

FROM
WHOLE SCHOOL
to
WHOLE SYSTEM
REFORM

MONICA MARTINEZ | JAMES HARVEY



The National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform

IN PARTNERSHIP WITH
Annenberg Institute for School Reform
Consortium for Policy Research in Education
New American Schools



FROM
WHOLE SCHOOL
to
WHOLE SYSTEM
REFORM

MONICA MARTINEZ | JAMES HARVEY

Report of a Working Conference

SPONSORED BY

The National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform

IN PARTNERSHIP WITH

Annenberg Institute for School Reform
Consortium for Policy Research in Education
New American Schools



The National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform



The National Clearinghouse for
Comprehensive School Reform
2121 K Street, NW, Suite 250
Washington, DC 20037
Telephone: 1 (877) 766-4CSR
Fax: 1 (877) 308-4995
Email: *AskNCCSR@goodschools.gwu.edu*
Website: *www.goodschools.gwu.edu*

Copyright © 2004 by the National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform (NCCSR). Permission to reproduce or transmit the information in this publication in any form or by any means must be sought in writing by NCCSR. Please note that in all cases federal regulations prohibit the use of NCCSR publications and/or products for profit.

The mission of NCCSR is to collect and disseminate information that builds the capacity of schools to raise the academic achievement of all students.

NCCSR is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education and is operated by The George Washington University under Contract No. ED-99-CO-0137. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Department of Education. The mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations does not imply endorsement by the U.S. government. Readers are free to duplicate and use these materials in keeping with accepted publication standards. NCCSR requests that proper credit be given in the event of reproduction.

Printed in the United States of America.

Acknowledgments

The National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform wants to thank the many people and organizations who made this report possible.

Our first acknowledgment goes to the partners who make up the Clearinghouse: the George Washington University, the Institute for Educational Leadership, and the Council for Basic Education. We are grateful, in particular, to Monica Martinez, the Clearinghouse's Director of Outreach, for her skill in leading the conceptualization and organization of this conference, which led to the development of these proceedings. Christine Enyeart, Assistant Director of Outreach, and Vincent Slatt, Program Assistant, were tireless in their efforts to coordinate and manage the conference arrangements and to keep the partnership informed, and provided pivotal support during the editorial and production process.

We are extremely grateful to the Annenberg Institute for School Reform, the Consortium for Policy Research in Education, and New American Schools for joining the Clearinghouse in planning and sponsoring the conference and for assisting in the formation of this document. Specifically, we thank Warren Simmons, Marla Ucelli, and Alethea Frazier-Raynor of the Annenberg Institute for School Reform; Jon Supovitz of the Consortium for Policy Research in Education; and Mary Anne Schmitt of New American Schools and Libia Gil of New American Schools/American Institutes for Research. The Clearinghouse is deeply indebted to them for their guidance and leadership.

Special thanks are extended to Judy Bray, President and CEO of State Policy Services, Denver, CO, whose keen understanding and focus on policy was instrumental throughout this writing process.

Finally, we want to thank James Harvey, of Harvey and Associates in Seattle, for his efforts in summarizing the meeting and in the drafting of this report.

Introduction

The National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform organized a working conference, in partnership with the Annenberg Institute for School Reform, the Consortium for Policy Research in Education, and New American Schools, to critically review the history of whole school reform. These four organizations brought together their expertise in school reform, system reform, technical assistance, and research to inform and support this meeting. The program effectively highlighted the evolution of whole school reform over the past two decades and explored how whole school reform can be supported within the context of system reform. Held in Chicago, IL, April 26–27, 2004, the two-day event, “From Whole School to Whole System Reform” (see Appendix I), brought together practitioners, policymakers, researchers, philanthropists, and representatives from a variety of organizations involved in supporting education reform (see Appendix II).

Proceedings of this meeting served as the basis of this report. Written by Monica Martinez and James Harvey, the following pages summarize the many discussions held during the conference. These ideas were crafted into a set of strategies and policy recommendations at the federal, state, and district levels for the support of improved, whole school reform initiatives in the future. The policy modifications outlined also provide guidance for reform support organizations, foundations, and national organizations involved in the implementation and facilitation of whole school reform and whole system change.

The policy recommendations presented within this document follow directly from participants’ discussions and, therefore, take into account the perspectives of a range of stakeholders, primarily model developers, intermediaries, and researchers involved in education reform.

NCCSR, together with its partners, is pleased to present these recommendations for review by policymakers and educators throughout the country. It is our hope that the policy modifications proposed in this document will help promote whole school reform as an effective means for improving student achievement and that, ultimately, the proposed changes will support schools in meeting goals for adequate yearly progress and improved education for all students.

Arthur Gosling
Executive Director
National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform

Contents

Acknowledgments	iii
Introduction	v
Executive Summary	1
1. Whole School Reform	5
History	5
Lessons Learned	9
2. Policy Implications	13
Using Data to Align Systems	14
Policy Recommendations	15
Addressing School Context and Autonomy	17
Policy Recommendations	17
Strengthening Teacher and School Leadership	19
Policy Recommendations	19
3. Shifting from Whole School to Whole System Reform	21
Appendices	
I. Conference Agenda	23
II. Conference Participants	27
III. Annotated Bibliography on Whole School Reform	31
List of Figures	
Figure 1. Characteristics of Whole School Reform Since 1980	6
Figure 2. Side-by-Side Comparison of CSRD and CSR Programs	8

*Without whole school and whole district reform,
policymakers' demands on schools are only likely
to exacerbate existing program incoherence.*

—WARREN SIMMONS

Executive Summary

In April 2004, the National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform with the Annenberg Institute for School Reform, the Consortium for Policy Research in Education, and New American Schools convened a working conference, “From Whole School to Whole System Reform,” focused on how to move from whole school to whole system reform (see Appendix I). Held in Chicago, the conference pulled together slightly more than 100 policymakers; funders; researchers; model developers; state, district, and school leaders; as well as representatives from intermediaries and national organizations (see Appendix II). Together, participants explored how and to what extent whole school reform has contributed to education reform generally, and what actions will be required to take reform efforts to the next level.

Contributions at the School Level

At a minimum, comprehensive school reform (CSR) has brought critical support directly to the school level in the following ways:

- ◆ The programs of New American Schools helped catalyze the CSR movement and influenced school design in some 4,000 schools.
- ◆ Since 1998, the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSR/D) program and CSR efforts in general have invested more than \$1 billion in school reform efforts, helping transform more than 5,000 schools that enroll approximately 2 million students.
- ◆ The movement has had a positive effect on achievement. According to a meta-analysis, conducted by Geoffrey Borman in 2002, of the 232 CSR evaluations completed through 2001, “the average student from a CSR school outperformed about 55% of [non-CSR] children.” CSR schools were also significantly more effective than traditional compensatory programs in raising student achievement.

- ◆ Federal support of this movement helped facilitate the rapid development of extremely entrepreneurial enterprises with regionally based personnel who are able to provide additional support structures for schools and systems.

