuring creates more fundamental change; it redefines the basic features of an organization with the primary purpose of improving student performance. Schools moved from a reform mode in the 1980s to a restructuring mode in the 1990s. Conley believed that if schools were to truly restructure, they would have to examine and change their underlying assumptions, values, beliefs, practices and relationships (Apodaca-Tucker, 2001).

The message throughout the research was clear: the ultimate goal of all school-based management efforts must be to improve student achievement. Additionally, the priorities must include a focus on the challenges to the curriculum and instructional
process, and a commitment to assess progress toward the educational goals of the district and the individual school (Briggs & Wohlstetter, 1999; Cotton, 1992; Davia, 1995; Odden & Wohlstetter, 1995). Rolling up their sleeves, "some schools found good results by beginning with an explicit discussion of the school's mission and vision for the future" (Weiss, 1993, p. 69). Others started the process of restructuring by experimenting with innovative schedules and instituting new organizational structures. At another level, boards and superintendents modeled genuine acceptance of a shared decision-making process and created a safe environment in which the process could work (Else, 2000).

Studying successful school-based management sites, Odden and Busch (1998) delineated a comprehensive list of must do's for schools. They included: (a) using standards to focus the school on student learning; (b) involving all of a school's teachers in decision-making, not just a few; (c) allowing individual schools to recruit and select their own faculty; (d) providing continuous school-wide professional development; (e) creating a professional school culture committed to producing higher levels of student learning for all; (f) sharing school information with a broad range of school constituents; (g) rewarding staff actions that help to achieve school objectives; (h) selecting principals who can facilitate and manage change; and (i) providing schools control over budget and ability to reallocate resources.

Mohrman and Wohlstetter (1994) labeled schools that did all or most of the above as high-performance schools: that is, places of learning that combined the governance reform of SBM with an overall push for curriculum and instructional reform. "With this combination councils could focus on ways to improve student academic performance and make schools more interesting places to work. Without the combination, SBM becomes
a political reform whereby the council at the school site ends up spending its time
deciding who is empowered and who isn't" (Wohlstetter, cited in Oswald, 1995, p. 3).

Chicago and Kentucky responded to the research, as well as to their own
observations. Both made significant modifications to their initial mandates for school-
based management in their respective jurisdictions.

In 1995, the Illinois legislature passed the Chicago School Reform Amendatory
Act. Its purpose was to bring more accountability to Chicago schools, and the local
school councils (LSC) in particular (Wade, 2004). Data showed that parents and
community members became more empowered, but student achievement did not
positively correlate with this development. The legislature handed over governing
authority to Mayor Richard M. Daley, who gained the power to override LSC's, if need
be. A major provision of the law was that an Academic Accountability Council was to
monitor school performance and to identify failing schools. The district, at the behest of
the Mayor, could intervene and implement wide-ranging corrective measures. The
LSC's, the district, and the Mayor began to work in concert, all with the single purpose to
improve student performance. Stricter student promotion standards were put into place
for grades 3, 6 and 8. "Students in third grade who scored more than one year below
grade level, and sixth graders who scored more that one and a half years below grade
level, were required to attend summer school" (Crump, 1999, p. 34). The 1995 Act gave
LSC's more budgetary latitude, but also gave the superintendent veto power over an
LSC's decision to renew its principal's contract. Weiss and Ziebarth (2001) observed:

Determining the degree to which the changes in student achievement in the
Chicago schools result from the 1988 law versus the 1995 law is a difficult
endeavor. What is clear, though, is that after some decreases in student achievement during the early years of the reform effort, important gains have occurred, particularly since 1995. For example, a study of standardized test scores in the Chicago schools strongly suggests that the 1988 and 1995 changes precipitated substantial improvements in achievement in a large number of elementary schools. (p. 4)

Not nearly as draconian as the Chicago revisions, Kentucky took it upon itself to continually tweak and strengthen its 1990 Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA). "KERA was enacted to improve student learning by letting the people closest to students make educational decisions" (Kentucky Department of Education, 1993, p. 1). Taking these words seriously, the Kentucky legislature passed a series of bills over a ten year period to increase the positive effects of KERA. To strengthen the council structure, new and returning members were required to receive annual training. Furthermore, councils which hired a principal were obligated to complete training on recruiting and interviewing.

Kentucky also turned its legislative attention to improving student achievement. School councils were directed to develop comprehensive school improvement plans using school assessment data disaggregated by race, gender, disability, English proficiency, and participation in the federal free- and reduced-price lunch program. A school with significant gaps in any of these categories was directed to develop a plan for closing it within a set two-year period. Senate Bill 111, enacted in 2004, transferred council authority in schools failing to meet school accountability goals for (2) two-year cycles in a row. Realizing that teachers were an important part of the achievement equation,
Kentucky legislators also directed councils to use three of the four professional
development days, required by Kentucky law, for training that would specifically help
teachers to improve academic achievement (Kentucky Department of Education, 1993;
Kentucky Association of School Councils, 2002).

The research studies in the 1990s helped to clarify certain aspects of school-based
management. In schools that concentrated decision-making on improving student
achievement, there was not one “most effective” model of SBM. George (1991)
reviewed the research and found a number of essential components for successful school-
based management: “training, a gradual transition, financial support, shared goals,
administrators willing to share authority, and support from the school community”
(George, 1991, p. 6).

Also evident in research was the finding that when school-based management was
authentically implemented, it changed the whole system of a district, and the entire
organization of a school (White, 1989). It restructured roles, as well and as
organizations. “School-based management and shared decision making strategies
directly challenge and seek to change the complex and well-entrenched patterns of
institutional and individual behavior that have remained untouched by top-down reforms
(Mutchler, 1990, p. 4). The following outlines how the roles of SBM players changed.

Board of Trustees and School-based Management

Perhaps of all the players in a school district, the role of the Board of Education
changed least when districts transferred to a shared-decision making model. School-
based management did not change the legal governance system of schools; therefore,
school boards did not give up authority by sharing authority. The main responsibilities of a board remained that of setting broad policies, allocating resources, monitoring progress and establishing a clear and unifying vision for the district and the schools (American Association of School Administrators, National Association of Elementary School Principals, and National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1988).

More importantly, it is the responsibility of a Board to support the efforts of the district. "In particular, the board’s clear message of support for school-based management lends credibility and fosters positive community attitudes toward SBM projects. The board’s role does not change as dramatically as that of some stakeholders, but its support remains vital" (Cotton, 1992, p. 8).

**Role of the Superintendent and District Office**

Whenever a shared decision-making model was introduced in a school system, the role of the superintendent did change. The main efforts of the superintendent had to be directed toward the smooth implementation of SBM in the district. To this end, superintendents had to model a collaborative approach to decision making, and to promote the district’s goals for school-based management. These steps helped to facilitate parallel actions at the school level. Superintendents and the central office staff also had to provide technical assistance when a school had difficulties with the implementation of a school-based management program. (Dolan, 1994; Orando & Gosech, 1999).

Research continued to point out that vague role definitions were a major impediment to the successful execution of SBM. All stakeholders needed to understand
the expectations and parameters of the site-based management effort, or else participants experienced frustration and/or cynicism about the endeavor (Holloway, 2000). The literature, in fact, describes "a pattern where central administration oversold decisions made at the site or quickly moved back to a centralized decision-making system, which lead to disillusionment of those involved" (Guthrie, 1986, p. 309). Superintendents in successful SBM districts provided clear role descriptions and responsibilities, including role descriptions for themselves.

Researchers also observed a problem endemic to school districts—staff turnover which Dolan (1994) contributes to the fragility of school-based management, especially in the early stages of implementation. School districts that experienced frequent changes in leadership found that SBM was at risk. Dolan (1994) reminded participants:

The sustainability of shared decision-making may be threatened by changes in leadership. New principals, board members, union representatives, and superintendents often bring new initiatives and management styles. Because site-based management goals may take several years to implement, district must create an infrastructure that will sustain shared decision-making even if the personnel change. The implementation of site-based management should be systemic and not based on individual preference. (p. 6)

Role of the Principal

Throughout the research history of school-based management, the evidence was unmistakable: the principal remained a key figure in the successful integration of shared-decision making (Conley, 1993; George, 1991; Reynolds, 1997). The Consortium on
Chicago School Research (CCSR) found that principals were the single most important factor in promoting school-based management. "Principals in successful SBM schools worked to create opportunities and remove barriers so that others could assume leadership positions" (Briggs & Wohlstetter, 1999, p. 18). This step was taken by distributing power, generating agreement around school goals, encouraging teachers to participate in school improvement efforts, and collecting information and distributing rewards (Briggs & Wohlstetter, 1999). Principals who had success in a decentralized school organization possessed the appropriate skill set. Principals who did not succeed were frequently in schools that were struggling to adapt to innovations, and then limited the participation of site councils, or allowed them to focus on trivial matters.

Researchers indicated that shared decision-making brought challenges, as well as benefits. Herman (1991) studied principals in SBM schools, and found that the anxiety levels for some principals increased as they encountered newly empowered teachers and parents. For others, "administrators may be faced with learning new skills and finding new ways to deal with the faculty. Principals may find the former too threatening and the latter time-consuming and inefficient" (Mofurman, 1994, p. 191).

Principals' reactions to school-based management varied. Administrators in Rochester, NY were vocal in their denouncement of the district's embrace of school-based management. They complained that their union was never consulted and that it never participated in the formation of the district's plan to implement it (Koppich, 1992). On the other hand, the Consortium on Chicago School Research found that 85% of Chicago principals supported their LSC's and maintained a cooperative relationship with its members. "Clearly, the weight of school-based management falls on the principal,
His/she is the crux of district organization. While some concerns are raised about the onus of the office, most appear to favor decentralization quite strongly" (Brown, 1990, p. 168).

**Role of Teachers**

The literature has identified many benefits for teachers when a district undertakes school-based management. Some of the documented gains were increased job satisfaction, better school-wide decision making, more interest and ownership of school outcomes, and increases in student achievement. School administrators also reported that shared-decision making minimized the sabotaging of decisions by faculty (Diamuke, 1992; Keats & Girling, 1991; March & Sinon, 1985). Cotton (1992) observed that teachers had been isolated from meaningful involvement in significant decision-making, and from frequent professional contact with one another for so long, that school-based management significantly increased their involvement in these areas. Quinn and Troy-Quinn (2000) summarized the research of teacher perceptions and reactions to shared decision-making into four generalizations: (a) participation in policy formulation enhanced teacher professionalism and job satisfaction, (b) teachers generally gave high praise to principals who involved them in policy formulation, (c) teachers neither wanted nor sought the opportunity to be involved in every decision, and (d) their participation produced ancillary benefits that included higher productivity, reduced staff turnover, and decreased grievances (pp. 58-60).

Many reformers argued that because teachers were the ones who eventually carried out the legislation and educational mandates, they should be included in the
decision-making process. Despite the positives, experience showed that teachers weren't always willing to carry the extra burden of decision-making. Ovando (1994) found that many teachers did not want to take on administrative duties in addition to their teaching responsibilities. They preferred that the principal make necessary decisions in keeping with the school's culture and overarching goals. Teachers reacted negatively to the lost preparation time, and the extended hours that were required for their participation in shared decision-making. Many others felt that the time it took away from students and the classrooms were unacceptable sacrifices.

The research also describes tensions and conflicts in the interaction between administration and teaching faculty in a school that shared decision-making. Echoing much of the literature, teachers also felt they suffered from vague role descriptions. Smith (1993) concluded that districts that gave little or no guidance, and that provided little clarity of the role of teachers in making decisions, often created levels of ambiguity that caused teachers to build their own varying definitions of school-based management (Smith, 1993). Sometimes the result of lack of clarity about roles was reaction, frustration and alienation from the very process that was supposed to include teachers. In other situations, teachers felt that school-based management was there in name, but not in practice. Administrators, often afraid to let go of the reins of control, reverted to a top-down hierarchical structure. Many times opinions were forced on the faculty that ultimately encouraged fear and submission rather than trust and collaboration (Button, 2001).

The fact that school-based management did not significantly alter classroom practices has been corroborated through school observations, anecdotal reports and
formal studies. They also suggest that newly empowered teachers did not focus on substantive instructional issues (Griffin, 1995; Levey & Ackers-Hocevar, 1998; Peterson, 1991). In a qualitative case study of five teachers in redesigned schools, Griffin (1995) found that the teachers expressed enthusiasm and satisfaction with their new roles, but mainly focused their decision-making powers on school-wide issues, and ignored or avoided examining classroom instruction. The reasons that surfaced for this occurrence were numerous: (a) teachers saw themselves as competent, therefore not needing help in the classroom, (b) teachers autonomy bolstered the notion that classrooms were their private domain, (c) teachers were hesitant to be critical of a colleague’s practices, even if they found them wanting, and (d) teachers felt overloaded, and the addition of shared decision making only added to this feeling.

All of the above served to create confusions and obstacles that needed to be addressed in order to involve teachers seriously and effectively in SBM.

Role of Parents

In many cases, school-based management altered the role of parents in a school or district. Cross and Reitzeg (1995) studied three Midwest urban districts and found that school-based management provided “a context for substantive parent involvement that goes beyond traditional bake sales and fund-raising” (p. 16). Other researchers noted that parents in decentralized school districts with shared decision-making gained a sense of ownership and it increased their feelings of usefulness. Cotton (1992) explained that because parents and community representatives had generally been underutilized in schools, any attempt to include them was perceived as positive.
However, in transitioning to a shared decision-making model, principals and teachers found it difficult or were uneasy engaging parents in candid discussions (Apadaca-Tucker, 2001). As a result, communication became limited. The University of Wisconsin’s Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools (CORS) research discovered that when professional educators controlled the flow of information, parent participation was largely symbolic. The connection between effective parent participation and the flow of school information was becoming clearer as evidenced “by successful SBM schools where power and information were dispersed broadly and parents became involved in significant decisions regarding curriculum, instruction and assessment” (Briggs & Wohlstetter, 1999, p. 15).

The research is inconclusive on the subject of empowering parents to make decisions that relate to the affairs of a school (Beck & Murphy, 1999). Anyon (1995) came to the conclusion that school reform efforts that ostensibly involved parents in decision making often reinforced traditional power relations. Beck and Murphy (1999) explained that the influence exerted by principals and teachers, and/or the perceptions by parents that school personnel were the “experts”, often curtailed parental participation in decision-making.

We emerged from our investigation more convinced than ever that the creation of structures to involve parents is, by itself, not enough to ensure their substantial involvement in their children’s education. Such structures may be good starting points if involved persons are willing to reach out to one another, to listen, to respond and to persist in efforts to create a democratic community. If the commitment to empowering is not present in a school, we fear that the creation of
a site council with parent representatives may actually reinforce stereotypes and perpetuate unequal influence patterns. (p. 100)

Later Studies of School-based Management and Student Achievement

The emergence of the curriculum standards movement in the late 1990s narrowed the focus for schools on student achievement (Coffey & Lashway, 2002; McChesney & Hertling, 2000; Wraga, 1999). School districts that employed SBM were mandated by states and municipalities to focus their decision-making authority on improving their students' achievement levels. Concomitantly, school-based management studies shifted their concern from teacher job satisfaction and school culture to instructional practices and student achievement (Odden & Wohlstetter, 1995). These new research findings supported the opinion that school-based management improved student academic performance—under certain circumstances.

More specifically, Briggs and Wohlstetter (1999) found that successful school-based management settings shared similar characteristics. Chief among them was that they had an "active, living vision focused on teaching and learning that was coordinated with district and state standards for student performance" (p. 6). Decision-making authority in the areas of budget, curriculum, and personnel were important, but only if that authority was used to create meaningful change in the process of teaching and learning. Furthermore, all of the decisions that were made were focused on improving student learning. Briggs and Wohlstetter (1999) wrote:

Several studies on SBM emphasize the importance of a vision, that is locally define and connected to high expectations for student learning, or more formally,
an instructional guidance mechanism. An instructional guidance mechanism may be state curriculum standards, national subject matter standards, or a state assessment, such as the Michigan Educational Assessment Program. Such mechanisms directed the development of curriculum and instruction at the school, as well as conversations in decision-making forums. Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) researchers found that standards and other instructional guidance mechanisms tended to specify the “what” or content of the curricula, but left the “how” or pedagogic issues up to individual schools. (p. 172)

Also emerging from the research was the finding that schools had to define and reorganize as professional learning communities that developed a common knowledge base. These communities dispersed power broadly throughout the school organization by creating networks of decision-making teams. They were characterized by excellent communication; they possessed multiple mechanisms for collecting information related to school priorities and disseminating it to all school constituents (Briggs & Wohlstetter, 1999). The Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools confirmed the effects of teacher empowerment resulting from school-based management structures. The participation by representatives of all constituency groups in decision-making engendered a strong feeling of professional community when focused on school-wide student improvement (Marks & Lewis, 1997). Leithwood and Menzies’ (1998) research suggested that shared decision-making led to the creation of a strong professional community. Teachers collaborated more, and overall, SBM schools had a greater school-wide focus on professional development, and a greater sense of accountability.
Although not a perfect model, the Chicago school-based management reform program offered evidence that large urban districts could use shared decision-making to create positive gains in student achievement. Because of the magnitude of the reform effort in Chicago, a number of research and educational institutions actively studied the Chicago experience implementing school-based management. One organization, The Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) found that the shared decision-making model resulted in an improved curriculum and more instructional reform (Weiss & Ziebarth, 2001). The Consortium on Chicago School Research (CCSR) also confirmed that teacher participation in decision-making through the LSCs was positively related to improvements in instruction. CCSR’s research also found that successful SBM schools were more likely to embrace a vision for their schools that reflected district and state standards, and that guided their decisions (Bryk, Thum, Easton & Luppescu, 1998). A smaller second study of fourteen Chicago schools corroborated the Consortium’s findings that changes in student achievement were linked to changes in the governance structure of schools (Hess, 1991).

Although the decision-making authority of LSCs was reduced significantly during the tenure of Superintendent Paul Vallas from 1995 to 2001, the local school councils remained a fixture of the Chicago public school structure. Wade (2004) reported:

A long-time parent leader recently remarked that "it is an enormous victory the LSC’s have survived and still have power, because there has been so much effort to undermine that power". While not all Chicago reform participants so openly state this, it is not an uncommon sentiment. It can be difficult to find LSC members who do not feel like junior partners in school reform. (p. 35)
As school districts started their exploration of school-based management, academia began to study its consequences for schools. In a fifteen-month study of six schools that switched to SBM, Lange (1993) found that as autonomy was achieved, better decisions were made than would have been made under centralized school management. This result was attributed to the fact that as the number of people involved increased, more alternative decisions and choices were generated and analyzed. This development frequently resulted in more innovative approaches to solving the issues at hand.

The research also uncovered some of the drawbacks to SBM. Licentos (1993) reports that many people felt frustrated by the slow pace of group decision-making when the number of participants in the process increased. She found that the increase in demands on faculty and administrator time posed the greatest barrier to implementing and maintaining SBM. Others objected to the heavier workloads and additional responsibilities. Allen & Glickman (1992) observed that many schools got “bogged down in ‘zero-impact’ issues, such as lunchroom supervision or bus duty—topics that may affect teachers’ lives but don’t have significant educational impact” (p.80). Weiss, Cambone and Wyeth (1992) observed that SBM redefined the comfort level for teachers. Faculty had to “extend themselves into new arenas of expertise where they were asked to engage other adults, negotiate, resolve differences, and come to a decision concerning issues that have not traditionally fallen within the scope of their duties” (p.350). These expectations were counter to the sense of the autonomy and relative isolation that characterized most teachers’ experiences in schools.

