Dissertations   Theses and Dissertations

1988

A Study of State Mandated Educational Change

Kathleen Jensen
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

A STUDY OF STATE MANDATED EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

By

Kathleen Jensen

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

October   1988

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Barney Berlin, my dissertation advisor, for his continued support and advice. His standards of excellence and enthusiasm are both respected and appreciated. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee for their assistance.

I am indebted to Dr. Ralph Tyler and Dr. Michael Fullan. Their contributions in the field of educational change have significantly influenced this study. I am sincerely grateful for their time, interest, and recommendations for revisions during my research.

I especially thank my parents. Their continuing encouragement and support have helped me through three decades of higher education. My perseverance is a tribute to their guidance, example, and belief in me.

I would also like to acknowledge the help and support of my family with special gratitude to my daughter, Karla, who edited and typed this dissertation. But my greatest debt is to my husband, Dean, who has been an understanding partner throughout this undertaking. Without his patience and humor, I could never have finished the task.

VITA

The author, Kathleen Becker Jensen, is the daughter of Paul Erwin Becker and Georgia Parnell Becker. She was born December 9, 1939, in Springfield, Illinois.

Her elementary and secondary education were obtained in the Athens Community Unit School District, Athens, Illinois, where she graduated in 1956.

She attended the University of Arizona (Tuscon) where she was a member of Pi Lambda Theta (honorary sorority), and in August, 1965 was awarded a Bachelor of Arts in Education with High Distinction. In June, 1979 she received a Master of Education from Loyola University of Chicago. In 1981 she received the General Administrative Endorsement from Northern Illinois University and in 1982 completed the requirements for the Reading Specialist Endorsement.

She began her teaching career in 1965 at Whitmore Elementary School, Tuscon, Arizona. Her seventeen years of classroom teaching also included experience in Albuquerque, New Mexico, Austin, Texas, and Wauconda, Illinois.

In 1982 she accepted the position of Elementary Supervisor in Community Consolidated School District 15, Palatine, Illinois. In 1985 she became Director of Elementary Programs and since 1986

has served as Executive Director for Curriculum and Staff Development.

She has made presentations at local, state, and national conferences including the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (National, 1987) and the National Staff Development Conference (1987). She is co-author of two articles: "Teacher-2-Teacher: The Palatine Peer Coaching Program," The Journal of Staff Development, Summer 1987 and "The Principal as Curriculum Leader: Experience vs. Performance, " National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Bulletin, September 1988.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the 1980's the quality of American public education has been a popular topic of debate. In 1983, the Education Commission of the States reported that over 250 education task forces had been established to develop educational reform programs (Chance, 1986). Reports such as the National Commission on Excellence in Education report, A Nation At Risk; the Carnegie Forum's Task Force on Teaching report, A Nation Prepared; and the National Governor's Association report, A Time For Results, illustrate the extent to which educational reform had become an important political issue. These reports served, as did Sputnik in 1957, to focus attention on the problems and the achievements of the public educational system.

A report presented at the National Governor's Conference, Jobs, Growth And Competitiveness , stressed the critical role of education in encouraging economic growth and improving the nation's position in the international economy (Honetschlager and Cohen, 1988). This economic imperative is also apparent in the opening lines of A Nation At Risk: "Our nation is at risk. Our once unchallenged pre-eminence in commerce, industry, science and technology is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world" (National Commis-

sion on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 1).

While the national reports played an important role in focusing attention on the problems of the public school systems, the states have had an important role in the reform movement. "The state government of the 1980s is a far stronger governance entity than the state body of the 1950s" (Frazier, 1987, p. 105). The state legislatures, departments of education, state boards of education, and governors' offices have assumed a stronger role as education has become a popular political issue.

> Governors such as Hunt (North Carolina), Graham (Florida), Alexander (Tennessee), DuPont (Delaware), Robb (Virginia), Kean (New Jersey), Riley (South Carolina), Clinton (Arkansas), White (Texas), Lamm (Colorado), Perpich (Minnesota), and Orr (Indiana) have made educational reform and change a major part of their legislative recommendations and personal time commitment. Because these governors gained the national spotlight at least partly through their stands on education, there is no question that more state executive leaders will follow their lead. (Frazier, 1987, p. 106)

Although the state reform programs vary considerably from state to state, the areas of reform can be broadly characterized under two categories. The first, student achievement, addresses such issues as graduation requirements, competency standards, testing, class size, and attendance programs. The second category, professional standards, includes such areas as teacher preparation, teacher salaries, and teacher testing and evaluation programs.

What will be the impact of this current reform movement? Historically the public educational system has proven resistant to

change efforts (Goodlad, 1970). As a result of Sputnik there were many educational reforms. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 made federal funds available for new programs in science, mathematics, and foreign languages. The National Science Foundation funded projects that led to changes in math, social studies, and science curricula. Yet most teachers continued to utilize traditional content and methods which they had observed as students.

Will the current reform efforts be more effective in producing change? This study will examine the effects of reform efforts in Illinois. Within the context of the national movement, Illinois is considered to be a "high change" state (Chance, 1987, p. 68). Illinois was recognized by the Third Anniversary Conference of A Nation At Risk (April 1986) convened by the National Commission on Excellence in Education and former Secretary of Education Terrell Bell, as one of three states invited to present its reform program [A. L. Berman, State Senator, Chair of Senate Education Committee; personal interview; July 7, 1988].

ILLINOIS REFORM EFFORTS

A history of the reform movement in Illinois provides a context for examining the changes brought about by the 1985 Illinois reform legislation. The process began as early as 1981 when the State Board of Education initiated a comprehensive review of state education mandates to determine which, if any, should be changed. Student records, transportation, compulsory attendance, and school

day/year requirements were examined. During this same time period, the Board also studied the quality of educational personnel in Illinois, their preparation and on-the-job performance as well as the system of funding for elementary and secondary schools. As a result, by the spring of 1983 there was already a broad base of information available about the problems affecting the public schools of Illinois.

In 1983 the publication of A Nation At Risk, and the myriad of other national reports, created a climate of public concern. This growing public sentiment and the information from the mandate studies conducted by the State Board led the Illinois General Assembly to create the Illinois Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education (hereafter referred to as the Commission). The Commission, made up of twelve legislative and eight lay members chaired by Senate Education Committee Chairman Arthur Berman and House Education Committee Chairman Richard Mulcahy, was directed to:

> Study the problems relating to elementary and secondary education in Illinois, conduct public hearings throughout the state, and consider all relevant information, data, suggestions and proposals for improving elementary and secondary education in the state. (The Commission, 1984, Introduction)

The Commission reviewed the studies already completed by the State Board of Education and solicited input from individuals and organizations for reform recommendations. Their preliminary report issued in 1984 stated:

The quality of our educational system has been seriously questioned. From many sources have come complaints that too many young people are completing school without having acquired the knowledge and skills necessary to successfully take their place in a rapidly changing society. There is wide agreement that the quality of our state's public school system must be significantly improved. (The Commission, 1984, Introduction)

In January of 1985 the Commission issued its report, Excellence In the Making . This report cited problems and made recommendations for improving Illinois education. In February, Governor Thompson focused his State of the State Address on education. He detailed his proposal for the Illinois Better Schools Program. Subsequent budget recommendations demonstrated his commitment to educational reform.

Other reform initiatives and reports were under way in 1984 and 1985. Among these were the State Chamber of Commerce's Task Force On the Future Of Education In Illinois, the Illinois Project for School Reform's Education In A New Illinois , education reform proposals in the Illinois Federation of Teachers' Meeting the Challenge; recommendations from the Chicago Teachers Union's Perspectives From the Classroom; and Chicago United's adoption of an education platform.

All of the above reports and initiatives laid the groundwork for the public policy discussions during the 1985 General Assembly. The Commission report, Excellence In the Making , however, served as the blueprint for the comprehensive legislation on school improvement, Senate Bill 730. "The fact that the Commission was a quasi-legislative organization, chaired by a legislative leader . . . afforded

its recommendations with a preemptive quality over those of other organizations" (Chance, 1988, p. 75). As a result of the work of the Commission and other groups, over 50 state school laws were passed.

LEGISLATED REFORM IN ILLINOIS

In 1985 comprehensive education bills were passed in Public Act 84-126. The bills covered the following areas: preparation of school personnel, performance of school personnel, accountability, curriculum, programs for students at risk of academic failure, early childhood programs, school district organization, and school finance (Madigan, 1985). "Virtually all of the recommendations of the Commission were incorporated into the legislation" [A. L. Berman, State Senator, Chair of Senate Education Committee; personal interview; July 7, 1988].

> The 1985 educational reform legislation addressed nearly every aspect of schooling . . . One of the most important pieces of the legislation, one which has long range implications for learning and teaching in Illinois schools, provides for the development of learning goals and assessment systems at both the state and local levels" (Illinois State Board of Education, 1986, p. iii).

Public Act 84-126, referred to by the state as the Learning Assessment Plan (LAP), requires the following:

1. The State Board of Education must establish goals consistent with the primary purpose of schooling.
2. Local school districts must establish student learning objectives which are consistent with the primary purpose of schooling and which meet or exceed state goals established by

the State Board.

3. School districts must also establish local goals for excellence in education.
4. The State Board must establish assessment procedures for local school districts.
5. School districts must assess student learning to determine the degree to which local goals and objectives are being met.
6. School districts must develop local plans for improvement in those areas where local goals and objectives are not being met.
7. School districts must disseminate the local goals and objectives to the public, along with information on the degree to which they are being achieved and, if not, what appropriate corrective actions are being taken by the district.
8. The State Board must approve the local school district objectives, assessment systems, plans for school improvement, and public reporting procedures. (Illinois State Board of Education, 1986, pp. iii, iv)

A major component of the school reform act is a move towards accountability. Michael Madigan, in his Report On Education Reform And School Improvement, lists accountability as one of the major categories of the reform legislation. He states, "Accountability is an increasingly critical component to assure that students graduating from high school have acquired those basic skills. The education reform legislation, Senate Bill 730, provides for several measures which will demand new standards for students and accountability for education personnel and school boards" (Madigan, 1985, p. 21). In the report Madigan lists several pieces of the reform legislation under the category of accountability. Among them are School Report Cards, Student Assessment, and Student Grade Retention.

Each school district is required to publish a School Report Card

which indicates data on student performance and comparisons with district and state norms. As Learner Assessment Plans are phased in for each of the six primary areas identified by the state, school districts must report to the public local goals and objectives along with information on the degree to which they are being achieved, and if not, what appropriate corrective actions are being taken. The State Board must approve the local objectives and assessment system, the School Improvement Plan, and the plan for reporting information to the public.

The State Board of Education staff presented workshops and disseminated information to local districts to explain the specific requirements for the Learning Assessment Plan (LAP). Sample learning objectives, also referred to by the state as learner outcomes, were distributed to all districts to help them in creating their own objectives.

In August of 1987 the implementation of the LAP began. All school districts in the state were required to submit Learning Assessment Plans in the six areas of Language Arts to the State Board of Education. The first of these areas was reading. A state learner assessment system was developed to match the state's goals for reading (see Appendix A for the Assessment Schedule).

In 1987 the State Board of Education distributed information to all districts on the state assessment of reading followed by a sample of the assessment items for grades 3, 6, and 8. During April of 1988 all schools were required to administer a one hour reading

assessment to their students at these three grades and return the assessments to an independent testing contractor, National Computer Systems, to be scored. The results of the state assessment will be published on a school report card comparing the school performance to state and local norms.

The state LAP process stipulates the requirements for the development of objectives and student assessment. But for changes to occur, there must also be changes in classroom instruction. The state model assumes that the public reporting of student assessment data will create a pressure for instructional practice consistent with state goals.

FOCUS OF THIS STUDY

This study concentrates on the Learning Assessment Plan (LAP) as it relates to the area of reading. Reading was chosen as the subject area to be studied for several important reasons. First, reading is considered by some educators to be one of the most important subject areas in the curriculum and has an impact on all other subjects. Second, reading is the first of the six subject areas for implementation of the LAP. It should, therefore, afford a relatively uncontaminated view of the change process. Finally, the state goals, objectives, and assessment in reading represent a departure from conventional and current practice.

The state goals, which were developed by the Center for the Study of Reading at the University of Illinois, incorporate the most

current research on reading instruction. The emphasis is on a whole language approach to reading as opposed to the more traditional discrete skills approach. This new view of reading stresses the process of reading rather than the content:

> Reading is the process of constructing meaning through the dynamic (ever-changing) interaction of the reader, the text (written material) and the context of the reading situation. . . . Prior knowledge is a major determinant of comprehension. That is, readers use information from the text together with already-possessed knowledge to determine the author's intended meaning. Inference is an inherent part of the ongoing moment-by-moment process of reading. Making inferences requires readers to use information from the text and prior knowledge to produce meaning. This process virtually guarantees that any text will have many acceptable and justifiable interpretations. (Illinois State Board of Education, 1986, p. 5)

The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) recognized the change they were advocating with the state reading goals:

> The last decade has brought substantial advances in the understanding of the reading process and reading instruction. These findings have been translated and integrated into the sample reading objectives and instructional techniques. The Illinois State Goals for Learning and sample learning objectives are a reflection of the current research and views about reading and represent a broad framework of what is known about the reading process and sound reading instruction. These objectives break with the past, build upon prior strengths, and go beyond to accommodate the significant advances made in recent research. (Illinois State Board of Education, 1986, p. 1)

This study reports data on the response of teachers and administrators to the state mandated programs in the early stages of the implementation of this reform. Upon examination of the

process of change adopted by the state of Illinois, it is evident that the state has adopted a "top-down" model. That is, both the nature of the change and pressure for change began at the state level. The objective of the state legislation was to improve instruction. But this objective can only be met if the individual teachers change the way they teach.

A number of researchers have identified phases, or stages, in the change process (see Chapter II for a discussion of these phases). This study will concentrate on the initial phases of the change in an attempt to determine the response to the state mandate and how teachers and administrators are accommodating to the pressure for change. The following questions will be addressed:

1. How do the Learner Assessment Plans (LAPs) submitted by the individual districts compare to the Sample Learning Objectives of the state?

2. What process was used in developing these district plans submitted to the state and who was involved in preparing them?

3. How do administrators view these state mandates and what steps are they taking to implement the changes?

4. How do teachers view these state mandates? What do they know about the LAP process and the expectations of the state and district?

5. How have teachers responded to the change?

6. How does the state's plan for improvement of instruction, as it has been implemented, relate to the Fullan model and other

theories of change?

Chapter II contains a review of the literature on change theory and studies of change. The methodology and research design utilized to investigate the above questions are described in Chapter III. The response to the reform mandates and the status of the change effort found in this study are presented in Chapter IV. In Chapter V the research questions are discussed, factors critical to successful implementation are identified, the implications of the study are discussed, and suggestions for changes to the reform process are made.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this review the literature on change is examined in order to select an organizational framework for systematically analyzing Illinois' current reform effort. This chapter is divided into two parts. The first part is a review of frequently cited change models in the literature. Change is now generally accepted to be a process, not an event (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978; Fullan, 1982; Hall and Hord, 1987; Havelock, 1973; Rosenblum and Louis, 1981; et al). These models provide a framework for conceptualizing some of the complex factors inherent in the process.

The first three models discussed: Social Interaction, Research, Development, and Diffusion (RD&D), and Problem-Solving, were summarized in an early review of the change literature by Havelock (Havelock, 1973). The Organizational Development model examines the process of change from an organizational perspective. Linkage models are a synthesis of the effective aspects of earlier models of the change process. Dialogue, Decision-Making, Action, and Eval-uation (DDAE) is not a change model, but a strategy. It is included in this review because it has been described as an "essential component" of change efforts (Goodlad, 1975). Readiness, Planning, Training, Implementation, and Maintenance (RPTIM) is a

13

comprehensive staff development model. The next model discussed is a model for the process of teacher change developed by Thomas Guskey. Joyce and Showers' coaching model provides the opportunity for teachers to receive ongoing feedback and support as they implement changes in their classrooms. The last two models in the first part are comprehensive models of the change process: the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) and the School Improvement Model developed by Michael Fullan.

In the second part of this literature review, research on change is discussed. The first section describes the findings of change studies. Two important studies of change which have been frequently cited in the change literature, the Rand Change Agent Study and the study of Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement (DESSI) are described. Other important change research study findings are also discussed in this section. The second section discusses the phases of the innovation process. The third section examines the complexity of educational change, describing the wide assortment of factors affecting implementation of innovations. The fourth section examines the implications of the change research for reform efforts. In the final section, a framework is selected from the change literature for this study's analysis of the current Illinois reform effort.

CHANGE MODELS

The change literature has provided a variety of models which provide useful frameworks for examining the process of change. Following is a discussion of some of the most frequently cited models.

Social Interaction Models

Social interaction models begin with a fully developed change which will ultimately either be accepted or rejected by individual adopters. The change process is viewed as a natural process, a series of social networks through which new ideas get communicated and validated. Everett Rogers is most frequently identified with this school of thought (Lindquist, 1978).

Rogers and Shoemaker's Innovation-Decision Model is an example of a social interaction model. It suggests four stages to the change process: knowledge, persuasion, decision, and confirmation (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971). Using this model, the change agent's role is primarily to help individual adopters to learn more about the innovation (Hall and Hord, 1987).

Research, Development, and Diffusion (RD&D) Models

Research, development, and diffusion (RD&D) models view change as a rational, orderly process in which "passive" users adopt innovations because it is logical to do so. The RD&D model is based on five assumptions about change: (1) a rational sequence--research, development, dissemination--will bring about change; (2)

large-scale plans are necessary; (3) a division of labor and separa-
tion of roles and functions are needed; (4) the target audience are
passive consumers who will accept and adopt the innovation; and (5)
a high initial development cost is necessary, but will yield results
in the long run (Havelock, 1973).

RD&D describes many of the national educational innovation
programs implemented in the 1960s. "That most of these programs
were never widely used illustrates the danger in not understanding
more about the user end of the RD&D continuum" (Hall and Hord,
1987, p. 34). Goodlad expressed serious concerns about the model's
usefulness:

> The RD&D model appears not to be, in its functioning, a strategy
> for change. It is simply what the letters stand for: research,
> development, and diffusion, with what comes out to be diffused,
> being more or less adrift, requiring some other force to pull it
> into close juxtaposition with persons who might have some use
> for it. A productive change strategy requires the inclusion of this
> latter element. (Goodlad, 1975, p. 16)

Problem Solving Models

"The problem-solver model, unlike the social interaction and
RD&D models, which consider the innovation adopter as the receiver
and the target of the change process, involves the 'adopter' through-
out the process, collaboratively solving his/her problems" (Hall and
Hord, 1987, p. 34). Havelock outlined five positions stressed by
advocates of this orientation: (1) that user need is the primary
concern of the change agent; (2) that diagnosis of need is essential

to the change process; (3) that change agents should be facilitative and nondirective; (4) that internal resources should always be fully utilized; and (5) that self-initiated and self-applied innovation will have the strongest user commitment and meet with the most success (Havelock, 1973).