Lessons about System Capacity for Change

Whole school reform and CSR can claim varied accomplishments specific to the school environment and improvements in student performance. Along the way, however, they have also provided important lessons about system capacity for change and ways to advance school reform efforts. The ever-shifting role and focus of school reform model developers has been central to the evolution of the whole school reform movement. It is widely acknowledged that change agents serve as a powerful catalyst for school-based improvement and for building the capacity needed to sustain those changes. Little agreement exists, however, about how to create a balance between the use of external assistance from reform model providers or intermediaries and improvements needed in the capacity of the school and district. To promote such a balance, the following recommendations were offered:

- ◆ Model developers and intermediaries must recognize that many complex activities occur simultaneously within individual schools and their districts, which need to be reconciled in order to maintain coherence when new initiatives are adopted.
- ◆ All participants must recognize the importance of partnerships. The most effective reform designs promote a team-based approach for building local competence rather than allowing each entity to act independently by importing expertise, which may be impervious to the local district context in which the school is embedded.
- ◆ Reform models must have the capacity to adapt to the local district context, a characteristic that should be developed alongside the capacity of the school and district to carry out further reforms.
- ◆ An alternative support infrastructure needs to be established to provide direct guidance and consultation to schools in the autonomous selection of their own reform models.
- ◆ Districts must find ways to sustain multiple school reform programs—by maintaining a so-called “portfolio of schools”—in an era when districts demand greater alignment across professional development, the curriculum, and instructional practice.

Contributions to Policy

Knowledge of what it takes to make a school successful has blossomed in recent decades. The successes and failures of whole school reform provide a rich array of knowledge from which policymakers can draw. This new knowledge connects school-level improvement with a supportive infrastructure that draws on the strengths and contributions of various stakeholders rather than simply advocating continued federal support for CSR. It compels schools and policymakers to act in new and different ways. To date, CSR has influenced the school-system policy environment in several important ways. According to conference participants, implementation of CSR has accomplished the following:

- ◆ Shown that school change can be accomplished and that outside technical assistance directed at the school level can make a difference.
- ◆ Molded practices that lead to school coherence around student achievement.
- ◆ Increased community demand for school improvement.
- ◆ Shifted the context of school change, resulting in greater receptivity to external assistance and strategies.
- ◆ Reinforced two often conflicting ideas—that of system alignment, by showing there are many ways for schools to align with standards and assessments, and that of school autonomy, by showing that schools with a clear and relevant focus do a better job.
- ◆ Increased the use of data-driven decision making.

This report outlines policy recommendations for federal, state, and district leaders charged with implementing or integrating CSR effectively within the larger context of education policy. Recommendations are organized around the three following areas:

- ◆ Using data to align systems
- ◆ Addressing school context issues
- ◆ Strengthening teaching and school leadership.

Need for Whole District Reform

Consensus emerged among stakeholders at the meeting indicating that whole school reform or CSR by itself is an incomplete theory of action. Individual schools do not operate in a vacuum, but within a framework of district and state policies. Reforming whole schools while preserving present district structures is not a viable option. Whole district reform is needed to create an environment for improving learning of all students—the central aim of policymakers at all levels. Through alignment of policy at the federal, state, and district levels, teachers and school leaders will have the appropriate tools and means to better serve all students through whole school reform.

Just as the development of whole school reform has shown some success at the school level, district-level reforms will certainly show comparable success as systems make changes necessary to increase student achievement. Joining whole school reform with whole district reform will guarantee that all citizens, regardless of background, will receive the type of high-quality education required to grow and prosper in a nation that grows and prospers with them. Indeed, in order to truly raise performance expectations and close the achievement gap, the issue is not whether implementing whole school reform or CSR is the best option for achieving these goals. Rather, the next step must focus on how whole school reform or CSR can be effectively implemented.

Whole-school reform connotes a coherent strategy to improve all aspects of a school, from instruction to school structure, with a focus on improving the learning of all students in all subjects rather than focusing solely on particular populations of students within a school or performance in specific subjects. This approach to school change was sparked by research, entrepreneurs, and philanthropic initiatives and was advanced through direct support from the federal government. There is no single definition for whole school reform; rather, the definition varies based on a wide range of distinct experiences.

In the past decade the terms “whole school reform” and “comprehensive school reform” (CSR) have typically referred to the use of school reform models or designs that offer an approach for changing the curriculum and the structure of a school, a singular instructional or pedagogical strategy, or the school culture. Regardless of these variations, the concept of whole school reform aims to dramatically improve student performance and to close the achievement gap.

History

In the early 1980s, the Title I schoolwide reform programs, the effective schools movement, and reform designs (e.g., the Coalition of Essential Schools and the School Development Program) began to support the idea that individual schools should serve as the unit of change for education reform. This approach required shifting the culture and focus of an entire school, its staff, and the community. The first schools to undertake this extremely difficult work were voluntary recruits, whose staff and leadership were willing to try new approaches.

Soon, networks of schools and districts began to form around certain reform approaches. Outside partners brought educators and innovators together to share experiences and to reinforce key ideas about school practice. Central ideas began to surface—for instance, school practices must reflect the belief that all students can learn. Another idea was that outside players, or “critical friends,” can identify gaps

Figure 1.
Characteristics of Whole School Reform Since 1980

	1980–1985	1985–1990	1990–1995	1995–2000	2000–present
LEAD AGENCY	University and R&D programs	School reform networks	Model developers	States via CSRD’s nine components	Feds via NCLB’s accountability
PURPOSE	School restructuring	Exchange of ideas	Many paths to state standards	Intervention and turnaround	Remediation for poor performers
FIELD	Vanguard, volunteers, innovators	National and state partnerships	State and district markets	Low-performing schools	Schools not making AYP targeted
GUIDING THEORY	Unit of change is the school	1000 Points of Light	All kids can learn	Scale-up what works	Evidence-based data; scientific research
FUNDING	Philanthropic grants		Agents + Public sponsors		

between theory and practice within a school. The emergence of these partners as central players shaped whole school reform in the 1980s. A stigma against using external assistance providers permeated, however, delaying the development of a market-based demand among states and districts for hiring external assistance. Figure 1 provides an overview of different aspects of the whole school reform movement as it has developed since 1980.

In the 1990s, with funding from grants, competitions, contracts, and sponsors, model developers began to formalize school reform approaches. They crafted a market niche, offering support to schools that needed or wanted to undertake changes. CSR exploded with the establishment of New American Schools in 1991. Its mission was to use private funds and the corporate design structure to develop entirely new concepts of what schools should be, what they should look like, and what they should try to accomplish. New American Schools raised and invested more than \$130 million to identify, develop, and take to scale a diverse portfolio of what they called “school designs.” Such models included Atlas, Modern Red SchoolHouse, Co-nect, America’s Choice, Success for All, and later designs such as Middle Start and Accelerated Schools. Through these efforts, New American Schools served as a catalyst for scaling up whole school reform and helped shape and develop new legislation to support this movement and further its potential.

The United States Congress established the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSR) program under the *1998 Fiscal Year Appropriations Act, Public Law 105-78*. Commonly known as Obey-Porter, the last names of its two sponsoring congressmen, this legislation was designed to bring together critical pieces within a school and to create an effective learning enterprise at the school level. Curriculum, instructional practice, professional development, community engagement, and technology were to be fused into a coherent whole during the whole school reform process. Unlike Title I, Obey-Porter identified several reform models by name as being illustrative of these concepts and outlined key elements of what constituted CSR (see Figure 2).

The *No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)*, signed into law in January 2002, saw the expansion of the CSR program from \$145 million annually to \$310 million and removed the “demonstration” label, incorporating the CSR program into Title I, Part F, of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*, the major program of federal aid to elementary and secondary education. This new legislation did not name specific model designs. This served to encourage multiple new designs and underlined CSR’s commitment to support coherent and comprehensive schoolwide reform rather than simply the adoption and implementation of isolated programs within a school. While maintaining much of CSR’s basic formula and key structure, the major changes wrought by the NCLB legislation centered on scientifically based research. In addition to the original nine components of CSR, two new components were added, which focused on ensuring use of practices grounded in scientifically based research (see Figure 2).

CSR has yielded measurable results but has also brought to light certain tensions intrinsic to targeting change directly at the school level. Regardless of whether a school used a national reform model or created a homegrown approach, the focus of their reform was on the actual school as the point of intervention. This pattern raised many questions about the meaning of coherence at the school level, the role of external assistance, what it takes to develop and sustain a market-driven approach, and definition of effective systems of support for school improvement.