Despite the drawbacks and challenges of school-based management, educational leaders continued to believe in its promise to improve the quality and effectiveness of
school decisions, to insure their acceptance by the school community and their efficient implementation, to strengthen staff morale, and to improve school performance (Liototos, 1993). Research on school-based management continues. However, the empirical evidence is still not convincing that school-based management significantly improves student achievement. Briggs & Wehlraat (1999) explain the various reasons why supportive data may not be available. They include: (a) difficulties in measuring change and outcomes associated with SDB; (b) complexities in implementing a management model that requires significant efforts from teachers, principals, district personnel to alter work practices, and (c) the challenge of working in an environment that is shaped by local, state and national politics (p. 4). Despite the tentative conclusions of many studies, there are other studies that find school-based management does lead to changes in school culture, classroom practices and student achievement.

As the history of school-based management in the United States for the past 25 years indicates, its contribution to the reform of American public schools remains debatable, possibly owing to its great variety or perhaps to the complexity of school reform itself. Cohen (1990) perhaps stated it best. "To expect major instructional improvement from decentralization, as many reformers do, only reveals how far Americans are from understanding what it might take to seriously improve teaching and learning" (p. 378).
The following Ishikawa diagram lays out the primary causal factors for the practice of school-based management from 1990 to the present. Each factor is assigned to one of the five causal factorial categories. A narrative summary follows.

Figure 5.3 Causal Factors of School-based Management—1990-present

Summary of Causal Factors—1990-present

Government at all levels continued to play a significant role in establishing school-based management in American public schools. Local, state and federal mandates were a governmental/political causal factor for SBM. Disappointed with academic results and the administrative structures that reinforced ineffective educational policy, federal legislation, state regulations, district mandates and local school policies stipulated broadening the decision-making circle. Furthermore, political leaders, at all levels of
government, were concerned about the lack of accountability for schools. The impression that educators were not accountable to taxpayers or to policy makers was a major governmental/political causal factor that pressured the introduction of school-based management into local school systems.

A number of educational causal factors evolved during the 1990s. A primary direction for school change called for schools to undergo extensive restructuring, in part to redefine the very culture of schools. Educators were asked to challenge underlying assumptions, values, beliefs, practices and relationships. Top-down mandates were shown to have limited effect, so restructuring needed to occur at the local school level. The call for improved student achievement was pervasive and resulted in the revaluation and revision of existing school-based mechanisms, as evidenced by the changes made by the Chicago public schools and by the state of Kentucky. Chicago significantly reduced the local school committee’s decision-making authority, and demanded greater accountability measures. Kentucky also reorganized its schools’ council structures, and tightened accountability through state legislation.

One measure of accountability was instituted by the standards movement, which attempted to set performance goals for education by quantifying expectations for school achievement. Intent on clarifying the school’s purposes, many schools with school-based management programs revised their goals and focused management on improving student achievement. The research studies of the best methods and practices aimed at increasing student achievement stressed the vital importance of schools defined as professional learning communities. Mirroring school-based management models, this kind of setting
decentralized decision-making responsibilities by sharing power with different constituency groups.

Summary and Ishikawa Diagram of School-based Management

Compilation of Causal Factors of School-based Management—1980-present

Figure 5.4 Compilation of Causal Factors of School-based Management—1980-present

Summary of Causal Factors of School-based Management—1980-present

School-based management was implemented in American public schools as part of an overall effort to reform educational practice and improve student learning. A basic
The premise of this effort is that the professionals who work most closely with the student will make the best decisions for the students and the school. Furthermore, the model is built on the assumption that the people who are responsible for implementing decisions in a school setting should have a voice in determining those decisions. SIM proponents assumed that an evolving sense of ownership for educational decisions would motivate school professionals to devote their efforts to school reform that would be enduring and consequential.

School decentralization efforts were supported by the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1966, which encouraged parent and community involvement in public schools. The Act set the stage for the redistribution of authority in school administration. School-based management started to take root in the 1970s. Moving more aggressively to decentralize, Florida passed the 1973 Educational Accountability Act that authorized "school-based management" through the creation of school advisory committees. At the beginning of the 1980s, national concern for the quality of teaching and learning in public education increased. Fueling this discontent were several emerging trends: the changing demographics of schools; the impact of societal forces such as unemployment, poverty, and the rise of single-parent families; and the evolution of society from an industrial to post-industrial orientation.

School-based management became a major tool for reforming schools beginning in the mid-1980s. Concerned about an economic crisis and America's ability to compete globally, the nation reacted to the alarm raised by *A Nation at Risk* as politicians, policy makers, educators, members of the business community and citizens in general, began calling for the restructuring of schools. Borrowing from the successes of American
corporations, reformists urged educational leaders to incorporate business models that featured participatory decision-making models. At the state level, numerous high-profile governors strengthened the educational reform movement by making it a priority in their respective states. Heeding the calls for reform, educators turned to the Effective Schools literature, extracting from it the lessons learned from minimizing school bureaucracy and supporting a more open and decentralized school organization.

Following a number of national reports in 1986, school-based management and a concomitant movement to professionalize the teaching profession emerged as nationwide campaigns. An informal network including legislators, educational leaders, and academics promoted these initiatives. But active support by teacher unions, and Albert Shanker of the AFT in particular, catapulted school-based management into the national arena. Kentucky was the first state to implement school-based management on a statewide basis, largely as a result of legal action that required Kentucky to completely reorganize its public schools.

With the rise of the standards movement in the mid 1990s, federal legislation, state regulations, district mandates and local school communities began to focus reform efforts on outputs rather than inputs. Improving student performance became the main goal of the continuing restructuring movement. School-based management systems changed their foci to the improvement of instructional practice that would increase learning and student achievement, as evidenced by the legislation passed by Illinois and Kentucky respectively to demand more accountability from existing SBM settings.

With the call for increased accountability, SBM schools developed district and/or school-wide visions that focused on teaching and learning. They also began to organize
themselves as professional learning communities, increasing communication, collaboration and collegiality. Research on school-based management continues. Although the empirical evidence is not conclusive that school-based management significantly improves student achievement, there is persuasive evidence that it does change the culture of a school, and that it has effects on classroom practices that may or may not influence student achievement levels. The research on school-based management continues to thrive even today.
CHAPTER VI

Historical Narrative of Peer Coaching

The history of peer coaching is not as extensive as that of team teaching or school-based management. However, the relative newness of the topic to the educational reform movement makes its impact on practice more readily evident and far more dynamic. As a reform tool introduced in the early 1980s, peer coaching became a popular intervention to assist in the professional development of teachers and to implement curriculum revision (Herrmann & Pendarvis, 1990).

In the simplest terms, peer coaching is a process in which two or more professional colleagues work together for the specific purpose of improving teaching performance (Ackland, 1991). As this approach matured and developed in sophistication, its role and purpose evolved as well. Its numerous manifestations include technical coaching, team coaching, collegial coaching, cognitive coaching, expert coaching, and challenge coaching. It expanded into the area of mentoring and teacher evaluation under the guises of peer mentoring and peer review. For the purposes of this historical narrative, peer coaching is the umbrella term used to describe all of these various expressions.

In more elaborate terms, peer coaching refers to a professional development method that is a confidential process through which teachers share their expertise and provide one another with feedback, support and assistance for the purpose of refining present skills, learning new skills, and/or solving classroom-related problems (Dalton & Noir, 1991). As always, the variety of definitions reflect the many purposes for which
this technique was employed. These purposes include sharing successful classroom prácêces, facilitating professional dialogue, and encouraging reflective practice (Costa & Garmstoa, 1994; Gottesman, 2000; Holloway, 2001). As a reform measure, it was employed to address school-wide problems, and to create a forum in which to examine instructional problems (Showers, 1982, 1984). It was called upon to support teachers by reducing their sense of isolation, and by building collaborative norms to enable teachers to give and receive ideas and assistance (Barth, 2001; Wong & Nicotera, 2003). For novice and senior teachers alike, it was seen as a way to support practice and increase teacher retention (Becker, 1996). All of these purposes, however, were directed at one goal: increasing student learning (Ackland, 1991; Becker, 1996; Wong & Nicotera, 2003).

The Decade from 1960 to 1979

Implementation Studies

With the large investment in education from the 1958 National Defense Education Act, and with the dramatic increase of federal funds in the 1960s to improve academic quality and social equality through Title I programs such as Head Start and Follow Through, the nation stopped to take stock of education’s progress. Unfortunately, the results were inconclusive at best and very disappointing at worst. Early evaluations of the Title I program showed few, if any, gains in achievement (McGill-Franzen, 2000).

A series of studies were undertaken to assess the effectiveness of the many programs and interventions that were implemented to address educational and social issues. The RAND Corporation undertook one of the first studies to evaluate the federally
funded educational programs of the 1960s and found that "success depended not on technology or funding, but on local adaptation and implementation" (RAND Corporation, n.d., p. 7). RAND's findings launched numerous other studies aimed at monitoring the progress of school reform. Most of these studies revealed that efforts at school reform were not generally having a positive influence in the areas where they were focused.

Showers and Joyce (1996) recounted:

By the early 1970s, educators recognized that many of those efforts, even when well funded and approved by the public, seldom led to changes. The lack of research on how people learn teaching strategies and how schools successfully disseminate innovations contributed to our failures. Educators assumed that teachers could learn new strategies, return to a school, and implement their new learning smoothly and appropriately. The organization of the schools did not support the intensive training efforts that occurred in summer institutes or workshops during the year, however. (p. 13)

As a result of the studies of the 1970s that attempted to evaluate the implementation of different reforms, new topics for research emerged, as well as fresh opportunities to review and to assess programs in teacher training, teacher supervision and professional development.

Supervision of Instruction

With the weak results from reform efforts reported in the implementation studies, governmental and educational leaders began the process of asking why their efforts were not making the expected gains in teaching and learning. First to come under review were
teachers themselves. "Initial diagnoses attributed the failure to a 'flaw' in the motivation, effort, and attitudes of the teachers" (Showers & Joyce, 1996, p. 13). Accordingly, teacher supervision was one of the initial issues to be examined and reported.

One documented obstacle to the successful implementation of school reform initiatives was "top down, rule-driven school systems" (RAND Corporation, n.d., p. 7). Evidence of this approach was seen in the model of supervision that dated to the early 1960s. At the turn of that century, schools were experiencing a rapid growth in student population, and in order to monitor the quality of education, educational leaders turned to consolidation and centralization (Glanz, 1991). Ebert et al. and Nicklaus (1999) observed:

Centralization led to increased emphasis on standardization for efficiency reasons and the development of a bureaucracy to support the larger school system. The idea of hierarchical systems that could standardize pedagogy and curriculum was a reflection of the accepted industrial model of management of the time. Many educators believed all children needed to master certain basic skills and only through a system of professional supervisors could the public be assured children were receiving and mastering instruction is the "essential" curricular components necessary to function in an industrial society. (p. 352)

This essentialistic model's main purpose was to inspect classroom practice to make sure that teachers were imparting the universally accepted set of skills and knowledge to their students. A supervisor's main responsibility was quality control, derived from the industrial model on which this format was based. The essentialistic model dramatically changed school supervision by increasing the number of supervisors 780 percent and by tripling the number of principals (Glanz, 1991).
However, a basic drawback to this supervision model quickly became apparent: teachers were afraid to ask supervision for help, or to seek assistance from colleagues, for fear that they would expose weaknesses in their teaching that could be held against them in later evaluations (Glanz, 1991). The potential benefits of collegiality, collaboration and reflective practice were pushed aside because supervision served a singular purpose: evaluation. Although this focus led to standardizing some effective classroom practices, it essentially hampered the professional development of teachers. Suffice it to say, the needs of the school bureaucracy overshadowed the needs of the individual teacher as the focus on supervision highlighted the issue of school evaluation (Etmeier & Nicklaus, 1999).

It wasn’t until the 1980s that these approaches to supervision were challenged for being too simplistic and limiting. The clinical supervision model was developed to address the apparent weaknesses of the traditional model. Its components included classroom observation, conferencing, and feedback. The supervisor’s role was to assist and guide the teacher in finding and applying appropriate instructional strategies and curriculum materials (Etmeier & Nicklaus, 1999). Supervision was no longer about imposing standardization, but about identifying appropriate instructional techniques suited to the context of individual classrooms and to the backgrounds of the students in that classroom. In sum, the focus of the work of the educational supervisor became “detailed observational data and close interaction between the supervisor and teacher with a focus on the teacher’s classroom behavior” (Munson, 1998, p. 108). Etmeier and Nicklaus (1999) remarked:
This experimental orientation commonly became known as clinical supervision and marked a departure, at least in theory, from the essentialistic supervisory practices common at the time. The clinical supervision process supported professional inquiry by encouraging teachers to take active roles in determining the focus of their own growth and shifted the function of supervision from inspection to a vehicle for active experimentation and individual teacher development. (p. 352)

As the role of supervision was changing in the 1960s and 1970s to meet the evolving needs of schools, so too was the role of professional development.

Professional Development

The 1960s "brought many revolutionary ideas to American society as well as to its classrooms" (Grant, Young, & Montbriand, 2001, p. 1). With a burgeoning school population of baby boom children and an increase of students from low-income families, President Johnson made equal educational opportunity for poor children a national priority. Numerous programs were put into place to mitigate the effects of societal problems on school achievement. In-service teacher education was overshadowed by the sweep of large-scale programming, and as a result, professional development activities declined in quality and in quantity (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988). The emphasis moved away from classroom practice, but the results of the implementation studies refocused school districts toward reevaluating instructional methodology and pedagogy.

Realizing that the improvement of classroom instruction was a multi-layered issue, educators in the 1970s began to reexamine the organization and design of
professional development. The common practice for school districts was to identify a desirable new teaching strategy, and then to organize a teacher workshop. The assumption was that teachers could quickly absorb a new teaching practice, and easily and effectively implement it in their classroom the next day. Despite their best intentions, most school districts were not able to support, monitor, and assess implementation. Showers and Joyce (1984) researched the topic and found:

In the 1970s evaluations of staff development that focused on reading strategies and curriculum revealed that as few as 10 percent of the participants implemented what they had learned. Rates of transfer were low even for those who had volunteered for the training. Well-researched curriculum and teaching models did not find their way into general practice and thus could not influence students' learning environments. (p. 12)

With the start of the new decade, educational theorists and scholars recommended new supervision and professional development models aimed at correcting some of the perceived and actual faults of existing models.

Causal Factors of Peer Coaching—1960-1975

The following Ishikawa diagram lays out the primary causal factors, which stimulated peer coaching programs from 1960 to 1979. Each factor is assigned to one of the five causal factorial categories. A narrative summary follows.
Summary of Causal Factors—1960-1979

Numerous societal/cultural causal factors from 1960-1979 provided the foundation for the implementation of peer coaching in the 1980s. The significant increase of the student population as a result of baby boom children, and the changing demographics of the school-age population, demanded that schools reevaluate and reorganize to meet the needs of their charges. The increase in numbers of children from low-income families compounded the schools' problems, as did the government's emphasis on equal educational opportunity for all students, which propelled the Johnson War on Poverty. These societal/cultural causal factors prepared the way for peer coaching with its focus on preparing teachers to respond to the challenges presented to the schools by many of the social problems that were affecting America's families.
The dramatic increase of federal funding for education as a result of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) precipitated a revaluation and revamping of America's public schools. NDEA was a governmental/political causal factor that paved the way for the development of peer coaching. The large expenditure of money and energy to improve education in the 1960s led politicians, business leaders, and citizens to question if taxpayer dollars were being spent wisely. Their concerns defined the direction for the research studies of the late 1960s and early 1970s that exposed the weaknesses and/or ineffectiveness of existing programs. These developments served as another major governmental/political causal factor leading to peer coaching.

The educational causal factors from 1960-1979 that aided the development of peer coaching programs relate to issues that emerge from the subjects of the supervision of instruction and professional development. The bureaucratic structure of teacher supervision that dated to the early part of the 20th century led to a call for a change in the essentialistic model of supervision. The need was met with the development of the clinical model of supervision. Popular and implemented frequently, this model expanded the role of supervision, leading the way to alternatives such as peer coaching.

Professional development returned to the forefront of educators' concerns as the implementation studies exposed the need for greater teacher training to implement school reform. Realizing that the improvement of classroom instruction was complex, educators began to suggest new professional development models, like peer coaching, which were aimed at improving current practice.
Taking notice of the implementation studies, Showers (1982, 1984) undertook research that led to the development of peer coaching. It became an effective strategy to support teachers’ efforts to improve classroom instruction. Its development also coincided with and complemented the reorientation of supervision practices that emerged during the early 1980s.

Supervision

With the introduction of the clinical model, the supervision of teachers moved away from its custodial function of overseeing, managing, and evaluating instructional practice (Drake & Roe, 1999). Yet the 1980s saw supervision move towards an existentialist orientation with an emphasis on teacher reflection and personal development (Garman, 1986). No longer seen as a tool to serve and maintain bureaucracies, supervision was seen as a means to move education towards professionalism. Brundt (1996) explained this paradigm shift:

Those who support this existentialist view maintain that knowledge is derived only from personal reflection. Appropriate instructional strategies, then, are those having personal meaning for the individuals involved and linking to their sense of the world. Therefore, changing teacher behavior is not the most important goal of the supervisor. Rather, the critical task of the supervisor is to help teachers more successfully engage in reflective behavior, which is thought to be a necessary element of professionalism. (p. 30)
This philosophical orientation towards an existential supervision model was embodied in the work of Glickman (1990). His model emphasized that teachers needed to find meaning in their work. It also fostered the idea that the primary responsibility of supervision was to support the teacher's intellectual growth and understandings of the craft of teaching. “The model emphasizes that a supervisor's role is not to teach specific skills that teachers are to apply, but rather to engage teachers in reflective practice and raise their level of awareness concerning the methods and processes they employ in the classroom” (Emmeier & Nicklaus, 1999, p.3).

The best-selling book, *In Search of Excellence* by Peters and Waterman (1982), stimulated business professionals to be reflective about their decisions and to initiate bold, innovative directions. In it, the authors championed corporations that nurtured a culture of learning within their walls. Hierarchically driven professional development efforts were seen as antithetical to individual experimentation and problem solving approaches embodied in successful companies (Wildman & Niles, 1987). Because of the nation's fascination with successful business practices and the drive by political, business and educational leaders to model that practice, schools started to examine their own supervision methods.

Melding into a forceful phalanx, business support and educational research pushed the agenda for a more reflective approach to supervision that took hold in the 1980s. Perhaps most convincing to educators was the research on successful professional development emanating from this period.
Professional Development

Shoewers (1982, 1984) and Joyce’s research documented the astoundingly poor return on investment from standard professional development. The summer workshop or the one-day in-service training day was extremely limited in respect to creating changes in classroom instructional practices. Their research reported that fewer than 10 percent of participants in professional development activities transferred the new knowledge and/or teaching methodologies to the classroom. Yet they also felt that assigning the blame to teachers was a unjust as well as counter-productive.

As a result, they undertook a series of studies in the 1980s where they “formally investigated the hypothesis that coaching, following initial training, would result in much greater transfer than would training alone” (Shoewers & Joyce, 1996, p. 12). The early studies found that results rose dramatically with members of peer coaching groups exhibiting greater long-term retention of new strategies and more appropriate use of new teaching models over time (Baker & Shoewers, 1984; Shoewers, Joyce & Bennett, 1987).

Studies that examined the results of innovative staff development programs revealed that peer coaching was more powerful in terms of transfer of training than all the other combined strategies such as giving information, outlining theory, providing demonstrations, or allowing for practice and feedback (Gingiss, 1993; Shoewers, Joyce & Bennett, 1987).

Through peer coaching, professional development could more directly affect student learning. Educators found that changing training design, and more importantly, traditional structures of supervision and professional development, could solve
implementation problems or ease them greatly. As a result of their work, Showers and Joyce (1996) recommended:

...that schools organize teachers into peer coaching teams and arrange school setting so that the teachers could work together to gain sufficient skill to affect student learning. We had moved from the 1950s and 1960s, where the probability of implementation was extremely low, to a very simple technology that virtually reversed the odds. (p. 14)

Armed with convincing research, peer coaching entered the lexicon of educational reform initiatives. During the 1980s, its form and function evolved to include numerous manifestations, each with its own set of proponents and critics whose commentary and debate propelled peer coaching into mainstream educational practice.