<u>Organizational Development (OD)</u>

The Organizational Development (OD) change strategy focuses on the organization rather than the individual. "A basic assumption of OD is that the nature of the group or organization is the source of many of the problems related to changing schools" (Hall and Hord, 1987, p. 35). "Its strength is that it views the organization as an interacting whole rather than as a set of independent parts" (Roark and Davis, 1981, p. 40). OD works to improve the functioning of the groups within the organization, enabling effective cooperation and collaboration to bring about needed changes within the organization.

An example of OD successfully applied is the use of a process model in the Participative Option Development (POD) project. The change agent operates in four stages. The first stage, entry, is characterized by three tasks--gaining acceptance; developing an adequate communication system, and establishing a working contract. The second stage involves diagnosis, design, and intervention. In the third stage, assessment occurs, both of the impact of the intervention and the overall state of the organization. In the final

stage, OD personnel are withdrawn from the client organization (Roark and Davis, 1981).

Linkage Models

"Havelock was one of the first to provide a general change model which joined previously separate traditions of thinking. He called his concept 'linkage'" (Lindquist, 1978, p. 9). Linkage models are derived from Havelock's initial work.

There are five elements to linkage models: (1) developing a structure for user problem solving and identifying users to help in dissemination and implementation activities; (2) establishing mechanisms for regularly determining user needs and transforming them into problem statements; (3) performing research at the critical time for users; (4) producing solution channels; and (5) establishing structures for user/researcher cooperation and collaboration (Waugh and Punch, 1987). "This type of collaboration will not only make particular solutions more relevant and more effective but will also serve to build a lasting relationship of mutual trust, and a perception by the user that the resource person is a truly concerned and competent helper" (Havelock, 1973, p. 165).

An example of a linkage model in operation is the National Diffusion Network (NDN). "This U.S. Department of Education program has been very effective at linking teachers with recently developed educational programs" (Hall and Hord, 1987, p. 38).

<u>Dialogue, Decision Making, Action and Evaluation (DDAE)</u>

A Kettering Foundation project studying change processes in a group of elementary schools led to the development of a cyclical strategy for facilitating school change. In <u>The Magic Feather Prin-ciple</u> (Bentzen et al, 1974), this strategy is described as Dialogue, Decision Making, Action, and Evaluation (DDAE). The process centers around staff efforts to bring about change in the school. Goodlad described its usefulness in change efforts:

> One of the essential components of any comprehensive strategy of change in school settings is total group and small group DDAE. . . . External change agents, instead of trying to insert something into the school's culture, first should be trying to help that culture develop an awareness of and a responsiveness to itself. Something akin to DDAE as an ongoing regularity is essential. (Goodlad, 1975, p. 177).

The "Magic Feather Principle" refers to the modern fable of Dumbo. Although he was capable of flying, Dumbo didn't realize that he could. Once his friend, the mouse, learned of Dumbo's unique talent, he did everything he could to try to convince Dumbo that he could fly. But Dumbo lacked the confidence. So the mouse gave Dumbo a "magic feather" (an ordinary feather), which enabled Dumbo to use his gift. Eventually, Dumbo realized the feather didn't cause him to fly--he finally believed in himself and didn't need the feather (Bentzen et al., 1974).

<u>RPTIM: A Staff Development Model</u>

Readiness, Planning, Training, Implementation, and Mainte-nance (RPTIM) is a comprehensive model that offers a systematic

approach to designing staff development. The model is based on the following basic assumptions or beliefs: (1) all school personnel need inservice throughout their careers; (2) significant improvement in educational practice takes time and long-range programs; (3) inservice education should focus on school programs; (4) adult learners want control over their learning and non-threatening learning environments; (5) educators vary in their professional competencies and readiness to learn; (6) professional growth requires individual and group commitment to new performance norms; (7) the school climate influences the success of professional development programs; (8) schools should be the primary target unit for change efforts; (9) school districts should provide needed resources and training; (10) principal commitment is central to adoption and continuation of new practices and programs in the school; and (11) effective inservice programs are based on research, theory, and the best educational practice (Wood, Thompson, and Russell, 1981).

Staff development in this model is seen as a five-stage process: Readiness, Planning, Training, Implementation, and Maintenance (RPTIM). Each stage includes practices, which delineate tasks to be completed as well as key personnel who should be involved. To determine the appropriateness of the stages to the model and the extent to which the practices specified were useful, a national study was conducted. The results of the study showed strong support for all stages and practices in the model (Wood, McQuarrie, and Thompson, 1982).

The Process of Teacher Change

Thomas Guskey developed a model of the process of teacher change as a result of staff development efforts (Guskey, 1986). According to the model, "significant change in the beliefs and attitudes of teachers is contingent on their gaining evidence of change in the learning outcomes of their students" (Guskey, 1986, p. 7). The model is based on the belief that change is a learning process for teachers that is developmental and primarily experientially based. It "implies that change in teachers' beliefs and attitudes is primarily a result, rather than a cause, of change in the learning outcomes of students. In the absence of evidence of positive change in students' learning, the model suggests that significant change in the beliefs and attitudes of teachers is very unlikely" (p. 9).

Guskey recognized that the underlying concept of the model was not new. Michael Fullan had expressed a similar viewpoint, stating: "changes in attitudes, beliefs, and understanding tend to follow rather than precede changes in behavior" (Fullan, 1985, p. 393). Guskey also acknowledged that his model was not a comprehensive change model. The simplicity of the model was "offered primarily as an ordered framework by which to better understand trends that appear to typify the dynamics of the teacher change process" (Guskey, 1986, p. 7). The implications of the model for staff development efforts, he felt, suggested three guiding principles: (1) change is a gradual and difficult process for teachers; (2)

teachers must receive regular feedback on student learning progress; and (3) teachers need continued support and follow-up after initial training (Guskey, 1986).

Joyce and Showers' Coaching Model

Joyce and Showers (1980) identified five key elements of successful change efforts: theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, and coaching. All five elements, they argued, must be present for lasting change to occur. They also identified five major functions of coaching: provision of companionship, provision of technical feedback, analysis of application, adaptation to students, and facilitation. Although they acknowledged that administrators or curriculum supervisors could perform the coaching function, Joyce and Showers suggested that peers could effectively coach one another as they implement changes. "From a purely logistical point of view, teachers are closer to one another and in an excellent position to carry out most of the coaching functions" (Joyce and Showers, 1982, p. 7).

The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM)

The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) is a comprehensive change model from the perspective of individuals within an organization. The model has evolved since its inception in the early 1970s as the Texas-based CBAM staff have worked with schools to implement changes. Key assumptions underlying CBAM are: (1) change is a process, not an event; (2) change is made by individuals; (3) change

is a highly personal experience; (4) change involves developmental growth in feelings as well as skills with respect to an innovation; (5) change is best understood in operational terms; and (6) the focus of facilitation should be on individuals, innovations, and the context (Hord, et al, 1987).

The CBAM model "views the teacher as the focal point in school improvement efforts, yet acknowledges and attends to the social and organizational influences as well" (Loucks and Hall, 1979, p. 2). Change facilitators are key to the success of CBAM. They play three distinctly different roles, operating as the source for innovation, impetus for innovation, and implementation facilitator (Hall and Guzman, 1984).

> In the CBAM model, change facilitators are responsible for using informal and systematic ways to probe individuals and groups to understand them. Three dimensions have been identified and verified for accomplishing this diagnosis: Stages of Concern, (SoC), Levels of Use (LoU), and Innovation Configurations (IC). With these three sets of diagnostic data in mind, the change facilitator is informed enough to provide interventions--actions that affect and facilitate teachers' use of new programs or practices. (Hall and Hord, 1987, p. 13)

The three diagnostic dimensions describe, essentially, three key questions that are asked in considering the teacher's position in the change process. The first dimension, Stages of Concern, asks: "How do they feel about it?"--teachers' concerns go through a series of varying emphases. The second dimension, Levels of Use, asks: "Are they using it?"--use ranges on a continuum, with gradual

behavioral changes as they move from absolute nonuse, to a state of comfortable and routine use, to a state of renewal, in which they seek to improve or replace it. The third dimension, Innovative Configurations, asks: "What is it?"--different teachers use very different forms of an innovation (Hall, 1986).

To help change facilitators to manage their role in the change process, another CBAM tool, a checklist for change facilitators, was created. This checklist, based on years of research, identifies six distinct categories of interventions. The categories are referred to as game plan components (GPC) because the role of the change facilitator is "not unlike that of an athletic coach who prepares a game plan (often with input from assistant coaches and sometimes from the players themselves) and then offers advice and assistance in carrying it out" (Hord, et al, 1987, pp. 79, 80).

Fullan's Model of the School Improvement Process

Michael Fullan analyzed and synthesized the literature on change. He explains that "many attempts at change fail because no disctinction is made between theories of change (what causes change) and theories of changing (how to influence those causes)" (Fullan, 1982, p. 7). Fullan created a comprehensive model of the school improvement process from an organizational perspective. He described two groups of factors (eight organizational factors and four process factors) that, when combined, identify in a systematic manner the theoretical framework that underlies successful school

improvement efforts. In brief, "the model of successful change processes is one whereby the eight organizational factors, supported and fueled by the four process variables, produce school improvement" (Fullan, 1985, p. 404).

The eight organizational factors describe variables that are typical of the characteristics of effective schools found in the literature: (1) instructionally focused leadership at the school level; (2) district support; (3) emphasis on curriculum and instruction; (4) clear goals and expectations for students; (5) a system for monitoring performance and achievement; (6) ongoing staff development; (7) parental involvement and support; and (8) an orderly and secure climate (Fullan, 1985).

The four process factors that underlie successful improvement processes are: (1) a feel for the improvement process on the part of the leadership; (2) a guiding value system; (3) intense interaction and communication; and (4) collaborative planning and implementation (Fullan, 1985). The process factors drive the interaction and development of the organization variables. The entire change process, Fullan explains, can be conceptualized in terms of three phases through which organizations must pass: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization.

Movement through the phases, or stages, of change "is not a linear process but rather one in which events at one phase can feed back to alter decisions taken at previous stages, which then proceed to work their way through in a continuous interactive way" (Fullan,

1982, p. 40). Fullan discusses the time frame for movement through the phases, cautioning that changes usually take more time than allotted:

> The total time frame from initiation to institutionalization is lengthy; even moderately complex changes take from three to five years. Of course, information can and should be gathered and assessments made throughout the process. The single most important idea . . . is that change is a process, not an event . . . a lesson learned the hard way by those who put all their energies into developing an innovation or passing a piece of legislation without thinking through what would have to happen beyond that point. (Fullan, 1982, p. 41)

Change agents or facilitators must possess three types of knowledge and skills: technical expertise related to the substantive content area, interpersonal skills, and conceptual and technical skills pertaining to planning and implementing change (Fullan, 1982).

Fullan offers guidelines for implementation of schoolwide change based on his model and analysis of the change literature: (1) develop a plan; (2) invest in local facilitators; (3) allocate resources (money and time); (4) determine the scope of the project; (5) concentrate on developing the principal's leadership role; (6) focus on instruction and the link to organizational conditions; (7) stress ongoing staff development and assistance; (8) ensure information gathering and use; (9) plan for continuation and spread; and (10) review the organization's capacity for future change (Fullan, 1985).

Managing change is a difficult and complex process, Fullan cautions. He identifies five basic dilemmas or problems: (1) change

versus changing; (2) common versus unique aspects; (3) plan-making; (4) where and how big to start; and (5) the key problem of the selection and training of managers (Fullan, 1986). To effectively manage change, facilitators must apply what they have learned about the process of change from their experiences. But they must also observe, listen, and sense the needs of the particular situations in which they are involved. So, although they must plan, they must also continuously analyze the situations in which they are involved, assess the effectiveness of their efforts, and modify or redirect their efforts, as needed:

> Managing change requires great sophistication in contending with the dilemmas, paradoxes, contingencies, unexpected events, and the multiplicity of factors operating in the organization and its environment. . . . It is important to retain a measure of humility in recognizing that change (or stability for that matter) in social systems will never be all that manageable" (Fullan, 1986, pp. 84, 85).

CHANGE RESEARCH

Studies of Change

One of the best known and most frequently cited studies in the change literature is the Rand Change Agent Study. The Rand Corporation conducted a two-phase study of federally funded educational programs from 1973 through 1977. The national study focused on four programs that were designed to introduce and spread innovative practices. It was conducted in eighteen states and examined 293 different projects. The results of the study were published in eight

volumes under the title <u>Federal Programs Supporting Educational</u> <u>Change</u> (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978).

The Rand study findings suggest that implementation of adopted innovations is neither automatic, nor assured. The strategies used to implement innovations were found to greatly influence the effectiveness of projects in the study. They could "spell the difference between success or failure, almost independently of the type of innovation or educational method involved; moreover, they could determine whether teachers would assimilate and continue using project methods or allow them to fall into disuse" (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978, p.26). Six implementation strategies found to be ineffective and some of the reasons cited for their ineffectiveness are discussed below.

1. Outside Consultants--effective implementation requires adaptation to the users, most outside consultants had neither the time nor the necessary information to tailor their advice to their clients.

2. Packaged Management Approaches--these were found to be too inflexible to permit the local adaptation necessary for effective implementation; additionally, they decreased staff's sense of ownership of the project.

3. One-Shot, Preimplementation Training--training that treated issues before they became problems was not meaningful to project staff; further, the training and assistance needs of

teachers change over time as they implement, these needs can not be predicted.

4. Pay for Training--extrinsic rewards for teachers such as pay for training did not gain their commitment.

5. Formal Evaluation--formal evaluation activities failed to provide formative data, since they rarely assessed process issues (adequacy of training, communication between staff, etc.); they also did not provide timely and appropriate data that would help project participants to modify and refine project activities.

6. Comprehensive Projects--comprehensive projects often failed because they attempted too much too soon (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978).

Effective implementation efforts promoted mutual adaptation. Mutual adaptation is "the process by which the project is adapted to the reality of its institutional setting, and teachers and school officials adapt their practices in response to the project" (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978, p. 28). The Rand study found that: "mutual adaptation was the only process leading to teacher change; in other words, teachers changed as they (and only as they) worked to modify the project's design to suit their particular school or classroom" (p. 17). Following is a summary of seven elements of a successful mutual adaptation strategy which were found to have positive effects on project outcomes and continuation.

1. Concrete, Teacher-Specific, and Ongoing Training--teachers required "hands-on" training to incorporate project guidelines, which were often very general, into classroom practice.

2. Classroom Assistance from Project or District Staff--the provision of local resource personnel for frequent, short consultation.

3. Observation of the Project in Other Classrooms or Districts--peers were generally the most effective counselors.

4. Regular Project Meetings--regular meetings focusing on problems helped to provide: a forum for feedback necessary to adaptation; an opportunity to share successes, problems, and suggestions; and a vehicle for building staff morale and cohesiveness important to effective implementation. However, without a supportive school climate, project meetings were seldom effective.

5. Teacher Participation in Project Decisions--there was a strong correlation between teacher participation in decisions concerning project operations and modifications and effective implementation, and continuation; participation also helped to promote teacher "ownership," which was especially important in projects requiring a significant time and energy investment by teachers.

6. Local Materials Development--local materials development helped to provide the clarity and commitment necessary for effective implementation and long-term continuation.

7. Principal Participation in Training--the active support of the principal was found to be critically important for project implementation and continuation (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978).

Important conclusions of the Rand study are described in the final volume of the series (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978). These conclusions are summarized below:

1. Federal change agent policies caused adoption, but did not affect implementation of innovations.

2. Educational methods and resources were not significant in determining the fate of adopted innovations.

3. Ambitious projects were often more successful, stimulating teachers' sense of professionalism. Clarity of project goals and precepts was important in all projects, but particulary in projects attempting a broad scope of change. Clarity often had to be achieved, however, in the course of implementation.

4. Locally selected implementation strategies strongly affected the short-term and long-term outcomes of projects. Elements supporting a mutual adaptation strategy were found to affect implementation, improve student performance, promote teacher changes and enhance the continued use of projects.

5. Leadership was a vital factor at both the school and project level: effective implementation required a good project director and a supportive school climate led by an active principal; early

and lasting principal support was critical for project continuation.

6. Aside from the difficulty secondary school projects found in implementing projects and promoting teacher change, no systematic effect of school background characteristics was found. Teacher characteristics, however, were critical: teachers' sense of efficacy had major positive effects on all classroom-level outcomes, teachers' years on the job had a consistent negative relationship to project outcomes, and teachers' verbal abilities were positively associated with improved student performance, but otherwise did not affect project outcomes.

7. A supportive district environment is necessary for an innovation to be effectively implemented and sustained. Therefore, district officials must mobilize a broad-based commitment to the innovation at all levels of the organization, and they must design continuation strategies that provide for the transition of the special project to a standard element of district operations.

The Rand Change Agent study provided many useful insights into managing change within an organization. Many of the findings suggested in the study have been supported in other research.

Clarity is important in successful change efforts, as the Rand study concluded, since mutual adaptation can only occur if teachers know precisely what elements of innovations are essential and how elements can be modified to meet their particular needs. Other

studies have addressed the issue of clarity: "Problems related to clarity have been found in virtually every study of significant change" (Fullan, 1982, p. 57). Fullan points out that unclear and unspecified changes can cause great anxiety and frustration. But he adds that false clarity, when a proposed change has more to it than people realize, is also a serious problem.

Mutual adaptation was suggested in early research studies of change. Miles noted: "The installation of an innovation in a system is not a mechanical process, but a developmental one, in which both the innovation and the accepting system are altered" (Miles, 1964, p. 647). Mutual adaptation requires a user orientation toward planning, focusing on the needs of users as they adapt innovations. This orientation has been suggested by a number of researchers (Havelock, 1973; Loucks and Hall, 1979; et al).

But Bird (1986) cautions that effective mutual adaptation of an innovation is not easily accomplished. After conducting a field study of an innovation, Bird found that "mutual adaptation inevitably implies a reduction in the integrity of the innovation and perhaps in the integrity of the host school as well" (p. 47). He explains that "there is a limit to adaptation beyond which little good, particularly little replicable good, can be expected. What is required is a solution, an organization of the innovation and the school, in which the essential requirements of both are met" (Bird, 1986, p. 47). Bird explains that teachers need support as they are adapting an innovation: "Under conditions common in many schools, it appears, staff

receive so little support for experimentation with their practices that they are likely to adapt, sometimes severely, any innovation suggested to them" (p. 59).