Two decades into whole school reform, it is important to recognize what CSR efforts have demonstrated and accomplished. More important, it is imperative to use these lessons and their implications for better implementation of current legislation and to inform future policy. At minimum, CSR has brought critical support directly to the school level in several ways:

- ◆ The programs of New American Schools alone helped catalyze the CSR movement and influenced school design in some 4,000 schools.
- ◆ Since 1998, the CSR program and CSR in general have invested more than \$1 billion in new schools, helping transform more than 5,000 schools that enroll approximately 2 million students.

Figure 2.
Side-by-Side Comparison of CSRD and CSR Programs

THE NINE COMPONENTS OF THE CSRD PROGRAM	THE ELEVEN COMPONENTS OF THE CSR PROGRAM
<p>Goals: Requires measurable goals for student performance and benchmarks for meeting those goals.</p>	<p>Goals and benchmarks: Requires measurable goals for student performance and benchmarks for meeting those goals. <i>The Department encourages districts to link these goals to their state’s definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP) in Section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA.</i></p>
<p>Supportive staff members: Ensures that programs are selected and supported by school faculty, administrators, and staff before implementation.</p>	<p>Supportive staff members: Ensures that programs are selected and supported by school faculty, administrators, and staff before implementation.</p>
<p>Research-based methods: Employs strategies that are based on reliable research and effective practices and that have increased student achievement in schools with diverse characteristics.</p>	<p>Proven methods and strategies based on scientifically based research: Employs strategies that are based on scientifically based research and effective practices and that have been replicated successfully in schools.</p>
	<p>Strategies that improve academic achievement: Adapts strategies found to significantly improve the academic achievement of students or to demonstrate strong evidence of improvement in the academic achievement of students.</p>
<p>External assistance: Uses high-quality, external, technical support from a CSR entity with experience or expertise in schoolwide reform and improvement.</p>	<p>External assistance: Uses high-quality, external, technical support from a CSR entity with experience or expertise in schoolwide reform and improvement.</p>
<p>Parental and community involvement: Provides for the meaningful involvement of parents and the local community in planning and implementing school-improvement activities.</p>	<p>Parental and community involvement: Provides for the meaningful involvement of parents and the local community in planning and implementing school-improvement activities.</p>
<p>Staff development: Provides high-quality and continuous teacher and staff professional development and training.</p>	<p>Professional development: Provides high-quality and continuous teacher and staff professional development and training.</p>
	<p>Support of change agents: Provides support for teachers, administrators, and other staff.</p>
<p>Coordination of resources: Identifies how all resources available to the school will be used to coordinate services to support and sustain the school reform effort.</p>	<p>Coordination of resources: Identifies how all resources available to the school will support and sustain the school reform effort. <i>In particular, the school should make efficient use of federal, state, local, and private financial and other resources to foster its improvement plan.</i></p>
<p>Evaluation: Includes a plan for evaluating the implementation of the schoolwide reform and its impact on students’ academic achievement.</p>	<p>Annual evaluation: Includes a plan for evaluating, <i>annually</i>, the implementation of the schoolwide reform and its impact on students’ academic achievement.</p>
<p>Comprehensive approach: Contains a comprehensive design for effective school functioning, which includes instruction, assessment, classroom management, professional development, parental involvement, and school management, and for aligning the school’s curriculum, technology, and professional development into a schoolwide reform plan.</p>	<p>Comprehensive approach: Contains a comprehensive design for effective school functioning, which includes instruction, assessment, classroom management, professional development, parental involvement, and school management, and for aligning the school’s curriculum, technology, and professional development into a schoolwide reform plan.</p>

- ◆ The movement has had a positive effect on achievement. According to a meta-analysis, conducted by Geoffrey Borman in 2002, of the 232 CSR evaluations completed through 2001, “the average student from a CSR school outperformed about 55% of [non-CSR] children.” CSR schools were also significantly more effective than traditional compensatory programs in raising student achievement
- ◆ Federal support of this movement helped facilitate the rapid development of entrepreneurial enterprises with regionally based personnel who are able to provide alternative support structures for schools and systems.

Lessons Learned

Whole school reform and CSR can claim a variety of accomplishments specific to school environment and student achievement (see Appendix III). Along the way, however, it has also provided important lessons about system capacity for change and how to advance school reform efforts. The ever-shifting role and focus of school reform model developers has been central to the evolution of the whole school reform movement. It is widely acknowledged that change agents serve as a powerful catalyst for school-based improvement and for building the capacity of schools to sustain those changes. There is less consensus about how to create a balance between using external assistance from reform model providers or intermediaries and improvements needed in the capacity of the school and district.

Model developers and other local intermediaries have learned that no school provides a blank slate for reform efforts. All external change agents who wish to help schools improve must recognize the need to reconcile the many complex activities that occur in a school and district simultaneously in order to maintain coherence when new initiatives are adopted.

The most effective reform designs have promoted the importance of teamwork in building local competence, rather than allowing each entity to act as a single resource of imported expertise, impermeable to local context. Some effective reform models and intermediaries partner extensively with schools and districts, adapting their reform model or design to fit the local context. In fact, a few have become key advocates and collaborators in local efforts to improve schools, demonstrating the critical importance of a balance between adoption and adaptation of a reform model.

Because of the nature of the development of a market-based demand for whole school reform models, and the fact that poorly performing schools are so diverse in their problems, there has been a lag in creating a group of models that can support the expanding universe of diverse schools that are clamoring for assistance.

It is clear that the capacity of the reform model to adapt itself to the local context is as critical to the success of the reform as is the capacity of the school and district to carry out those reforms.

In addition, developers and intermediaries must change the way they relate to a school. Rather than presenting research for practitioners to absorb, there is now a growing effort to develop an infrastructure through which consultants can work collaboratively with a school over several years. Reform model developers and intermediaries have had to develop a system that identifies the types of people who must be hired, specifies how information is organized and delivered to the field, and outlines how support is provided.

An infusion of funds through New American Schools, the Annenberg Challenge Grant, and, most recently, the Gates Foundation, has supported this direct assistance to schools. The result is an increase in the number of new organizations supporting autonomy and whole school change. These proponents have indirectly and directly advocated for more choice of reform models at the local level, thus supporting the development of market-based approaches to school reform that introduce the use of well-researched programs at scale within a local and state accountability framework. This variety helps districts steer clear of a monolithic, uniform approach toward improvement across all schools. For schools to have this degree of autonomy in selecting their own model, however, an alternative support infrastructure must be established whereby schools receive direct guidance and consultation.

Although a diverse array of approaches to school change has emerged, creating a strategy that encourages and supports school autonomy, central questions have arisen concerning the various roles that other participants must play in the school reform network. Many of the schools undergoing whole school change efforts, whether using homegrown strategies or national reform models, must take into consideration the extent to which the district's central office directs and guides school performance. In this era of greater alignment of professional development, curriculum, and instruction, can districts sustain multiple-school reform programs, a so-called "portfolio of schools"? Or possibly supporters of different approaches to reform need their own subdistrict that comprises a local education support network?

Maintaining high standards while also fostering diverse schools in which staff and community exercise solid professional judgment is the main challenge facing education policymakers today. School reform model developers and intermediaries have begun to demonstrate how systems can bridge that chasm and help create a framework of state, district, and school support to drive a process of continuous improvement and to get results for all children.