Peer Coaching Manifestations

The multiple variations of peer coaching still retain a basic structure and purpose; that of a collaborative process of planning, observations, and feedback, with the goal to raise the implementation level of instructional techniques and curriculum (Acklund, 1991; Odell, 1990; Perkins, 1998; Showers & Joyce, 1990). The early model of peer coaching proposed by Showers and Joyce (Showers, Joyce & Bennett, 1987) fulfilled numerous functions. First of all, it provided companionship for teachers who now could talk about their successes and failures. This approach also was designed to remove or minimize the sense of isolation experienced by many teachers. Another basic element to peer coaching was feedback. In this case it was crucial that the comments teachers gave to one another were objective and non-evaluative, reinforcing the reflective quality of
feedback and eliminating any judgmental features. Analysis was provided in the coaching process so that teachers could internalize the strategy with the aim of using it more spontaneously and more flexibly. The coaching process was designed to develop teachers' abilities to adapt their teaching strategies so that a teaching model would meet the special needs of students in the class. And underscoring the whole process was the availability of support of any kind, as needed.

Showers and Joyce's work focused on increasing the effectiveness of professional development activities (Showers, 1982, 1984). They were emphatic that their model of peer coaching should not be confused with, or used for, evaluation of teachers. Although peer review, an amalgam of peer coaching and evaluation, was eventually to be developed and used by a number of school districts, the original researchers were adamant that the evaluation of teaching remain a distinct and different function from peer coaching (Showers & Joyce, 1996).

As peer coaching began to be used in school districts across the country, and as it became an important topic for consideration and review, educators and researchers clarified some of the terminology that grew around the subject, and practitioners expanded the function of peer coaching. In the 1980s, during the early stages of peer coaching, six working models emerged: technical, collegial, challenge, team, cognitive and reciprocal coaching. Technical, team, and challenge coaching generally focused on innovations in curriculum and instruction (Kent, 1985; Neubert & Bratton, 1987), while collegial, cognitive, and reciprocal coaching focused on improving existing practice (Garmstoa, Linder & Whiaker, 1993).
More specifically, technical coaching's main purpose was to assist in the transfer of skills learned in in-service workshops into classroom practice (Hargreaves & Dawe, 1990; Baker & Showers, 1984). "This mode promotes collegiality and the sharing of professional dialogue and gives teachers a shared vocabulary for discussing professional views" (Garmston, 1987, p. 18). Collegial and cognitive coaching both foster collegiality, and they also then seek to improve classroom instruction by encouraging the teacher to become more analytical about classroom practice. "The long range goal of collegial coaching is self-perpetuating improvement in teaching" (Garmston, Linder, & Whitsier, 1993, p. 58). Team coaching involved the introduction of resource teachers such as reading teachers, math specialists, or learning resource teachers to coach classroom teachers (Nobert & Bratton, 1987). Most often, rather than observing teacher performance and commenting on it, team coaches taught alongside the classroom teacher. Also, they were recruited because they had considerable expertise in a particular subject area or methodology. Challenge coaching involved whole faculties or sub-sets (e.g., fourth grade teachers) working together to investigate and resolve problematic situations, often resulting in a formal plan to address the identified problem (Acklund, 1991; Becker, 1996). "Based on data and ongoing assessment, teachers select to work together to plan lessons, share objectives, plan application, divide the labor, practice innovations, support others' practice, and study the impact on students" (Murphy, 1999, p. 23). Reciprocal peer coaching "enables teachers to observe one another and exchange support, companionship, feedback, and assistance in a coequal or non-threatening fashion (Acklund, 1991, p. 22). Despite the differences between coaching strategies and the
functions of this approach, all coaching forms used peers to achieve the goal of improving the teaching and learning process (Wong & Nicotera, 2003).

Early research focused on the role of the coach, clarifying the position by identifying the characteristics of a dynamic coach. The research also generated a description of the coach’s responsibilities and the resources or strategies necessary to insure successful teaching and learning activities. Coaches were also called upon to model lessons or team teach, as well as to observe classroom practice and effectively conference with teachers (Baker & Showers, 1984; Showers, Joyce & Bennett, 1987). Neubert and Braton (1987) analyzed quotes from peer coaching participants, mentors and mentees, and found five characteristics of coaches that promoted a successful partnership. Coaches need to have knowledge or expertise, credibility as an effective classroom instructor, the ability to provide appropriate support, as well as the ability to facilitate growth by allowing the classroom teacher to maintain ownership of his or her room. Other attributes of successful coaches are the abilities to build trust, identify what a teacher needs, and provide a safe risk-taking environment. Coaches are expected to have a large repertoire of teaching strategies and methodologies, be flexible, and be recognized as a strong leader (Baker, 1984; Hargreaves & Dawe, 1990).

One recommendation in the research was clear: peer coaches are not to be evaluators. Particularly for the more reflective modes of collegial and cognitive coaching, non-evaluative communication is at the heart of the coaching process. Coaches were trained to use a particular form of communication, which discouraged the expression of their opinions (Costa & Garmston, 1994). The role of evaluation in peer coaching remained a subject for discussion and debate in educational journals. Wanzare
and da Costa (2000) took a broader view of peer coaching and proposed that it be used to evaluate teachers in a peer review process. However, Wong and Nicotera (2003) explained the complications, "The issue of peer coaching and evaluation is controversial partly because many unions prohibit peer review. ‘New unionism’ though, has begun to consider peer review as a mechanism to increase teacher responsibility in schools" (p.4).

In 1981 the city of Toledo, Ohio promoted the implementation of the peer review process in its school system, which expanded the expressions and functions of peer coaching. Negotiated into the local union contract, this reform was adopted as a strategy to improve instruction. Involving new and veteran teachers alike, the Toledo Plan required all newly hired teachers, regardless of prior experience, to be assigned to a consulting mentor teacher for the purpose of professional development and evaluation. The evaluation process called for continuous mutual goal-setting, using classroom observations and follow-up conferences. The consulting teacher had the final responsibility for the evaluation of the new teacher and two evaluation reports were filed during the crucial first year. Veteran teachers in the district who had serious teaching problems engaged in a performance review that resulted in a recommendation for the teacher’s continuation or termination of employment (Toledo Federation of Teachers, n.d.). Although touted as a national model for reform, Toledo served to inspire only a handful of school districts to implement peer coaching. Firmly established as a reform initiative during the 1980s, the next decade served to solidify peer coaching’s role in school reform.

The following Ishikawa diagram offers the major causal factors leading to the development of peer coaching from 1980 to 1989. Each factor is assigned to one of the five factorial categories. A narrative summary follows.

Figure 6.2 Causal Factors of Peer Coaching—1980-1989


Peer coaching took hold and progressed during the 1980s into a viable and effective reform measure. A governmental/political causal factor for peer coaching was the development of the new unionism, which reversed the historically adversarial roles of teachers and administration into that of cooperative agents for education change. One reform embraced by this new relationship was peer coaching.

Numerous educational causal factors contributed to peer coaching's creation and development. The role of supervision continued to evolve during the decade towards a
more "existentialist" orientation with a focus on teacher reflection and personal development. This reorientation led educators to expand their thinking about supervision, which in turn opened the door to peer coaching. The drive toward professionalism was another educational causal factor for peer coaching. With its strategies for peer monitoring, peer coaching became a legitimate practice that addressed the call for professionalizing education.

The educational causal factor with the most direct effect on the advancement of peer coaching was the research on professional development. Studies revealed that there was a dramatic improvement in the effectiveness of professional development when peer coaching was part of the process. Teachers participating in peer coaching exhibited greater long-term retention of new strategies and more appropriate implementation of innovative teaching models. Teacher isolation was also identified as an educational causal factor. Long identified for its debilitating effects on teachers and their instructional practices, the isolation of teachers from other colleagues was positively addressed by peer coaching. The pressure to incorporate business models into educational practice was a contingency causal factor. The successful reflective and self-directed business practices of the 1980s led naturally to the espousal of peer coaching as a reform strategy.

**From 1990 to the Present**

As the decade of the 1990s began, the second wave of school reform was in full gear. The "outpouring of concern for the quality of American education" (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986, p. 11) propelled the issues of teacher
professionalism, improving student achievement through standards-based instruction, and teacher retention into the national spotlight. Working in tandem, these issues made peer coaching a "hot topic" (Hyman, 1990).

**Teacher Professionalism Through Leadership**

Following the Era of National Reports (1986-1990), the call for teacher professionalism gained momentum. An interest in teacher leadership and the professionalization of teaching became hallmarks of many education reform policies (Cooper, 1994). *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986), *A Time for Results* (National Governors' Association, 1986), and *Tomorrow's Teachers* (The Holmes Group, 1986) each placed the topic of professionalizing K-12 education on the national agenda. The reports called for more teacher autonomy, more teacher-led reform, and better qualified teachers, which all identified teachers as the key to successful school reform (Hart, 1995).

Yet if teachers were the ultimate change agents and reform leaders, then many realized that leadership had to be inclusive, interactive, and reciprocal (Heller & Firestone, 1995). Several cited a central reason for reform failure: although teachers had to be practitioners, they did not initiate instrumental reforms. By being removed from leadership roles, teachers lacked investment in the reform process. Heller and Firestone (1995) further explained, "Enthusiasts assert that teachers will make or break any serious attempts to reform instruction and curriculum. With their leadership, new techniques and approaches that fundamentally redesign teachers' work will be more likely to take hold..."
and persist" (p. 67). For this reason and others, the call for the professionalization of teaching through teacher leadership was prominent during the 1990s.

One form of teacher leadership described in the literature was peer coaching; and there are a variety of explanations as to why peer coaching can be equated with leadership. Firestone and Heller (1995) observed that by establishing a coaching system within a school, teachers engage in the activities that are linked to leadership: creating a vision for change, encouraging staff, and monitoring progress. Taking a slightly different view, Larabert et al. (1995) suggested that learning together is a kind of leadership experience. Teachers engaging in peer coaching become constructivist leaders through the use of reflective practice, which modifies their instruction. By generating new classroom practices and engaging others in changing their own practices, teachers become instructional leaders by furthering their own practice and collaborating with peers to do the same. Bogner (2002) feels that by virtue of teachers being asked to perform duties outside of their traditional responsibilities, they become teacher leaders. New expectations such as monitoring their own change, aligning their instruction to standards, working in collaborative groups and serving on multiple committees involve leadership because they require responses to school-wide issues. Barth (2001) wrote that as teachers engaged in substantive discussions about teaching and learning, they developed the skills, confidence and motivation to assume leadership roles.

Researchers and chroniclers of the history of schooling who advocate peer coaching as a way to develop teacher leadership also acknowledge that the nature of change is to create stress. The most frequently mentioned negative consequences are role ambiguity, conflict, and overload (Smylie, 1992; Smylie & Denny, 1990). At a
fundamental level, revolutionary proposals like peer coaching that engendered teacher leadership "challenge long-established and accepted values, beliefs, and norms of the teaching profession" (Hart & Breidenstein, 1996). A key norm that was challenged was the role of the principal. " Principals educated and socialized under power-centered role expectations often lack the skills and knowledge necessary to practice more dispersed leadership" (Hart & Murphy, 1994, p.152). As a result, Hart (1995) observed that the extent and success of teacher leadership in a school depended on the school ethos, collegial and professional norms, and customs of a school. As the decade progressed, two additional forms of peer coaching emerged: peer mentoring and peer review.

**Peer Mentoring**

The most common form of peer coaching to develop during the decade was peer mentoring: coaching for teachers with less than 3 years of experience. Through this mode of coaching, experienced master teachers supported and assisted novices teachers in a formalized program of observation and consultation, with the specific purpose of improving the new teacher's classroom instructional practices.

Research on teacher retention fueled the adoption of peer coaching. Educational leaders became concerned about the number of problems faced by new teachers, and the subsequently high attrition rates of teachers in the first year of teaching (Fiedler & Haskelkorn, 1999; Gold, 1996). Studies showed that mentoring programs were highly successful in bridging the transition from teacher preparation programs to actual classroom teaching. As a result of coaching, researchers found that retention rates improved significantly (Feiman-Nemser, 1996). Klug and Slazman (1991) offered an
explanation: "Research on induction programs finds that beginning teachers benefit from a formal and structured induction team approach rather than from informal mentoring programs" (p. 242). A study by Gold (1996) in New Jersey of new teachers validated this finding. The attrition rate for first year teachers without a mentoring program was 18 percent, while the attrition rate for those in a mentoring program was a significantly lower 5 percent. By the end of the decade, 19 states and the District of Columbia required teacher mentoring programs for beginning teachers, and 10 additional states had established voluntary mentoring programs for beginning teachers (Bonefi, 1999).

Peer mentoring had other unanticipated gains. Although coaching was beneficial to beginners, experienced teachers also profited from it. Research shows that peer coaching programs encouraged professional growth, promoted recognition, and fostered collegiality for mentors (Killion, 1990). Mentors also discovered that working with beginning teachers engaged them in reflection about their own instructional practices (Everson & Smithley, 2000). Fulfilling another need, mentoring programs served to foster teacher leadership advocated by so many reformers (Hart, 1995). "Teacher mentor plans pursue several of the common goals of teacher leadership structures including the utilization of professional expertise, and the influence over new professionals" (p. 13).

Although the positive impact on teacher retention, and the development of teacher leadership opportunities, are evident in the research, the findings also suggest that unfocused programs and inadequately prepared mentors undermine the benefits of peer mentoring. Feiman-Nemser (1996) explained:

Many states recognize the need for sustained on-site support for entry-year teachers; however, educational researchers caution that the enthusiasm for
establishing mentoring programs has not been matched by clear goals about the purposes of mentoring, nor has support for new teachers been subjected to rigorous empirical scrutiny. (p. 2)

Cohen, McLaughin, and Talbert (1993) reported that mentors who did not practice the kind of conceptually oriented, learner-centered teaching called for by many initiatives hampered reform efforts. Therefore, mentoring "had a conservative effect on new teachers' practice, introducing and helping to support the status quo instead of encouraging new teachers to explore innovative practice" (p. 9). Educators argued for further study so that they could improve mentor preparation and track the effects of mentoring on classroom practice (Everson & Smithy, 2000). Kyle, Moore and Sander (1999) urged school districts to provide professional development for mentors to learn about the coaching process and what was expected of them. Their research showed that mentor teachers needed ongoing support, which provided opportunities to discuss ideas, problems, and solutions with fellow mentors. The mere presence of a peer mentoring program was not sufficient. When thoughtful and thorough mentor training was provided, novice teachers who worked with trained mentors possessed a higher level of teaching skills than new teachers whose mentors were not trained. As peer mentoring was taking hold as a successful form of peer coaching, peer review was not received so warmly. It was viewed skeptically by some, and to many others, it was controversial.

Peer Review

Peer review expanded the purpose of peer coaching by assigning the function of evaluation alongside that of support and assistance to improve classroom instructional
practice. In peer review, two teachers were paired in a coaching relationship, while the consulting teacher conducted formal evaluations of the coached teacher and made recommendations regarding employment status (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, n.d.). Often the teacher being evaluated was identified as “at risk” and peer review was used as an intervention and remediation strategy. “Peer review is often linked to peer assistance, which helps new and veteran teachers improve their knowledge and skills. Experienced consulting teachers serve as mentors to new teachers or to veteran teachers who are experiencing problems” (Hertling, 1999, p. 2).

Advocates of peer review maintained that this approach provided more substantive support than principal evaluations, which were often cursory in nature. Due to work loads, time constraints, and antiquated evaluation models, principal evaluations were perfunctory and did not provide the focused and time consuming guidance needed to help struggling teachers to improve their classroom instruction (Smith & Scott, 1990). In peer review, the consulting teacher observed, as well as demonstrated, and provided instructive feedback and recommendations to the at-risk teacher. Peer review was seen as an effective way to improve the quality of teaching and to help struggling teachers to improve (American Federation of Teachers & National Education Association, 1995).

Smith and Scott (1990) believe that an additional benefit to peer review is that it creates constructive relationships among principals and teachers, transforming them from adversaries to allies. Faculty and administration forge positive new working relationships through their mutual efforts to improve teaching standards.

Opponents of peer coaching objected to the introduction of the feature of evaluation. They maintained that non-evaluative support was the foundation on which
peer coaching was built, and to interject formal evaluation would destabilize its integrity (Garnston, 1987; Joyce & Showers, 1996). Others questioned peer review for a variety of different reasons. Hymon (1996) laid out his concerns:

> It is also possible to question whether a teacher can learn the skills necessary for effective observation, feedback and interpretation of classroom action and persistently apply them with another teacher. It requires a teacher to talk in terms of negatives and positives while the informal, implicit agreement among teachers requires that they only be positive toward one another. Many teachers, especially union leaders sensitive to the line drawn between union members and supervisors, question how knowledge gained by one teacher about another’s behavior will be used in evaluation procedures. (p. 53)

Because peer review involved potential changes in employment, teacher unions voiced strong opposition, but it was only with their support and involvement that peer review programs could be implemented. Critics stated that peer review presented legal problems for local union affiliates. “In collective-bargaining states, consulting teachers could be classified as supervisors and lose their bargaining-unit status” (Hertling, 1999, p. 4.). Simpson (1997) suggested that local union affiliates could avoid the problem of decertification of teacher-supervisors by negotiating with unions to include a clause in contracts to allow consulting teachers to remain in the bargaining unit. Others feared that peer review conflicted with the union’s duty to ensure fair representation, and that it presented a conflict of interest for the unions when responding to grievances related to peer review. The AFT and NEA (1998) responded that their role was to be fair and consistent in managing grievances, but they did not have an obligation to handle every
member's grievance. In order to set peer review in motion, they suggested that separate panels be set up to process grievances related to peer review.

With the rise of standards-based curriculum and the call for greater accountability, the interest in peer review revived in the late 1990s. Jan (2005) reported:

About half a dozen school systems in Ohio, New York, Maryland, Minnesota, and California have adopted similar programs to help new teachers improve and identify poor ones. Teacher evaluations have assumed new importance in recent years with the passage of state and federal education reform acts, which aim to get all students to meet basic academic standards. School systems and parents are taking a closer look to make sure teachers are passing muster. They want evaluations to be more than a checklist. (p. 1)

Signaling a sea change for peer review, California passed a sweeping peer assistance and review law in late 1998, which contained a carrot and a stick. Legislators appropriated $41 million in incentive funds for districts that negotiated peer review programs by July 1999, and threatened to withhold up to $400 million in aid from districts that missed a January 2000 for negotiating the same (Johnston, 1999).

Although Ohio amended its statute to allow peer review, and California encouraged it with financial incentives, peer review remained legally ambiguous for many states (Korchner, 2001). "Peer review programs require a high level of union-management trust and cooperation, which is sometime difficult to achieve" (Hertling, 1999). And too, "the success of peer review often depends on the environment of the school. Is there a climate of collegiality?" (ASCD, n.d.). With a stultifying effect, all of the above consorted to make peer review a small player in reform initiatives.
National Commission on Teaching & America's Future

The educational reform pundit continued their drumbeat for change in the way America conducted schooling. With authoritative credentials and monetary clout, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York funded the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) which spent two years studying and discussing the progress and problems facing education. Chaired by James Hunt, Jr., Governor of North Carolina, and directed by Linda Darling-Hammond of Teachers College, Columbia University, the working group included other notables such as Anthony Alvarado, Superintendent of District 2 in New York City, James Comer of Yale University, and Albert Shanker, AFT President. The Commission issued its report, What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future in September 1996, which emphatically stated that a positive and productive future for the United States depended on what teachers knew and how they applied that knowledge in the classroom. The Commission noted that reforms such as student and teacher performance standards could not succeed if teachers were not supported with necessary resources such as training, materials, and environments that encourage good teaching (United States Department of Education, 1997). In brief, America could not succeed unless the conditions of teaching and professional development changed.