Teacher efficacy, found in the Rand study to affect student learning in innovation projects, has also been studied by a number of researchers. In a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary study, researchers found teachers' sense of efficacy affects student learning, and influences the success of innovation and improvement efforts (Ashton and Webb, 1986). Innovation efforts, then, should take into consideration the potential effects of the innovation on teachers' sense of efficacy.

In 1982 another major study of change was completed (Crandall, 1982). This study of Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvements (DESSI) involved 45 program innovations encompassing 145 schools and/or school districts in ten states. Over 5000 interviews and questionnaires were compiled and a parallel field study was conducted which examined the same sample and issues. Although the findings are described in some detail in 10 volumes, the findings reported by Huberman and Miles (1984) are particularly relevant to this study.

"The merits of the innovation itself, including its potential for solving local problems, are one reason for adoption, but not necessarily the main one" (Huberman and Miles, 1984b, p. 39). Huberman and Miles reported that whereas improvement of classroom instruction was the primary motivation for administrators, for teachers

administrative pressure was the primary motive for change. This was followed by improvement of classroom instruction, novelty value, and social influence (peer pressure).

"Administrative decisiveness bordering on coercion, but intelligently and supportively exercised, may be the surest path to significant school improvement" (Huberman and Miles, 1984b, p. 43). Huberman and Miles reported that the scenario most likely to lead to permanent change could be characterized as supported-enforcement. In this scenario, the principal or other administrator provides a great deal of support to the teachers expected to change, but also continues the pressure for change. "The general picture is one of administrative decisiveness, accompanied by enough assistance to increase user skill, ownership, and stable use in the context of the system" (Huberman and Miles, 1984b, p.45).

"Well executed, high-quality innovations do bring about measurable improvements, but some of them may destabilize the very conditions that have produced the improvements" (Huberman and Miles, 1984b, p. 50). As the researchers found, personnel who were widely perceived as doing a good job with an innovation were often offered career changes based on their perceived accomplishments. Thus, the stable personnel needed for continued success of the project were often not available. "On balance, we might wish for school-improvement programs that could accommodate individuals' needs for capacity development and career advancement without

destabilizing the local gains achieved" (Huberman and Miles, 1984b, p. 52).

The critical role of the principal in school improvement efforts has been stressed by a number of educational researchers. "It is becoming increasingly clear that the actions taken by the building principals to support or inhibit a change effort has direct effect on how teachers feel about and ultimately use a new program" (Loucks and Hall, 1979, p. 19). "When the principal communicates a vision to the school staff and is directly involved in implementation, the probability of effecting school change is greatly increased" (Huling-Austin et al, 1985, pp. 33, 34).

Central office leadership and commitment has also frequently been cited as vital to innovation efforts. "To teachers, principals, and other program-level staff faced with the challenges of making a new program work, the knowledge that district officials are com- mitted to their programs' success, understand their problems, and are willing to help, is a critical motivating factor" (Bass, 1978; p. 201). "Central administrators are often powerful advocates and can sponsor or block adoption of change programs" (Fullan, 1982, p. 45). "Teachers and others know enough now, if they didn't 15 years ago, not to take change seriously unless central administrators demon- strate through actions that they should" (Fullan, 1982, p. 65).

The importance of strong leadership to manage change has repeatedly been stressed in business settings (Peters & Austin, 1985; et al). Rosabeth Moss Kanter explains: "In successful change

efforts there is a continuing series of reinforcing messages from leaders, both explicit and symbolic" (Kanter, 1983, p. 300).

Peter Drucker (1985) discusses the importance of leadership in Innovation and Entrepreneurship. He explains that successful managers in innovative organizations focus their organizations on opportunities to improve the overall effectiveness of the organization: "We need to encourage habits of flexibility, of continuous learning, and of acceptance of change as normal and as opportunity for institutions as well as individuals" (Drucker, 1985, p. 260).

Warren Bennis and Burt Nanus (1985) also examined the role of leaders in innovative efforts. They conducted an in-depth analysis of ninety top leaders, 60 CEOs and 30 outstanding leaders from the public sector. "The study concentrated on leaders directing new trends. There were no "incrementalists.' These were people creating new ideas, new policies, new methodologies. They changed the basic metabolism of their organizations" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 23). Effective leaders created and maintained vision. "The problem with many organizations, especially the ones that are failing, is that they tend to be overmanaged and underled" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 21).

The Phases of Innovation

A number of researchers have identified specific phases, or stages in the change process. Three phases were identified in the Rand Change Agent Study: mobilization, implementation, and insti-

tutionalization (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978). Hall and Hord identified five phases: assessment of present practice, adoption, initiation, implementation, and institutionalization (Hall and Hord, 1986). Levine identified four stages: recognition of need, planning and formulation a solution, initiation and implementation plan, and institutionalization or termination (Levine, 1980). Rosenblum and Louis identified four stages: readiness, initiation, implementation, and continuation (Rosenblum and Louis, 1981). The phases identified by these researchers have striking similarities, as Fullan notes:

> Most researchers now see three broad phases to the change process. Phase I--variously labeled initiation, mobilization, or adoption-consists of the process which leads up to and includes a decision to adopt or proceed with a change. Phase II--implementation or initial use (usually the first two or three years of use) involves the first experiences of attempting to put an idea or program into practice. Phase III--called continuation, incorporation, routinization, or institutionalization-refers to whether the change gets built in as an ongoing part of the system or disappears by way of a decision to discard or through attrition. (Fullan, 1982, p. 39)

The Complexity of Organizational Change

Change is a complex process. And "nothing has been more characteristic of efforts to change schools than oversimple conceptions of the change process" (Sarason, 1982, pp. 11, 12). There appear to be definite phases to the process (Berman and Mclaughlin, 1978; Hall and Hord, 1987; Levine, 1980; Rosenblum and Louis, 1981; et al). And users' perceptions of the change are very important in

the process (Fullan, 1982; Havelock, 1973; Loucks and Hall, 1979; Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971; et al).

Communication is essential for change--communication between change agents and users (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978; Fullan, 1982; Hall and Hord, 1987; Havelock, 1973; Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971) and between users (Bentzen et al, 1974; Berman and McLaughlin, 1978). Leadership is vital in the change process (Bass, 1978; Bennis and Nannus, 1985; Fullan, 1982; Huling-Austin, Stiegelbauer, and Muscella; Kanter, 1983; Peters, 1985; Rosenblum and Louis, 1981; et al). Further, organizations which are more tightly structured and "whole"-oriented respond more easily and successfully to change (Kanter, 1983; Rosenblum and Louis, 1981; Wilson and Corbett, 1983).

Staff participation in implementation planning is also essential for successful change efforts (Bentzen et al., 1974; Berman and McLaughlin, 1978; Fullan, 1982; et al). Ralph Tyler explains that "unless the teachers have participated in identifying the problems or inadequacies of the school and in developing workable and promising solutions, they may not believe that a given problem exists or that a proposed solution will be an improvement over current practices" (Tyler, 1988, p. 16). Kanter also stresses the importance of participation, explaining that "a great deal of innovation seems to demand participation, especially at the action or implementation stage" (Kanter, 1983, p. 243).

Huberman and Miles "found that efforts to develop cooperation, coordination, and conflict resolution across the differing worlds of administrators and users were often critical to successful implementation--and that it was often important to lay off from close supervision, giving dedicated professionals the chance to invent, adapt, and extend" (Huberman and Miles, 1984a, p. 280). But they caution that too much flexibility can lead to lower percentages of use and weaker institutionalization of an innovation.

Sarason was among the first to identify the culture of the school as a critical factor in the change process. "One must make explicit and examine the degree to which one's theory of change takes account of the important social and psychological dimensions that categorize the setting" (Sarason, 1982, p. 34). Building upon Sarason, Corbett, Firestone, and Rossman (1987) conducted a study to investigate the effects of school culture on change efforts.

The design of their study included intensive fieldwork, indepth interviewing, and observations in three high schools with differing demographics, histories, and native populations. The data analysis strategy was designed as a cross-case comparison approach. The researchers found that where proposed changed threatened not only "the way we do things" but "who we are around here," resistance to the change resulted in extreme aversion, and/or partial compliance. When the normative control of the change was not taken into account, the results were less than expected.

Leiberman and Rosenholtz (1987) reported case studies that show "the major barrier to school improvement is the school culture itself, but that the bridge to its improvement and change is that very same culture (p. 94). The culture "has within it the possibilities of becoming a collaborative, humane, problem-solving culture rather than an isolated, defensive one" (p. 95).

Fullan organized the complex factors affecting implementation of innovations in school, identifying critical factors in four broad categories (Fullan, 1982):

1. Characteristics of the Change: need and relevance of the change, clarity complexity, quality, and practicality of the program

2. Characteristics at the School District Level: the history of innovation attempts, the adoption process, central administrative support and involvement, staff development (inservice) and participation, time-line and information systems (evaluation), and board and community characteristics

3. Characteristics at the School Level: the principal, teacher-teacher relations, teacher characteristics and orientations

4. Characteristics External to the Local System: role of government, external assistance

The Rand Change Agent Study also identified clusters of factors crucial to successful implementation. Following is a summary of the clusters, along with supporting findings from other studies:

1. Institutional Motivation--teacher commitment is influenced by at least three factors: (1) the motivation of district managers "The attitudes of district administration about a planned change were a signal to teachers as to how seriously they should take a special project" (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978, p. 72); (2) project planning strategies; and (3) the scope of the proposed change-agent project.

2. Project Implementation Strategies--staff development strategies selected to assist the staff in acquiring the new skills and information necessary for project implementation were most important; strategies that facilitated the development of clarity were critical, since specificity of goals had a major effect on implementation: "The more specific the teachers felt the project goals were, the higher the percentage of goals the project achieved, the greater the student improvement attributed to the project, and the greater the continuation of both project methods and materials" (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978, p. 79).

3. Institutional Leadership--"The Change Agent data show that the more effective the project director (in the view of the teachers), the higher the percentage of project goals achieved, and the greater the student improvement observed as a result of the project" (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978, p. 81).

4. Teacher Characteristics--"The most powerful teacher attribute in the Rand analysis was teacher sense of efficacy. This

teacher characteristic showed a strong, positive relationship
to all of the project outcome measures" (Berman and McLaughlin,
1978, p. 85).

Rosenblum and Louis (1981) suggest that implementation
involves two vectors:

> One vector, which we have called 'facts of educational change,'
> refers to the aspects of the educational system in which the
> change is taking place. The second vector concerns the nature of
> the implementation that is taking place. This vector comprises
> two dimensions of organizational change: the quantity of change
> and the quality of change. (p. 63)

However one chooses to organize or label the factors affecting
implementation, it is clear that the change process is complex.
Multiple factors must be managed in implementation efforts. Change
facilitators must carefully plan for implementation so that these
factors can be managed appropriately.

Researchers suggest different emphases for implementation
plans. With CBAM, change facilitators focus on individuals as pri-
mary units for change. Goodlad argues that the school is the optimal
unit for change (Goodlad, 1975). Rosenblum and Louis found that
strong, centralized district level efforts are critical to educational
change (Rosenblum and Louis, 1981).

Implications of the Change Research

Several educational researchers have analyzed the process of
educational change and the role of government in effective reform

efforts. The Rand Change Agent Study recommended three operational premises for federal reform policy: (1) educational performance could be improved if more attention were paid to all stages of the local change process; (2) educational performance could be improved with adaptive implementation assistance; and (3) educational performance could be improved if the capacity of school districts to manage change were enhanced (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978).

Fullan suggested five broad mutually reinforcing guidelines for government involvement in reform efforts: (1) concentrate on helping to improve the capacity of agencies to implement changes; (2) clearly communicate the policy and spend time interacting with local agencies about the meaning, expectations, and needs in relation to local implementation; (3) ensure that program development and inservice assistance needs are met; (4) government agency leaders should ensure that their own staff, especially those who have the most direct contact with the field, have the opportunity to develop knowledge and competence regarding the policy and program, as well as in how to facilitate implementation; and (5) ensure that explicit implementation plans are developed, since explicit plans are needed to guide the process of bringing about change in practice (Fullan, 1982).

Rosenblum and Louis also examined the role of government in supporting change. They characterize current discussion regarding government/local involvement in reform efforts as a "debate

between proponents of a 'top-down' or a 'bottom-up' approach. One view is that 'bottom-up' or homegrown remedies for educational problems are best. The alternative, 'top-down' view is not, however, without its continued support. Local schools, some argue, do not have the capacity to make major changes without external direction because they behave as partially closed systems" (Rosenblum and Louis, 1981, p. 276).

Griffiths' findings lend support to the top-down view: "Since the tendency of organizations is to maintain a steady state, the major impetus for change comes from outside rather than inside an organization . . . When change in an organization does occur, it will tend to occur from the top down, not from the bottom up" (Griffiths, 1964, pp. 431-435). Huberman and Miles (1984a) have also found the top-down approach to be effective. In discussing the process of change, they refer to the necessity for administrative pressure (top-down) as well as administrative support. "Collegial decision-making appeared at most to heighten initial commitment--though this had the nontrivial consequence of carrying the project through the first serious barriers encountered during program execution" (Huberman and Miles, 1984a, p. 55).

But other researchers disagree: "Top-down planning generally fails even with the best of intentions because it cannot generate the staff commitment necessary to project success and because this planning style does not incorporate the special knowledge and sug-

gestions of the staff who will be responsible for project implementation" (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978, p. 74).

Leiberman and Miller (1986) argue that "mandating new policy from the top without attending to organizing, supporting, and providing teachers and principals with the necessary learnings they need to carry out any school improvement efforts will be ineffective" (p. 100). They suggest there are "tried and true notions" about school improvement that have been enriched and expanded over time:

> Working with people rather than working on people.
> Recognizing the complexity and craft nature of the teacher's work.
> Understanding that there are unique cultural differences in each school and how these affect development efforts.
> Providing time to learn.
> Building collaboration and cooperation, involving the provisions for people to do things together, talking together, sharing concerns.
> Starting where people are, not where you are.
> Making private knowledge public, by being sensitive to the effects of teacher isolation and the power of trial and error.
> Resisting simplistic solutions to complex problems; getting comfortable with reworking issues and finding enhanced understanding and enlightenment.
> Appreciating that there are many variations of development efforts; there is no one best way.
> Using knowledge as a way of helping people grow rather than pointing up their deficits.
> Supporting development efforts by protecting ideas, announcing expectations, making provisions for necessary resources.
> Sharing leadership functions as a team, so that people can provide complementary skills and get experience in role taking.
> Organizing development efforts around a particular focus.
> Understanding that content and process are both essential, that you cannot have one without the other.

Being aware of and sensitive to the differences in the worlds of teachers and other actors within or outside of the school setting. (Leiberman and Miller, 1986, pp. 108, 109)

Rosenblum and Louis recommend a "resources-down, plans-up" relationship, in which local organizations develop implementation plans with resources, guidance, support, and monitoring from government. This approach, they argue, may be the most workable since it combines the features of top-down and bottom-up approaches. It allows for flexibility and control in reform efforts (Rosenblum and Louis, 1981)

The approaches cited above suggest governments play a supportive role in educational reform, providing resources and technical assistance to local organizations during implementation. And they suggest that government should help local organizations to more effectively manage the process of change.

Time is frequently cited as a problem in educational reform efforts:

To develop a workable plan, to provide necessary training for those who will carry it out, and to try the plan and modify it to fit the particular conditions in a given school all require much more time than most reformers realize. It takes six or seven years to get a reform really working as intended. (Tyler, 1988, p. 16)

As Fullan explains: "The decision-makers for educational change have an adoption time perspective, not an implementation one" (Fullan, 1982, p. 68). "Implementation for most changes takes two or three years; only then can we consider that the change has

really had a chance to become implemented" (p. 40). "In any case, the total time frame from initiation to institutionalization is lengthy; even moderately complex changes take from three to five years" (p. 41).

Selection of a Framework for This Study

The most comprehensive models described in the change literature are CBAM and Fullan's model. Further, current research supports the assumptions behind both of these models. CBAM emphasizes managing change by attending to the needs of individuals in the change process, Fullan's model emphasizes managing change from an organizational perspective. All of the school districts in the state have been expected to respond very quickly to the Illinois reform mandates. Because of the pressure of accountability with the publication of the state assessment results, school districts have had to mobilize their organizations to develop plans and implement them in a relatively short period of time. Since Fullan's model emphasizes an organizational perspective, it was selected for this analysis of the early stages of the Illinois reform effort.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The pressure for school reform in Illinois had its origin in the forces which produced the report, A Nation At Risk. Within months of the release of this report, the Illinois Legislature formed a joint legislative committee, the Illinois Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education, to address educational reform in Illinois. The Commission report and recommendations were released in January, 1985. By June 1985, the report had become law (Public Act 84-126) "with few substantive changes in the bill from the beginning of the legislative process" [A. L. Berman, State Senator, chair of Senate Education Committee; personal interview; July 7, 1988].

While Public Act 84-126 is comprehensive, with companion bills expanding a number of aspects of school reform, this act most directly addresses classroom instruction. Specifically, the language of the bill mandates:

Sec. 2-3.63 Student learning objectives. The State Board of Education shall require each school district to set student learning objectives which meet or exceed goals established by the State and to also establish local goals for excellence in education. Such objectives and goals shall be disseminated to

the public along with information on the degree to which they are being achieved, and if not, what appropriate actions are being taken. The State Board of Education shall establish a process for approving local objectives mentioned in this section; for approving local plans for improvement; for approving public reporting procedures and for recognition and commendation of top-achieving districts.

Sec. 2-3.64 Student Assessment. The State Board of Education shall require that school districts assess the proficiency of all pupils enrolled in 3rd, 6th, 8th, and 10th grades (later amended to 11th grade), other than pupils receiving special educational services under Article 14 of this Code in meeting the objectives specified in Section 2-3.63. Pupils enrolled in the 3rd, 6th, and 8th grades must be assessed in at least the following subjects by the date specified and thereafter as follows: reading by the end of the 1987-88 academic year, reading and mathematics by the end of the 1988-89 academic year, and reading, mathematics and language arts by the end of the 1989-90 academic year. All pupils enrolled in the 10th grade shall take student assessment tests in the following subjects matter areas: (a) reading beginning during the 1989-90 school year; (b) reading and mathematics beginning during the 1990-91 school year; and (c) reading, mathematics and language arts beginning during the 1991-92 school year. The State Board of Education shall prescribe the assessment procedures to be used; shall insure that test items necessary for State reporting are included; and shall provide model assessment procedures from which school districts may select. The State Board of Education shall establish a common month in each school year for which testing shall occur to meet the objectives of this Section. (Public Act 84-126, State of Illinois)

The State Goals and Sample Learning Objectives were developed over a period of two years (1984-1985) by a committee chaired by Dr. John Corbally. To implement Public Act 84-126 the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) developed an action plan and timetable. Language arts was the first curricular area to be affected by

the mandated Learner Assessment Plan (LAP). The timetable is outlined below.