The following policy recommendations address some of the lessons learned from whole school reform. The recommendations came out of a meeting of diverse stakeholders that was convened by the National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform in conjunction with the Annenberg Institute for School Reform, the Consortium for Policy Research in Education, and New American Schools and harmonize with recommendations of several recent national reports. As with each previous transformation of the CSR movement, proponents will have to determine how their work addresses the central problems that schools and districts face today within the greater context of dramatically improving academic performance and closing the achievement gap.

Our knowledge of what it takes to make a school successful has blossomed in recent decades, and the successes and failures of whole school reform have provided a rich array of knowledge from which policymakers may draw. This new knowledge connects school-level improvement with a supportive infrastructure, which leverages the strengths and contributions of various stakeholders rather than simply advocating for continued federal support for CSR. It compels schools and policymakers to act in new and different ways.

Consensus emerged among the stakeholders at the meeting that whole school reform or CSR by itself is an incomplete theory of action. Schools do not operate in a vacuum, but within a framework of district and state policies. When CSR is a fully integrated tool in the hands of states and districts, it can address a system's toughest problems and facilitate opportunities for schools seeking to set and follow unique paths to student success. In order to truly raise performance expectations and close the achievement gap, the issue is not whether implementing whole school reform or CSR is the best option for achieving these goals. Rather, the next step must focus on how whole school reform or CSR can be effectively implemented.

District support for schoolwide reform is critical, particularly in the face of frequent leadership changes. Identifying the proper match between whole school reform models and school needs often taxes the capacity of both school leaders and district leaders. School districts must play a crucial role in crafting the careful balance between developing a school's internal capacity to improve on its own and managing the provision of external support when and where it is needed.

As with districts, states can also embrace or marginalize whole school reform and CSR. State leaders can implement CSR in ways that empower schools to make important decisions, but they can just as easily entangle these efforts in a maze of competing reforms and requirements. They can put systems in place to help schools and districts develop the capacity to make smart selections among external support options, or they can leave localities to sort out competing claims themselves.

CSR Effects on the Policy Environment

- ◆ CSR shows that school improvement can be accomplished, and that outside technical assistance directed at the school level can make a difference.
- ◆ CSR molds school practices that lead to greater coherence around student achievement.
- ◆ CSR increases community demand for improvement.
- ◆ CSR shifts the context of school change, resulting in greater receptivity to external assistance and strategies.
- ◆ CSR reinforces two often conflicting ideas—that of system alignment, by showing there are many ways for schools to align with standards, and that of school autonomy, by showing that schools with a clear and relevant focus do a better job.
- ◆ CSR increases the use of data-driven decision making.
- ◆ CSR helps raise and address the question, “what will you do if your students don’t demonstrate success?”

Policy recommendations for federal, state, and district leaders charged with implementing or integrating CSR effectively within the larger context are described below. The content is organized into three categories:

- ◆ Using data to align systems
- ◆ Addressing school context issues
- ◆ Strengthening teaching and school leadership.

Using Data to Align Systems

Most students can meet rigorous standards and expectations when provided with the support needed. Since the National Education Summit of 1989, convened and led by President George H. W. Bush and then-Governor Bill Clinton of Arkansas, raising expectations and insisting on standards have become key to the federal role in the American education system. States have since made a commitment to implementing standards-based reform, and eliminating the achievement gap has become a national goal supported by a remarkably broad spectrum of groups across the country and across partisan lines. To attain a national goal of eliminating the achievement gap, all levels of government must commit energy, attention, and resources to whole school reform over several years.

One of the great advances in present education policy is the insistence that reform be data-driven. While educators may have considered data in the past, its collection and analysis have now taken center stage in school-improvement efforts within the profession and in the public mind. Without a deep understanding of proper application, data alone provide no valuable solutions. Districts and schools need help as they struggle with how to use data to improve student achievement and to close the achievement gap. Most teachers, principals, and district personnel are not trained in data analysis and, without assistance, are likely to struggle with mountains of information, failing to draw the appropriate conclusions. States are in a position to help districts and schools review test results, understand item-by-item analysis, focus on the distribution of results rather than the averages, and develop data profiles that can serve as action guides.

Policy Recommendations

Federal Role

- ◆ Continue to mandate high expectations and standards-based reform in all reform initiatives, including support for and development of value-added data approaches.
- ◆ Fully fund state efforts to measure progress regularly and provide students in persistently failing schools with viable options for receiving an excellent education.
- ◆ Determine how to maintain a commitment to data-driven change without imposing expensive new regulations and overburdening states and districts.
- ◆ Support research, development, and data analysis about the implementation of standards, teaching and learning practices and their relationship to school improvement, and the work of intermediary organizations in connecting policy to practice.
- ◆ Support intermediary organizations in their efforts to help states and localities obtain valid, reliable data.
- ◆ Allow states and districts to use CSR funding to help schools plan and prepare for whole school reform implementation.

State Role

- ◆ Build on the initial hard work of defining standards by confirming that the standards describe what is required for success in learning and in work and that state assessments are genuinely aligned with state standards.
- ◆ Set core standards for supplemental services, state exams, and other criterion, while maintaining a waiver system for graduated compliance.
- ◆ Use data to support students in the most challenged circumstances (i.e., in communities with high numbers or proportions of students from low-income families).
- ◆ Establish methods to report achievement results that go beyond test scores and serve as a means to show other important school outcomes such as graduation rates and progress toward achievement goals.
- ◆ Shift from exclusive focus on working with CSR schools to an aligned approach between the district and school with new competencies built at the district level. Recruit employees who have experience with and a track record of success at the district level.
- ◆ Inform districts of how students are performing compared to students of comparable demographics from other areas of the state.
- ◆ Benchmark state standards and assessments against national standards and requirements in neighboring states.
- ◆ Identify best practices and effective districts and build on those examples to create models for district reform.

- ◆ Develop the capacity to systematically review CSR programs, identify what works and what doesn't, and provide that information to educators.
- ◆ Collaborate with other states in developing model mechanisms to compare school progress and outcomes with similar schools serving similar populations.
- ◆ Work closely with external providers who have experience improving low-performing districts.
- ◆ Provide additional support for schools in communities that serve the most challenged student populations.
- ◆ Provide superintendents with substantial technical assistance on data analysis and data-driven reform and create learning communities so they can discuss what works across district lines.
- ◆ Review state certification requirements to ensure that prospective teachers and administrators receive training in data analysis and usage.
- ◆ Review and revise state codes that constrain districts and schools in their pursuit of high standards and demanding expectations.
- ◆ Develop economies of scale in data management through regional state contracts to share the costs and burden of data development.

District Role

- ◆ Ensure that principals, teachers, and parents understand the developing data-driven, standards-based school environment, why it has arisen, and what it means for each employee, parent, and student.
- ◆ Identify key attributes of state standards and assessments to help schools align curriculum against the rubrics on which they and their students will be assessed.
- ◆ Insist on greater clarity from states regarding district and school data needs.
- ◆ Use data to advance a culture of “continuous improvement” within the district and its schools based on success in meeting achievement goals.
- ◆ Support ongoing intensive professional development for district staff, teachers, and administrators on standards-based reform and data-driven instruction.
- ◆ Identify outstanding administrators and teachers who have the capacity to engage in data-driven decision making and provide assistance to others in the district.
- ◆ Build data links among state standards and accountability measures, district curricula, and individual school results to pinpoint effective practices.
- ◆ Align support for instructional practice with accountability structures.
- ◆ Review and improve the state-developed comparison mechanisms among schools and students.
- ◆ Monitor emerging state and federal requirements and be prepared to identify areas where requirements advance or hinder improved achievement.