Research gathered by NCTAF indicated that teacher retention was a major problem for school districts around the country. The data indicated that teachers leave their profession due to the lack of support and opportunities for collaboration, which they expect to experience (Curtis, 2004). "Schedules, hectic classrooms and the physical
layout of many schools discourage quality conversations among colleagues, and much of
the expertise in individual classrooms is kept in isolation" (p. 1).

The Commission started their report by stating three premises on which it was
based. First, what teachers know and how they perform are the most important influence
on what students learn. Secondly, recruiting, preparing, and retaining good teachers must
become the central strategy for improving our schools. And thirdly, school reform cannot
succeed unless it focuses on creating the conditions under which teachers can teach, and
teach well (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996).

As a result, What Matters Most (1996) offered a blueprint for recruiting,
preparing, and supporting quality teachers in all of America’s schools. Its specific
recommendations were to get serious about standards for both students and teachers,
reinvent teacher preparation and professional development, fix teacher recruitment and
place qualified teachers in every classroom, encourage and reward teacher knowledge
and skill, and create schools that are organized for student and teacher success (National
Committee on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996). Foreshadowing future federal
legislation, it stated: “We propose an audacious goal for America’s future. Within a
decade—by the year 2006—we will provide every student in America with what should
be his or her educational birthright: access to competent, caring, qualified teaching in
schools organized for success. This is a challenging goal to put before the nation and its
educational leaders” (p. 10).

The report’s sole focus was on teachers. It emphasized that a change in student
performance was dependent most on quality teaching, and not as much on other aspects
of the process of schooling. Becker (1996) expanded on this finding:
New curriculum, standards, resources/materials, assessments, methodologies, technology, and reforms will not and do not have much impact unless teachers have appropriate access, knowledge, skills and continuous learning opportunities. Teachers require time for reflection, mentoring relationships, collegial interaction, expert role models, and ongoing professional development for any of these changes to be effective. (p. 1)

For many, the answer to the Commission’s grave concerns about teacher retention, isolation, and the lack of quality classroom instruction, appeared in the practice of peer coaching (Becker, 1997). “Peer coaching is a model of professional development that can be used to improve student learning by improving teaching” (p. 2). The report underscored the need for educational leaders to re-examine their practices in professional development and supervision, which they did in large measure during the late 1990s and into the new millennium.

*Expanding Views of Professional Development and Supervision*

To meet the demand for change, professional development strategies aimed at preparing teachers to improve the quality of instruction became a centerpiece of school reform efforts (Wong & Nicotera, 2003). Along with *What Matter’s Most: the report Teachers Take Charge of Their Learning: Transforming Professional Development for Student Success* (1996) focused on the importance of professional development in improving classroom instruction. It was published by The National Foundation for the Improvement of Education (NFIE), which is a division of the National Education
Association. Perhaps out of self-interest, the NFIE report outlined the obstacles to quality professional development:

Today's teachers are expected to keep abreast of new knowledge, individualize instruction for a diverse population of students, help all students achieve high standards, introduce new technologies into the classroom, become expert in student growth and development, help manage the school, and reach out to parents and the community. America's teachers are striving to do all this and more but they find themselves pressed for time and opportunities to learn. Teachers work collaboratively; yet all day they are isolated from other adults. Neither the time nor the telephones are available to communicate with other professionals in or outside the schoolhouse. (National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, 1996, p. 3)

As early as 1994 with the passage of the Improving America's Schools Act, there was a mandate for integrated, teacher-driven, long-term professional development. This legislation, a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, was a major reform initiative of the Clinton administration. In response, the United States Department of Education developed "...a set of principles for professional development that stress not only high quality, integrated training, but that also recognize the leadership role teachers must assume in their own training" (Galbraith & Anstom, 1995, p.1).

Also fueling the interest in peer coaching was the research on adult learning (Arrendondo & Ruckniski, 1998). "Viewing the acquisition of teaching competence from a cognitive developmental perspective accounts for and helps us appreciate the
continuing effort that is required to develop expertise" (Wildman & Niles, 1987, p. 6). Although there was research to suggest that stages and levels of adult cognition tended to be stable over time, Reiman and Thiet-Sprinthall (1993) found that certain kinds of interventions could enhance teachers' cognitive activities, ultimately leading to more desirable teaching behaviors. The study data suggested that mentor/mentee interactions could foster important changes in cognitive structures. Its conclusions encouraged supervisory relationships, like peer coaching, that promote dialogue, reflection, and ultimately, better teaching. Sullivan and Glatz (2000) elaborated on the connection between professional development, supervision, and peer coaching:

Through the ongoing discussion of teaching and learning, curriculum development and implementation, peer coaching can become the heart of professional development. It encompasses all of the skills the authors deem essential for supervisory leadership in the 21st century: collaborative relationships, participatory decision making, reflective listening and practice, and teacher self-direction—with the clearly expressed goal of developing autonomous professionals. (p. 217)

Understanding that traditional approaches to in-service staff training were not effective, educators and researchers advocated methods of teacher development that were based on continuous collegial interaction and support (Costa & Garmston, 1994; Gottesman, 2000; Little, 1990). By the middle of the 1990s, even Joyce and Shovers (1996), who had provided the initial data in support of peer coaching, extended their recommendation for peer coaching to include greater demands on its participants.

"Increasingly we have found that attention to the social organization is extremely
important. We now ask entire faculties to decide whether they want the school site to work with us, and we discuss at length exactly how we might work together” (p. 14).

Supporting their sentiments, Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) advised organizational leaders to work to establish a culture that values professional, collegial interactions among all school participants. They suggested a form of peer review where faculties as a team planned, shared, evaluated, and learned from one another. Peer coaching gained national acceptance from academics and practitioners alike. As a result, the literature during this time period was rife with articles supporting the benefits of peer coaching, as well as exposing its shortcomings.

**Benefits of Peer Coaching**

As peer coaching started to infiltrate the practice of schools, it was researched and studied. Much of the literature extolled the benefits of peer coaching, as validated through research, and/or teacher and administrator anecdotes. The benefits of peer coaching were wide-ranging.

*Increased professionalism and collaboration.*

Many professionals and scholars believe that the strength of peer coaching is in its potential to promote a culture of collaboration and professionalism among teachers (Wong & Nicotlea, 2003). Hyman (1990) explained:

> Peer coaching promotes honest, helpful, and mutually beneficial interaction between people performing essentially similar jobs. It promotes what is natural in human society—talk between people with common interests, common jobs, and
common status. It promotes and encourages healthy substantive discourse between teachers who focus on the act of teaching rather than the economic or social aspects of teaching. Peer coaching promotes professional behavior between teachers even as it recognizes that the field of teaching may not compare favorably in professionalism with such fields as medicine, law, accounting and engineering. Indeed, the very act of peer coaching serves to professionalize teachers. (p. 53)

Peer coaching offered the support, guidance and/or coaching to make professional development what it should be—growing and learning as a professional (Curtis, 2004). As importantly, it encouraged professional dialogue. It offered meaningful intellectual and social engagement with ideas about teaching and learning practices, and it increased the reflective thinking a teacher engages in about student work and classroom practice (Garmston, Linder, & Whitaker, 1993)—all hallmarks of collaboration and professionalism.

Isolation.

Peer coaching was developed in schools as a mechanism to improve teaching, but also to address the issue of isolation (Baker, 1984). Recognizing the research of Lortie (1975) and others that identified isolation as a major drawback for classroom teachers, educators continued to seek ways to eliminate or to minimize the debilitating effects of isolation experienced by many of America’s public school teachers. The collaborative spirit that surrounds peer coaching helped to break the grip of psychological isolation
from other adults that teachers experienced in their workplace (Boremholtz, 1991).

Galbraith and Anstrem (1995) explained coaching's effect on isolation:

Coaching reduces isolation by providing the professional dialogue that encourages teachers to generate solutions to their own problems. By sharing instructional strategies and techniques, teachers pool not only their physical but also their intellectual resources. Such collaboration is especially important in enabling teachers from a variety of disciplines to become familiar with and value the contributions of the others. (p. 4)

The research also supports another substantial benefit: peer coaching's ability to build collaborative structures lead to greater retention of faculty. "Peer coaching is known to increase retention in the teaching profession by reducing the feeling of isolation while strengthening collaboration with colleagues" (Curtis, 2004, p. 1).

*School culture and climate.*

Others found that peer coaching has the ability to improve school climate (Garmston, 1997) and the potential to modify the "deep structure" of schools—also known as school culture (Hyman, 1990). Hyman (1990) elaborated:

This is beneficial because acceptance of the deep structure is in effect acceptance of educational fatalism and pre-determinism, which are contrary to a fundamental belief that all teachers share—that they can affect the lives of their students. A modification of the school's deep structure is necessary if we are to implement meaningful change, and peer coaching can help effect that modification (p. 54).
Corroborating this finding, Showers' (1985) research showed that when peer coaching is part of the school culture, teachers felt empowered. This research led to school-wide change. “When peer coaching is part of the school climate teachers no longer feel there is just one more superficial program tacked onto the school for a year” (Curtis, 2004, p. 3). The collegial structure of peer coaching gives teachers limitless support, allowing them to weather numerous issues and problems encountered during the school year.

_Improved instruction and student achievement._

Peer coaching was viewed as an innovative tool to significantly improve the implementation of new curriculum and instructional strategies (Shewers, Joyce & Bennett, 1987). The coaching process engaged teachers in conversations that focused on student work, curriculum materials, and subject matter in relation to both content and performance standards (Neubert & Bratton, 1987). As a result, the percentage of teachers incorporating new instructional strategies climbed from a low of 10 percent to a high of 80 percent (Joyce & Showers, 1984).

With its positive effect on implementation and teacher effectiveness, peer coaching was able to affect a quantifiable increase in student achievement (Acklund, 1991; Good, 1997; Holloway, 2001). Teachers planned lessons together, shared materials and strategies, and observed and learned from one another. The structure of coaching encouraged teachers to use data to inform their teaching practice. They jointly collected and examined student achievement data and used them to determine the areas of focus and intervention (Murphy, 1999). Peer coaching offered follow-up, support and
ongoing professionally embedded assistance (Guskey & Sparks, 1996). In the true spirit of collegiality, peer coaching built communities of teachers who continuously engaged in the study of their craft (Little, 1982; Showers, 1982).

**Improved supervision.**

Peer coaching offered an effective alternative to supervision (Hyman, 1990).

Hyman explained:

In the current system, a principal or other supervisor visits the tenured teachers only once or twice and the probationary teachers only three to five times a year. The principal observes for 25-30 minutes, writes a report, and confers with the teacher for perhaps 30 minutes. Then the teacher writes a retort, and the principal files the report with the superintendent. This “hit-and-run” approach may function adequately for meeting legal evaluation requirements, but for actually improving teaching, it is a mild disaster. It violates virtually every principle of staff development set forth in our collected wisdom. (p.53)

As schools implemented peer coaching, teachers were trained to observe one another and to provide feedback for formative purposes. This approach had two benefits: it alleviated the time constraints experienced when principals tried to schedule all of the necessary observations, and it minimized teachers’ anxieties about the observation experiences (Manson, 1995). Another benefit was that it took pressure off of supervisors to improve teaching (Hyman, 1990). Peer coaching established supervision as a collaborative process: an opportunity to gather student achievement data and other information around which professional dialogue took place. Although the benefits of
peer coaching were amply cited, the literature of the period also thoroughly in outlined the many obstacles to implementing it.

Obstacles to Peer Coaching

Peer coaching is more complex than it first appears (Gallbraith & Astrom, 1995). Underlying any construct is a set of assumptions. Fueling the reluctance by educational leaders to embrace peer coaching was a number of assumptions that made them skeptical. Hyman (1990) enumerated several of these:

Teachers have the ability to help each other; teachers want to change; teachers can learn the skills to perform peer coaching in a relatively short period of time; teachers will accept and believe what their peers say to them; and, teachers can and will trust other teachers to lead them to positive change. In addition, teachers are professional who can act like professionals in other fields to upgrade their actions. (p. 52)

As a collaborative structure, peer coaching relied heavily on the motivation, expertise and professionalism of teachers. First and foremost, educational leaders had to embrace the assumptions of peer coaching that teachers had the interest, will, and ability to direct their own development. If they did not, the basic premises of peer coaching presented the first set of obstacles.

Related to this challenge were several essential preconditions. Above all, a school-wide norm of continuous improvement was a pre-requisite (Dalton & Moir, 1991). "There must be a general perception on the part of the people involved that they are good, but can always get better—that they can always improve what they are doing"
(Galbraith & Angstrom, 1995, p. 5). Secondly and equally as key, trust between and among peers was an essential component. A reasonable level of trust among participants, and between faculty and administration, had to permeate their interactions. "Only in an atmosphere of trust will peers freely admit their failing to each other and be receptive to suggestions for improvement" (Koballa, Eidson, Finco-Kern, Grimes, Kight & Sams, 1992). And thirdly, "there must be an interpersonal climate in the school that conveys the sense that people care about each other and are willing to help one another" (Galbraith & Angstrom, 1995, p. 5). Absent any of these preconditions, school practitioners found peer coaching difficult, if not impossible.

The complex nature of schools also presented a significant obstacle to implementing peer coaching. Specifically, the culture of isolation in schools had a chilling effect on collegial endeavors (Gottescan, 2000). The subtle resistance from teachers to have another adult in their classroom worked against the structure of peer coaching. "The resistance to peer sharing and observation makes an awkward and ironic contrast to the recognition that peer sharing and observation is an effective form of teacher development" (p. 182). The resistance that results from the culture of isolation was found to be detrimental to school improvement in general, and peer coaching in particular.

On an administrative level, there were a number of obstacles to peer coaching cited in the literature. These included limited resources and lack of time. Wong and Nicotrz (2003) explained how these are related:

Many schools and districts have limited access to funds for professional development. In peer coaching, teachers often leave their classrooms to observe
another teacher, which may require a substitute teacher. Additionally, time is required for collaborative planning and development of lesson plans. These are resource and logistics issues that the administration must solve through reallocation and restructuring of the school to ensure an effective program. (p. 5)

The research confirms that peer coaching is time consuming. Successful peer coaching required adequate released time for teachers to observe and to conference with one another. If resources were not allocated for this activity, then peer coaching became burdensome and counter-productive (Hyman, 1990). A condition of adequate resources is based on the assumption that the school has an active and supportive principal advocating for the procedural and monetary needs of peer coaching. The frustrations managing the many logistical problems related to the implementation of peer coaching programs was often the "final straw" for teachers and administrators. "Such concerns as preparing meaningful substitute teacher plans, guilt associated with being away from the classroom and parental complaints associated with substitute teachers are major problems to resolve when planning for peer coaching" (Mothers, 1990, p. 379).

Peer Coaching in Practice

Despite the obstacles, school districts across the country implemented successful peer coaching programs. Educators learned from their experiences and from others' examples. Cited below are two large urban school districts that initiated peer coaching as part of a larger reform effort, and had very different experiences in doing so.
Boston.

In the 1996-97 school year, Boston Public Schools started a full-blown effort to implement standards-based instruction. Realizing that this major effort would require additional support and assurance for classroom teachers, the system implemented content coaches at multiple schools in Boston (Bogner, 2000). Focusing specifically on literacy and mathematics, the coaches worked as in-school staff developers whose main objective was to improve teacher practice by engaging teachers in reflective discussions. "In schools all over Boston, external coaches are offering principals and teachers the kind of professional development that research says is most effective: ongoing, in-school, high quality, and focused on instruction" (Guiney, 2001).

Superintendent Thomas Payzart, with support from Boston's teacher union, proposed the coaching model and championed it as a systemic, district-wide approach to improve student performance. He was particularly concerned with the estimated 38 percent of Boston's students who were unwitting participants in the district's unofficial policy of social promotion. He wanted to break the cycle of routinely promoting students at the end of the year without their mastering the appropriate grade level knowledge or skills. Guiney (2001) explained the school system's approach:

Boston's approach to whole school improvement rests on two central strategies: (1) focus on instruction and on professional development to improve instruction; and (2) place an unwavering emphasis on helping teachers work together, make their work public, and end teacher isolation. In the process, teacher leadership emerges. (p. 741)
Building upon its success, during the 2001-02 school year the district piloted the Boston Plan, a variation on its content coaching model. Known as Collaborative Coaching & Learning, this program used contractual time set aside during the school day for professional development. "Teachers studied, demonstrated, and mastered together an instructional strategy from Readers' or Writers' workshops, two of Dr. Payzant's priorities for all schools. They then translated that learning into practice in their own classrooms." (Boston Public Schools, 2003, p. 1). The details of implementation spoke to the system's determination to meet its goal to improve student performance. The Boston Public School's web site explained:

Within each six-week cycle, a content coach was in a school two days each week, working with two groups of 5-10 teachers. Each group chose a particular instructional strategy to study, such as how to confer with a student on revising a draft. The cycle included an ongoing inquiry group to learn about the strategy's theory and technique and a weekly lab site in a host classroom, which included a pre-conference between the coach and the demonstrating teacher, a demonstration lesson by one teacher while other team members observed, and a debriefing for questions and comments. (Boston Public Schools, 2003, p. 1)

Boston's teacher unions played a minor but supportive role in implementing peer coaching and in the success of the program; they supported Superintendent Payzant's expansion of the Collaborative Coaching & Learning model when he made it the coaching model for all of Boston's schools starting with the 2002-03 school year.
San Diego.

San Diego’s Superintendent met a stormier, if not contentious, path when implementing peer coaching in California’s second largest city. Landing the position as leader of the 140,000 student district without any prior educational experience, former U.S. district attorney Alan Bersin was appointed San Diego’s Superintendent in 1998. Realizing that he needed an experienced and knowledgeable advisor, Bersin recruited former New York City Superintendent Anthony Alvarado to be the district’s academic chancellor (Smith, 2005). Moving quickly to institute change, Bersin and Alvarado implemented a number of reform initiatives meant to reorganize and reprioritize San Diego’s educational system. Superintendent Bersin proposed a coaching and mentoring program for improving the classroom practices of San Diego’s 8,000 teachers, a replication of a model developed and successfully implemented by Alvarado in New York City. The school board reallocated $65 million, part of which was to be used to finance better training and mentoring for teachers (Keller, 1999).

Immediately coaching became “a bone of contention” for the Superintendent and the San Diego Education Association, where localized school governance was entrenched (Hornblower, 2005). Objecting to Bersin’s top-down style, the teacher union took issue with tight district control of the program. “The union fought for site-based control rather than central command, arguing that teachers in individual schools were better judges of reform strategies than outsiders” (Smith, 2005, p.1). Hornblower (2005) described the source of the conflict:

The district leadership faced unyielding opposition from a strong teacher’s union, convinced that instructors at the grassroots were better suited to carry out school
reform, and that a top-down approach was misguided. The union fought implementation of Alvarado’s New York scheme. It was uncomfortable with the principals’ new roles as instructional leaders taking orders from a central hierarchy. And many teachers were deeply opposed to opening their classrooms to outside consultants and coaches bent in implementing the Alvarado curriculum and method. (p. 3)

To break the very public deadlock, Stephen Weber who was the President of San Diego State, volunteered to mediate. In an eventual deal, the university’s School of Education offered to oversee the design of a peer-coach certification program and to independently certify its graduates. That offer assuaged the concerns of union members that teachers approved for the jobs by the district administration would not have credibility as coaches. They voiced their trepidation that district-picked and district-trained peer coaches would be viewed as evaluators and critics sent by the administration (Keller, 1999).

Although a peer coaching program was launched with some success, the relationship between the Superintendent and the teachers never improved. Bersin’s support with the school board was tenuous throughout his tenure, and finally with a school board election in 2004 that changed the balance of support for the Superintendent, the peer coaching initiative was terminated completely (Hornblower, 2005).