1. School districts received notification that learning objectives for language arts were to be developed by each district and forwarded to ISBE by August 30, 1987. In addition, districts were required to submit a plan for assessment of these objectives utilizing assessment instruments with an established reliability and validity.

2. The ISBE developed and circulated booklets to each district describing the State Goals for Learning and Sample Learning Objectives.

3. Districts developed Learner Assessment Plans in the area of language arts and submitted them to ISBE for approval. The plan included the district learning objectives and instruments for assessment.

4. Plans were reviewed by ISBE, and were either approved or returned to the district for revision. ISBE personnel indicated that plans were rejected if: further information was needed, assessment procedures were not validated, the plan had major inconsistencies, or the plan contained too many objectives [Dr. R. Sampson, Department of Curriculum Improvement, Illinois State Board of Education; personal interview; November, 1987]

5. The state developed a set of sample test items for all grade levels being assessed and circulated these items in the form of

practice tests approximately 45 days prior to the state assessment.

6. During April, 1988, all public school students at grades 3, 6, and 8 were tested.

7. During the fall of 1988, the individual school districts are scheduled to receive the test results. This data will be reported in standard scores and percentiles with comparisons between schools within each district and between districts.

8. In October of 1988, the assessment data must be released to the public via the School Report Card and the news media.

9. Reading will be assessed annually. In addition, new subject areas will be phased in each year until all are included by 1993.

As indicated in Chapter I, the legislatative mandates were designed to produce change in a top-down fashion. Since, as indicated in Chapter II, some researchers of change feel that the top-down model has many barriers to its success, this study was designed to determine what changes have occurred in response to the state mandates. It is part of a larger research project to examine the changes over a three to five year period. This study investigates the first phases of the change process, as described in the Fullan model: the Initiation Phase and the early stages of the Implementation Phase.

In focusing this study, the decision was made to concentrate on the area of reading in elementary schools for the following

reasons. First, reading is generally acknowledged to be the most important skill learned in elementary school. Second, the State of Illinois adopted a philosophy of reading emphasizing a whole language/process approach. Acceptance of this philosophy by classroom teachers should lead to major changes in goals, objectives, and instructional techniques in reading. Third, since reading is the first curriculum area to be assessed, any changes in reading instruction are less likely to be the consequence of compounding factors. The response to LAPs in the future, (e.g., mathematics in 1989) may be influenced by prior experience.

The decision was made to concentrate on grades 3 and 6 in this research since reading is taught as a separate subject at these grade levels. Although grade 8 is included in the first phase of the state plan, reading, at this level, may or may not be taught as a separate subject. In addition, the Durkin study (1978), which served as a reference point for this study, was conducted at grades 3 and 6.

In summary, this study seeks to determine what changes have occurred during the initation phase and the early implementation phase of a state mandated change in reading. These mandates are expected to influence the teaching of reading in the classroom and are enforced through a process requiring the establishment of local goals and objectives, the administration of state and local assessment, and the dissemination of results to the public.

Following are the research questions which have been generated by a comparison of the State of Illinois change process with the Fullan (1982) model of change:

1. How do the Learner Assessment Plans (LAP's) submitted by the individual districts compare to the Sample Learning Objectives of the State?

2. What process was used in developing these district plans submitted to the state and who was involved in preparing them?

3. How do administrators view these state mandates and what steps are they taking to implement the changes?

4. How do teachers view these state mandates? What do they know about the LAP process and the expectations of the state and district?

5. How have teachers responded to the change?

6. How does the state's plan for improvement of instruction, as it has been implemented, relate to the Fullan model and other thoeries of change?

RESEARCH DESIGN

When selecting a methodology which would produce answers to the questions posited, it became evident that no single data source would yield sufficient evidence to answer all of the questions. A qualitative method, while producing in-depth data, would create risks associated with a small sample size. The decision was made

to collect data from multiple sources and in different ways to afford a broader perspective of the response to the first year of the Implementation Phase of the school reform (Public Act 84-126). No question is answered by a single set of data. Contradictions are examined and reconciled.

The choice of a multiple methodology is consistent with the approach used by Huberman and Miles (1984a) in the Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement (DESSI) study:

> Surveys are inappropriate vehicles for picking up on subterranean career agendas or internecine rivalries or people's incoherent behaviors, and when they do get such data, the statistical analyses often yield interpretations that border on the surreal. Field studies, on the other hand, can handle only a few settings, and can get so mired in local-setting variables that they lose the programmatic thrust of the study initially undertaken. Surveys and field studies combined not only extend and deepen the data set; they also keep one another analytically honest and on target. . . . One of its [the field study's] purposes was to compensate for a survey's typical weaknesses (predesigned instrumentation, one "snapshot" pass at a site, difficulties in unraveling over-time processes, clumsiness in the face of unanticipated or unequivocal findings). Another objective was historical and descriptive: that of "telling the story," and identifying and documenting typical patterns and local determinants. There was the additional hope of validating, or at least of lending more plausibility to survey-analytical findings. (Huberman and Miles, 1984a, pp. 36, 37)

In this study of legislated reform in Illinois, the quantitative data obtained from teacher and adminstrator surveys was supplemented with qualitative data describing implementation of the change. Data was collected from five sources: personal interviews, examination of school districts' Learner Assessment Plans, teacher

surveys, administrator interviews, and classroom observations. Following is a description of each of the data sources.

Personal Interviews

A number of individuals who were involved in various phases of the development of Public Act 84-126 were interviewed. The data from these interviews helped to provide historical background, a framework from which to analyze other data, and insights into the motives of the key legislative figures as well as the State Board of Education personnel. A list of the persons interviewed provides an indication of the different perspectives:

1. Mary Barber (Assistant to the Governor for Education)
2. Arthur L. Berman (State Senator, Chair of Senate Education Committee)
3. Dr. Tom Kerins (Department of Program Evaluation, Illinois State Board of Education)--Dr. Kerins has responsibility for the student assessment portion of the law.
4. Gail Lieberman (Assistant to the Governor for Education)-- Ms. Lieberman was on the staff of the Illinois State Board of Educaton in 1985.
5. Ruby Payne, Educational Service Center, Lake County, Illinois
6. Dr. Robert Sampson (Department of Curriculum Improvement, Illinois State Board of Education)--Dr. Sampson has primary responsibility for the implementation of the Learner Assessment Plans.

In addition to the personal interviews, other ISBE employees and legislative personnel were contacted by phone for background information and answers to specific questions.

Document Examination

In August, 1987 all school districts in Illinois were required to submit a Learning Assessment Plan for the area of reading at grades 3, 6, and 8. In this plan the district listed the reading objectives for grades 3, 6, and 8 as well as the method of assessing student progress (utilizing assessment instruments with an established reliability and validity).

During the spring of 1987, ISBE prepared and distributed a set of sample learning objectives to each district with instructions for completing the Learner Assessment Plan. The directions stated: "School districts have the option to adopt or adapt these objectives for local use or to develop a completely different set which is consistent with State Goals and is based on their view of local needs and conditions" (Illinois State Board of Education, 1986). District plans were reviewed by the ISBE staff. Most were accepted, but some were returned for more information or revision. By November, 1987 over 95% of the approximately 1000 school districts in Illinois had submitted an acceptable plan.

At this time the researcher visited the ISBE office in Springfield, Illinois. A random sample of 14 districts in Suburban Cook County and 6 districts in Lake County was generated. The Learner Assessment Plans (LAPs) submitted by these districts were anal-

yzed by the researcher, utilizing a protocol sheet (see Appendix B) as follows:

1. The district personnel responsible for the LAP.
2. The nature of district objectives, as well as their relationship to the state sample learning objectives.
3. The district plan for the assessment of objectives.

The information obtained from the LAPs was later compared with the results of the administrator interviews.

Teacher Survey

A survey containing twenty-two multiple choice questions was developed to determine:

1. What teachers knew about the state LAP process.
2. What teachers planned to do in response to the district objectives.
3. What input teachers had in the development of the LAP.
4. What teachers knew about their district LAP's.
5. What changes teachers anticipated in reading instruction as a result of the LAP's.
6. What curriculum changes teachers regularly experienced.

The survey was validated through an examination of content by a committee of six experts (Tyler, Berlin, Cienkus, Schiller, Robert, Montgomery). After agreement on the content and wording of each item, the questionnaire was administered to a sample of teachers in two districts. The teachers were asked to complete the survey on two consecutive days to establish test-retest reliability. On the

twenty-two items, the percentage of agreement varied from a low of 44% to a high of 100% (seventeen teachers completed the survey on both days). The mean percent of agreement was 78.6%. After rewriting the questions with low agreement, a new sample of eleven teachers also completed the survey instrument. In this revised version the percent of agreement rose to 85.3%, while no item elicited less than 66.1%. The instrument was then ready to be administered with an answer sheet which could be electronically scored. After the first data was collected in November, it was determined that for clarity question 19 should be rewritten into two questions. The teacher data from February and June reflect this change. Appendix C contains the items used in the teacher survey.

No attempt was made to collect teacher data from the same districts as the administator interviews. That decision was made to minimize potential concerns of both groups: administrators might have felt threatened by the responses of their teachers, and teachers might have felt pressured to respond in a manner that would reflect positively upon the district.

A sample of north and northwest suburban teachers enrolled in graduate education courses through the Chicago Consortium of Colleges and Universities was used for the study. The graduate classes were chosen to avoid a large concentration of teachers from any single school or district. One group (n=146) was surveyed in November, a second group in February (n=87). In June the instrument was administered once more (n=107). About 50% of the June respon-

dents had completed either the November or the February survey. It was felt that sufficient time had elapsed that respondents were unlikely to remember previous answers. The results were analyzed both in terms of the data from each administration of the survey as well as the combined data., Responses are reported in percentages.

Administrator Interviews

When gathering the data from the ISBE in Springfield, the names of the person(s) preparing the district LAP were also record-ed. Between January and August 1988, all twenty districts were contacted and the people responsible for preparing the LAPs were interviewed. The teacher survey instrument was utilized with minor modifications to compensate for differences in position among those interviewed. In addition to the items on the teacher survey, com-ments were recorded on their responses to three additional ques-tions (see Appendix D for the instrument used in the administrator interviews). The additional questions asked were:

1. What reading text are you presently using?
2. How did the district utilize the money allocated by the state for reading improvement?
3. When the state reading assessment was administered in April, 1988, how were your teachers informed and involved?

Classroom Observations

Because the focus of this study is change, Dr. Ralph Tyler suggested that data on how reading is currently being taught would

provide evidence on the extent to which the state philosphy and goals for reading are, indeed, a change from current practice.

The Durkin study (Durkin, 1978) is widely viewed as a definitive study of reading instruction in the classroom. Durkin observed classrooms in grades 3 through 6 to determine the amount of time spent on comprehension instruction. The major findings of the study include the fact that almost no comprehension instruction was found (less than 1% of the total instructional time), and at no time was study skills instruction observed. A large part of the instruction time was spent on giving, completing, and checking assignments. In addition, a "sizable" amount of time was spent on non-instructional tasks (Durkin, 1978).

The researcher set out to determine if the findings in this study are still representative of classroom practice. Principals were asked to identify their best teachers of reading at the third and sixth grade levels. These grade levels were selected because Durkin used them and also because the statewide LAP plan was implemented at these levels. An instrument was developed based on the state learning objectives. The researcher visited classrooms, (20 reading lessons), recording all teacher directed activities and the amount of time spent on each. The teacher was asked to define the beginning and the ending points of the lesson to ensure that a complete lesson was observed.

This data was reviewed to determine which of the activities addressed the state learning objectives. No attempt was made to

assess the quality of the activities. The amount of time spent on each objective was recorded. The data was analyzed to determine the extent to which the change in reading instruction is being implemented in the classroom.

In summary, a multiple-methodological approach is utilized in this study. Data from five separate sources is consolidated to address the research questions. The results are reported in Chapter IV by data source and discussed in Chapter V by research question.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter describes the findings collected from the data sources utilized in this study: personal interviews, examination of districts' Learner Assessment Plans, teacher/administrator surveys, and classroom observations. The data from each source are reported separately in the sections which follow.

PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

As indicated in Chapter III, a number of personal interviews were conducted with individuals who were involved in various phases of the development and implementation of Public Act 84-126. The interviews ranged from brief telephone conversations to six in-depth discussions extending for many hours over a period of days or weeks. For the most part, data collected from interviews was not the sole source of information utilized. Instead, interview data served to confirm information obtained from other sources or to identify other questions, which were then researched through written sources. The interview data is summarized below in four categories: Historical Background, Role of the Illinois State Board

63

of Education, Implementation of Public Act 84-126, and Model of Change.

Historical Background

As the history of Public Act 84-126 was discussed, it became clear that a number of factors influenced the nature of the reform:

1. The report of the Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education, a bipartisan commission composed of legislators and lay people, was highly influential in shaping the legislation. The co-chairs of the commission were the legislators whose committees would consider any bills, Senator Arthur Berman and Representative Richard Mulcahy. Thus, when the legislature considered school reform, key support was already in place.

2. Governor Thompson (Republican) and Senator Berman (Democrat) had a great personal interest in education. Governor Thompson had a daughter entering school, while Senator Berman's children were just completing their Chicago Public School education. Both men were concerned about the quality of the schools.

3. Illinois was very concerned about business climate. Since business leaders are more readily attracted to a state whose schools are perceived to be "good," the various economic development agencies, the newspapers, and the Governor agreed that statewide school reform was an important factor in holding businesses and attracting new industry to Illinois.

Role of the Illinois State Board of Education

The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) was involved from the beginning in the school reform effort. It was responsible for collecting and analyzing data related to the legislation, and ISBE staff helped legislative staff develop the drafts of the Commission report as well as Public Act 84-126. ISBE personnel provided background information for legislators and helped relate the Illinois movement to the events in other states as well as events at the national level. Since ISBE is generally non-political, staff summaries are usually accepted at face value by both Democratic and Republican legislators.

Implementation of Public Act 84-126

With Public Act 84-126, the legislators were attempting to improve the quality of schooling throughout the state. As legislators, they faced the question of how to ensure that proposed reforms actually took place. The mechanism they selected (with enthusiastic endorsement of Governor Thompson and the ISBE) was to attempt to mobilize public opinion on the district level to keep the pressure on for reform/improvement.

The School Report Card was created to report on student scores on a school by school basis within each district. The school report card is sent to each home and to the local media, in the belief that good practices which result in high scores will be encouraged, while low scores will lead to a public outcry for reform/improvement.

One component of the Learning Assessment Plans, which are the subject of this research study, is a complex assessment and reporting structure. Each district is expected to develop its own objectives in every subject, along with assessment plans for these objectives, based on validated instruments. These data are to be reported to the public. In addition, statewide tests have been (or are being) developed. The results of these tests are also to be reported to the public, in a format which will enable the public to compare different districts to one another as well as schools within districts. The belief is inherent that poor results will generate pressure for change within school districts (or schools).

Additionally, the statewide tests have generated a pressure for conformity with ISBE philosophy. For example, the reading test administered during April, 1988 was developed to reflect a philoophy of reading instruction that emphasizes comprehension and strategic approaches to interpreting reading materials. Schools emphasizing a phonetic, literal comprehension approach might be expected to do poorly on the state assessment, leading to changes in classroom instruction. There will be similar pressures in other areas of instruction, as the assessment instruments are phased in over the next few years.

Model of Change

The Fullan model of change provides the theoretical basis for the analyses in this study. In an attempt to determine the theoretical basis for the state plan, the researcher asked in all six inter-

views and a number of phone conversations: "What change model influenced the state plan?" The unanimous response was that there was no plan for change which guided the ISBE and the legislature. The basic idea was to generate pressure on "unsuccessful" school districts, who would then develop their own plan for change. The only changes required by the state were to file plans with the ISBE and to report test results to the public.

The ISBE has been careful to label its objectives as model learning outcomes, and to indicate that each district should develop its own set. ISBE personnel are very sensitive to the charge that they are imposing a state curriculum, and they have taken steps to reassure districts that a state-wide curriculum is not part of the overall plan for change.

DOCUMENT EXAMINATION

As part of the state mandates, all school districts in Illinois were required to submit a Learning Assessment Plan in the area of reading at grades 3, 6, and 8. In the plan districts were required to list the reading objectives for these grade levels as well as the methods for assessing student progress. School districts had the option to adopt or adapt the state's sample learning objectives or to develop a completely different set which was consistent with the state goals for reading. These district plans were submitted to and approved by the Illinois State Board of Education.

In November of 1987 the researcher visited the ISBE Office in Springfield and reviewed a random sample of Learner Assessment Plans from 20 districts, 14 districts from suburban Cook County and 6 districts from Lake County, utilizing a Content Analysis Instrument for the Learner Assessment Plan submitted to the ISBE (see Appendix B). This information included the nature of the goals and objectives, relationship of objectives to the state learning objectives, and the evaluation instruments used to assess objectives.

An analysis of the objectives indicated that in ten of the twenty district plans examined, all 14 of the state's objectives were adopted with no changes. In total, sixteen of the districts (80%) did not develop objectives of their own but adopted all or part of the state's objectives. Only two district plans included a majority of locally developed objectives. Table 1 summarizes the sources of the districts' objectives in the random sample. The objectives in Table 1 were reported for grade three. With few exceptions, each district repeated the same objectives for grades 6 and 8.

Districts were required to provide data on the assessment instruments using codes developed by the state (see Appendix E). The codes specified the type of test (e.g., publisher's standardized shelf test, publisher's customized test, district's locally developed test); the validity and reliability of the test (e.g., publisher's assurance, assurance of district personnel who have matched the assessment approach with the district's curriculum, emperical data and results); and any commercially developed tests utilized (stan-

Table 1

Source of Objectives

Number of districts	Number of state objectives	Number of dist.-devel. objectives	Total number of objectives
10	14	0	14
1	13	0	13
1	12	0	12
1	11	0	11
1	9	0	9
1	6	0	6
1	5	0	5
1	7	1	8
1	5	2	7
1	4	23	27
1	0	2	2

Total 20

dardized batteries and standardized reading tests). Table 2 shows the commercially developed tests specified in the LAPs of the districts in the random sample.