Addressing the School Context

Although policies directed at improving the school context might be the hardest to define, they are the most critical imperatives for school reform. Reform initiatives can no longer come as mandates from the upper echelons of administrative hierarchy, nor can they simply be imported strategies from researchers and model developers. Rather, such initiatives need to be incorporated, or modified to fit, within the context of each individual school. A balance must be struck at the district level between the adoption of a CSR model and the adaptation of that model to the context of the school and district. Regardless of how well a model is grounded in high-quality research, such a balance cannot be attained without assistance and guidance from the state.

Placing both the responsibility and authority for reform on those who are most accountable for and affected by student performance is a sound, strategic principle rarely applied by states and districts. Authority and accountability for student performance must be assigned to those closest to the problems and opportunities. Like many private and parochial schools throughout the United States, CSR initiatives stress the importance of the individual school and its community as the primary partners in educating all children.

Policy Recommendations

Federal Role

- ◆ Provide incentives that encourage states to enable districts to exchange greater school autonomy for increased accountability.
- ◆ Create authority for states to bundle and deregulate federal categorical programs for districts with approved district-wide, school-improvement plans.
- ◆ Provide continued support for intermediary organizations that help states, districts, and individual schools develop well-grounded plans for school autonomy harnessed to data-driven accountability.
- ◆ Develop leadership academies in which state and federal officials can explore theories of systems analysis and change in large, complex systems.
- ◆ Maintain continued support for a national clearinghouse of information on and concerning whole school reform, its history, programs, and development, thus providing a central body of knowledge available to all districts, states, model developers, and intermediary organizations.

State Role

- ◆ Envision state policies organized as much around school outcome (e.g., graduation rates or closing the achievement gap) as around school inputs (e.g., enrollment and per-pupil allocations).
- ◆ Authorize schools to offer time-individualized and performance-based programs in addition to standardized grade promotion and credit-based programs.
- ◆ Involve district leaders in refining statewide goals and their implementation.
- ◆ Grant regulatory waivers to schools and districts interested in new performance-based or whole school reform approaches.
- ◆ Convene regular meetings that collect advice and recommendations of parents, community members, and educators in order to identify public perceptions concerning issues surrounding a school's implementation of whole school reform initiatives.
- ◆ Create opportunities for district and school leaders to explore theories of systems analysis and change in large, complex systems.

District Role

- ◆ Ensure that schools have the autonomy and authority to develop in different ways, with distinct personalities, and then allow families to choose from among all public schools in local districts.
- ◆ Transform local-district financial mechanisms so that funds follow students and to ensure that schools in desirable neighborhoods do not receive more funding simply because more senior (and more expensive) teachers congregate there.
- ◆ Invest in outside expertise, by using local funds for CSR in addition to federal and state dollars, to obtain technical help for supporting district staff during the reform process.
- ◆ Prepare school leaders to select their own staff with the understanding that hiring teachers with greater experience and higher salaries means fewer adult professionals in the school; hiring more junior—yet equally qualified—teachers with lower salaries means more adult role models in the school.
- ◆ Insist that school autonomy be accompanied by school accountability and be prepared to intervene if a particular approach to reform does not yield expected results.
- ◆ Open schools to the public by inviting parents and community members to play a central role in school design and analyzing results; transmit the results of this more open process to state and federal leaders.

Strengthening Teaching and School Leadership

Radical reforms to the education environment will require targeted support to strengthen the professional knowledge and skills of teachers and other school leaders. Although the quality of certification varies widely from state to state and even within districts, recent analyses reveal that there are more than enough certified teachers and school principals in the United States to meet national needs. Unfortunately, many of these certified teachers and principals have left the field of education. As well, schools in challenging communities have trouble attracting qualified candidates for teaching and administrative positions. It must also be recognized that some community members, often those with political power, will oppose necessary structural changes when they feel that schools are already serving their children well.

The current system of selecting and promoting teachers and principals within schools has shown that not all students receive the best quality of instruction. CSR has shown the potential benefit of improving the capacity of all teachers and school leaders around commonly understood goals. In pushing for a system of certified, well-trained professionals—a system that can incorporate current employees and future hires—the results of whole school reform provide a strong argument for significant changes in education policy.

Policy Recommendations

Federal Role

- ◆ Support a national research program focused on the best means of providing professional support.
- ◆ Provide incentives to encourage students and young professionals to enter teaching and school administration.
- ◆ Create multi-tiered levels of support for school-based planning and community development.

State Role

- ◆ Establish teams of high-quality consultants who can provide professional development assistance and leadership skills training to schools and districts engaged in CSR.
- ◆ Review and, if necessary, modify certification requirements to ensure that only the highest quality teachers are placed in the classrooms.
- ◆ Support new teachers and leaders as they advance their skills once in the field.

District Role

- ◆ Develop partnerships with reform support organizations to redesign the district leadership structure and make it more efficient and beneficial to schools and employees.
- ◆ Move district hiring practices away from placing any available applicant into any available position and toward a system of promoting and hiring the person who is the best fit for an open position.
- ◆ Critically examine the capacity of school leaders and the culture within the individual school to determine how to shift from a command-and-control approach to a service-and-support approach.
- ◆ Help school staff members coalesce into learning communities that, working with collective bargaining representatives, could counsel ineffective teachers and administrators out of education and encourage qualified educators and staff on ways to advance in their careers.
- ◆ Foster norms of continuous staff learning and school improvement by building teachers' knowledge and skills through peer-mentoring, focused professional development centers, and the establishment of formalized teacher and school networks.

Shifting from Whole School to Whole System Reform

3

As the nation looks back on 20 years of efforts to advance whole school reform, it also shifts toward whole system reform. Knowing that no one entity has all the answers, a consensus is growing—improvements at the school level require professional learning communities and strong, open partnerships between all stakeholders. More importantly, policymakers have abandoned the idea that schools will improve on their own and have embraced a role of encouraging and facilitating change. Comprehensive approaches to reform provide the best results and also require the most diverse forms of assistance.

Developing internal capacity to create demanding, disciplined, and high-trust cultures is also required of schools in the twenty-first century. Individual skill, professional learning communities, the integration of coherent programs, flexible resource utilization, and excellent leadership at all levels are excellent goals that can be attained through whole school reform. These goals can be achieved not through embracing whole school reform as a “silver bullet,” but rather through policies aimed at continuous improvement. From the very first stage of policy implementation, embracing a commitment to using data, contextual evidence, and leadership experience can provide effective learning environments for all students.

Reforming whole schools while preserving present district structures is not a viable option. Whole district reform will create the environment needed to improve the learning of all students, which has been the central aim of policymakers at all levels. Through alignment of policy at the federal, state, and district levels, teachers and school leaders will have the appropriate tools and means to better serve all students through whole school reform or CSR. Just as the development of whole school reform has shown some success at the school level, it will certainly show comparable success at the district level. In order to truly raise performance expectations and close the achievement gap, the issue is not whether implementing whole school reform or CSR is the best option for achieving these goals. Rather, the next step must focus on how whole school reform or CSR can be effectively implemented.

“From Whole School to Whole System Reform” April 26, 2004 to April 27, 2004 Conference Agenda

April 26, 2004

Welcome

Arthur Gosling, Executive Director, *National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform*

Margaret McNeely, Comprehensive School Reform Team Leader, *Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Programs, U.S. Department of Education*

Monica Martinez, Director of Outreach, *National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform*

Setting the Stage: What was intended by whole school reform?

The introduction provided participants a starting point for discussion by establishing a common definition of whole school reform and attempting to make explicit the efficacy of the theory of whole school reform—from its roots and multiple meanings, embedded in federal, state, and local policy, as well as from philanthropic or entrepreneurial initiatives.

Warren Simmons, Executive Director, *Annenberg Institute for School Reform*
Mary Anne Schmitt, President, *New American Schools*

Session One: In what ways has whole school reform made a difference?