Effects of Peer Coaching

As peer coaching became more prevalent in school districts around the country, researchers examined its effects on schooling. They found that it produced a number of
outcomes, most of which were positive; and these outcomes had the greatest impact on teachers and school environments. Showers and Joyce (1996) explained:

We have been convinced throughout that peer coaching is neither an end in itself nor by itself a school improvement initiative. Rather, it must operate in a context of training, implementation, and general school improvement. There is no evidence that simply organizing peer coaching or peer study teams will affect students' learning environments. The study of teaching and curriculum must be the focus. (p.13)

With that said, it is important to examine some of the effects of peer coaching, particularly on teachers and school environments. Besides greatly improving the transfer of new teaching strategies from professional development activities to classroom practice, pioneers Showers and Joyce (1996) found an ancillary effect of peer coaching. "Successful peer coaching teams developed skills in collaboration and enjoyed the experience so much that they wanted to continue their collegial partnerships after they accomplished their initial goals" (p. 12). Hyman (1990) offered some insight:

Peer coaching begins to offer opportunities to teachers to conduct their lives as other professionals do for the ultimate benefit of the "client". It does so as it promotes and utilizes the techniques of small-group cooperative learning. It recognizes that the principles of cooperative learning, which are strenuously and validly advocated for students in our school, apply equally to teachers seeking to improve themselves. (p. 56)

Hoy, Tarter & Witkoskie (1992) found that as a result of the support that peer coaching provided to teachers by their colleagues and by building administrators,
teachers were more likely to take risks to improve their instruction, and showed more interest in building activities and goals. Supporting this finding, Munro and Elliot (1987) studied 41 high school teachers who collaborated to develop new strategies in the classroom. Participants reported that coaching enabled them to meet more instructional objectives than traditional methods of supervision. Sparks and Burde (1987) found similar results when implementing a coaching program. Most teachers in their study reported a greater likelihood of trying new practices after collaborating with a colleague.

Munson's (1998) study of 8 coaching pairs in Washington State provided some further insight into why teachers are more willing to implement new strategies in peer coaching. He found that participants felt less anxious and more comfortable when observed by another teacher rather than by an administrator, and less defensive when their teaching was discussed with another teacher. Survey data showed that the teachers desired more feedback about what was happening in their classrooms and felt that their coaches' observations were more helpful in improving their teaching skills.

Ehmeier (2003) studied peer coaching's impact on five teacher affective variables: (a) commitment to teaching, (b) commitment to school, (c) trust in administration, (d) trust in teachers, and (e) desire for collaboration. His results indicated that the collaborative nature of peer coaching played a major role in increasing teachers' commitment, collaboration, efficacy, and trust. Results highlighted the importance of peer trust in influencing commitment to building goals, commitment to teaching, and overall satisfaction. Ehmeier (2003) explained the significance and the ramifications of the study when he wrote:
Peers more directly influence commitment to teaching through establishment of trusting relationships and establishment of satisfying working relationships. Pragmatically, this finding suggests that improving teacher retention in schools is really a function of making sure teachers establish functional and supportive relationships with other teachers and believe that principals care and supports teachers' efforts in the classroom. (p. 127)

Supporting this line of thinking, researchers discovered that new teachers involved in a mentoring program that included peer observations were more likely to remain in the teaching profession beyond four years than teachers who were not involved (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992; Odell & Ferraro, 1992). This finding might be explained by the observation by many educators that peer coaching alleviates burnout and isolation and fosters communication, trust and support among teachers (Anastos & Ancowitz, 1987; Ebmeier, 2003). Yet on a cautionary note, it must be reported that Little (1990) and others suggest that coaching can generate conflicts for teachers because it violates traditional norms of autonomy, privacy, and equality in schools.

Spillane, Halverson and Diamond (2001) studied how the distributive leadership of peer coaching influenced school environments. As teachers moved into leadership roles of mentoring to shape classroom practice, school environments became communities of learners. This development entailed teachers supporting one another and administrators supporting teachers in their professional learning, both leading to a healthy interdependency, which positively affected the school culture. They also found that opinions and ideas were given greater weight in determining school practice, when leadership was shared. This expanded decision-making body created more ideas for
solving the complex issues of improving student performance. In addition, by sharing leadership and building a collaborative environment through peer coaching, teachers more readily supported reform initiatives, allowing for greater implementation success and a greater sense of shared mission (Bogner, 2002).

Serving as an example of the effects of peer coaching on teachers and school environments, Old Adobe Union School District in Sonoma County, California implemented this program in the late 1980s. It had two main purposes: to support newly hired teachers and to provide leadership opportunities to experienced teachers. The program was put into place when the County experienced a rapid growth in student population, and the district took in a large number of new and mostly inexperienced teachers. The district leadership noticed that the retention rate was dropping significantly, and implemented Peer Sharing and Caring (Raney & Robbins, 1989). One of the classroom teachers reported a change in the school atmosphere and other results:

As a result of Peer Caring and Sharing, topics of conversation in the staff room are less often about personal matters and more frequently about the act of teaching and classroom management. There is an atmosphere of experimentation and openness to new ideas. Teachers eagerly consult their colleagues for assistance and share their own expertise. In addition to promoting collegiality and providing new teachers the support they so urgently need, the program has had beneficial effects on experienced teachers. (Raney & Robbins, 1989, p. 38)

As a result of the positive effects of peer coaching that have been validated either through empirical or anecdotal evidence, peer coaching remains a viable and actively pursued reform initiative, from its inception in the early 1980s through to the present. Peer
coaching can help to build a professional culture that supports teachers who are knowledgeable and responsive to all students, regardless of the students' needs (Kovic, 1996, p. 30).

**Causal Factors of Peer Coaching—1990–present**

The following Ishikawa diagram presents the major causal factors leading to the development of peer coaching from 1990 to the present. Each factor is assigned to one of the five causal factorial categories. A narrative summary follows.

**Figure 6.3 Causal Factors of Peer Coaching—1990–present**

**Summary of Causal Factors—1990–present**

The concern that American citizens had for the quality of the United States educational system was a continuing societal/cultural causal factor. This fueled the second wave of school reform, which contributed to the implementation of peer coaching.
The numerous national reports that emerged in the late 1980s and early 1990s were a government/political causal factor. *A Nation Prepared, A Time for Results*, and *Tomorrow's Teachers* all focused attention on teachers and the importance of being better prepared for classroom instruction. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future joined the movement towards improved teaching. Its report, *What Matters Most*, called for schools to become environments that encourage good teaching.

This mandate affirmed the need for practices such as peer coaching.

Teacher retention developed as a major educational causal factor for peer coaching. Research indicated that American classrooms had a serious problem keeping their teachers, and further research showed that mentoring programs were highly effective in aiding in their retention. Another educational causal factor was the support of professionalism through teacher leadership. It was recognized that if teachers were to become change agents and leaders of reform then they would have to be part of the leadership structure.

The movement towards standards-based instruction was an educational causal factor, as evidenced by the Boston public schools. In their efforts to implement new instructional practices, the system implemented peer coaching throughout the district. Other districts, such as San Diego, also used peer coaching to supplement their efforts to improve student performance through standards-based instruction. An additional educational causal factor was the expansive notions of teacher supervision that developed during the decade. As school administrators redefined and recalibrated the role of supervision, their new perspective allowed for the integration of peer mentoring and peer review into the lexicon of acceptable supervision models.
A contingency causal factor that contributed to the acceptance of peer coaching was the research on adult learning. Researchers found that interventions, like peer coaching, could enhance teachers' cognition, ultimately leading to the improvement of their instructional practices. The research finding and theories of adult learning were disseminated, and a better understanding of adult learning led to support for reflective practices such as peer mentoring.

**Summary and Ishikawa Diagram of Peer Coaching**

Compilation of Causal Factors of Peer Coaching—1960-present

---

**Figure 6.4 Compilation of Causal Factors of Peer Mentoring—1960-present**
Summary of Causal factors of Peer Coaching—1960-present

Peer coaching was introduced as a reform tool in the early 1980s, and grew to become a popular intervention to aid the professional development of teachers and to implement curriculum revision. It is defined as a confidential process through which teachers share their expertise and provide one another with feedback, support and assistance for the purpose of refining and/or improving instructional practice. It grew and evolved into numerous manifestations including technical coaching, team coaching, collegial coaching, cognitive coaching, challenge coaching, peer mentoring and peer review.

Following the large investment of federal funds in education programs from the National Defense Education Act in 1958, and the Johnson era War on Poverty, which developed Title I programs to address social inequalities and to improve academic quality, numerous studies were undertaken to assess their effectiveness. A RAND Corporation study, and other research that followed, found that the implementation of reform was not positively affecting gains in the areas where they were focused. As a result of the implementation studies, during the 1970s the processes of implementing and supervising reform initiatives, as well as the training of teachers and in-service professional development, were closely scrutinized.

Other developments, including an increased school population, and the changing demographics of public school attendees, forced schools to reexamine existing practices, particularly in the areas of supervision and professional development. Finding that traditional bureaucratic structures of "essentialistic" supervision were not effective in helping teachers to meet the changing needs of their students, school administrators
adopted the clinical model. The implementation studies exposed the need for greater preparation of teachers. School reform initiatives called for fresh thinking, and new professional models were developed to facilitate reform. These changes in mindsets paved the way for the future embrace of peer coaching.

With the start of the 1980s, concern for the quality of American education remained high. Researchers began to suggest new supervision and professional development models to address these concerns. Supervision models called for a existentialist orientation to supervision—employing reflection and self-direction. Research, as well as business models that were employed during the decade, supported this trend. Showers and Joyce, who found that fewer than 10 percent of participants in professional development activities transferred the new knowledge to the classroom, researched professional development. They also found that coaching, following initial training would result in much greater transfer, and as a consequence peer coaching was established as a viable reform initiative.

As peer coaching took root in America’s school systems in the 1980s, six working models emerged. In general, technical, team, and challenge coaching focused on innovations in curriculum and instruction, while collegial, cognitive, and reciprocal coaching focused on improving existing practice.

During the second wave of reform in the 1990s, peer coaching met the call for greater teacher professionalism as summoned by the numerous national reports emanating from 1986-1990. Peer coaching engaged teachers in activities that were linked to leadership: creating a vision for change, encouraging staff, and monitoring for change. In addition, peer coaching was implemented to counter the effects of isolation,
reverse the increasing problem of teacher retention, and meet the challenge of instituting standards-based instruction. Despite the success of peer coaching, practitioners found that it had some negative side effects, including role ambiguity, conflict, and work overload, and it challenged the culture of schooling.

As notions of professional development expanded, the 1990s saw two additional forms of peer coaching emerge: peer mentoring and peer review. Peer mentoring became the most common form of coaching. One of its aims was to improve teacher retention by pairing a novice teacher with an experienced master teacher who offered support and guidance in improving classroom practice. Peer review added the element of evaluation, long disassociated with the collegial nature of coaching. In peer review, two teachers were paired in a coaching relationship; however, the consulting teacher conducted formal evaluations and made recommendations regarding continuation of employment. Because peer review involved potential changes in employment, teacher unions voiced strong opposition, and it was only with the emergence of the new unionism, which provided support and cooperation, that peer review programs could be implemented.

As peer coaching became widely practiced, it was researched and studied. Much of the literature extolled the benefits of peer coaching, but also presented its obstacles. On the positive side, peer coaching increased professionalism and collaboration, helped to minimize isolation, positively effected school culture and climate, and improved instruction and student achievement. On the negative side, the complex nature of schools presented a significant obstacle to implementing coaching. The culture of autonomy had a debilitating effect on collegial endeavors; administrators undermined a structure they
saw as challenging to their authority; and peer coaching increased the demands on time as teachers were already feeling the burden of overload.

As peer coaching became more prevalent in school districts, researchers examined its effects on schooling. The most significant positive outcomes are related to the teacher and to school environments. Researchers found that teachers were more likely to take risks to improve their instruction, and to increase their commitment to teaching, which in turn improved teacher retention. Schools became more collegial institutions and developed the characteristics of professional learning communities.
CHAPTER VII
Comparative Historical Analysis

This chapter addresses the major research questions of this study: Why has collegiality been used as a response to school reform initiatives in the United States? What are the cause and effect relationship patterns between collegiality and school reform? What has been the effectiveness of collegiality in meeting school reform objectives for the past 45 years? Using the methodologies of comparative historical analysis, a number of answers emerge which give greater insight into the complexities of collegiality as a response to school reform.

Aggregate Causal Factor Comparison

It is a straightforward comparison of the compilation Ishikawa diagrams for the case studies of teacher teams, school-based management, and peer coaching, three out of the five causal factor categories, societal/cultural, governmental/political, and educational were the principal categories to lead to the main effect of collegiality (Fig. 7.1). These categories had the most influence on the adoption of collegiality by virtue of their cumulative numbers. The aggregate number of causal factors attributed to the societal/cultural category were 15, the aggregate number for the governmental/political category were 20, and the aggregate number for the educational category were 31.

Although there were significant contingency and economic causal factors, these types of causal factors in the aggregate were considerably less. The aggregate number for the economic category was 4, and the aggregate number for the contingency category was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Societal/cultural</th>
<th>Governmental/political</th>
<th>Educational</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in Cultural Norms</td>
<td>NDREA</td>
<td>Individual Accountability</td>
<td>Property Tax Rev-41</td>
<td>Sprunk 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diminishing Confidence in Public Schools</td>
<td>NRC Administration</td>
<td>Teacher Shortage/Utilization Studies</td>
<td>Global Competitiveness</td>
<td>Business Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands for Equal Opportunity</td>
<td>A Nation at Risk</td>
<td>Teacher Isolation</td>
<td>Economic Crisis</td>
<td>Astounding Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing School Demographics</td>
<td>A Nation Prepared</td>
<td>Cyber Classroom Movement</td>
<td>Corporate Restructuring/Business Models</td>
<td>Research on Adult Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Safety</td>
<td>A Time for Results</td>
<td>Test Score Decline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-out Rate</td>
<td>Turnaround Points</td>
<td>School Restructuring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESGI</td>
<td>Lower Levels of Academic Achievement</td>
<td>Middle School Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Demographics</td>
<td>High School Reform</td>
<td>Coalition of Essential Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal Impact</td>
<td>Class Size Reduction</td>
<td>NASP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution to Post-industrial Society</td>
<td>Era of National Reports</td>
<td>Small Schools Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscious for Quality of American Education</td>
<td>Policy Network</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inequality</td>
<td>State-level Politics</td>
<td>Dropout/transformation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War on Poverty</td>
<td>Teacher Unions</td>
<td>Decolonization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased School Population</td>
<td>School Funding Challenges</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Demographics</td>
<td>Local, State, Federal Mandates</td>
<td>School Reforming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absence of Accountability/Implementation Studies</td>
<td>Effective Schools Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Culture Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.1 (continued)

_Causal Factors in the Aggregate for Teacher Teaming, School-based Management and Peer Coaching_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Societal/cultural</th>
<th>Governmental/political</th>
<th>Educational</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Union</td>
<td>Call for Improved Student Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomorrow’s Teachers</td>
<td>Standards Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Commission on Teaching &amp; America’s Future</td>
<td>Professional Learning Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bureaucratic Structure of Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in Models of Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existentialist Orientation to Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research on Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standards-based Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expanding Notions of Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
also 4. The following section shares analyses derived from the use of the methodology of explanation building. Explanation building reveals the significance and limitations of comparing and analyzing the aggregate causal factors.

**Educational Causal Factors**

It is not surprising that educational causal factors were the main influence for the three effects of collegiality—teacher teaming, school-based management, peer coaching. It is important to point out that the causal factors indicate that educational leaders were responding to issues and concerns, as well as to the emergence of numerous educational movements.

Of the 31 causal factors for the three forms of collegiality, 16 relate to specific issues or concerns. These include: individualization of instruction, teacher shortage, teacher isolation, test score decline, decentralization, accountability, the demand for improved student achievement, ineffective professional development, teacher retention, and the call for teacher leadership. It is also noted that the number of issues and concerns appear in similar numbers in all three forms of collegiality. Perhaps the most informative analysis from this comparison is that educators have generally have been in a reactive mode for the past 45 years, as opposed to a proactive mode. It is apparent from an analysis of the aggregate number comparison that educators were responding to issues and concerns presented by people outside of the sphere of education. Society and government drove the educational causal factors of collegiality; educators reacted. This self-imposed secondary role placed individuals with potentially the most knowledge and experience in the back seat of the reform movement.
A further analysis shows that educational movements, eight in total, were significant educational causal factors. There included: Open Classroom Movement, school restructuring, Middle School Movement, Small Schools Movement, Effective Schools Movement, Professionalism Movement, Standards Movement, and the Professional Learning Communities Movement. The large number of recognized movements in education is potentially a negative indicator. This fact implies a proclivity towards vacillation by the educational reformers, which intimates that educators were unable to find and focus their efforts on effective practices. It is interesting to note that educational movements were a far greater cause for the implementation of teacher teaching and school-based management than they were for peer coaching. Most of the educational movements listed above emerged during the 1980s and were in reaction to A Nation at Risk. Interdisciplinary teacher teaching and school-based management held sway during this period, and were the effects of the educational movements of this decade. The movements of the 1980s waned as peer coaching took onto the reform scene in the 1990s; therefore the impact of educational movements on the effect of peer coaching was nominal. In sum, an analysis of educational causal factors leads to a greater understanding of why education has been in a reform mode for 45 years, and continues to be so.

In this case, numbers do not indicate strength. Although the aggregate number of educational causal factors is the greatest, an analysis of those causal factors leads to the understanding that educators were in a reactive mode and were driven by the issues and concerns presented by sociocultural factors, as well as governmental/political causal factors. In addition, the fascination with formalized movements has done little to address
the problems that have prompted a continuing reform mode in American education for the past 45 years. Therefore, a closer look at the societal/cultural, and governmental/political causal factors is warranted, and perhaps is more revealing about the nature of collegiality.

**Societal/cultural Causal Factors**

Why were the 15 societal/cultural causal factors so influential, although smaller in number? An analysis leads to the following conclusion: their reach, by nature, had breadth and depth. The change in cultural norms, the evolution to a post-industrial society, and the change of demographics of public school classrooms touched every American, and in significant ways that educational causal factors never achieved. Their reach penetrated deeply into the psyche of American culture and society, and with a transformational force that threatened established values, and mores, and challenged the foundations of long established institutions.

In the 1960s experimentation and revolution took hold and a broad-based coalition of citizens confronted authority structures, advocated for greater social tolerance, created environmental awareness, and changed attitudes about gender roles, marriage and child rearing (Law, n.d.). In the 1970s the technology age took hold and the country experienced the evolution from the industrial to the post-industrial age (Murphy & Bock, 1991). Business and economics became global, pushing the reach of societal/cultural causal factors to their maximum (Toch, 1991). While these factors were causing a whirlwind of change, the composition of the population of the United States was making a shift that significantly altered the countenance of America's public school
classrooms. The growing number of students from minority, limited-English proficiency, and low-income families demanded that institutions of learning rethink tried-and-true methods of delivering instruction. The changing demographics of students challenged schools in ways they had never been before (Rayvid, 2002). It is no wonder that educational causal factors appear weak, and the actions of educators ineffective. By sheer force of their disposition, societal and cultural causal factors focused and drove reform, eclipsing education’s role.

**Governmental/political Causal Factors**

An examination of the 20 governmental/political causal factors that led to the implementation of collegiality fleshes out the analysis of aggregate causal factors. By far the largest type of governmental/political causal factor was the national report. Most often the national report was less a document reflecting government priorities and more a statement of political agenda; nevertheless, it became the governmental/political causal factor of choice. Although national reports did not challenge America as fundamentally as the societal/cultural causal factors did, the reports’ influences were far reaching.

All three forms of collegiality, teacher teaming, school-based management, and peer coaching were greatly impacted by the Era of National Reports. The germination of school-based management and peer coaching happened as a direct result of the reports, and the rebirth of teacher teaming can be attributed to the governmental/political causal factors of national reports. These results stand more as a testament to politics than to government, particularly on the national level. This analysis draws a definite and important distinction between governmental causal factors and political causal factors.
Although closely allied, they remain different in significant ways for this portion of the aggregate causal factor analysis.