Table 2

Types of Tests Used to Assess Objectives

No. of Districts	Code	Test
6	017	Stanford Achievement
6	008	Iowa Test of Basic Skills
3	002	California Achievement Tests
2	004	Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills
2	016	SRA Achievement Series
1	- - -	No commercially developed test

Tot. 20

All but one of the twenty districts reported using a standard-ized achievement test to assess the majority of their objectives. Twelve of the nineteen listed one or two objectives which would be assessed by a locally developed test.

Finally, for each objective, districts were required to indicate on their LAPs the percentage of students expected to achieve the objective by the end of the specified grade level. These percentages ranged from 45% to 95%, with a mean percentage score of 70%.

TEACHER SURVEYS/ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEWS

A twenty-two item survey was administered to teachers at three different times during the school year (total n=340) in an attempt to determine teacher response to the Learner Assessment Plan for reading. This same survey was also used in interviews with administrators who prepared the district Learner Assessment Plans to elicit their opinions of the state Learner Assessment Plan and their interpretations of the responses of the teachers in their districts. The wording was slightly modified to reflect the administrators' perspectives. It is important to note that the administrators were not in the same districts as the teachers surveyed. This decision was made to minimize defensive responses from administrators who might fear that the views of the teachers would contradict their own and reflect poorly on the district.

The following pages describe the results of the survey. They are reported by category, not in the numerical order used in the survey. For each category, there is a table summarizing the data from the survey items addressing the category and a discussion of the results. The wording of the choices for some items has been abbreviated. The seven categories discussed are: (1) the differences between state and local learner outcomes; (2) teacher involvement in the development of local learner outcomes; (3) teachers' knowledge/opinions of the state's learner outcomes; (4) teachers'

Table 3

The Differences Between State and Local Learner Outcomes

7. The source of the district's learner outcomes for the plan was:

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. Text book series	6.8%	9.2%	3.7%	6.5%	5%
b. State's, basically unchanged	2.7%	5.7%	6.5%	4.7%	20%
c. State's, tailored to dist. needs	26.0%	35.6%	27.1%	28.8%	55%
d. District developed outcomes	22.7%	20.7%	15.0%	19.7%	20%
e. Not sure	37.7%	25.3%	44.9%	36.8%	0%
No Answer	4.1%	3.5%	2.8%	3.5%	0%

8. As a result of the state learner plan for reading submitted by my district, the reading curriculum:

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. Is unchanged from last year	17.8%	24.1%	22.4%	20.9%	40%
b. Was discussed at great length, but remains the same	21.2%	27.6%	17.8%	21.8%	10%
c. Modified to meet new dist.obj.	22.7%	18.4%	21.5%	21.2%	35%
d. Modified to approximate the the state learner outcomes	8.9%	6.9%	7.5%	7.9%	15%
e. Not sure	24.0%	19.5%	27.1%	23.8%	0%
No Answer	5.4%	3.5%	3.7%	4.4%	0%

Table 3 (cont'd)

9. How closely do the state learner outcomes compare to your 1986-1987 (last year's) reading outcomes?

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. Very similar	27.4%	31.1%	18.7%	25.6%	50%
b. Somewhat different	24.7%	26.4%	22.4%	24.4%	30%
c. Very different	6.2%	8.0%	12.1%	8.5%	20%
d. Not sure	21.2%	27.6%	33.6%	26.8%	0%
e.	18.5%	2.3%	8.4%	11.2%	0%
No Answer	2.0%	4.6%	4.7%	3.5%	0.0%

15. What tests will be used in your district to measure student performance on the district reading objectives?

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. Standardized achievement tests	47.3%	49.5%	43.0%	46.5%	85%
b. Standardized reading tests	8.2%	10.3%	14.0%	10.6%	5%
c. Reading series' publisher tests	17.1%	13.8%	12.2%	14.7%	0%
d. District created tests	10.3%	18.4%	25.2%	17.1%	10%
e.	0.7%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%	0%
No Answer	16.4%	6.9%	4.7%	10.3%	0%

and principals' responses to the LAP process; (5) the results of the state mandates in reading; (6) the sources of district curricula; and (7) changes to district curricula. A summary of other information obtained from the administrator interviews follows the survey data.

Four survey items addressed the differences between state and local learner outcomes: items 7, 8, 9, and 15. On item seven (see Table 3) almost 40% of the combined teacher sample did not know the source of their districts' objectives. And in the June sample, 45% of the respondents were not sure of their districts' learner outcome plans. Approximately one third of the teachers indicated that their district plan was a slight modification of the state outcomes. 75% of the administrators reported that their district learner outcomes were essentially the same as the state's.

Item eight was included to determine how the district curriculum had changed as a result of the state learner outcome plan. On the teacher sample, 42% indicated there was no change in curriculum, 8% felt the curriculum was modified to approximate the state learning objectives, and 24% were not sure. Of the administrators surveyed, 40% felt the curriculum was unchanged and 15% felt it was modified to approximate the state learning objectives.

Item nine was included to determine the degree to which the district learning objectives prior to the state plan matched the sample learning objectives recommended by the state, or in other words, how different the state learning objectives were from dis-

trict ones used prior to the plan. Of the teachers surveyed, 27% were not sure, 24% felt they were somewhat different, and 26% felt they were very similar in approach. Less than 10% of the teachers indicated that the state learning objectives were significantly different. Of the administrators surveyed, 50% indicated that the state objectives were very similar to their own and 20% felt they were very different in approach.

Item fifteen related to the tests used to measure district learning objectives. Approximately 57% of the teachers responded that standardized tests were utilized, 17% responded that locally constructed tests were utilized. In the administrator survey, 90% of the respondents revealed that standardized tests were utilized.

Two survey items addressed the extent of teacher involvement in the development of district learner outcomes: items 5 and 6 (see Table 4). When asked who developed the district learner outcome plan, 34% of the teachers were not sure and 41% indicated that it was developed by a committee made up of a majority of teachers. Of the administrators surveyed, 70% responded that the district plan was developed by a committee with a majority of teachers.

With regard to total staff input, one third of the respondents on the teacher survey felt that only the teachers on the committee had input and almost 40% were not sure. Half of the administrators surveyed indicated that only the teachers on the committee had input while 45% felt that at least a majority of the teachers had input.

Table 4

Teacher Involvement in the Development of Local Learner Outcomes

5. Who developed your district learner outcome plan?

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. Central office personnel	11.6%	16.1%	15.9%	14.1%	5%
b. Building administrators	2.0%	3.5%	2.8%	2.6%	0%
c. Committee, majority of tchrs.	42.5%	49.4%	32.7%	41.2%	70%
d. Others	4.1%	5.7%	2.8%	4.1%	25%
e. Not sure	37.7%	21.8%	39.3%	34.1%	0%
No Answer	2.0%	3.5%	6.5%	3.8%	0%

6. What was the extent of teacher involvement in the process?

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. All teachers in the district	7.5%	16.1%	4.7%	8.8%	20%
b. Majority of teachers	15.1%	16.1%	11.2%	14.1%	25%
c. Only tchrs. on the committee	30.2%	36.8%	33.7%	32.9%	50%
d. No teachers had input	2.7%	3.5%	3.7%	3.2%	5%
e. Not sure	42.5%	24.0%	43.0%	37.9%	0%
No Answer	2.0%	3.5%	3.7%	2.9%	0%

Table 5

Teachers' Knowledge/Opinions of the State's Learner Outcomes

1. Indicate the level of your knowledge of the state learner outcomes in the area of reading.

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. Have not read them	37.0%	21.8%	37.4%	33.2%	100%
b. Generally aware of the content	38.4%	42.6%	34.6%	38.2%	0%
c. Examined them in some detail	9.6%	17.2%	13.1%	12.6%	0%
d. Compared them to district obj.	13.0%	14.9%	12.1%	13.2%	100%
e.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0%
No Answer	2.0%	3.5%	2.8%	2.6%	0%

3. Do you think the state's model learner outcomes in reading are appropriate?

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. Yes	24.7%	23.0%	19.6%	22.6%	55%
b. No	7.5%	12.6%	15.9%	11.5%	45%
c. Not sure	33.6%	39.1%	31.8%	34.4%	0%
d. Haven't read them	30.1%	20.7%	22.4%	25.3%	0%
e.	0.7%	0.0%	3.7%	1.5%	0%
No Answer	3.4%	4.6%	6.6%	4.7%	0%

Survey items 1 and 3 (see Table 5) were designed to assess what the respondents knew about the state's learner outcomes and how they felt about them. Item one revealed that almost 70% of the teachers knew little or nothing about the state learner outcomes in reading. Only 25% felt they had substantial knowledge of the learner outcomes. As would be expected, the administrators who had responsibility for preparing the plan all responded that they were not only familiar with the state learner outcomes, but had analyzed them in terms of the district objectives.

When asked if the state's learner outcomes were appropriate, almost 60% of the teachers indicated that they did not know much about it. Of the 34% who did know, one out of three felt they were not appropriate. Among the administrators surveyed, 45% felt that the state learner outcomes were not appropriate.

Four survey items assessed teachers' and principals' responses to the LAP process: items 11, 12, 13, and 14 (see Table 6). In item eleven, 18% of the teachers surveyed indicated that in response to the state learner outcomes in reading, they would not change instruction although 40% revealed a knowledge of the new emphasis of the reading process. Administrators responded that 35% of the teachers would not change instruction, but like the teachers, felt that 40% would place more emphasis on the reading process.

On item thirteen the percentage of teachers who felt they would ignore the state learner outcomes dropped from 25% in

Table 6

Teachers' and Principals' Responses to the LAP Process

11. In response to the state learner outcomes in reading, our teachers will probably:

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. Make no changes in instruction	15.8%	23.0%	17.8%	18.2%	35%
b. Emphasize phonic skills	2.7%	3.5%	1.9%	2.6%	0%
c. Emphasize comprehen. skills	34.9%	25.2%	28.9%	30.6%	25%
d. Emphasize the reading process	35.6%	43.7%	42.0%	39.7%	40%
e.	2.7%	0.0%	1.9%	1.8%	0%
No Answer	8.3%	4.6%	7.5%	7.1%	0%

12. The response of my principal(s) to the state learner outcomes in reading has been to:

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. Ignore them	12.3%	9.2%	5.6%	9.4%	5%
b. Expect teachers to meet them	21.9%	28.7%	37.4%	28.5%	55%
c. Encourage and support work toward them	29.5%	31.1%	36.4%	32.1%	35%
d. Make implementation of them an important building goal	22.6%	25.3%	15.0%	20.9%	5%
e.	2.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.2%	0%
No Answer	11.6%	4.6%	5.6%	7.9%	0%

Table 6 (cont'd)

13. The response of the teachers in my district to the state learner outcomes in reading has been to:

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. Ignore them	25.3%	19.5%	15.0%	20.6%	20%
b. Individually implement the district plan	20.4%	30.0%	30.8%	26.2%	35%
c. Work together	35.5%	44.8%	43.0%	39.4%	45%
d.	5.4%	0.0%	3.7%	3.5%	0%
e.	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0%
No Answer	14.0%	5.7%	7.5%	9.7%	0%

14. Because of the state-mandated learner outcomes, the teaching of reading in my district will:

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. Not change	17.8%	12.6%	18.7%	16.8%	25%
b. Change somewhat	39.8%	41.5%	43.0%	41.2%	55%
c. Change substantially	8.9%	10.3%	13.1%	10.6%	15%
d. Probably change, but not sure to what extent	21.9%	31.0%	20.6%	23.8%	5%
e.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0%
No Answer	11.6%	4.6%	4.6%	7.6%	0

November to 15% in June. Approximately 75% of the teachers in February and in June were attempting to implement them. The data from administrators on this item was very similar.

On item fourteen, 17% of the teachers surveyed felt their teaching would not change and 75% indicated it would change to some extent as a result of the mandates. This data is very consistent with responses to item thirteen. Similarly, 75% of the administrators responded that teachers would change and 25% felt they would not.

Item twelve was included to determine what the principals' response has been to the state mandates in reading. In the teacher survey, 38% responded that principals left implementation to teachers. The administrators who developed the plans for their districts indicated that 60% of the principals would leave it up to the teachers.

Four survey items addressed the results of the state mandates: items 2, 4, 10, and 16 (see Table 7). Although 75% of the teachers felt that the reform legislation would have some effect on the quality of reading instruction throughout the state, only 21% felt that reading instruction would improve (and of the 21%, only 3% felt it would greatly improve). However, among the administrators surveyed, 40% felt that the reforms will make very little difference and only 20% thought the reform would improve instruction.

Teacher responses to item ten, what program changes would occur, were very evenly distributed among the choices; 22% indica-

Table 7

The Results of the State Mandates in Reading

2. To what extent do you feel the 1985 reform legislation will improve the quality of reading instruction throughout the state?

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. It will make little difference	8.9%	11.5%	15.0%	11.5%	40%
b. It may have some effect	53.5%	51.7%	54.2%	53.2%	40%
c. It will improve instruction	17.8%	21.8%	15.0%	17.9%	10%
d. It will greatly improve instruction	2.7%	4.6%	2.8%	3.2%	10%
e. I don't know much about it	14.4%	5.7%	10.2%	10.9%	0%
No Answer	2.7%	4.6%	2.8%	3.2%	0%

Table 7 (cont'd)

4. What impact do you feel the state learner outcomes will have on your district's reading instruction?

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. No changes in instruction	11.0%	14.9%	9.3%	11.5%	10%
b. Minor changes in instruction	49.3%	57.6%	58.9%	54.4%	60%
c. Major changes in instruction	12.3%	12.6%	12.1%	12.4%	30%
d. I'm not sure	24.0%	10.3%	12.1%	16.8%	0%
e.	1.4%	1.1%	2.8%	1.8%	0%
No Answer	2.0%	3.5%	4.8%	3.2%	0%

10. If you anticipate there will be changes in the reading program, what will be the nature of the changes?

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. Teaching methods	24.7%	18.4%	22.4%	22.4%	40%
b. Curriculum changes	27.4%	17.2%	15.9%	21.2%	20%
c. Changes in the types of tests	15.1%	28.7%	21.5%	20.6%	10%
d. Not sure	19.9%	16.1%	23.4%	20.0%	5%
e. Don't think it will change	9.5%	16.1%	10.3%	11.5%	25%
No Answer	3.4%	3.5%	6.5%	4.4%	0%

Table 7 (cont'd)

16. How will your teachers prepare students for the state-wide reading test?

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. Do nothing differently	18.5%	17.2%	12.1%	16.2%	0%
b. Rely on the district plan	29.5%	23.0%	26.2%	26.8%	10%
c. Incorporate state learner outcomes into daily instr.	28.8%	35.7%	35.5%	32.6%	15%
d. Instruction same, but prepare students for the test	12.3%	14.9%	18.7%	15.0%	75%
e.	1.4%	2.3%	0.9%	1.5%	0%
No Answer	9.5%	6.9%	6.6%	7.9%	0%

ted the changes would be in teaching methods, 21% in curriculum changes, 21% in types of tests, 11% felt there would be no program changes, and 20% weren't sure. Of administrators surveyed, 40% felt that the change would be in teaching methods and 25% felt there would be no changes.

Table 8

The Sources of District Curricula

17. In my district the curriculum in most subject areas consists of:

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. District developed guides	32.9%	24.1%	21.5%	27.1%	30%
b. Teachers eds. of adopted texts	15.1%	25.3%	21.5%	19.7%	25%
c. District developed guides and teachers eds. of adopted texts	33.6%	40.3%	43.9%	38.5%	45%
d. Developed by indiv. teachers	11.6%	4.6%	9.4%	9.1%	0%
No Answer	6.8%	5.7%	3.7%	5.6%	0%

18. Teachers' reading objectives primarily come from:

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. District curriculum guides	9.6%	9.2%	11.2%	10.0%	00%
b. Combination of dist. guide and reading basal series	49.3%	48.3%	43.9%	47.4%	55%
c. Basal series	17.1%	23.0%	17.8%	18.8%	45%
d. Indiv. tchr. developed curricula	13.7%	10.3%	20.6%	15.0%	0%
e.	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.3%	0%
No Answer	10.3%	9.2%	5.6%	8.5%	0%

Survey items 17 and 18 (see Table 8) assessed the sources of district curricula. Approximately one third of the teachers and administrators indicated that the curriculum consists of district developed curriculum guides, 20% of the teachers and 25% of the administrators responded that the curriculum consists of the teachers edition of the text, and approximately 40% of the teachers and 45% of the administrators felt it was a combination of the two.

Approximately one half of the teachers and administrators reported that the reading objectives primarily come from a combination of the district curriculum guide and the basal series. However, 45% of the administrators indicated that teachers develop their own objectives, but less than 20% of the teachers reported they did.

Survey items 19, 20, 21, and 22 (Table 9) addressed the regularity of curriculum changes. Teacher responses to these questions were somewhat inconclusive, which may indicate that this question was frequently misinterpreted. Generally, however, it appears that curriculum changes occur on a regular cycle. This information was confirmed by the administrators' responses. Apparently, teachers often have the latitude to make curriculum changes after consulting with the principal or curriculum director.

Table 9

Changes to District Curricula

19. In my district, curriculum changes occur irregularly--
the causes of curriculum changes are:

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. Outdated textbooks	- - - - -	24.1%	20.6%	22.2%	5%
b. School Board recommend.	- - - - -	14.9%	6.5%	10.3%	0%
c. Admin. recommendations	- - - - -	8.0%	14.0%	11.3%	0%
d. Tchr. committee recommend.	- - - - -	2.3%	16.8%	10.3%	5%
e.	- - - - -	0.0%	2.8%	1.5%	0%
No Answer	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	90%

20. In my district, curriculum changes occur on a regular
cycle--the major subject areas change:

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. Approx. every 3-4 years	- - - - -	11.5%	17.8%	14.9%	0%
b. Approx. every 5-6 years	- - - - -	37.9%	29.0%	33.0%	70%
c. Approx. every 7-8 years	- - - - -	13.8%	12.1%	12.9%	20%
d. Approx. every 9-10 years	- - - - -	4.6%	5.6%	5.2%	0%
e.	- - - - -	3.4%	6.5%	5.2%	0%
No Answer	- - - - -	28.7%	29.0%	28.9%	10%

(Respondents answered either 19 or 20)

Table 9 (cont'd)

21. In my district, if a teacher proposed a curriculum change he would:

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. Be allowed to make the change	21.2%	8.0%	5.6%	12.9%	10%
b. Need to explain the rationale, perhaps be allowed to change	30.2%	23.8%	28.0%	27.6%	60%
c. Need to convince all building staff to change	6.2%	2.3%	8.5%	5.9%	0%
d. Need to convince all district staff to change	11.6%	14.9%	12.1%	12.6%	15%
e. Need to submit change at reg. scheduled revision	24.0%	41.5%	40.2%	33.5%	15%
No Answer	6.8%	10.3%	5.6%	7.4%	0%

22. What district-wide curriculum changes have occurred in your district in the last five years?

	Tchrs Nov. n=146	Tchrs Feb. n=87	Tchrs June n=107	Tchrs Comb. n=340	Admin n=20
a. None	2.7%	3.5%	0.9%	2.4%	5%
b. Those caused by new texts	26.7%	32.2%	25.2%	27.6%	15%
c. Those mandated by the state	2.1%	3.5%	10.3%	5.0%	5%
d. One subject area	28.8%	5.7%	6.5%	15.9%	5%
e. More than one subject area	34.2%	47.1%	40.2%	39.4%	70%
No Answer	5.5%	8.0%	16.9%	9.7%	0%

Other Information From Administrator Interviews

In addition to the data on the survey, the following information was obtained from administrators responsible for preparing the LAP in personal interviews.