Panelists established a common definition and theory of whole school reform and discussed how whole school reform has made a difference, which contributions have proven by research, and how it applies as a reform strategy within a school, system of schools, or a district.

Jonathan Supovitz, Senior Researcher, *Consortium for Policy Research in Education* (Facilitator)

Toks Fashola, Senior Research Scientist, *American Institutes for Research, Johns Hopkins University*

Sam Stringfield, Principal Research Scientist, *Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University*

Marc Tucker, President and CEO, *America's Choice*

Session One: Breakout groups

Conference participants met in mixed-role groups of approximately 20 participants, randomly created from the different entities represented at the conference (state-level CSR coordinators, researchers, reform model developers, and representatives from foundations and national organizations, national and regional intermediaries, and local and district intermediaries), to identify which aspects of whole school reform have or have not been successful and to provide evidence for these assertions.

Session One: Reconvene

In a plenary session, participants reported findings from their small-group discussions, bringing to closure discussion on the topic of the definition, role, and effectiveness of whole school reform.

Marla Ucelli, Director of District Redesign, *Annenberg Institute for School Reform*

Keynote Luncheon: “From Whole School to Whole System Reform”

Dr. Fullan reviewed whole school reform models, concluding that the use of such models has been beneficial in certain circumstances, but that the strategy itself represents an incomplete approach to school improvement. Alternatively, he introduced a tri-level approach to school reform, which represents a transition from CSR models to whole system reform, that encompasses three levels—school and community, district, and state.

Michael Fullan, Dean, *Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto*

Session Two: Fishbowl—How do reform support organizations develop and sustain a school’s capacity to initiate and sustain change?

Designed to unearth the tensions between school-level practitioners and reform support organizations, this session identified how the capacity of schools can be developed to implement and sustain whole school change. Central to this debate were issues surrounding system leadership in building capacity and coherent alignment between multiple, technical-assistance providers within the same district.

Warren Simmons, Executive Director, *Annenberg Institute for School Reform*
(Facilitator)

Alan Bersin, Superintendent, *San Diego Unified School District*

Libia Gil, Chief Academic Officer, *New American Schools*

Ellen Guiney, Executive Director, *Boston Plan for Excellence*

Laurie Levin, Director, *Institute for Research and Reform in Education*

Steve Jubb, Executive Director, *Bay Area Coalition for Equitable Schools*

Jennifer O’Day, Senior Research Scientist, *American Institutes for Research*

Sam Stringfield, Vice-Chair, *Board of School Commissioners, Baltimore City Public Schools*

Session Two: Breakout groups

Using a small-group discussion format, major stakeholders involved in whole school reform (e.g., state-level CSR coordinators, researchers, reform model developers, and representatives from foundations and national organizations, national and regional intermediaries, and local and district intermediaries) met to identify action-oriented policies relevant for implementing CSR at the local, state, and federal levels and for ensuring that whole school reform could be an effective means for improving school and district capacity to sustain change.

Session Two: Reconvene

Again in plenary session, participants reported findings from each small-group discussions to other conference participants in order to create a broad understanding of the perceived needs for policy reform from each of the major players engaged in whole school reform.

Marla Ucelli, Director of District Redesign, *Annenberg Institute for School Reform*

Wrapping Up—Summary of Day One

Monica Martinez, Director of Outreach, *National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform*

April 27, 2004

Opening and Setting Stage—Day Two

Monica Martinez, Director of Outreach, *National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform*

Session Three: The efficacy of policy

Federal and state governments, philanthropies, and districts themselves expend enormous sums of money and energy to initiate and sustain various forms of whole school and system change. This session analyzed the efficacy of previous policies and examined modifications needed to start and sustain whole school and whole system change more effectively at the federal, state, and district levels. Panelists specifically discussed the types of rigorous, evidence-based data that can be used to create stronger links between the outcomes of philanthropic initiatives and federal, state, and local policy.

Mary Anne Schmitt, President and CEO, *New American Schools* (Facilitator)
Gordon MacInnes, Assistant Commissioner, *New Jersey Department of Education*
Cheryl Smith, Professional Staff Assistant, *Appropriations Committee, U.S. House of Representatives*
Constancia Warren, Senior Program Officer and Director of Urban High School Initiatives, *Carnegie Corporation of New York*

Session Three: Plenary discussion on policy reform

Participants responded to panelists from the previous session in an intensive question-and-answer session, which was designed to incorporate previous discussions, synthesize new ideas, and to identify specific policy recommendations concerning the future of comprehensive school reform.

Marla Ucelli, Director of District Redesign, *Annenberg Institute for School Reform*

Closing Remarks: The future of whole school reform in the context of systems change

Warren Simmons, Executive Director, *Annenberg Institute for School Reform*

Monica Martinez, Director of Outreach, *National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform*

From Whole School to Whole System Reform Conference Participants

Daniel Aladjem

American Institutes for Research

Denise Alston

National Education Association

Jacqueline Ancess

Teachers College, Columbia University

Deborah Appelbaum

Council for Basic Education

Raymond Bartlett

Council for Basic Education

Valerie Bass

Colorado Department of Education

Julie Bender-Yuda

Pennsylvania Department of Education

Jo Ann Berkley

New Jersey Department of Education

Alan Bersin

San Diego Unified School District

Barbara Bianchi

State of New Mexico

Bram Bluestein

A.T. Kearney, Inc.

Judy Bray

State Policy Services

Harold Brown

KnowledgeWorks Foundation

Susan Brownlee

The Grable Foundation

Hugh Burkett

U.S. Department of Education

Gina Burkhardt

North Central Regional Educational
Laboratory

Melissa Busch

American Institutes for Research

James Candela

Michigan Department of Education

Janet Carroll

Rhode Island Department of Education

Gene Chasin

National Center for Accelerated Schools

Lou Cicchinelli

Mid-continent Research for Education
and Learning

Jean Collier

The GE Foundation

Michael Connelly

Mosaica Education

Ann Cook

New York Performance Standards
Consortium

Glenda Copeland

AIM at Middle-Grades Results

Janice Crawford

The Ball Foundation

Don Dailey

American Institutes for Research

Nina de las Alas

National Clearinghouse for
Comprehensive School Reform

Diane Debacker

Kansas Department of Education

Cheri Dedmon

Hamilton County Schools, TN

Carol Diedrichsen

Illinois State Board of Education

Konyka Dunson

National Clearinghouse for
Comprehensive School Reform

John Easton

Consortium on Chicago School Research

Beverly Echols

District of Columbia Public Schools

Christine Emmons

School Development Program

Kurt Engelmann

National Institute for Direct Instruction

Christine Enyeart

National Clearinghouse for
Comprehensive School Reform

Toni Eubank

Southern Regional Education Board

Toks Fashola

American Institutes for Research

Michelle Feist

Academy for Educational Development

Nina Frant

Institute for Educational Leadership

Alethea Frazier-Raynor

Annenberg Institute for School Reform

Catherine Fromme

Washington Office of Public Instruction

Michael Fullan

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

Mary Futrell

The George Washington University

Linda Gerstle

ATLAS Communities

Libia Gil

New American Schools

Bruce Goldberg

Co-nect Schools

Dan Good

Ohio Department of Education

Arthur Gosling

National Clearinghouse for
Comprehensive School Reform

Betheny Gross

Consortium for Policy Research in
Education

Ellen Guiney

Boston Plan for Excellence

Elizabeth Hale

Institute for Educational Leadership

Gavin Haque

High/Scope Education Research

Carey Harris

A+ Schools

James Harvey

James Harvey and Associates

Thomas Hatch

National Center for Restructuring
Education, Schools and Teaching

Billie Hauser

Appalachian Educational Laboratory

Philip Hawkins

MicroSociety

Jane Heidt

Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound

Thomas Herd

A.T. Kearney, Inc.