The Reagan administration's reversal on the importance of education to the national agenda, and the President's direct and decisive role in rallying the country around the concerns outlined in A Nation at Risk (Bell, 1993) serve as evidence of the crucial role politics played in setting the course for educational reform. Other political entities, such as the American Federation of Teachers, and the informal policy network identified by Ogawa (1994), all united to propel national reports that advanced their priorities, perspectives, and ambitious agendas. Government, per se, stood back and took a passive role; politics stepped forward and became the primary shaper of governmental/political causal factors. As a result, the reports had greater impact because they started with political bases that had established leverage and effective mechanisms for advocating their causes. It is not by coincidence that school-based management became the form of collegiality most widely practiced. Its agenda to decentralize decision-making power was embraced by political entities with considerable influence.

It is interesting to note that in contrast, local, state and federal mandates served as a governmental/political causal factor, and most often were least effective in implementing collegiality as a tool of educational reform. Repeatedly found in the literature, and cited frequently in this study's three case studies, the caveat that collegiality can't be mandated or forced became a truism. This warning was supported by the experience of instituting teacher teaming in Nevada, experimenting with school-based management in New York City, and implementing peer coaching in San Diego.

All three of these large educational entities fell to the sword of Darnocles—mandated
collegiality. New York City's efforts never really took off; San Diego's were undermined and eventually rendered ineffective by the actions of the teachers' union, and Nevada, although still holding on to its conviction to reduce class size, struggled to produce clear and measurable progress with its forced teacher teaming arrangements.

The aggregate number of government/political causal factors is reason for attention, but proved to be more so when this researcher examined their important role in fostering collegiality as a response to reform. Governmental and political causal factors maintain a crucial role in the comparative historical analysis and will be revisited numerous times in the ensuing chapter.

Contingency and Economic Causal Factors

Although much smaller in number, contingency causal factors and economic causal factors had a considerable role in prompting the use of collegiality as a reform tool. Two contingency causal factors, Sputnik I in 1957 and the emergence of business models as exemplars of education in the 1980s, had extraordinary impact on educational reform. This study, and many others, ranks the launching of Sputnik I as the seminal event in jumpstarting educational reform (Haggerty, 1995; Cuban, 2004). The effect of the successful launching of Sputnik I had the reach of a societal/cultural causal factor; it penetrated deep into the soul of America and transformed the way its citizens viewed their system of public schooling. More to the point, Sputnik I put educators and political leaders on the defensive. Feeling the glare of public scrutiny, political leaders passed landmark legislation in the form of the National Defense Education Act. Establishing the response mode that would plague them for the next 45 years, educators and academics
were forced to undertake the largest wholesale revision of its public school system that America had ever experienced. As it relates to collegiality, the mindset of reform that was triggered by Sputnik I put into motion the collegial practice of team teaching.

Although not on the scale of Sputnik I, but influential in their own right, successful business models emerged in the 1980s as prototypes for education, serving as a major causal factor for the use of collegiality in school reform. Intertwined with this factor is the economic causal factor of global competitiveness. As America saw its economic preeminence challenged during the decade, its leaders began to seek ways to improve the country's global competitiveness (Toch, 1991). The message to corporate leaders was that business as usual would not suffice. They sought out new and innovative ways to retool the way America conducted business, with the specific aim of strengthening the country’s competitive edge. The success of Total Quality Management (TQM) and other participatory decision-making models led business leaders to call for the replication of these models in education. The interplay between these two causal factors, business models and global competitiveness, generated the synergy necessary to propel school-based management into the national spotlight, and into the organizational structures of school systems across the country. Even though the aggregate number of causal factors for the economic, and contingency categories is small, each provides a major causal factor for the acceptance of collegial practices as an educational reform effort.
Aggregate Causal Factor Comparison Summary

The aggregate causal factor comparative analysis explains why numbers do not indicate strength. Even though the educational category had the most causal factors, these did not exert the most influence on the adoption of collegial practices for school reform. Their reach lacked breadth and depth. Because the societal/cultural and governmental/political causal factors were all-consuming for the American public in the 1960s and 1970s, and because the intertwining of the contingency and economic causal factors of business model and global competitiveness became a major dynamic in the 1980s, the educational causal factors throughout the 45 years of reform were overshadowed and overpowered. An important observation about this aggregate causal factor comparison is that educators were continually put into the position of reacting to causal factors outside of their realm during the period of reform. Because collegial practices were propelled by causal factors beyond education, powerful governmental, political, societal, and cultural forces compromised their effectiveness of this reform strategy. These forces will be examined using theme and pattern matching—signature methodologies of comparative historical analysis.

Theme and Pattern Matching Analysis of Causal Factors

Theme and pattern matching provide a more complex comparison of the compilation Ishikawa diagrams for the case studies of teacher teaming (TT), school-based management (SBM), and peer coaching (PC). An analysis of these causal factors led to four major themes, which offer greater insight as to why collegiality has been used as a
response to school reform in the past 45 years. These themes were: (a) the concern for the quality of American education, (b) the greater roles of government and politics in education, (c) the changing landscape of American demographics and values, and (d) the demand for schools to change from centralized bureaucracies to decentralized professional organizations. The same methodology yielded four secondary themes, which warrant attention. They include: (a) the concern for the effects of teacher isolation, (b) the influence of business on educational reform, (c) the renewed focus on student achievement and accountability, and (d) the debate about the importance of school culture and climate on educational outcomes. These themes, when compared and analyzed, result in a deeper understanding of the qualities of collegiality and the value they have for schools that are engaging in reform.

Major Themes and Attributed Causal Factors

Four major themes emerged from the pattern and theme analysis. They were: concern for the quality of American education, the greater roles of government and politics in education, the changing landscape of American demographics and values, and the evolution of schools from centralized bureaucracies to decentralized professional organizations. The following section provides further analysis.

Concern for Quality of American Education

One of the major reasons that collegiality was used as a response to reform was because of the persistent concern that American public schools were declining. Spurred by Sputnik I in the late 1950s and continuing through to the standards movement of the
late 1990s and beyond, America’s educational leaders, politicians, media centers, and concerned citizens experienced a great deal of angst about the state of this country’s schools. Enormous time, talent and energy were expended to seek ways to diminish the threats created by Russia’s domination of space travel, the forces of global competition, and the educational mediocrity that characterized most American schools—all causes exacerbated by the decline in quality of American education. Table 7.6 outlines the causal factors that are the underpinnings of the concern for the quality of American education, the categories to which they are assigned, and the collegial forms that were developed as a result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Factor</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Collegial Form(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diminishing confidence in public schools</td>
<td>Societal/cultural</td>
<td>TT, SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDEA</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>TT, PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Era of National Reports</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>TT, PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Nation at Risk</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New unionism</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards movement</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global competitiveness</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>TT, SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sputnik I</td>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business models</td>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>TT, PC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the causal factors for this theme are far-reaching. The significance of far-reaching was established in the aggregate causal factor analysis and is supported by this thematic analysis. Sputnik I, the National Defense Education Act, global competitiveness, the Era of National Reports, and A Nation at Risk are significant causal factors, which not only contributed to the concern for quality of American education, but in a real sense created this concern. The significance of these causal factors should not be underestimated, and their importance for understanding multiple causation and collegiality are crucial. These five causal factors embrace three of the causal categories, contingency, governmental/political, and economic, and demonstrate the multiple nature of historical causation.

An analysis of the concern about the quality of American education clearly reveals that governmental/political causal factors were in the plurality, and also were the major drivers establishing this theme. Government and politics were inserted into the national debate on school quality and helped to shape its direction. This debate generated a call for action, which was met with a myriad of solutions to bolster education's decline. These solutions included teacher teaming and school-based management as major schemes to improve education. The impact of government and politics on school reform, and their influence on the national debate, had implications for collegiality as a response to school reform initiatives in the United States. An understanding of these factors offers insight as to why collegiality failed.

Government and politics tend to be attuned to election cycles, most specifically those periods related to elections. Though many political spokespersons worked to control the national debate about America's schools, they also had the most to lose if the public's
concerns were not assuaged. Therefore, both federal and local political leaders demanded prompt results from reform initiatives, which most often meant before the next local, state, or national election, depending on the officeholder. Research on collegiality comes into direct conflict with this need. Indeed, the three case studies make it clear that in order to realize positive effects from collegiality, the approach needs a large investment of time. For example, school-based management research indicated that it can take anywhere from 5 to 15 years for effective shared decision-making structures to be implemented, a much longer time than government expects.

Concern for the quality of American education was a driving force throughout the 45-year period of educational reform, and the concern to this date has not abated. If collegiality is to improve the quality of American education, then it must be afforded the time to do so. History suggests that political leaders at all levels of government do not have the luxury of time, and since they continue to shape the debate and to influence solutions to the problems facing schools, collegial practices such as teacher learning and school-based management seem doomed to fail.

**Increased Governmental/Political Role in Education.**

A major theme to emerge from a causal factor analysis is the increased role of government and politics in education. Admittedly there is a distinction between government and politics, but for the purposes of this analysis, the differences are not central. Many times it is not clear where government starts and politics ends, or vice-versa, as factors that have influenced the direction of American Education. Table 7.7 lists the multiple causal factors that contributed to the formulation of this theme.
Table 7.7

Causal Factors for Increased Governmental/Political Role in Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Factor</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Collegial Form(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act</td>
<td>Societal/cultural</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War on Poverty</td>
<td>Societal/cultural</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDEA</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>TT, PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reagan administration</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Nation at Risk</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy network</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State level politics</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Union</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School funding challenges</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property tax revolt</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic crisis 1980's</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global competitiveness</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>TT, SBM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The origin of this theme can be traced to the late 1950s with the passage of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA). Although the nation's legislators were careful to respect the historical and constitutional autonomy of education as a state function, the NDEA established the precedent for a larger federal role in education (Haggerty, 1995).
Examining the causal factors attributed to this theme, it is apparent and perhaps not surprising, that governmental/political causal factors are in the majority.

The next major investment by the federal government into education was its attempt to reduce the effects of poverty with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Its entitlement programs, part of the Johnson administration’s War on Poverty, were designed to address social injustices largely ignored or under-funded by the States (Levine & Lesotte, 1990). With a massive infusion of federal monies, the relationship between states and the federal government regarding education remained forever tied. The concerns for the nation essentially became concerns for the states through the carrot-and-stick approach of federal funding.

In reaction to the increased role of government and politics in educational matters, the state of Florida used collegiality, in the form of school-based management, to address the issues raised by the federal government. Feeling responsibility to account for the significant federal funding which was granted to bring about equity in its school systems, the Florida legislature authorized school-based management for its schools (Peterson, 1991). School councils were granted budget decision-making powers and the legislature saw the collaborative nature of collegiality as the best response to the increased governmental and political role in education.

Feeling that the balance between federal and state control over education was tipping the wrong way, the Reagan administration was swept to power with a pledge to limit the federal role (Berube, 1991). His administration’s attempts to disengage were short-lived. On the heels of the economic crisis of the 1980s, Reagan eventually allied himself with the recommendations for educational reform outlined in A Nation at Risk.
Foreseeing the possible political gains, President Reagan committed to a nation-wide campaign to raise public awareness about America's need to remain globally competitive. These actions reversed Reagan's original intent to eliminate the Department of Education, and only cemented the federal role in education. By making school reform a high-profile issue and tying it closely with America's need to be globally competitive, the Reagan administration set into motion the widespread use of collegiality in the form of school-based management. As the country bought into Reagan's and *A Nation at Risk*'s message, business leaders and politicians encouraged schools to restructure, urging the adoption of decision-making models that involve many of the constituencies that have a stake in the schools. The business community touted Total Quality Management. This development is a primary example of how government and political influence education. More specifically, it illustrates how these influences and the adoption of expressions by the schools on such a broad scale.

Reagan's support of school reform can safely be placed in the arena of politics, as can teachers unions whose wide-ranging and aggressive efforts gave school-based management a national following. It is important to note that out of 12 causal factors attributed to this theme, eight of them are associated with school-based management. In the 1980s, collegiality achieved something heretofore unattainable—a political base. At best its supporters can be described as a loose confederation, but nonetheless, collegiality had its ardent devotees and promoters. Proclaimed as an answer to many of the ailments of schools by union leader Albert Shanker, supported by the AFT and NEA and its affiliates, and encouraged by the informal policy network of educational leaders and politicians (Ogawa, 1994), collegiality in the form of school-based management entered the
heady world of politics. Like the fate of most political fortunes, school-based management slipped away with the passage of time.

A conclusion is that the potential benefits that government and politics had to offer collegiality were great, but the real gains made by their influences in education were ephemeral and therefore nominal. Chicago and Rochester, NY, stand as examples. The intervention of politics into school-based management schools in these two major cities was detrimental to the goals of collegiality—that of establishing an atmosphere of collaboration and mutual decision-making. As school-based management rode a wave of political popularity, it was dead-ended by the political polemics that often infected the collegial relationships that school-based management required.

Politics, on all levels, was not a friend to collegiality. Although increased governmental and political intervention in educational matters was a major cause for the widespread use of collegiality, at the end of it all, competing interests, shortsightedness, and divisive attempts to seize power by school district constituencies rendered school-based management ineffective.

The Changing Landscape of American Demographics and Values.

The impact of the changing demographics and values of America during the past 45 years on the use of collegiality as a reform tool was significant. Figure 7.8 lists the causal factors that contributed to the development of this theme, the categories to which they are assigned, and the collegial forms that were developed as a result.
Table 7.8

*Causal Factors for the Changing Landscape of American Demographics and Values*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Factor</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Collegial Form(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes in cultural norms</td>
<td>Societal/cultural</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands for equal opportunity</td>
<td>Societal/cultural</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing demographics</td>
<td>Societal/cultural</td>
<td>TT, SBM, PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal impacts</td>
<td>Societal/cultural</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution to post-industrial society</td>
<td>Societal/cultural</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social inequality</td>
<td>Societal/cultural</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War on Poverty</td>
<td>Societal/cultural</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased school population</td>
<td>Societal/cultural</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School funding challenges</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualization of instruction</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher shortage</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike the preceding analysis, all three forms of collegiality, teacher teaming, school-based management, and peer coaching, were affected in equal measure by the emergence of this theme. The even-handedness with which this theme affected collegiality is important to note. Five causal factors precipitated the use of teacher
teaming, four causal factors brought about the use of school-based management, and four causal factors are attributed to the development of peer coaching.

Changes in American demographics and values had a pervasive influence on many areas of American society, but their consequences for education were dramatic and particularly noteworthy in the scheme of this study. For a deeper understanding of the dynamic change brought about by this theme, demographics and values need to be unlinked, although they are thematically united in important ways.

The demographic change in America of the past 45 years has been, and remains, significant. The increase of students from minority backgrounds, those with limited-English proficiency, and the inclusion of those with learning issues, as well as those with physical and mental challenges, have dramatically changed the look and feel of the America's classrooms (Murphy & Everton, 1991). These demographic changes influenced the implementation of all three forms of collegiality highlighted in this study. The reason for this corollary is straightforward: when the student population started to change, educators found that they needed to alter classroom practices. The homogeneity of America's schools was disappearing. Student populations became heterogeneous and reflected the composition of the country. The traditional approaches to teaching and learning, used for many decades, proved eventually to be ineffective for teaching America's school children. Collegiality, particularly in the forms of teacher-teaming and peer coaching, offered new possibilities for influencing student achievement.

In theory, teacher teams could regroup students and individualize more easily. Teaming also presented a solution to the teacher shortage exacerbated by the increased school-age population of baby boomers, and increased immigration to the United States.
Peer coaching, on the other hand, offered a low cost and effective approach to addressing the problems and issues generated by a changing student population. It also positively contributed to addressing the shortage of teachers by increasing teacher retention. Though experiences with teacher empowerment and teacher leadership, faculty members were more likely to stay with their chosen profession (Boyer, 1995). And finally, the parent and community constituencies of these newly emerging groups were demanding a greater voice in public education (Wade, 2004). School-based management offered an inclusive approach to school administration that held the promise of making schools more responsive to the needs of very different learners. The changing demographics’ impact and contribution to the multi-causal factor of collegiality was striking, broad-based and, in many cases, effective.

The changing values of America and their impact during the 45 year period covered by this study are sweeping, and are also responsible for causing educators to turn to collegiality. The change in cultural norms in the 1960s was fertile soil for the Open Education Movement and it nurtured America’s first attempts at teacher teaming. Looking for answers to the post-Sputnik critical view of education, educators looked for ways to break the hold of traditional educational methods. As a result, American’s accepted, even if for a brief period, the iconoclastic notion of open space schools. These schools and their values of individualization and learner-directed discovery embraced teacher teaming, and found that its collaborative structure was compatible with the goals of the Open Education Movement. Also during this period, many Americans were demanding equal opportunity and social equality. Again schools were called upon to rethink their structures, and collegiality in the form of teacher teaming and peer coaching...
was called upon as possible strategy to address deep rooted problems of American society.

Continuing into the 1980s, impacts on society brought about by changing American demographics and values were altering American education. The increase of minority and immigrant children along with the problems created by poverty, drug addiction, unemployment, and changing family structures, forced schools to reevaluate and explore more effective educational models. Responding to confusing and often conflicting needs, educational leaders turned to collegiality to find effective responses. Teacher teaming reemerged through the Middle Schools Movement, school-based management evolved into the most popular form of school reform, and peer coaching, in its nascent stage, was developing into one of the most effective forms of collegiality to be tried in the 45 year history of school reform.

The even-handed impact that the changing demographics and values of America had on the development of collegial practices is remarkable only if for the fact that the qualities of collegiality in general, and teacher teaming, school-based management, and peer coaching specifically, were seen as effective antidotes to the ailments of the country. Politicians, business leaders, educators, and citizens trusted collegiality to help assuage the pains of American society, and in many cases, collegiality was able to uphold that trust.

_Bureaucracy versus Professionalism._

The tensions between bureaucracy and professionalism and its impact on the use of collegial practices as a reform tool is the last major theme to develop from the theme
and pattern matching methodology analysis. Figure 7.9 gives the causal factors associated with the theme of bureaucracy versus professionalism.

**Table 7.9**

*Causal Factors for Bureaucracy Versus Professionalism*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Factor</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Collegial Form(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evolution to post-industrial society</td>
<td>Societal/cultural</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Era of National Reports</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>TT, PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New unionism</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School restructuring</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>TT, SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralization</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism movement</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning Communities</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic structure of supervision</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in models of supervision</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical/existentialist supervision</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher retention</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher leadership</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The bureaucratic structure of schools has been established for many years. Looking for ways to control the burgeoning public school systems in the early 1900s, educational leaders turned to the principles of scientific management as espoused by many professionals during this period. Bureaucratic structures were imposed on large and small districts alike, with a central office controlling school administration and staff that imposed uniformity that was supposed to inscribe quality and provide accountability. In many ways, bureaucracy worked. School systems thrived on the orderliness of bureaucracies with their clearly delineated duties, and strict order of command. As the number of schools across the nation exploded, bureaucracy served the nation well with its prepackaged administrative structure and instructional practices at-the-ready. Bureaucracy could be employed in short-order to get the schools functioning and running smoothly.

The bureaucratic model served schools well for many decades. However, as many urban and suburban districts grew, the span of control, one of the linchpins of a successful bureaucracy, became too large. More germane to this study, bureaucratic structures became too rigid, unable to respond and adapt as America evolved to a post-industrial society. Top-down, rule driven school systems became the anathema of school reform. This severe problem was exposed through the many national reports that circulated and gained national prominence in the 1980s. The basic message of these reports was reinforced with the frequent calls for school restructuring, and decision-making decentralization made by a broad spectrum of leaders from the political, corporate, and academic arenas. Schools needed to be more professional places where
teachers were afforded the opportunity and/or were required to assume the responsibilities of professionalism.