The administrators expressed a concern that the subject areas are being phased in so rapidly (Reading in 1987-88, Mathematics in 1988-89, Language Arts in 1989-90, Biological and Physical Sciences in 1989-90, and Physical Development and Health in 1992-93) that there is insufficient time to adequately prepare for these changes. They also felt that the state was giving contradictory messages regarding the latitude to develop local assessment plans.

Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) personnel stated that districts could develop local objectives and assessment instruments to meet local needs. However, since the state assessment is to be based on the state goals and objectives and the results of the state assessment will be reported to the public via the School Report Cards, in reality there is pressure to conform to the state goals and objectives.

Smaller districts with little or no central office personnel felt they had insufficient time and resources to involve teachers in preparing the Learner Assessment Plans to meet the state mandates. In one small district, the Superintendent was also the principal and curriculum director. This single person was unable to provide adequate leadership in all areas of the change process.

The Learner Assessment Plans address the same grade levels (3, 6, 8, and 11) for each of the seven subject areas. Teachers at these grade levels have expressed a great deal of concern and frustration with this requirement. And with the requirement of state and local assessment in the month of April, administrators expressed concern about a significant loss of instructional time.

The ISBE also mandated that the local Learner Assessment Plan must utilize instruments with an established reliability and validity. But many of the state reading objectives are process objectives for which there are few standardized tests available. School districts have not had sufficient time to develop valid and reliable tests to assess process objectives. Thus, districts felt pressured to use standardized tests to measure both content and process objectives.

CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

Since the intent of this study was to determine what changes have occurred as a result of the state mandates in reading, it was necessary to establish the extent to which the State Goals and Sample Learning Objectives for reading are, indeed, a change from past classroom practice. Thus, a number of classrooms were visited to determine how reading instruction is currently being conducted.

Background

To better understand the history and magnitude of this change, it is important to cite research efforts which have contributed to

the changes in philosophy of reading and instructional practices. As early as 1976 the National Institute of Education, recognizing the need for more research on reading instruction, issued the following statement: "A considerable, though not entirely adequate body of facts has been assembled about decoding, but much less is known about the process of understanding written text" (Durkin, 1978, p. 483). Researchers and practitioners have strongly urged the NIE to focus its attention and that of the field on the problem of reading comprehension. The National Institute of Education issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) describing the needs for a Center for the Study of Reading whose critical concern would be comprehension. The responsibilities outlined in the application directed the Center to identify and implement means by which knowledge gained from relevant research on reading could be used in developing and improving practices for reading instruction. The contract for establishment of the Center for the Study of Reading was awarded to the University of Illinois at Champaign.

The Durkin study (1978) was conducted by researchers at this center. Classrooms at grades three through six were observed to determine instructional practices in reading. The observers recorded the time, activity, audience, and source (i.e., workbook or manual). Durkin found little time (5.53%) was spent on comprehension instruction, and no time was spent on study skills instruction. Only 8.58% of the reading period was spent on other types of reading instruction such as oral reading, phonics, structural analysis, and

word meaning. The investigators found that teachers spent large periods of time on written assignments. Durkin's study portrays teachers as "mentioners," assignment givers, checkers, and inter-rogators.

The Center for the Study of Reading was awarded the contract to develop the state goals, sample learner outcomes, and the state assessment for reading. The following statement issued by the Center for the Study of Reading was disseminated to all districts in the state.

> Perhaps no other area of the school curriculum has been as heavily researched at the theoretical and practical levels as reading. Within the last decade, substantial advances in under-standing the reading process and reading instruction have been made. Because of the magnitude of these advances, it is time to translate and integrate these research findings into learning objectives for reading.

> The sample learning objectives are a reflection of the current research and views about reading. They represent a broad frame-work of what is known about the reading process and sound read-ing instruction. These objectives break with the past: they build on the strengths that existed, and go beyond to account for re-cent significant advances. Specifically, the new direction in reading is based upon the following points:

> Reading is the process of constructing meaning through the dynamic (ever-changing) interaction of the reader, the text, and the context of the reading situation. Reading takes place only when the various subskills of reading are integrated to produce a smooth, coherent holistic process.

> Prior knowledge is a major determinant of comprehension. That is, the readers use information from the text together with already-possessed knowledge to determine the author's mean-

ing.

Inference is an inherent part of the ongoing moment-by-moment process of reading. Making inferences requires readers to use information from the text and prior knowledge to produce meaning. This process virtually guarantees that any text will have many acceptable and justifiable interpretations.

Hallmarks of effective readers are attributes like sensitivity and flexibility. Skilled readers are sensitive to the purpose for which they are reading, the requirements of the reading task, and their own individual reading ability and knowledge about the text. Flexibility requires readers to adjust reading strategies in response to this sensitivity. Skilled readers monitor their own comprehension and apply appropriate fix-up strategies when necessary.

Personal reading and study habits and attitudes developed in home, peer and school environments play an important role in determining growth in reading skill and achievement. Skilled reading requires a great deal of practice over a long period of time using a variety of materials from all content areas for many different purposes.

The process of reading across developmental levels remains more constant than it changes. This fact is an inevitable consequence of the linguistic and cognitive basis of reading. Therefore, the reading objectives are the same across all grade levels. The reading task becomes more complex as the difficulty of the reading material increases. The vocabulary demands, sentence complexity, and clarity of the organizational plan or concept load all contribute to the difficulty of the text. The determination of text difficulty is also influenced by the knowledge, interest and motivation readers bring to the reading situation. (Illinois State Board of Education, 1986, pp. 5, 6)

The above points indicating the "new direction in reading" are incorporated into the sample learning objectives for reading (see Appendix F). Of the 14 sample learning objectives, the following

eight objectives address the new direction in reading referred to in the passages above [John O'Flahavan, Center for the Study of Reading; personal interview; April, 1986].

Given the readers' prior knowledge and reading material with appropriate vocabulary demands, sentence complexity, organizational plan, and concept load, students should be able to:

B-1   Ask questions and make predictions about a passage prior to reading, based upon prior knowledge and the limited information about the passage contained in the title, pictures, or other introductory material.

B-2   Ask questions and make predictions about a passage while reading taking into account all of the important information available up to that point in the reading.

C-1   Understand a variety of reasons for reading such as learning of new information, use of text to accomplish the readers' goals, social interaction, entertainment, and self-exploration.

C-2   Use appropriate texts such as fiction, nonfiction, poetry, letters, directions, and reference material to accomplish the various purposes of reading

D-1   Understand the difficulties of the text (vocabulary demands, content, organization, author's purpose), requirements of the task, (what is expected as a result of reading), and their own knowledge, abilities, and motivation.

D-2   Adjust their strategies for reading and understanding, using decoding skills, context clues, self-questioning, predicting, reference materials, rereading, and adjustment of reading speed based on the demands of the reading situation.

E-1   Make inferences about the text such as . . . author's purpose, . . . mood and tone using information both from the text and prior knowledge.

F-1   Use, synthesize and analyze information from a variety of sources to enhance understanding, e.g., form opinions based upon a variety of information, to compare/contrast, to verify information and to expand knowledge. (Illinois State Board of Education, 1986, pp.15, 16)

Focus of the Observations

The classroom observations of reading lessons in this study were analyzed to determine the extent to which the state's sample learning objectives were currently being implemented. Twenty reading lessons were observed: 13 at third grade and 7 at sixth grade. The observations were conducted in suburban schools where the average reading scores were at or above grade level. With one exception, the observations were conducted in public schools. As in the Durkin study, when the principals were contacted about the possibility of observing, a request was made to see the "best teachers." All teachers knew beforehand that they were to be visited. The assumption of the research was that the classrooms were typical of good instructional practices in reading.

The researcher recorded all teacher-directed activities and the amount of time spent on each. The teacher indicated the starting and ending points to ensure that a complete lesson was observed.

Observation Findings

When all of the data was collected, it was reviewed to determine which of the activities addressed the state learning objectives. The data was then analyzed to determine the amount of time spent on the objectives earlier identified as representing the

new direction in reading previously referred to in the ISBE pubication.

The findings of the third grade and sixth grade observations are summarized in Tables 10 and 11, respectively. The twenty classroom observations (13 in third grade, 7 in sixth grade) represent ten different schools in seven different districts. The numbers in the chart indicate minutes per objective.

The instructional time has been divided into three categories: teacher-directed time spent on activities related to the state learning objectives, teacher-directed time spent on activities unrelated to the state learning objectives, and time spent on silent reading. The results of the two grade levels are compared in Table 12.

Table 10

READING OBSERVATIONS--THIRD GRADE

State Learning Objectives	3a	3b	3c	3d	3e	3f	3g	3h	3i	3j	3k	3l	3m
A1					13			7	5		5		
A2				3	15		2		15	5	5	12	15
A3			16			4							
B1	13							11		7			7
B2	6					10							
B3			6					4		4			
C1		10											
C2		10					10						
D1								2		2			
D2													
E1				7	5	14							
E2													
F1				4				1					
G1													
Total Minutes	19	20	22	14	43	18	12	25	20	18	10	15	22
Other Objectives	17	10	34	30	2	16	13	8	10	6	36	3	28
Silent Reading	14	20	4	11	15	5	3	22	20	5	24	15	0
Total Time	50	50	60	55	60	39	28	55	50	29	70	33	50

(Classrooms)

Table 11

READING OBSERVATIONS--SIXTH GRADE

State Learning Objectives	(Classrooms) 6a	6b	6c	6d	6e	6f	6g
A1							
A2		5	17	7	6	3	3
A3			2		2	9	1
B1			8				
B2	7				4		
B3				4			2
C1							16
C2							
D1						1	
D2			9			4	
E1	8					1	
E2							
F1	1.5			18	6		
G1							9
Total Minutes	16.5	5	36	29	18	18	31
Other Objectives	13	15	25	10	10	16	21
Silent Reading	7.5			3	10		
Total Time	37	20	61	39	31	44	52

Table 12

CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES ADDRESSING STATE LEARNER OUTCOMES

THIRD	Total Minutes	% of Rdg. Time	**SIXTH**	Total Minutes	% of Rdg Time
A1	33	5 2 %		0	0.0 %
A2	72	11.5 %		4 1	14.4 %
A3	20	3.2 %		14	4.9 %
*B 1	38	6.1 %		8	2.8 %
*B2	16	2.5 %		1 1	3.9 %
B3	14	2.2 %		6	2.1 %
*C 1	1 0	1.6 %		1 6	5.6 %
*C 2	20	3.2 %		0	0.0 %
*D 1	4	0.6 %		1	0.4 %
*D 2	0	0.0 %		13	4.6 %
*E 1	26	4.1 %		9	3.2 %
E2	0	0.0 %		0	0.0 %
*F 1	5	0.8 %		25	8.8 %
G1	0	0.0 %		9	3.2 %
Total on State Objectives	258	41.0 %		253	53.9 %
Total on Other Objectives	213	33.9 %		110	38.7 %
Silent Rdg.	158	25.1 %		21	7.4 %
Total	629	100.0%		284	100 0%
Total on New State Object.	119	18.9%		83	2.2 %

* New State Objectives

With the range of lessons observed and the small sample size, it is difficult to make generalizations. However, similarities between the percent of time spent on each of the fourteen objectives at third and sixth grade suggest that reading instruction is similar at these grade levels.

Between 20% and 30% of the instructional time was spent on "new" state objectives, while approximately 25% was spent on the "old" objectives. Of the remaining time, approximately 30% was spent on other objectives.

At third grade 25% of the total observation time was spent in silent reading while less than 10% of the sixth grade observation time was devoted to silent reading. This difference is probably accounted for by the teachers' accommodations to being observed.

The total data suggest that these "best" teachers are beginning to incorporate the new instructional strategies (e.g., K.W.L., a predicting strategy) of reading. No effort was made to assess the quality of the instruction or to evaluate achievement of the objectives. However, it was clear to the observer that not all teachers effectively implemented these reading strategies.

In this chapter, the research findings have been reported. In the next chapter these findings are analyzed and the research questions answered. A comparison is made between the state reform plan and the Fullan model of change, and guidelines for reform efforts are discussed. Recommendations are made for facilitating the state reform effort, and the limitations of the

research as well suggestions for further study are presented. A summary of the study completes this final chapter.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter is divided into five sections. The first section addresses the response to the state mandates in reading. Five of the six research questions stated in Chapter I are answered. The data reported in Chapter IV will provide the basis for answers to these questions. The second section analyzes the state mandated change in terms of the Fullan model. The third section discusses the factors affecting the likelihood of change described by Fullan. The factors are discussed in relationship to this change. The fourth section suggests guidelines for this reform effort. Fullan's guidelines for government involvement in reform are discussed, as are other critical factors related to the state plan (i.e., time, assessment). In the concluding section, the author's recommendations for facilitating this reform effort are presented, the limitations of the study and suggestions for further research are discussed, and the study and its findings are summarized.

THE RESPONSE TO THE STATE MANDATES IN READING

How do the LAPs submitted by the individual districts compare to the state's sample learning objectives?

The administrators who were responsible for preparing the district LAPs reported in the survey that the primary source of the learning objectives submitted in the district Learner Assessment Plan was either the district's own objectives (20%) or state objectives modified to meet district needs (55%). Teachers, in comparison, were less sure of the source of the objectives, with over one third responding "not sure" on survey item seven (source of district learning objectives).

However, when the investigator directly examined the LAPs submitted by the twenty districts, it was found that 50% of the districts utilized the state's learning objectives without any changes, while another 40% used the state objectives with slight modifications, omitting one or more of the fourteen objectives recommended by the state.

Thus, as indicated by administrator comments during the interviews, most districts (90%) chose to adopt the state learning objectives with few, if any, modifications. One possible reason for this decision was that local districts felt pressure to submit a Learner Assessment Plan which would be approved by the Illinois State Board of Education.

Further evidence supporting this theory was found during the examination of LAPs submitted to the ISBE. With very minor modifications, the twenty districts submitted identical objectives for grades three, six and eight. Although in most cases this was a departure from past practice, the decision to utilize the same objectives for each of the three grade levels reflects the state philosophy:

> The process of reading across developmental levels remains more constant than it changes. This fact is an inevitable consequence of the linguistic and cognitive basis of reading. Therefore, the reading objectives are the same across all grade levels. (Illinois State Board of Education, 1986, p. 6)

Since most of the districts had different objectives for each of the three grade levels in question prior to the LAP requirement, the decision to change to one set of objectives for all grade levels may have been caused by a desire to insure that the LAP would be approved. Or, it may have been the easiest way for districts to meet the mandate.

The assessment requirements strongly influenced the content and design of the LAP. The district plan had to include the method of assessment for each of the objectives. Further, the assessment instrument had to have an established reliability and validity. Since the state objectives were new, most of the districts had no tests with evidence of reliability and validity. The major testing companies, anticipating this dilemma, published and disseminated to local districts a correlation between their standardized achievement tests and the state learning objectives. It was easy for local

districts to adopt the state learning objectives and utilize the standardized achievement tests they were currently using to assess these objectives. Conceivably, then, the Learner Assessment Plan could be a "paper change" at the district level, with no changes at the classroom level. This might account for the fact that as late as June of 1988, the teacher surveys revealed that 45% of the teachers were unsure about their districts' Learner Outcome Plans.

What process was used in developing district plans and who was involved?

Nineteen of the twenty districts surveyed utilized a committee in developing Learner Assessment Plans. In the twentieth district the administrator developed the LAP by himself.

The typical committee was made up of a representative group of teachers from grades 3, 6, and 8 with each school in the district having at least one representative. In the 19 districts with committees, the committee was chaired by an administrator--either a principal, assistant superintendent for curriculum, a reading/language arts coordinator, or, in one case, the superintendent. In most cases the committee began work during the spring of 1987 and completed the LAP prior to the August 31 deadline for submission.

Many districts (50%) worked independently, but the six districts in Lake County received assistance from the Educational Service Center (ESC). Staff members of the ESC in Lake County had previous experience with implementing educational reform mandates in other states. They provided a continuous source of accurate and

credible information, assistance in validating assessment instruments, examples, and encouragement. In one small district the ESC was the sole resource available to the superintendent, who also functioned as principal, transportation director, and curriculum leader. In Lake County, the ESC directors worked with one or two representatives from each district to develop common objectives and to design and validate instruments to assess the objectives.

The administrators from Lake County reported that the ESC staff had done an excellent job of coordinating the LAP development efforts. However, because there are 50 districts and 209 schools in the county, it was not possible for ESC staff to provide inservice for teachers at the district or school levels.

In three cases in Cook County, the administrators reported close cooperation with neighboring elementary districts which served a common high school. In these cases all cooperating districts submitted the same LAPs.

Combining the six districts served by the Lake County ESC, the three districts in Cook County that worked together, and the one superintendent who completed the LAP without input from staff, in ten of the twenty districts (50%) the LAP was not developed by a district committee but was even further removed and more likely developed by one or two teachers representing the district on a county or township committee. One superintendent reported that teachers refused to participate in the development process even

though they were offered stipends to do so. They felt it was a waste of their time and energy.

How do administrators view the state mandates and what steps are they taking to implement them?

Evidence from the surveys indicated that administrators were almost evenly split on the question concerning the appropriateness of the state's learning objectives. Eleven responded yes and nine responded no. Teachers were less certain, with 64% of the combined sample who were not sure, hadn't read them or chose not to answer.

In spite of the fact that 45% of the administrators responded that the state learning objectives were inappropriate, 90% adopted them with few or no modifications. This lends support to the belief that they were simply meeting the LAP requirement of the mandates rather than making a decision based on a guiding value system.