David Huie

National Clearinghouse for
Comprehensive School Reform

Jacquelyn Jackson

U.S. Department of Education

Jerry Jailall

North Carolina Department of Public
Instruction

Helen Janc

Council for Basic Education

Steve Jubb

Bay Area Coalition for Equitable Schools

Tracie Kalic

Kansas State Department of Education

Tom Kerschner

The Great Books Foundation

Sally Kilgore

Modern Red School House

James Kushman
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

Michael Lamb
County of Allegheny, PA

Julia Lara
Council of Chief State School Officers

Bruce Latta
Council for Basic Education

Laurie Levin
Institute for Research and Reform in
Education

Susan Lusi
Alliance for Excellent Education

Gordon MacInnes
New Jersey Department of Education

Melissa Martin
National Clearinghouse for
Comprehensive School Reform

Monica Martinez
National Clearinghouse for
Comprehensive School Reform

Andrea McCarrier
Literacy Collaborative

Margaret McNeely
U.S. Department of Education

Steven Mertens
Center for Prevention Research and
Development

William Miles
Public Education Network

Shazia Miller
Chicago Public Schools

Karen Mitchell
SRI International

Patrick Montesano
Academy for Educational Development

Jacquelyn Moore
Nevada Department of Education

Akili Moses Israel
LEED-Sacramento

Peggy Mueller
Chicago Community Trust

Michael Murphy
Idaho Department of Education

Kathy Nelson
The Johns Hopkins University

Joe Nuber
Houston Independent School District

Jennifer O'Day
American Institutes for Research

Janice Ollarvia
National Association of Secondary School
Principals

Marvin Pittman
North Carolina Department of Public
Instruction

Michele Pola
The Houston A+ Challenge

Rosemary Powers-Ardinger
Idaho State Board of Education

Rose Raynak
Florida Department of Education

Chris Rhines
Oregon Department of Education

Trenace Richardson
National Clearinghouse for
Comprehensive School Reform

Diane Rivers
Quality Educational Systems, Inc.

Kay Sapp
Tennessee Department of Education

Cheryl Sattler
Success for All Foundation

Mary Anne Schmitt
New American Schools

George Schueppert
The Great Books Foundation

Shirley Schwartz
Council for Great City Schools

Katrina Scott-George
Oakland Unified School District

Sherman Shrager
Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers

Warren Simmons
Annenberg Institute for School Reform

Leonard Simutis
Eisenhower National Clearinghouse

Vincent E. Slatt
Institute for Educational Leadership

Cheryl Smith
U.S. House of Representatives

Carol Solis
Urban Learning Centers

Adria Steinberg
Jobs for the Future

Linda Stelly
American Federation of Teachers

Sam Stringfield
Center for Social Organization of
Schools

Jonathan Supovitz
Consortium for Policy Research in
Education

Michael Surpatl
Elizabeth Public Schools, NJ

Randall Taylor
Pittsburgh Public Schools

Jean Thomases
Academy for Educational Development

John Thompson
Pittsburgh Public Schools

Ana Tilton
New American Schools

Marc Tucker
National Center on Education and the
Economy

Marla Ucelli
Annenberg Institute for School Reform

Sala Udin
Pittsburgh City Council

Yolanda VanNess
Core Knowledge Foundation

Carolyn Vincent
The George Washington University

David Wakelyn
America's Choice

Fran Walter
U.S. Department of Education

Constancia Warren
Carnegie Corporation of New York

Jennifer Whitson
The National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive
School Reform

Doris Williams
Rural School and Community Trust

Maxine Wood
Talent Development High Schools

Connie Yowell
The MacArthur Foundation

David Zuckerman
Laboratory for Student Success

Annotated Bibliography on Whole School Reform

SETTING THE STAGE

Cross, C. (Ed.). (2004). *Putting the pieces together: Lessons from comprehensive school reform research*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform. This book informs readers about the history and context for the development of CSR, the challenges faced in implementing CSR programs, evidence supporting the effectiveness of various models, and the perspectives of both a researcher and a practitioner who have been involved with this effort for well over a decade.

Desimone, L. (2000, May). *Making comprehensive school reform work. Urban diversity series, no. 112*. New York, NY: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education and Institute for Urban and Minority Education. CSR has the potential to help overcome inequities in education, to provide a vehicle for a combination of state and local control, and to allow reform to permeate the classroom. This monograph focuses on principles learned from evaluations of CSR, especially large-scale implementation of CSR designs.

Rotberg, I. C. & Harvey, J. J. (1993). *Federal policy options for improving the education of low-income students: Vol. I. Findings and recommendations*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. In this report, the authors conclude that Title I's impact on education in low-income communities would be greatly increased through schoolwide reform and they encourage the federal government to expand the funding to include schoolwide rather than selective programs.

WHOLE SCHOOL REFORM MAKING A DIFFERENCE

Borman, G. D., Hewes, G. M., Overman, L. T., & Brown, S. (2002). *Comprehensive school reform and student achievement: A meta-analysis*. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk, Johns Hopkins University. This meta-analysis was conducted to review the overall achievement effects of CSR; to study the specific effects of 29 of the most widely practiced and externally developed models; and to assess how various CSR components, contextual factors, and methodological factors associated with the studies mediate the effects of CSR. The report found that the overall effect of adopting CSR models on student achievement was significant. In addition, CSR schools were found to be significantly more effective than traditional Title I-targeted or compensatory programs.

Camburn, E., Rowan, B., & Taylor, J. (2003). Distributed leadership in schools: The case of elementary schools adopting comprehensive school reform models. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(4), 347–373. This article uses data from a study of three of the most widely adopted CSR models to examine distributed leadership in the context of elementary schools' adoption of comprehensive school reforms.

Datnow, A., Borman, G., Stringfield, S., Overman, L. T., & Castellano, M. (2003, Summer). Comprehensive school reform in culturally and linguistically diverse contexts: Implementation and outcomes from a four-year study. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(2), 25–54. This paper presents findings from a four-year study of 13 culturally and linguistically diverse elementary schools that implemented CSR designs. Students from CSR schools had achievement outcomes that were generally equivalent to those for students from matched comparison schools. Under some circumstances, though, Limited English Proficient students and their English-speaking peers from CSR schools outperformed their comparison school counterparts.

Herman, R., Aladjem, D., McMahon, P., Masem, E., Mulligan, I., O'Malley, A., et al. (1999). *An educators' guide to schoolwide reform*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. This guidebook offers educators assistance in identifying effective CSR models that meet their schools' needs. Twenty-four specific model designs are included. Researchers rated each model's relative strengths in three areas: evidence of student achievement, technical support provided to schools implementing the models, and first-year costs.

Ross, S. M., Sanders, W. L., Wright, P., Stringfield, S., Wang, L. Weiping, & Alberg, M. (2001). Two- and three-year achievement results from the Memphis restructuring initiative. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 12(3), 323–346. The purpose of this study was to analyze student achievement data from 1995 through 1998 collected from the Memphis Restructuring Initiative (MRI) and to examine the effects of the initiative, if any, on student achievement. Analyses of academic achievement focused on “value-added” assessments.

REFORM SUPPORT ORGANIZATIONS DEVELOPING AND SUSTAINING SCHOOLS' CAPACITY FOR CHANGE

Bauer, S. C. (2001). *Caught in the middle: District administrators' experiences in comprehensive school reform*. Unpublished manuscript. The paper focuses on the question of how district-level stakeholders mobilize themselves to support whole school reform. The paper was based on a case study of a district, using a participatory, action-research process. Findings are presented in four areas: district context, strategic capacity, administrative capacity, and human resource capacity.