In this causal factor analysis, it is clear that teacher teaming remained mostly on the outside of the contentious struggle of bureaucracy versus professionalism. Yet, school-based management and peer coaching were central to the professionalism movement, and for many, were synonymous with it. School-based management’s causes were spread among school restructuring, the call for decentralization, and the Professional Learning Communities Movement, and it was custom-made for the demands of these three causal factors. School-based management satisfied the basic requirements of restructuring and decentralization, and complemented the expectation that schools would become places where professionals were seen as life-long learners alongside their students. School-based management was spawned in the throes of the debate of whether schools should retain their bureaucratic nature or whether they should transform themselves into professional institutions with a re-configured chain of command.

Although school-based management enjoyed wide popularity, it did not overcome the influence of government and politics to realize its exceptional potential.

Peer coaching’s genesis is similar to school-based management, but not only did it emerge from the milieu of bureaucracy versus professionalism, also managed to thrive once it was launched. Seeking ways to professionalize teaching and improve instruction, peer coaching developed into a safe and effective collegial choice. Not only did it help to solve crucial problems such as high teacher turnover and isolation, it also was heartily embraced by teachers, principals, administrators, and eventually, unions. Peer coaching was a practice that gave professionalism authenticity and clout. As teachers and
administrators adopted the new unionism and become cooperative partners for educational change, they sought ways that they could work together to positively affect student achievement. Peer coaching fit this description. As a result, it became a hallmark of the collaborative nature of the new unionism.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that out of the three forms of collegiality, peer coaching was the only one to evolve from research. Teacher teaming and school-based management arrived on the reform scene with their philosophical tenets in place, but neither had the confirmation of research. Peer coaching evolved from research on professional development, and its ability to survive in the tumult of reform is a testament to its long-term viability as a collegial practice. As a result, the examination of the theme, bureaucracies versus professionalism, gives greater clarity to what makes collegiality work and allows it longevity. It appears that the genesis of an educational practice does not guarantee its acceptance or effectiveness.

Secondary Themes and Attributed Causal Factors

Four secondary themes emerged from the theme and pattern matching methodology. They were: the concern for the affects of teacher isolation, the influence of business on educational reform, the renewed focus on student achievement and accountability, and the debate about the importance of school culture and climate on educational outcomes. These are explored in the following section.

A Concern for the Effects of Teacher Isolation.

One of the secondary themes to emerge from a theme and pattern matching analysis of the causal factors of collegiality is the concern for the impact of teacher
isolation or teacher effectiveness. The causal factors attributed to this theme, the categories to which they are assigned, and the collegial forms that were developed as a result are shown in Table 7.10.

Table 7.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Factor</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Collegial Form(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilization studies</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher isolation</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>TT, PC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research by Lortie (1975) in the late 1960s and the eventual publication of his book, *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study* identified teacher isolation and its detrimental effects on teachers and their profession. His description of “egg crate schools” became a part of the lexicon of educational jargon. Lortie’s research was spurred by the post-Sputnik era search for answers to how to change the status quo of American schooling. The logical conclusion from his work was that the lonely experience of teachers needed to be addressed if the lot of teachers and their classroom practices were to improve.

Team teaching was one of a number of practical suggestions that he offered. He suggested that team teaching had the ability to broaden and deepen relationships among teachers. As a pragmatist, he also outlined the numerous obstacles to getting teachers to work together. One of the major hurdles was the high value teachers placed on autonomy. During the 45 years of school reform, solving the isolation versus autonomy
conundrum has remained difficult, if not impossible, and has served to undercut the
effectiveness of collegial practices such as team teaching.

Concomitantly, public school populations in the late 1960s were experiencing
tremendous growth from the baby boom. This placed more demand on administrators to
find teachers and to retain them. Numerous utilization studies were carried out in the
1960s and early 1970s that examined the problem of the teacher shortages. The studies
recommended how to better utilize teachers already in the profession. The concept of

team teaching was proposed because of its versatility. The many configurations that team
teaching could assume made it an attractive alternative that was able to entice teachers to
join and to remain in the profession. Norwalk, Connecticut was one of the first to seize
the recommendation and its school district experienced modest gains in retaining teachers
as a result.

Later in the 1980s and early 1990s, the issue of teacher isolation once again
became a concern for educational leaders. Faced with a potential teacher shortage
because of the high turnover of new teachers, peer coaching became an answer for
countering the negatives of teacher isolation. Coaching was found to reduce teacher
isolation by its very nature. It facilitated dialogue and collaboration, both which
contributed to minimizing isolation. These experiences, in turn, helped to increase
retention by reducing feelings of isolation.

This analysis argues that collegiality is a powerful tool for reducing teacher
isolation, but that the value that teachers place on their autonomy and independence in
the classroom ironically creates the isolating experience about which they complain. In
order for collegiality to be successful, educators must acknowledge these competing values and find ways to address them.

The Influence of Business on Educational Reform

This secondary theme, the influence of business on educational reform, is closely connected to the primary theme of the concern for the quality of American education, yet as a theme in this analysis, it warrants assignment as a separate secondary theme because of its direct impact on the use of collegiality as a response to school reform. The causal factors, the categories to which they are assigned, and the collegial forms that were developed as a result are shown in Table 7.11.

Table 7.11
The Influence of Business on Educational Reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Factor</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Collegial Form(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern for quality of American education</td>
<td>Societal/Cultural</td>
<td>SBM, PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Nation at Risk</td>
<td>Governmental/Political</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Nation Prepared</td>
<td>Governmental, Political</td>
<td>TT, PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School restructuring</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>TT, SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism Movement</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>SBM, PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global competitiveness</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>TT, SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic crisis</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business models</td>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>TT, PC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a result of Sputnik I, America's diminishing confidence in public schools that developed in the 1960s focused the nation on the need to be technologically and scientifically competitive. Politicians, who saw the United States' preeminent role in world affairs being challenged and jeopardized, were the driving forces behind the concern. This development differs from the concern for the quality of American education that grew in the 1980s, which was tied to the desire of the United States to be globally competitive. Even though this concern was embraced by politicians and governmental leaders, the impetuses came from business and corporate leaders who understood that their companies' ability to grow and produce increasing profit were in peril unless the country became more competitive in markets that were now global in nature. An acknowledgement of the difference between these similar causal factors is central to understanding the importance of this secondary theme. Although both causal factors explicitly support the need and/or desire of the United States to remain dominant in world affairs, the change in locus of influence shifted dramatically in the 20 years between 1960 and 1980. Business leaders demanded a role in shaping education, unlike any other period in the nation's history. As a result, the captains of industry in this country exerted unprecedented influence on education and helped to shape the direction of educational reform.

The economic crisis of the early 1980s served as a major trigger for the reconfiguring of the way America organized itself. Although its effects on the country were all encompassing, germane to this study is the revamping of American business models, school structures, and traditional classroom instructional practices. With rising unemployment, plant closings, and corporate downsizing, A Nation at Risk increased
public awareness of the crisis in financial sectors related to stresses created by global competition in the marketplace.

Acting as a balm to ease the concerns of the country, the report *A Nation Prepared* recommended school restructuring and the Professionalism Movement as solutions to many of the problems in education. In light of the successful restructuring of businesses across the country, a crescendo of support for school restructuring was expressed by politicians, business leaders, academics and the media. The call for restructuring schools was successful and propelled the collegial practices of teacher teaming and school-based management into the mainstream of reform practices. The report also called for schools to prepare teachers better to meet the challenges of the changing demographics of their classrooms. The report also acknowledged the problem of retaining good teachers, and forcefully suggested that their empowerment would lead to greater job satisfaction, thereby reversing the trend of high teacher turnover. These recommendations gave birth to the Professionalism Movement, which in turn nurtured the collegial practice of peer coaching.

The expanding web of interaction between business and education was a hallmark of the 1980s. However, neither teacher teaming, school-based management nor peer coaching would have been successful had it not been for the direct influence of business. Once again, education took a "back seat" as the greater force of business world set the agenda for school reform.
The Renewed Focus on Student Achievement and Accountability.

The secondary theme of the renewed focus on student achievement and accountability is also closely associated with the major theme of concern for the quality of American education. The following offers an analysis of their connection to the causes for the employment of collegial practices as an educational reform tool. The causal factors, the categories to which they are assigned, and the collegial forms that were developed as a result are shown in Table 7.12.

### Table 7.12

**Causal Factors Contributing to the Renewed Focus on Student Achievement and Accountability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Factor</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Collegial Form(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class size reduction</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation studies</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of accountability</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools Movement</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call for improved student achievement</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards Movement</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards-based instruction</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the causal factors associated with the theme the renewed focus on student achievement and accountability emerged within the last 20 years. It is important to note...
at the start of this analysis that explicit concern for student achievement was not a driver of educational reform until halfway through the period of time on which this study concentrates. Although the primary goal of education has always been student achievement, it wasn't until after many years of attempts to reform education that educators realized that student achievement must be made an explicit goal if reform initiatives were to be effective. This observation is at the center of this secondary theme.

Two parallel strands led to this phenomenon. One strand was the rise of the Effective Schools Movement of the 1980s, a reactionary rejoinder to the Coleman report of the late 1960s. Challenging the report's basic premise that schools bring little influence to bear on a child's achievement that is independent of his background and general social context, the work of Edmonds (1983) and others organized to form the Effective Schools Movement. Their literature and other effective schools research revealed that collegiality is the strategy to build professional relationships to enhance teacher effectiveness and to advance student achievement. Nurtured in the fertile reform environment of the 1980s, school-based management took hold with the promise of creating new professional structures within schools that would efficiently and effectively advance reform.

The second strand can be traced to the aftermath of the massive infusion of federal money into education as part of the Johnson administration's War on Poverty. The negative findings and repercussions of the implementation studies placed reform leaders on the defensive. American taxpayers demanded a greater return on their tax dollars as evidenced through the property tax revolts in the 1970s. After 25 years of earnest attempts to reform schooling, politicians belatedly decried the absence of
accountability. The 1980s and 1990s brought governmental, political, and educational entities to the realization that accountability and measurable improvement had to be part of the reform equation or their efforts would never see appreciable gains. The calls for improved student achievement increased during the last two decades of the twentieth century. The demands for standards-based instruction created the Standards Movement, which encouraged educators to investigate new practices such as peer coaching. The above scenarios suggest reasons why governmental/political and educational causal factors were the exclusive domains of this secondary, but still pertinent theme.

The main observation from the analysis of this theme is that collegiality can have a positive effect on student achievement only, however, under certain conditions. School-based management efforts most often obfuscated the goal of improving student achievement. Its heavy association with political, causal factors, as indicated in previous analyses, left it administratively powerful yet instructionally powerless to effect student achievement. As the historical narratives and analytical conclusions in this study make clear, the promises of school-based management in its early stages were not met. School-based management did, however, reach its potential once schools focused their decision-making powers on improving student achievement. Using Nevada’s experiment with teacher teaming and the research from the Middle School Movement during the past 20 years, its success at raising student achievement is unclear as evidenced by the inconclusive and sometimes contradictory research results. Of the three forms of collegiality, peer coaching retains the greatest promise for affecting student achievement. Its emergence from the push for accountability, and the standards-based instruction that followed, can lay claim to being the most effective form of collegiality to positively
affect student achievement. Collegiality’s flexible and amorphous qualities suggest that it is an uncertain variable in raising student achievement. If collegial practices were ever to have solid support, they had to demonstrate evidence that they were responsible for advances in student performance.

**Debate of the Importance of School Culture and Climate**

Educational factors were the major cause for the debate about the importance of

Table 7.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Factor</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Collegial Firm(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school reform</td>
<td>Governmental/political</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Classroom Movement</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools Movement</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Movement</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Schools Movement</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism Movement</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>SBM, PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School restructuring</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School culture change</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>SBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
school culture and climate in educational reform. The causal factors, categories, and the resulting collegial forms are shown in Table 7.13. The theme is almost exclusively influenced by educational causal factors. The historical narratives of teacher teaming, school-based management, and peer coaching illustrate the debate about the role and importance of school culture and climate in educational reform. An analysis of this theme indicates that educators placed a higher value on the role of culture and climate in school reform than people outside of education did.

Teachers, administrators, educational leaders, and academics posited the importance of a cohesive culture and a positive climate in the workplace, and the research supported their contention. Studies consistently supported the ability of collegiality to positively affect school culture and climate. In particular, collegiality demonstrated positive effects on teachers. Through team teaching, teachers' sense of isolation was greatly reduced, and their communication with one another was greatly increased.

During the 1960s, because of the attacks on education from all corners of the country, the recruitment and retention of teachers were affected by the perception that teaching was a low prestige profession. Team teaching helped to entice teachers to join and to stay in their profession, which eased the teacher shortage of the 1960s and early 1970s. During this period, education embraced the Open Education Movement and the promise it held to transform education. Unfortunately, like moths to candle light, schools were "burned" by their affiliation with a doomed educational movement, which contributed to making educators secondary players in educational reform efforts. It wasn't until the revitalization of the Middle School Movement in the 1990s that teacher teaming regained its appeal and popularity in the form of interdisciplinary teaching.
In the 1990s, research showed that school-based management had its greatest impact on school climate. Teachers collaborated more and were absent less. It empowered them through their inclusion in decision-making on matters that directly affected them. School restructuring through the Effective Schools Movement, the Professionalism Movement, and the Small Schools Movement encouraged reformers to look to school-based management. School cultures and climates were transformed, but statistics showed that student achievement was not. Educators were again allied with educational innovations that did not produce results. The demands of politicians, business leaders, and the public for better results from the nation's schools were not assuaged by the methods and movements embraced by educators.

With the 1990s, peer coaching brought a sense of professionalism to teaching that strengthened commitment to teaching. This resulted in a higher persistence rate that improved the critical issue of teacher retention that developed during the decade. The Professionalism Movement positively affected school cultures and climates, but by this time educators became aware of the need to focus more intently and directly on student achievement. With this newfound awareness came more success for collegiality, this time in the form of peer coaching.

Despite all of the benefits associated with collegiality's ability to positively affect school culture and climate, people beyond the realm of education remained skeptical, and even cynical, of the importance of culture and climate change in educational reform. Their views were reinforced by the consistent rate of low student achievement. The positive effects on school culture and school climate did not translate to student achievement. Many critics asked: why expend precious time, money and energy on
collegial practices that do not affect the bottom line of student achievement. Educators had support for their convictions about the advantages of collegiality, but the main conclusion to be drawn from this secondary thesis is that collegiality’s main goal, as a reform measure, must be to change teacher practice—not just change school culture or climate.

Comparative Analysis Summary

Using the methodologies associated with comparative historical analysis, this study has uncovered eight reasons, four primary and four secondary, to answer the question: Why has collegiality been used as a response to school reform initiatives in the United States?

The evidence suggests that one of the leading reasons was the persistent and pervasive concern for the quality of American schooling that has existed for the past 45 years. Caught unaware by the success of Sputnik I, the United States entered a long period of self-reflection and introspection, with much analysis focused on the inadequacies of its system of public schools. For the past four and a half decades, politicians, government leaders, the business community, and educators have spent a great deal of time, talent and energy in their pursuit of strategies to combat threats to American commerce and security. These threats have changed over the years. They have included Russian domination of space, global competitiveness, and educational mediocrity. However, the continuous presence of real challenges to America’s preeminence on the world stage, coupled with the instability of America’s educational
system to educate its citizenry, have contributed to the use of collegiality in the country's schools. As a result, government and political leaders asserted themselves and crafted the national debate on school quality. Solutions were sought, and many were offered. Two collegial practices, teacher teaming and school-based management, were presented. However, collegiality required implementation time to be effective. But because there were demands prompt results, it conflicted with political expectations. This study's observation is that if collegiality is to have any effect on improving the quality of American education, then it must be afforded the time to do so.

The second major reason that collegiality was the response of choice for many educators was influenced by the role of government and politics in educational matters. This thematic pattern can be traced to the passage of the National Defense Education Act in the late 1950s, reinforced by the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the mid-1960s. The expanding financial influence of the federal government forged an interdependent relationship with education that remains strong today. As a result, the concerns of the country became the concerns of the States through the "carrot-and-stick" approach of federal funding. Politics continued to intrude on education with the publication of *A Nation at Risk*. This report, supported by the Reagan administration, made school reform a high profile issue. By tying it closely with the need for the United States to stay globally competitive, school restructuring came into national focus.

School-based management, with its close association with the shared decision-making business models that were so successful at the time, became a highly touted school reform. Teacher unions and their officials added their support, and SBM became the first form of collegiality to gain a political base. School-based management's popularity was
often sidelined by the polemics of politics. This study's conclusion is that the potential benefit that government and politics had to offer collegiality were great, but the real gains made by the increased governmental and political role in education were nominal, and sometimes detrimental to the use of collegiality as a response to school reform.

The third reason that collegiality was used as a reform tool was the significant change in the demographics and values of the United States. The increase of students from minority backgrounds, those with limited English proficiency, and the inclusion of those with special needs dramatically changed the nature of the American classroom. As a result, the instructional methods of the past, effective with a much more homogeneous population, were no longer useful. Collegiality, particularly in the form of teacher teaming and peer coaching, offered new possibilities for changing the way teachers taught. School-based management presented an inclusive approach to school administration that held the promise of helping schools to adapt to meet the needs of the changing school population. The change in American values that characterized much of the past 45 years is equally responsible for causing educators to turn to collegiality. The change in cultural norms of the 1960s led to valuing the tenets of individualized instruction and learner-directed discovery as evidenced by the Open Education Movement. During this time, teacher teaming experienced a brief but wholehearted welcome by reformers. Also during this period, many Americans were demanding equal opportunity and social equality, and schools were called upon to rethink their structures. Teacher teaming and peer coaching were embraced as strategies with potential to address social problems as well as instructional ones. In the 1980s, the increase of minority and immigrant children, along with the impacts of poverty, drug addiction, unemployment,
and changing family structures, forced schools to reevaluate and to explore more effective educational models. Teacher teaming reemerged through the Middle Schools Movement, school-based management emerged as a popular form of school reform, and peer coaching became an effective process for improving classroom instruction. The inherent collaborative qualities of collegiality became effective in meeting the challenges to school reform.

The fourth and last major reason that collegiality was used as a response to school reform was that it was a tool to help schools successfully transition from bureaucracies to professional organizations. Although the bureaucratic model served schools well for most of the 20th century, its top-down and rule-driven structure, as well as its inflexibility, came into conflict with the effort of schools to reorganize. The many demands for professionalizing education were met by the collegial structures of school-based management and peer coaching. School-based management satisfied the basic requirements of restructurings and decentralization called for in the 1980s. Peer coaching gave the Professionalism Movement a practice with compelling substance and an effective operation.

Four secondary reasons emerged for the use of collegiality as a response to reform. Concerns about the effects of teacher isolation resulted from the work of Lortie (1975). His description of "egg crate schools", which separated and insulated teachers from one another, underscored the advantage of the concept of team teaching. Teacher isolation was also seen as a contributing factor to the teacher shortage of the baby boom era, and again, teacher teaming was called upon to address this concern. This study's conclusion is that collegiality can be a powerful tool for reducing teacher isolation;
however the conflict between the value that teacher's place on autonomy, and the isolation that is generated because of it, presents major obstacles to the implementation of collegiality.

The influence of business on educational reform is another secondary theme to emerge from this study. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, the push for school reform came mainly from the political and governmental arenas. Politicians and governmental leaders were concerned that the country was not technologically and scientifically competitive. However, the 1980s saw business take the lead in shaping education. The economic crisis early in the decade served as the impetus for business to change the way it structured itself. One of the ways that businesses improved their output was by empowering employees through shared decision-making. Many suggested, and some demanded, that schools restructure themselves using the new business models as their prototype. This groundswell propelled the collegial practices of teacher teaming and school-based management into the mainstream of reform practices. While education and business seemed to intersect during this period, this theme highlights the finding that educators themselves did not exert the most influence on the direction of education reform.