The Center for the Study of Reading at the University of Illinois developed the state's philosophy, goals, and objectives for reading. This information was communicated to personnel at the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE). The ISBE prepared a document with a two page description of the "new direction" in reading, and a listing of the seven goals and fourteen sample learning objectives (Illinois State Board of Education, 1986). This document was the sole source of information to the districts. There was no attempt to explain or justify it. The district administrator, who in most cases had little background in reading, was left to communicate the change to the teaching staff. In view of the fact that 45%

of the administrators did not feel the change was appropriate, and perhaps many did not fully understand the direction of the change, it seems unlikely that the information was completely and positively communicated either to the principals or teachers.

The administrator interviews indicated that in most cases the following implementation steps were taken:

1. Worked with committee to develop LAP--Spring 1987

2. Submitted plan to ISBE--August 1987

3. Informed teachers of state assessment and distributed sample tests--March 1988

4. Administered state assessment--April 1988

5. Administered local assessment--April 1988

Survey responses clearly indicate that teachers had little knowledge of the LAP process before April 1988 and didn't know any more in June after going through the assessment. There could be several reasons for this lack of information. First, as explained above, the administrator (who in many cases had a limited background in reading) did not understand or agree with the changes, and therefore did not completely or accurately communicate the changes to teachers.

Second, many teachers resented the mandated change and those at the affected grade levels (3, 6, and 8) felt especially imposed upon. One superintendent explained that he had to plan stress workshops for teachers at these grade levels. Another administrator described a very emotional meeting where he stood in front of a

large group of teachers (150) at grades 3, 6, and 8 to explain the mandates. The teachers were so negative and hostile that he ended with the plea, "Please don't kill the messenger!" Conceivably, the lack of information may have been avoidance of teachers' reactions.

Third, with a short period of time in which to implement the change, administrators simply were unable to effectively communicate with the staff regarding the change. In the administrative interviews, there were many complaints of additional paperwork as a result of the mandates and limited time and resources for implementation.

Fourth, if the administrator did not agree with the changes or the LAP process, the response may have been minimal compliance or a paper change rather than efforts to inform staff on implementation of instructional changes.

How do teachers view these state mandates? What do they know about the LAP process and the expectations of their state and district?

Less than 26% of the teachers had specific knowledge of the content of the state's sample learner outcomes, as indicated in survey question one. This is consistent with the teacher response to survey question three (the appropriateness of the state's sample learner outcomes)--66% of the teachers hadn't read them, weren't sure, or did not respond at all on this item.

Teachers' responses to item ten (the nature of the changes, if there will be changes) also indicated a lack of knowledge of the

direction of the change. Approximately 20% responded teaching methods will change, 20% indicated the curriculum will change, 20% felt the tests would change, and 20% weren't sure. From the diversity of responses no definite conclusions can be drawn. The lack of consistency could be attributed to the fact that districts are responding to the mandates differently, or it could reflect a lack of information.

Only 30% of the teachers felt that the curriculum had changed from the previous year. There was a considerable discrepancy between teachers' and administrators' responses to what tests are being used to measure district objectives--less than half of the teachers (46%), but 85% of the administrators indicated standardized achievement tests were used. There was an even greater discrepancy between the teacher/administrator responses in June, after one year of implementation of the LAP and actual administration of the tests. Either the teacher/administrator samples were not representative, or more likely, the discrepancy could be indicative of a lack of knowledge and/or understanding of the district Learner Assessment Plan.

How have teachers responded to the change?

Almost 75% of the teachers responded that they were attempting to implement the state learner outcomes and approximately the same percentage indicated that their teaching would change at least to some extent. This data was very consistent with the administrators' views.

Although three-fourths of the teachers felt their teaching would change, there was little agreement on the direction of the change. This could be reflective of their lack of knowledge, which was apparent even in the June sample after one year of implementation--only 25% indicated substantial knowledge of the state objectives.

What changes can be predicted in reading curriculum and instructional methods as a result of the state pressure to change?

Forty percent of the teachers and administrators predicted that teachers would place more emphasis on the reading process, thus revealing some knowledge of the philosophical change advocated by the state.

In preparation for the state assessment, only 15% of the teachers reported that they would make no changes in instruction but would prepare their students for the test. However, 75% of the administrators believed their teachers would respond this way. This discrepancy could be possibly explained by the fact that the administrators had more information about the state tests than the teachers and realized that teachers might need to prepare students for them. For example, although the state tests were multiple choice, each item could have one, two, or three correct answers. Most likely this would be the first time students had taken a test with multiple correct responses. Because administrators knew that the results of this new type of assessment would be published, they

may have placed more importance on preparing students for the test. It is interesting to note that even after administration of the state assessment, only 15% of the teachers indicated (in June) that they would prepare their students for the test. This might reflect a belief on the part of the teachers that their reading instruction should be sufficient or, an unwillingness to change instruction to prepare students for the test.

ANALYSIS OF THE STATE PLAN

How has the state's plan for improvement of instruction, as it has been implemented, relate to the Fullan model and other views of change?

All of the school districts in the state have been expected to respond very quickly to the Illinois reform mandates. Because of the pressure of accountability with the publication of the state assessment results, school districts have had to mobilize their organizations to develop plans and implement them in a relatively short period of time. Since Fullan's model emphasizes an organizational perspective, it was selected for this analysis of the early stages of the change process.

Fullan's model of the school improvement process involves two groups of factors: eight organizational factors and four process factors. These factors, when examined in relation to each other, help to identify and characterize in a systematic manner the theoretical framework which underlies successful change efforts.

Following is an examination of the eight organizational factors and four process factors in terms of the data collected in this study.

Organizational Factors

1. Instructionally focused leadership at the school level

   Loucks and Hall (1979) comment on instructional leadership: "It is becoming increasingly clear that the actions taken by building principals to support or inhibit a change effort has direct effect on how teachers feel about and ultimately use a new program" (p. 19). While approximately 50% of the teachers reported that their principals supported them in their implementation of the LAP process, only 30% of the administrators reported that principals supported the process, and only 5% reported that the principal had made the LAP process an important building goal. With the additional comments from administrative interviews, it becomes evident that principals are not providing focused instructional leadership toward implementation of the reading goals reported in the Learner Assessment Plan.

2. District support

   Fullan explains that "central administrators are often powerful advocates and can sponsor or block adoption of change programs"

(Fullan, 1982, p. 45). Although one district did require teachers to submit regular reports on their progress toward meeting the goals included in the LAP, most districts had no clear plan to translate their LAPs into classroom instruction. Data from the surveys revealed that teachers had limited knowledge of the state learning objectives and the local LAP process. Obviously the central administrators were not powerful advocates for change when they, in many cases, did not inform their teachers. Further, it is unlikely that many of the district administrators supported the change--almost half indicated that they did not feel the state learning objectives were appropriate. Clearly most district administrators have not provided the leadership or resources to implement the changes in reading instruction.

3. Emphasis on curriculum and instruction

Although this factor was not directly assessed in the study, information from the surveys indicated that in a majority of districts the curriculum consisted of a combination of the district developed curriculum guides and the teacher's edition of the adopted texts. Further, in most of the districts the curriculum in major subject areas changes every 5-6 years. While these suburban districts evidently place emphasis on the curriculum at the district level, there was no data collected to examine this emphasis at the building level.

4. Clear goals and expectations for students

An examination of the data reported in the survey reveals a number of teachers who were unsure, did not know, or who gave no response on items relating to the LAP. Discussions with administrators also support the impression that teachers know little about the state learning objectives or the district learner assessment plan. If the teachers are unclear, they can not effectively communicate the goals and expectations to their students, at least in relation to this topic.

5. A system for monitoring performance

The state developed a one hour reading assessment to be administered during the month of April. In addition, each district was required, in the learner assessment plan, to report their reading objectives and assessment procedures. Almost all districts reported that they assessed their district objectives in April, primarily through the use of standardized tests. These data will be available to the public in October 1988. Because of the state requirement for a common month of assessment and the nature of standardized tests, these data are poor indicators of achievement of student learning outcomes. As Tyler explains:

> A standardized test is designed to be used in schools throughout the nation, despite the different learning sequences they have and with children coming from a

variety of backgrounds and at various stages of learning in the field covered by the test. For this reason, it cannot include enough questions appropriate to each child's stage of development to measure reliably what he has learned during a single school year. (Tyler, 1975, p. 101)

With the exception of one district which developed a monitoring plan, all other districts relied upon general achievement data rather than specific feedback for information on progress toward achievement of objectives.

6. Ongoing staff development

Information from teachers and administrators indicates that few staff development efforts during 1987-1988 school year were focused on the district or state reading objectives. In fact, in many districts, even the testing programs (both district and state) were given to the teachers with little or no explanation other than procedures to follow in administration of the test. While reading was undoubtedly part of the staff development plans in some districts, there is evidence that the staff development plans were not correlated with the LAPs in more than two-thirds of the districts. In three districts, outside consultants committed to the state's philosophy of reading were hired to conduct the staff development programs. Although the LAPs were not necessarily mentioned in the inservice, the philosophy inherent in the state learning objectives was communicated to the teachers in these districts. Based on

the classroom observations, it is clear that the state's philos-
ophy of reading has been at least partially adopted by the
better teachers.

In summary, some teachers are moving toward the reading
methodology recommended by the state, but it is unlikely that
this can be attributed solely to the state LAP process.

7. Parental involvement and support

The state plan for reform depends on the reaction of parents
and other community members to the data reported for the
reading assessment. There are no statewide plans to educate
parents or involve them in the reading process. The parental
role appears to be limited to reaction to the published assess-
ment results, with consequent pressure brought to bear on dis-
tricts for instructional improvement in reading.

8. Orderly and secure climate

There was no attempt by the state to determine the climate
of districts. In districts where the mandated change is resent-
ed, the climate in the schools and/or classsrooms may miti-
gate against change.

Process Factors

1. A feel for the improvement process on the part of the leadership

In this study, three levels of leadership are involved. At the state level the ISBE has been charged with the responsibility for implementing the change. Although the researcher looked for evidence of a model for the process of change adopted by the state, interviews with ISBE and legislative personnel indicate that the state plan could be characterized as:

1) Require Learner Assessment Plans from all districts

2) Assess student progress annually

3) Publish the results to exert pressure for change.

This plan does not consider research on change: "Change is a process, not an event. . . . A lesson learned the hard way by those who put all their energies into developing an innovation or passing a piece of legislation without thinking through what would have to happen beyond that point" (Fullan, 1982, p. 41). The leaders at the state level have not addressed the process of change. As Sarason notes, "Nothing has been more characteristic of efforts to change schools than oversimple conceptions of the change process" (Sarason, 1982, pp. 11, 12). He suggests that "the way in which the change process is conceptualized is far more fateful for success or failure than the educational method or content (e.g., reading, social studies) one seeks to implement" (p. 78).

The second level of leadership is provided at the district level. While there is no clear indication in the data found in this study about the capability of the district administration to manage the change process, providing the leadership for school change is clearly a district responsibility. Without guidance from the state on the change process and lacking information on the nature of the change, it would seem likely that only district administrators who were knowledgeable about the current research in the area of reading and staff development would be successful in implementing the change.

At the third level, the individual building level, the principal must assume the leadership role in the improvement process. The data from the teacher surveys indicates that only 21% of the teachers are working in schools where the principal has implemented a change procedure as part of the LAP process. The remaining 79% of the principals may understand the process of change, but may lack knowledge, direction, and/or support from the district level.

2. A guiding value system

Tyler explains that "unless the teachers have participated in identifying the problems or inadequacies of the school and in developing workable and promising solutions, they may not believe that a proposed solution will be an improvement over

current practices" (Tyler, 1988, p. 16). As evidenced by the survey, teachers, as a whole, are largely unaware of the philosophy of reading proposed by the state and the content of their district's learner assessment plan.

Corbett, Firestone, and Rossman (1987) suggest that "there is a tendency from above to view schools as empty vessels that can be filled and refilled according to changing public concerns and reform agendas" (p. 57). They add that "this tendency rests on the assumption that schools are value-free, easily adjusted organizations. This, of course, is far from the case. Schools not only teach values but also have a value structure embedded in them" (p. 57). The guiding value systems of the individual schools were not addressed in this study.

3. Intense interaction and communication

Constant communication and information-sharing among the various levels of personnel serve as sources of support and pressure for change. Huberman and Crandall (1983) confirmed this in their summary of the Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Change (DESSI) study. They indicated how and why pressure and support work together to effect school improvement.

Teachers and administrators reported in this study a notable lack of interaction and/or communication between all levels involved; ISBE staff to local districts, district administrators

to building administrators and teachers, and building adminis-strators to teachers.

4. Collaborative planning

    Research evidence supports the need for collaboration between leaders and implementers of change. In the review of the literature in Chapter II, studies are reported which support both the "top-down" and "bottom-up" views of change. A combination of the two--"resources-down" and "plans-up"--incorporates the advantages of each model (Rosenblum and Louis, 1981). The state can supply the impetus and resources, and collegial decision-making at the user level can facilitate implementation.

    In this study little evidence of collaborative planning was found at the district or building levels. However, in Lake County and in three districts in Cook County, districts worked together to develop learner assessment plans for the state. This involved only a few teachers from each of the districts.

    Although most districts reported that a committee with a majority of teachers developed the LAP required by the state, only one district in the study had an implementation plan. This was the only evidence of planning for implementation.

FACTORS AFFECTING THE LIKELIHOOD OF CHANGE

Most theorists agree that change is a complex process. Fullan organized the complex factors associated with organizational change into four broad categories: characteristics of the change, characteristics at the school district level, characteristics at the school level, and characteristics external to the system (Fullan, 1982). Following is a discussion of the factors affecting the likelihood of this change effort in each of the four categories.

Characteristics of the Change

Fullan identified four factors describing the characteristics of a change which affect implementation: (1) the need and relevance of the change; (2) clarity; (3) complexity; and (4) quality and practicality of the program.

For the reform effort to be successful, the teachers must see the need and relevance of the change. Evidence from the survey clearly indicated that teachers had little information about the change in reading philosophy or the LAP process. Another important characteristic of the change is its complexity. Since this philosophical process change is complex, the change will be very difficult to implement. Although there is sufficient research to support the philosophy and direction of the change, the quality and practicality of the learning materials and methodologies must be assured if teachers are to successfully implement this process change. No

evidence was found that districts accounted for these factors in their implementation plans.

Characteristics at the School District Level

Fullan identified six factors at the school district level that affect implementation: (1) the history of innovative attempts; (2) the adoption process; (3) central administrative support and involvement; (4) staff development (in-service) and participation; (5) time-line and information systems; and (6) board and community characteristics.

The districts' history of attempts at innovations affects teachers' responses to change efforts. The more teachers have had negative experiences with "innovations," the more resistant or apathetic they will be to future change attempts. Although this factor was not assessed in the data collected, it is a critical factor.

The data in the study revealed that teachers were largely unaware of the process involved in developing their district Learner Assessment Plans and the majority had little input into the process.

The support of district administration is critical for district-wide change. Fullan explains: "Teachers . . . know enough now, if they didn't fifteen years ago, not to take change seriously unless central administrators demonstrate through actions that they should" (Fullan, 1982, p. 65). The evidence from administrators and teachers indicates that strong district leadership and support was lacking.

An obvious but critical component of successful change efforts is staff development and participation. The amount and quality of inservice are both important. For complex changes to occur, teachers need ongoing staff development and support. An examination of the data revealed that teachers received little or no inservice on the reading learner assessment plan.

Although researchers have repeatedly stressed that lasting change takes time (see Chapter II), reformers often ignore this fact. Unrealistic time lines have added to the problems of implementation. In the Illinois reform effort, schools are expected to phase in changes in different subject areas every year through 1993 (see Appendix A for the assessment schedule). This leaves little time for teachers to implement the changes in one subject area while preparing for the next change. The teachers most affected by the state reform will be elementary teachers in grades three and six. The administrators revealed that teachers at these grade levels are hostile and feel unfairly pressured.

Support of the community has been found to correlate positively with successful implementation of innovations (Corwin, 1973). The school board can also affect implementation of innovations: "For example, a case study of the Toronto school system shows how the school board was central to the initial development of new multicultural policies and programs which were not necessarily welcomed by many schools" (Fullan, 1982, p. 70). Since information on the change was not clearly communicated to teachers, it

is unlikely that the school boards or communities were involved in the change. However, the general public seems to support accountability and publication of assessment results.

Characteristics at the School Level

Fullan identified three factors at the school level that affect implementation: (1) the principal; (2) teacher-teacher relations; and (3) teacher characteristics and orientations.

Current research on innovation shows the principal strongly influences the likelihood of successful change (see Chapter II). The results of the surveys showed that most principals were not assuming a strong leadership role in implementing the reading instructional change.

Berman and McLaughlin (1978) found that the quality of working relationships among teachers was strongly correlated to implementation. In the absence of principal support many teachers did report that they were working together to try to implement the LAP.

Characteristics External to the System

Fullan identified two factors external to the system that affect implementation: (1) the role of government and (2) external assistance.

The public sentiment that the educational system was not doing an adequate job prompted the state reform legislation. But have the government agencies utilized what is known about the difficulties of implementation and allocated resources, provided for staff development, and addressed the factors critical to successful

implementation efforts? The evidence in this study indicates that the state mandated the content of the change but made no provision for managing the process.

GUIDELINES FOR REFORM EFFORTS

Fullan's Guidelines for Government Involvement in Reform

Fullan suggests five broad guidelines for government involvement in reform efforts: (1) concentrate on helping to improve the capacity of agencies to implement change; (2) clearly communicate the policy and spend time interacting with local agencies about the meaning, expectation, and needs in relation to local implementation; (3) ensure that program development needs and inservice needs are met; (4) government agency leaders should ensure that their own staff, especially those who have the most direct contact with the field, have the opportunity to develop knowledge and competence regarding policy, program, and implementation; and (5) ensure that explicit implementation plans are developed since explicit plans are needed to guide the process. The implications of the guidelines for the Illinois reform effort are discussed below.

1. Concentrate on helping to improve the capacity of agencies to implement change.

   An examination of the current status of the Illinois reform effort in the area of reading reveals that little assistance has been given to schools for implementation of the instructional

change. Some funds were allocated through the Reading Improvement and Staff Development programs, but in most districts the funds were not expended to facilitate implementation of the learner assessment plan.

2. Clearly communicate the policy and spend time with local agencies about the meaning, expectation, and needs in relation to local implementation.

While the ISBE held a number of area meetings to provide information on the development of the required LAP, this was a time-consuming and complex task. Small districts found it particularly difficult to find the time and resources to prepare or implement these learner assessment plans.

3. Ensure that program development needs and inservice needs are met.

The state has given no assistance in developing programs for implementation or providing technical assistance in this direction.