Berends, M., Kirby, S. N., Naftel, S., & McKelvey, C. (2001). *Implementation and performance in New American Schools three years into scale-up*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. This interim progress report describes trends in implementation, school performance, and related factors for a sample of 104 schools in eight partner jurisdictions participating in the New American Schools program. Factors found to affect implementation were teacher perceptions, school characteristics, the nature of the design, design-team assistance, and school-district support.

Desimone, L. (2002, Fall). How can comprehensive school reform models be successfully implemented? *Review of Educational Research*; 72(3), 443–479. This article reviews, analyzes, and synthesizes the literature that documents CSR implementation. The article's analysis was based on a theory of policy attributes, which posits that the more specific, consistent, authoritative, powerful, and stable a policy is, the stronger its implementation will be.

Hatch, T. (2000). What does it take to “go to scale”? Reflections on the promise and the perils of comprehensive school reform. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 5(4), 339–354. This report examines experiences and evaluations of the New American Schools design teams and other whole school reform efforts, focusing on the challenges in the scale-up efforts and suggesting that some designs are effective in improving some aspects of schooling, given certain conditions.

Murphy, J., & Datnow, A. (Eds.). (2003). *Leadership lessons from comprehensive school reforms*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc. The purpose of this book is to explore the role of leadership in CSR. Specifically, this book examines observations and findings from research on seven CSR programs and two Annenberg Challenge initiatives to provide insight into the type of leadership important in the successful implementation of CSR.

Ross, S. M. (2001). *Memphis city schools with CSR models: Possible factors responsible for the outcomes*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. This report documents a study that was conducted to address the question of what factors most strongly contribute to Memphis schools' success or lack of success in raising achievement through a superintendent-led, district-wide, restructuring initiative from 1995 to 2001.

Stringfield, S., Millsap, M. A., Winfield, L., Brigham, N., Yoder, N., Moss, M., et al. (1997). *Special strategies for educating disadvantaged children. Urban and suburban/rural. Second year report*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education. This volume presents second year findings from a three-year project that collected case study data on 10 promising strategies for educating disadvantaged children. The study occurred at 25 urban or suburban/rural sites that had Chapter 1 programs or were eligible for Chapter 1. Strategies included Reading Recovery, computer-assisted instruction, peer tutoring, extended-day and extended-year

projects, schoolwide projects, Success for All projects, Comer School Development projects, Paideia projects, and Re: Learning/Coalition of Essential Schools projects. Although all 10 of the special strategies had positive impacts on groups of at-risk students, the quality of implementation was always critical; and fiscal and other crises had powerful negative impacts on program implementation.

Taylor, K., Moreno, A., & Case, M. (2000). *Doing CSR: The role of leadership and professional learning community in implementing comprehensive school reform. Interim report*. San Francisco, CA: WestEd. This document reports findings from case studies of seven schools in three states. The case studies tracked the schools' processes for reform and found that communication appeared to be a key factor in establishing shared goals and in focusing the school on student learning. In addition, the report cites the important role that principals played in moving reform forward, including ensuring accountability and reinforcing vision.

EFFICACY OF POLICY

Berends, M., Chun, J., Schuyler, G., Stockly, S., & Briggs, R.J. (2002). *Challenges of conflicting school reforms: Effects of New American Schools in a high-poverty district*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. This report chronicles a study that examined the conditions of NAS classrooms compared with non-NAS classrooms and studied the relationships between classroom conditions and student achievement in a high-poverty district in San Antonio, Texas. The study focused on the conditions in the district, schools, and classrooms that promote or inhibit design implementation and on changes in teaching and learning.

Bodilly, S. J. (1998). *Lessons from New American Schools' scale-up phase: Prospects for bringing designs to multiple schools*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. This book is an implementation analysis of the first two years (1995–1997) of a five-year, longitudinal study plan that involved a New American Schools partnership with 10 jurisdictions. Key questions investigated were: “Did schools implement the designs and to what extent?” and “Why did some schools make more progress than others toward implementation goals?”

Datnow, A., Hubbard, L., & Mehan, H. (2002). *Extending educational reform: From one to many*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer Press. This book presents data that explore what happens when externally developed CSR designs “go to scale” or are deliberately transferred to multiple sites and settings. Data were drawn from two, comprehensive, longitudinal studies of school reform scale-up, as well as related studies on school change. Among the CSR designs reviewed were Audrey Cohen, AVID, Coalition of Essential Schools, Core Knowledge, the Modern Red SchoolHouse, Roots and Wings, School Development Program, and Success for All.

Datnow, A., & Kemper, E. A. (2003, April). *Connections between federal, state, and local levels in the implementation of comprehensive school reform*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. The purpose of this paper is to determine how activities at various policy levels—federal government, state, district, design team, and school—influence the implementation of CSR.

Education Commission of the States. (1999). *Comprehensive school reform: Five lessons from the field*. Denver, CO: Author. This report presents the results of a five-year study conducted by governors and other state and local policymakers on education reform and offers advice on what it takes to implement CSR. The text focuses on the difference between comprehensive reforms and piecemeal improvement strategies, stresses the importance of district support in any reform, emphasizes the importance of finding a strong match between schools and reform models, and discusses the need to create stability in schools in spite of administrative changes.

Erlichson, B. A., & Goertz, M. (2001). *Implementing whole school reform in New Jersey: Year two*. New Brunswick, NJ: Department of Public Policy and Center for Government Services, Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy, Rutgers, The University of New Jersey, Government Services.

This report summarizes findings from the second year of a three-year study of a large-scale, whole school reform mandated by the New Jersey State Supreme Court in the case of *Abbott v. Burke*. The report seeks to describe the processes of implementation and school-based budgeting of *Abbott v. Burke* that were utilized by the state department, districts, schools, and developers. Many of the obstacles reported in the Year One report still exist, such as short timeframes, lack of capacity, and unclear roles and responsibilities.

Huebner, T. A., & Calisi, G. (2000). *CSR implementation: California districts supporting schools*. San Francisco, CA: WestEd. This report is based on a study that examines the district's role in supporting CSR in California. Two research questions were posed: 1) In what ways do districts support schools in CSR and 2) How might this support vary across districts? The study focused on nine districts that received the highest scores on their CSR Program applications.

Conference Partnership



The National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform (NCCSR) was established in 1999 by the U.S. Department of Education in recognition of the fact that practitioners need information about developing reform programs and documenting the impact of reforms. Over the past five years, NCCSR, a partnership of the George Washington University, the Council for Basic Education, and the Institute for Educational Leadership, has disseminated information about comprehensive school reform through its web site, reference and retrieval services, outreach activities, and multiple publications.



Annenberg Institute for School Reform (AISR) develops, shares, and acts on knowledge that improves the conditions and outcomes of schooling in America, especially in urban communities and in schools serving underserved children. An independent center at Brown University, the Annenberg Institute is a standards-based and practice-centered, policy-research and technical-assistance organization that emphasizes promoting quality education for disadvantaged children and communities.



The Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) studies how reforms—in policy, organization, or structure—lead to improvements in instruction; how knowledge and experience influence reforms; and how the links between knowledge, reforms, and practice can be strengthened. Since 1985, CPRE has united education researchers from the University of Pennsylvania, Harvard University, Stanford University, the University of Michigan, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison in an effort to improve elementary and secondary education through their research efforts.



New American Schools (NAS) provides support through research-based education services to state departments of education, school districts, charter authorizers, and networks of schools. As a business-led, nonpartisan, nonprofit organization, NAS is a leading provider of professional services and investment in K–12 education and, with its strategic partners, offers key stakeholders the tools and external assistance needed to facilitate and sustain student and adult learning.