Another secondary reason that collegiality was used as a response to reform is related to the escalating demands for improved student achievement and accountability. After 20 years of reform efforts and little to show for it, politicians, government leaders and citizens in general began to demand greater accountability for student achievement. Although the implicit goal of education had always been student achievement, it wasn't until the early 1990s that educators understood that student achievement must be made in
explicit goal of school reform. School-based management's early attempts to improve schools fell well short of that goal, but once SBM's decision-making powers were focused on student achievement, research showed that it could be an effective tool for reform. Peer coaching retained the greatest promise for affecting student achievement. Its benefits for classroom instruction have been confirmed through credible research studies. Despite these results, this study found that collegiality's nebulous qualities make it an uncertain influence on student achievement. If collegial practices ever are to have a strong following, they must be held accountable for student achievement levels.

The final reason uncovered by this study for why collegiality was used as a response to school reform is the debate about the effects of school culture and climate on educational outcomes. Educators continue to argue the importance of culture and climate and influences on school achievement, while research consistently supports the ability of collegiality to positively affect both of these variables of schooling. In the 1960s and 1970s, teacher teaming reduced isolation and increased communication among teachers, helping to attract and to retain teachers. In the 1980s, school-based management positively impacted school climate with its emphasis on the inclusion of stakeholders in the decision-making process. In the 1990s, peer coaching brought professionalism to teaching, and improved the effectiveness of professional development activities. But despite all of the benefits associated with collegiality's ability to positively affect school culture and climate, those outside of education remained skeptical, and even cynical, that this approach could reform schools. The conclusion of this study is that collegiality's main goal should be to change teacher practice—not just to change school culture or climate.
Through the process of comparative historical analysis, the eight reasons summarized above emerged as the answers as to why collegiality was used as a response to school reform. To answer the second major research question, i.e. what are the cause and effect relationship patterns between collegiality and school reform?, this study looked at the aggregate causal factor analysis for each of the five causal categories: societal/cultural, governmental/political, educational, economic, and contingency.

The aggregate number of causal factors attributed to the societal/cultural category were 15, the aggregate number for the governmental/political category were 20, and the aggregate number for educational category were 31. These were the three highest categories, and contained the largest number of causal factors that led to the main effect of collegiality. The aggregate number for the economic and contingency categories was four each. The methodology of explanation building was used to create the analysis for the cause and effect relationship pattern between causal factors.

Although the education category contained the largest number of factors, it did not indicate the most influence on the effect of collegiality. Of the 31 causal factors attributed to education for all three forms of collegiality, 10 related to specific issues or concerns, such as teacher shortage, teacher isolation, accountability, and teacher retention. This study concludes that educators have generally been in a reactive, not a proactive, mode for the past 45 years. That is, educators and school reformers have been responding to issues and concerns presented by those outside of the realm of education, and particularly by politicians, government leaders, the business community, and citizens. Society and government drove the educational causal factors of collegiality; educators
reacted. This reactionary role relegated educators, those with potentially with the most knowledge and experience, to the "back seat" of the reform movement.

A further analysis shows that the number of organized movements, such as the Open Education Movement, Middle School Movement, and Effective Schools Movement, made up a significant number of the educational causal factors, most of them originating during the decade of the 1980s in reaction to *A Nation at Risk*. The large number of movements in a short period of time implies that educational reformers were unable to find and focus their efforts on effective practices. It is noted that educational movements were a far greater cause for the implementation of teacher teaming and school-based management, than they were for peer coaching. This causation is due to the fact that teacher teaming and school-based management were associated with most of the movements of the 1980s, whereas peer coaching is only associated with the Professionalism Movement of the next decade.

Explanation building leads this study to conclude that numbers do not translate into impact. Although the aggregate number of educational causal factors is the greatest, these factors were driven by the issues and concerns presented by society/cultural and governmental/political causal factors. In addition, education's embrace of many different innovations did little to address the problems that kept American education in a reform mode for the past 45 years. Societal/cultural causal factors, though smaller in number than those of education, were much more influential in leading to the use of collegiality as a response to reform. In brief, their reach had breadth and depth. Examples of these factors include the change in cultural norms of the 1960s, the evolution to a post-industrial society, and the changes in the demographics of public school classrooms.
which affected every American in more significant ways than educational causal factors ever achieved. The power of the societal/cultural causal factors to transform traditional values, mores, and institutions, gave them extraordinary status, and by their force, they drove reform, eclipsing education's role.

Governmental/political causal factors were equally as effective in defining and controlling the debate on reform. The largest type of governmental/political causal factor were national reports, which held significant sway over public opinion and set educators' priorities. *A Nation at Risk* and the many national reports that followed had great impact because they were backed by political bases that had influence and effective mechanisms for communicating and advocating their causes. This study notes, that in contrast, the governmental/political causal factor of local, state and federal mandates were most often least effective in implementing collegiality as a reform measure. There are many examples in the narrative case studies, such as San Diego, New York City and Nevada, that support the contention that collegiality can't be mandated without negative consequences for teachers and students. In sum, the aggregate number of governmental/political causal factors is very important to understanding the cause and effect relationships between the three forms of collegiality. As this study indicates, governmental/political causal factors had a crucial role in the comparative historical analysis of collegiality as a response to reform.

Although much smaller in number, economic and contingency causal factors had a major role in the use of collegiality as a reform tool. The two factors with the most impact were Sputnik I (contingency causal factor) and the emergence of business models as exemplars for education (economic causal factor). Both are cited frequently in the
historical narratives, and understanding their contribution to the use of collegiality as a response is essential to understanding the complexity of this research topic.

The aggregate causal factor comparison explains why numbers do not translate into impact. They also explain why government/political, and societal/cultural causal factors overshadowed the forces of education, taking the lead in setting the direction for reform. This dynamic is one of the major observations of this study: educators were continually put into the position of reacting to causal factors beyond the sphere of schooling, and therefore were relegated to a secondary role in the 45 year period of school reform.

The answer to the final research question, i.e. what has been the effectiveness of collegiality in meeting school reform objectives for the past 45 years, is embedded within the numerous examples and research data cited in the historical narratives. As a whole, the historical narratives report collegiality’s success, or lack of it, in achieving reform objectives. It is clear that collegiality can be effective, but only in certain circumstances. It is also clear that collegiality can be ineffective, creating disappointments, and or worse, cynical attitudes about educational progress for those who are invested in its potential and believe in its premise.

Teacher teaming stands as a textbook example of the tenuous position of collegiality. Its first large-scale appearance in the form of team teaching is universally cited for its ineffectiveness. It was scraped along with the Open Education Movement and open space schools, and is generally referred to as a passing fad. Despite its failure to thrive, teacher teaming reemerged in the 1980s with the publication of the report Turning Points, which revitalized the Middle Schools Movement with its call for interdisciplinary
teams. As part of this movement, team teaching flourished, although the voluminous research that followed indicated that teaming’s influence on student achievement was unclear. The unsubstantiated claims of teaming were supported by Nevada's attempts to reduce class size. There, too, the research suggested questionable efficacy. The narratives clearly indicated that the ability of teacher teaming to positively affect student achievement were inconclusive, at best. However, teacher teaming’s ability to positively affect school climate obscures the question of its effectiveness. Teaming under the right circumstances can raise teacher morale, strengthen communication, and diminish teacher isolation and increase teacher retention rates. These indirect results are confirmed and substantiated by research; however, the indirect consequences of collegiality, particularly on student achievement, characterize it as a questionable response to school reform.

School-based management is the most written about, researched and widely practiced of the three forms of collegiality in this study. The development of a political base that advocated and lobbied for its use as a reform measure makes it unique. Yet the historical narrative makes it clear that its value as an effective reform response is questionable. Early school-based management groups were unfocused and their responsibilities too vague. Also, research cited that school councils often became distracted by the minutiae of running a school, for example recess duty and bus schedules, instead of focusing on classroom instruction. The politics of shared decision-making created fractious school-based management teams, further compromising their effectiveness. Additionally, many councils found themselves constrained by existing federal, state, school board, district, and teacher union regulations, leaving very few decisions over which they had control.
Despite its shaky start, school-based management redeployed itself and reached its potential—when it refocused its authority on student achievement. Successful councils had a well-thought-out and clearly defined committee structure. Experience showed that effective school-based management teams enabled leadership, focused on student and adult learning, and generated a school-wide perspective. When these elements were in place, then school-based management could have a positive effect on student achievement. The complexities of school-based management offered many obstacles, but once they were overcome, this collegial practice could legitimately claim to be an effective reform response.

Of the three forms of collegiality in this study, peer coaching delivered the most on its promise to positively effect change in schooling practices. Its well-pedigreed status within research findings gave it credibility and authority. The historical narrative of peer coaching outlines its popularity as a reform tool to improve classroom instruction. As a support for the professional development of teachers, and for the implementation of curriculum revision, with the direct aim of improving classroom instruction practice, peer coaching became the most effective collegial reform. It, too, had indirect consequences. Peer coaching increased professionalism and collaboration. It rejuvenated teachers, decreased turnover, and facilitated school-wide communication. Under the guise of peer mentoring, it improved teacher retention rates, and as peer review, it expanded its purpose, which made it even more functional and effective. Yet most importantly, it improved instruction and student achievement. With its positive influence on teacher effectiveness, peer coaching was able to create a quantifiable increase in student achievement. In the true spirit of collegiality, it improved school culture and
climate by building communities of teachers who continuously engaged in the study of their craft. Although there were obstacles to employing peer coaching, it proved ultimately to be the most effective collegial practice.
CHAPTER VIII

Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter presents relevant conclusions that can be drawn from the comparative historical analysis of collegiality. It answers the questions framing the study: What has been learned as a result of this study? How has this study contributed to the body of knowledge on the topics of collegiality and school reform? The chapter ends with recommendations for possible areas for future research.

Conclusions

Using the methodologies of comparative historical analysis, this study uncovered 4 major themes that explain why collegiality was used as a reform response. These were: the concern for the quality of American education, the increased governmental and political role in education, the changing landscape of American demographics and values, and the evolution of schools as centralized bureaucracies to decentralized professional organizations. In addition, four secondary themes were identified: the concern about the effects of teacher isolation, the influence of business on educational reform, the renewed focus on student achievement and accountability, and the debate about the importance of school culture and climate on educational outcomes.

In addition, the aggregate causal factor analysis led to several important observations and conclusions. Although the educational causal factors were the largest in the aggregate, they were not the most influential. During the past 45 years of educational reform, educators have been reacting mostly to issues and concerns presented by those
outside of educational circles. Additionally, educators have experimented with many educational innovations, some of which grew into large reform movements, which indicates that educators were unable to identify effective practices for generalized use and to focus on implementing them. The extensive reach of societal/cultural causal factors was transformational. They penetrated deep into American culture and society, changing established values and stores, and challenging the foundations of long established institutions. Because of their power to create change, society and cultural causal factors were able to drive the school reform agenda, and eventually overshadowed education's role. Government/political causal factors also took control of the reform agenda, frequently using national reports as their mouthpiece. Although economic and contingency causal factors were small in number, they contained several factors, such as Sputnik I and global competitiveness, both of which had enormous impact on the use of collegial practices as a response to reform. With these findings as a reference point, a number of important conclusions can be drawn about collegiality and school reform.

This study's findings concur with Little's (1982) research on collegiality. In order for collegiality to be effective, a norm of collegiality must be nurtured at the school level if collegial practices such as teacher teaching, school-based management, and peer coaching, are to be effective. The importance of the norm of collegiality cannot be underestimated. Legislation can't produce it; however, educational leaders can. Despite the efforts of politicians, government and business leaders, and concerned citizens to lobby for their interests and mandate reform through legislation, regulation and national reports, educators experienced first hand the truism that change can't be mandated. San Diego's experience with peer coaches stands as the example of this principle. Taking a
top-down approach, the superintendent mandated peer coaching, and although implemented, it ran awry and eventually died at the hands of the teacher union because it would not support it. In instances where collegiality was successful, such as Boston, Kentucky, and Rochester, teachers were partners in developing the reform initiative.

Conclusion: A norm of collegiality must exist in an institution if collegial practices are ever to succeed, and that norm cannot be mandated.

Furthermore, Little’s research made clear the importance of collegial practice rising to the level of joint work. Joint work implies that teachers and administrators closely and collaboratively review and critique classroom practices. Interestingly, most of the instances of collegiality cited in this study never rose to the level of joint work. Cincinnati’s efforts to implement team teaching stands as an example. Although its carefully thought-out efforts to use teams were embraced by teachers, the majority of teams never rose to the level of joint work. Most were distracted and/or absorbed by non-instructional issues, never undertaking the thornier issue of critiquing classroom instructional practices. Conclusion: Collegiality calls for high levels of professional inquiry. If collegiality is to be effective, it must rise to the level of “joint work”.

The narratives of teacher teaming, school-based management, and peer coaching underscore the relationship of the investment of time to the success or failure of collegiality. Research studies make clear the necessity for common planning time for teams. Site councils implementing school-based management discovered that the time it required to arrive at decisions expanded with the shared decision-making model, and the most frequently cited obstacle to implementing peer coaching was the amount of time it took away from classroom teachers. Incorporating reform initiatives takes time, but with
the many demands already placed on teachers and administrators, few have the patience and/or time to devote to exploring and integrating new practices. On a similar point, the development of systems to incorporate, process, and support any new reform initiative also takes time. Developing school structures to help teachers and administrators to retool their thinking is difficult and complex work. Learning how to perform differently requires time and support structures. As pointed out in the comparative analysis, the political leaders expecting immediate results are often those least willing to provide the time needed for a collegial practice to be effectively implemented. Conclusion: If collegial practices are to be meaningfully integrated and effective, they must be given time to develop.

Collegiality and school culture are intertwined in complex and profound ways. School cultures are comprised of the values, beliefs and traditions of an institution. Often school cultures institute and sanction acceptable procedures, processes and interactions. Indeed, common sense suggests that it is reasonable and necessary to operate within the definition of a particular school culture in order to achieve it. School reform and collegiality were not exempted from this unspoken rule. School reform initiatives in general, and collegial practices in particular, called for educators to adhere to new belief systems and to new patterns of interaction. These changes challenged existing school cultures. Teacher teaming demanded that the role of teacher be reexamined and redefined; school-based management challenged the bureaucratic structure of school administration; and peer coaching expanded the definition and purposes of supervision. All three of these changes forced the development of new interpersonal relationships. Since belief systems and patterns of interaction are ingrained as part of a school’s culture,
changing them is very difficult. Schools don’t naturally “re-culture” themselves when they confront change. On the contrary, they tend to retreat and hold tighter to their cultural values. Conclusion: Collegiality calls for new belief systems and new patterns of interaction. These systems and patterns are culturally ingrained, and must be taken into consideration and addressed when implementing change.

The historical narratives make it clear that the relationship between student achievement and collegiality is a tenuous one. Although there is evidence that collegiality can positively affect student achievement, on the whole, its results are meager and unreliable. With the current focus on accountability and student achievement, educators must show how collegiality can effectively improve student achievement. The narratives clearly show that when, and only when, the resources and practices of collegiality are squarely focused on student achievement, can they be effective. Teacher teaming, school-based management, and peer coaching are not ends unto themselves; rather they are the means to an end. Experience has shown that in schools and districts where school-based management and peer coaching were held accountable for improved student achievement, their main goal was to employ collegiality to change teacher practice. Conclusion: If collegiality is ever to have credibility and acceptance, it must be held to some level of accountability.

All three historical narratives offer solid evidence that collegiality is a powerful tool for reducing teacher isolation. As first identified by Lortie (1975), teacher isolation had debilitating effects on teachers, and grave consequences for schools. As a result of their sense of isolation, teachers left the profession earlier, and/or were reluctant to join in the first place. Teacher teaming, school-based management, and peer coaching all had
positive effects on reducing teacher isolation, and in turn, creating benefits such as reducing the high turnover of experienced teachers, and aiding in the recruitment and retention of new teachers. However, the research also points out that teachers value their classroom autonomy, that this value is deeply rooted in school culture, and the practices that the value embraces are long established in schools. This study highlighted how the culture of classroom autonomy and isolation works against collegiality. Teachers in Nevada kept moving away from teams as the state built more schools, indicating their deep preference for working autonomously. School-based management councils frequently were ineffective because of their inability or unwillingness to focus their decision-making authority on classroom practices. Although it is difficult, the culture of autonomy can be challenged as evidenced by successes in Boston, Dauphine County, Florida, and Kentucky. Conclusion: If collegial practices are to be successful as a response to reform, educators must acknowledge and work with teacher independence and the value teachers place on classroom autonomy.

Collegiality often creates more questions than answers. A major question that arises is: What is the worth of the many indirect benefits that collegiality generates? The narratives again are very clear that collegiality is responsible for many positive effects on educators and schooling. In Cincinnati, teachers in teams reported greater satisfaction with their work, and acknowledged that they had more frequent and higher quality interactions and collaborations with their peers than did teachers who were not in teams. School-based management increased the ability of educators to use resources and personnel more efficiently, and it increased their sense of professionalism. In SBM schools, parents and students reported higher levels of satisfaction than in non-SBM
schools. Principal told of their high degree of satisfaction with school-based management, despite an increased workload. Research validated that peer coaching increased professionalism and collaboration in schools; it became an effective mechanism for addressing teacher isolation, and it positively influenced school culture and climate. Yet, reformers, educators, and the research literature are still debating the value of all of these indirect benefits of collegiality. For many, the indirect nature of collegiality’s benefits makes it questionable as a reform response. Conclusion: The real value of collegiality cannot and/or will not be validated until there is a consensus among educators about the importance of indirect benefits.

This study offers a final conclusion. It was observed earlier in this report that when the main cause for the introduction of collegiality is government and/or political, the results are ephemeral. Collegiality needs to serve a broader purpose in order to have staying power. Too frequently, collegial practices were seen as an “innovation,” and that when put into place, they would fix problems. The 45-year history of school reform is filled with innovations that are now out of favor. If there is one lesson to learn, it should be that collegiality is not a function; it is a frame of mind. The rise and fall of different schooling movements stand as the example. These movements brought a variety of innovations to schools, including teacher teaming, school-based management and peer coaching. They were implemented with little thought to addressing school culture, or to creating the support structures necessary for success, or to giving collegiality the time necessary to develop fully. When collegial practices on their own didn’t achieve their promise, they were discarded, leaving educators and reformers disillusioned and disheartened. Conclusion: Collegiality can’t be thought of as only an innovation. If it is,
it becomes disposable like other educational reforms. Collegiality can only be effective and have staying power if it does not become an end in itself; it must become a part of a school’s culture.

The results of the study lead to this last observation: The reasons why collegiality was employed as a reform strategy—political and governmental intervention, global competitiveness, the American public’s concern for the quality of education, and others—were related to national themes; but the causes for the failures of collegiality were local in their source—no norm of collegiality, classroom practices didn’t rise to the level of joint work, school cultures didn’t support innovation, and other conditions related to individual schools. Although this study finds that the goals and purposes of collegiality are determined in a macro environment, its practices are implemented on the micro level of the school; and it is at the local level where collegiality experienced devastating obstacles and inevitable failures. If collegiality is ever to be effective, the local school level must be acknowledged and addressed for its particular conditions. It is expected that the nation’s leaders will make demands on schools, but they and their local leaders have to prepare, nurture and support collegiality’s efforts at the local level if collegial practices are ever to be adopted successfully.

Recommendations for further study

The findings and conclusions of this study present several opportunities for future research and additional analysis. This study offered a comparative history of three forms of collegiality, using cross case techniques to develop the analysis. Another study could limit the case to one, and developing the case more fully. It is also suggested that other
forms of collegiality, such as action research, could be examined as a case study. A third recommendation is to conduct a more in-depth study of one of the three major causal factor categories, societal/cultural, government/political, or educational, and its role in the implementation of collegiality as a response to reform.

This study also presents an overview of education policy for a 45 year period, drawing from diverse historical events, legislation, and activities that led to the use of collegiality. Additional research could include the review and analysis of a specific interval in the history, such as a particular decade, or it could examine more closely the origins and impacts of key legislation, reports, and research studies such as National Defense Education Act, A Nation Prepared, or the research of Joyce and Showers.
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