4. Government agency leaders should ensure that their own staff, especially those who have the most direct contact with the field, have the opportunity to develop knowledge and competence regarding policy, program, and implementation.

The role of the ISBE staff has been to communicate the policy change (the LAP process). No assistance has been provided to districts in interpreting the philosophical change in reading or in managing the change process.

5. Ensure that explicit implementation plans are developed since explicit plans are needed to guide the process.

In most districts surveyed explicit implementation plans have neither been required nor developed in response to the mandates.

The Problem of Time in Reform Efforts

Time is an important variable in any successful change effort. Theorists and implementers agree that several years are necessary for implementation of a substantial change (see Chapter II). Fullan [1987 Conference] suggests that a minimum of five years is needed for the implementation phase, while Tyler (1988) suggests that it takes six or seven years to get a reform implemented as intended. He explains that "to develop a workable plan, to provide the necessary training for those who will carry it out, and to try the plan and modify it to fit the particular conditions in a given school all require much more time than most reformers realize" (p. 16).

The legislature and the ISBE have, as Fullan (1982) describes, "an adoption time perspective, not an implementation one" (p. 68). This perspective has resulted in a very short time frame for LAP development, implementation, and state assessment. A danger of

this time pressure is that districts will complete the required steps for the LAP, but develop no commitment to the change process.

Problems With Assessment-Driven Reform

There are two major problems with assessment-driven reform. First, when schools and teachers are judged on the basis of test scores, the result may be that teachers teach to the test. Tyler (1978) explains that this is not a new phenomenon: "In 1933 the Regents of the State of New York established higher passing scores for the Regents High School Examination . . . the higher passing scores . . . caused more teachers to teach to the test" (Tyler, 1987, p. 279). Eisner (1979) agrees with this position. He explains that few teachers can withstand the public pressure for high scores on district and state mandated tests, even if teachers wanted to pursue educational values that those tests did not assess. Tyler adds:

> Reformers equate high test scores with educational quality and effectiveness, and as long as this is the case, tests will drive the system and significantly influence what we teach and how we teach it. The sole criterion for school success can not be measured by standardized tests. (Tyler, 1987 p. 279)

The second major problem with assessment is the nature of the test. Tyler explains that "achievement tests used to measure learning outcomes in accountability programs yield misleading and faulty data" (Tyler, 1973, p. 104). Since many of the reading learning objectives are process objectives, the nature of the assessment instrument is of critical importance. Assessment instruments which can effectively measure process objectives are difficult to

construct. Local districts need technical assistance in developing criterion referenced tests which can effectively measure all learning objectives.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Recommendations

Based on all of the evidence collected in this study and a comparison with the Fullan model of change, the researcher recommends the following changes to facilitate implementation of the reform:

1. Provide training and support for state, district, and building level administrators on managing the process of change.

2. Provide clear information and inservice on the philosophy and direction of the change.

3. Involve teachers in planning, identifying and solving problems of implementation.

4. Provide resources for staff development and train local personnel to ensure project continuation.

5. Adjust the time schedule to allow more time for districts to respond to the change.

6. Focus the LAP process on more grade levels to reduce the pressure on teachers at grades 3, 6, 8, and 11.

7. Adjust the LAP assessment criteria to encourage districts to develop and use criterion referenced tests rather than standardized achievement tests to measure learning objectives.

8. Provide assistance to districts in developing instruments that assess process learning.

Limitations of the Study

There were three major limitations to this study of the legislated reform effort in Illinois. First, the sample size and composition. The teacher sample was composed primarily of teachers in the northwest suburbs of Chicago. The teachers were from Cook, Lake, and McHenry counties and were enrolled in graduate programs. Although efforts were made to include a large number of responses, a more diverse teacher population and larger number of responses might have produced more generalizable data. Similarly, a larger sample size of administrators may have increased the level of confidence in any conclusions drawn. Further, since no large districts were included in the study (e.g., Chicago, Rockford) the results can not be generalized to larger city systems.

A second limitation of the study was the inability to compare teacher and administrator data within the same district, although for political reasons a conscious decision was made to avoid sampling teachers from the same district as administrators. Similarly

the classroom observations were not made in the same districts as the administrators interviewed. These decisions were made to relieve the fear of contradiction or embarrassment if inconsistencies were detected. However, the correlation of three sources of data from the same district may have strengthened the conclusions of the study.

A third limitation of the study was the number of classroom observations. The classroom observations were included to investigate current practice in reading instruction. Because of the variety and complexity of the reading process, a much larger sample of classrooms would have enabled the investigator to form conclusions on current classsroom practice with greater confidence.

Suggestions for Further Research

There are a number of possible directions for further research. First, replicate the study using larger sample sizes. Second, collect data over a longer period of time to determine the long-term effects of the state reform. Third, expand the study to include other geographical areas in Illinois as well as large urban districts. Fourth, investigate the change process as the state phases in other subject area to determine if the uniqueness of the state learning objectives in reading created conditions which did not exist in other areas. Fifth, utilize a more qualitative methodology to develop, refine, and validate models of change. It is important to carefully study change as it is being implemented in a wide variety of settings to provide a better understanding of the complexity of the process.

Summary

In 1985 the State of Illinois passed school reform legislation which requires each school district to develop and submit Learning Assessment Plans (LAPs) specifying goals, objectives, and methods of assessment for each of six major subject areas. In 1987 implementation began with reading. This study chronicles the early phases of the reform.

State and local plans for change were investigated. Classroom observations of the teaching of reading and a teacher survey assessed teacher responses to the state mandated change. Teachers and administrators' perceptions and opinions of the state mandates were also examined. The data collected in this study were compared with the change literature, most specifically to the model of change developed by Michael Fullan. Additionally, suggestions were made for modifications to the state change process.

Because of the complexity of the change process, multiple sources of data were utilized. The methodology included examination of 20 district LAPs, structured interviews with the administrators who prepared the LAPs, administration of 340 teacher questionnaires, and observation of twenty reading lessons.

Following are the major findings of the study. First, no evidence was found of a state change model. The state's plan for change basically consisted of operationalizing the requirements of the law: (1) development of model state objectives; (2) development of objectives and assessment systems by each district; (3) state-

wide assessment of student achievement at grades 3, 6, 8, and 11; and (4) publication of the assessment results. Implementation of these changes was left to the individual districts.

Second, the results of the teacher survey indicated that teachers had little knowledge of the state or district plan and had participated minimally in the change process. In addition, almost half of the administrators and a number of teachers felt that the reading changes advocated by the state were inappropriate.

Third, the organizational and process factors identified by Fullan as necessary for successful change were not addressed in the state plan.

Finally, this study revealed that while the state is advocating a process change in the teaching of reading, the state gave no attention to managing the process of this change.

REFERENCES

Ashton, P. T., and Webb, R. B. (1986). <u>Making a Difference, Teachers'</u>
<u>Sense of Efficacy and Student Achievement.</u> New York:
Longman, Inc.

Bass, G. V. (1978). <u>A Study of Alternatives in American Education,</u>
<u>Vol. I: District Policies and the Implementation of Change</u>.
Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Bennis, W., and Nanus, B. (1985). <u>Leaders, The Strategies for Taking</u>
<u>Charge</u>. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Bentzen, M. M., and Assoc. (1974). <u>Changing Schools: The Magic</u>
<u>Feather Principle.</u> New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Berman, P., and McLaughlin, M. W. (1978). <u>Federal Programs Sup-</u>
<u>porting Educational Change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and Sus-</u>
<u>taining Innovations</u>. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Bird, T. (1986). Mutual Adaptation and Mutual Accomplishment:
Images of Change in a Field Experiment. In <u>Rethinking School</u>
<u>Improvement</u>, Leiberman, A. (Ed.), New York: Teachers College
Press, Columbia University.

Chance, W. (1986). <u>". . . the best of educations." Reforming America's</u>
<u>Public Schools in the 1980s</u>. The John D. and Catherine T. Mac-
Arthur Foundation.

Corbett, H. D.; Firestone, W. A.; and Rossman, G. B. (1987). Resistance
to Planned Change and the Sacred in School Cultures. <u>Educa-</u>
<u>tional Administration Quarterly</u>, 23 (4), 36-59.

Corwin, R.(1973). <u>Reform and Organizational Survival--The Teacher</u>
<u>Core as an Instrument of Educational Change.</u> New York: John
Wiley, and Sons Inc.

Crandall, D. et al (1982). A Study of Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement, Vols. I-X. Andover, MA: The Network.

Drucker, P. F. (1985). Innovation and Entrepreneurship, Practice and Principles. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Durkin, D. (1978). What Classroom Observations Reveal About Reading Comprehension Instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 14 (4), 481-533.

Eisner, E. (1979). The Educational Imagination: On the Design and Evaluation of School Programs. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Frazier, C. M. (1987). The 1980s: States Assume Educational Leadership. In The Ecology of School Renewal, Goodlad, J. (Ed.), Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Fullan, M. (1982). The Meaning of Educational Change. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Fullan, M. (1985). Change Processs and Strategies at the Local Level. The Elementary School Journal, 85 (3), 391-421.

Fullan, M. (1986). The Management of Change. In The Management of Schools, Hoyle, E. and McMahon, A. (Eds.), World Yearbook of Education, London: Kogan Page.

Goodlad, J. I. (1975). The Dynamics of Educational Change. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Goodlad, J. I.; Klein, F. M. ; and Assoc. (1970). Behind the Classroom Door. Worthington, OH: Charles A. Jones Company.

Griffiths, D. E. (1964). Administrative Theory and Change in Organizations. In Innovation in Education, Miles, M. (Ed.), New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff Development and the Process of Teacher Change. Educational Researcher, 15 (5), 5-12.

Hall, G. E., (1986). Deriving Teaching Skill from Studies of the Implementation of Innovations in Education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA), April.

Hall, G. E., and Guzman, F. M. (1984). Sources of Leadership for Change in High Schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA), April.

Hall, G. E., and Hord, S. M. (1986). Institutionalization of Innovations; Knowing When You Have It and When You Don't. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA), April.

Hall, G. E., and Hord, S. M. (1987). Change in School, Facilitating the Process. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Havelock, R.G. (1973). The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications, Inc.

Hord, S.; Rutherford, W. L.; Huling-Austin, L.; and Hall, G. E. (1987). Taking Charge of Change. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Huberman, A. M.,and Crandall, D. (1983). People, Policies, and Practices: Examining the chain of School Improvement. Vol. 9. Implications for Action, a Study of Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement. Andover, MA: The Network.

Huberman, A. M., and Miles, M. B. (1984a). Innovation up Close, How School Improvement Works. New York: Plenum Press.

Huberman, A. M., and Miles, M. B. (1984b) Rethinking School Improvement. Teachers College Record, 86 (1), 34-54.

Huling-Austin, L., Stiegelbauer, S., and Muscella, D. (1985). High School Principals: Their Role in Guiding Change. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL), April.

Illinois Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education (1984). Excellence in the Making: A Preliminary Report, July.

Illinois Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education (1988). Excellence in the Making: Revisited, June.

Illinois State Board of Education (1986). State Goals for Learning, September.

Joyce, B. and Showers, B. (1980). Improving Inservice Training: the Messages from Research. Educational Leadership. 37 (5), 379-385.

Joyce, B. and Showers, B. (1982). The Coaching of Teaching. Educational Leadership. 40 (1), 4-10.

Kanter, R. M. (1983). The Change Masters. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Leiberman, A. and Miller, L. (1986). School Improvement: Themes and Variations. In Rethinking School Improvement, Leiberman, A. (Ed.), New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Leiberman, A. and Rosenholtz, S. (1987). The Road to School Improvement: Barriers and Bridges. In The Ecology of School Renewal, Goodlad, J., (Ed.), Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Levine, A. (1980). Why Innovation Fails. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Lindquist, Jack (1978). Strategies for Change. Berkely, CA: Pacific Soundings Press.

Loucks, S. F., and Hall, G. E. (1979). Implementing Innovations in Schools: A Concerns-Based Approach. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA), April.

Madigan, M. J. , Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, State of Illinois (1985). Report of Education Reform and School Improvement, July.

McLaughlin, M. B., and Marsh, D. D. (1978). Staff Development and School Change. Teachers College Record, 80 (1), 69-94.

Miles, M. B. (1964). Innovation in Education. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

National Commission of Excellence in Education (1983). A Nation At Risk, Washington D.C.: United States Department of Education, April.

Peters, T., and Austin, N. (1985). A Passion for Excellence, the Leadership Difference. New York: Random House.

Roark, A. E., and Davis, Jr., W. E. (1981). Staff Development and Organization Development. In Staff Development/Organization Development. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Rogers, E. M., and Shoemaker, F. F. (1971). Communication of Innovations. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press, A Division of the Macmillan Company.

Rosenblum, S., and Louis, K. S. (1981). Stability and Change, Innovation In an Educational Context. New York: Plenum Press.

Sarason, S. B. (1982). The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Second Edition. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Tyler, R. W. (1973). Testing for Accountability. In Accountability for Teachers and School Administrators, Ornstein, A. (Ed.), Belmont, CA: Fearon Publishers/Lear Siegler, Inc.

Tyler, R. W. (1987). Education Reforms. Phi Delta Kappan, 69 (4), 277-280.

Tyler, R. W. (1988). Making Education Reform Work. The Education Digest, 8 (8), 14-16.

Waugh, R. F., and Punch, K. P. (1987). Teacher Receptivity to System-
wide Change in the Implementation Stage. Review of Education-
al Research, 57 (3), 237-254.

Wilson, B. L., and Corbett, H. D. (1983). Organization and Change: The
Effects of School Linkages on the Quantity of Implementation.
Educational Administration Quarterly, 19 (4), 85-104.

Wood, F. H., McQuarrie Jr., F. O., and Thompson, S. R. (1982). Prac-
titioners and Professors Agree on Effective Staff Development
Practices. Educational Leadership, 40 (1), 28-31.

Wood, F. H., Thompson, S. R., and Russell, Sr. F. (1981). Designing
Effective Staff Development Programs. In Staff Development/
Organization Development, Alexandria, VA: Association for
Supervision and Curriculum Development.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

STATE ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE

GRADES 3, 6, & 8:

Reading	1987-1988
Mathematics	1988-1989
Language Arts	1989-1990
Biological and Physical Sciences	1989-1990
Social Sciences	1990-1991
Fine Arts	1991-1992
Physical Development & Health	1992-1993

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

LAP ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT

School
District_____Phone__(____)_____

Contact
Person_____Title_____

Nature of Objectives?

Relationship of Objectives to State Learning Objectives?

Evaluation Instruments?

Relationship of Evaluation Instruments to Stated Goals?

Additional Information?

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

Dear Elementary or Junior High School Teacher:

Attached you will find a survey of your knowledge and opinions about the State Learner Outcomes. Of course, there are no right answers. Please answer the questions on the separate answer sheet, using a #2 pencil.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Kathleen Jensen

TEACHER SURVEY

In 1985, reform legislation was passed by the Illinois Legislature in an attempt to improve education throughout the state. As part of this legislation, the state established model learner outcomes in all major subject areas. Districts are required to respond to the state learner outcomes with their own learner outcomes, a plan for accomplishment, and a plan for assessment. The state also requires that student progress on local outcomes be reported to the community on the newly mandated "School Report Card."

The items which follow relate to your district's plan in the area of reading. Please respond in terms of your own knowledge about the plan. There are no right or wrong answers, but mark only one response to each item. If you find that more than one response is appropriate, choose the one which most closely describes your situation.

PART I -- DISTRICT READING PLAN FOR LEARNER OUTCOMES

1. Indicate the level of your knowledge of the state learner outcomes in the area of reading.

    ____ a.   I have not read them
    ____ b.   I am generally aware of their content
    ____ c.   I have examined them in some detail
    ____ d.   I have analyzed them in terms of our district objectives

2. To what extent do you feel the 1985 reform legislation will improve the quality of reading instruction throughout the state?

    ____ a. It will probably make very little difference in reading instruction

    ____ b. It may have some effect on reading instruction

    ____ c. It will improve reading instruction

    ____ d. It will greatly improve reading instruction

    ____ e. I don't know much about it

3. Do you think the state's model learner outcomes in reading are appropriate?

    ____ a. Yes

    ____ b. No

    ____ c. I'm not sure

    ____ d. I haven't read them

4. What impact do you feel the state learner outcomes will have on your district's reading instruction?

    ____ a. There will be no changes in instruction

    ____ b. There will be minor changes in instruction

    ____ c. There will be major changes in instruction

    ____ d. I'm not sure

5. Who developed your district learner outcome plan?

    ____ a. Central office personnel

    ____ b. Building administrators

    ____ c. A committee with a majority of teachers

    ____ d. Others _____

    ____ e. I'm not sure

6. What was the extent of teacher involvement in the process?

   ___ a. All teachers in the district had input
   ___ b. A majority of teachers in the district had input
   ___ c. Only the teachers on the committee had input
   ___ d. No teachers had input
   ___ e. I'm not sure

7. The source of the district's learner outcomes for the plan was the:

   ___ a. text book series.
   ___ b. state learner outcomes, basically unchanged.
   ___ c. state learner outcomes, modified to meet the district's needs.
   ___ d. district developed learner outcomes.
   ___ e. I'm not sure

8. As a result of the state learner plan for reading submitted by my district, the reading curriculum:

   ___ a. remains unchanged from last year.
   ___ b. was discussed at great length but remains essentially the same as last year.
   ___ c. was modified by the district to meet new district objectives.
   ___ d. was modified to more closely approximate the state learner outcomes.
   ___ e. I'm not sure

9. How closely do the state learner outcomes compare to your 1986-1987 (last year's) reading outcomes?

   ___ a. Very similar in approach to reading instruction
   ___ b. Somewhat different in approach to reading instruction
   ___ c. Very different in approach to reading instruction
   ___ d. I'm not sure

10. If you anticipate that there will be changes in the reading program, what will be the nature of the changes?

   ____ a.   Teaching methods
   ____ b.   Curriculum changes
   ____ c.   Changes in the types of tests
   ____ d.   I'm not sure
   ____ e.   I don't think our reading program will change

11. In response to the state learner outcomes in reading, I will probably:

   ____ a.   make no changes in reading instruction.
   ____ b.   place more emphasis on specific phonics skills.
   ____ c.   place more emphasis on specific comprehension skills.
   ____ d.   place more emphasis on student's awareness of the reading process.

12. The response of my principal to the state learner outcomes in reading has been to:

   ____ a.   ignore them.
   ____ b.   expect teachers to meet the learner outcomes in whatever ways they can.
   ____ c.   encourage and support teachers as they work to meet the learner outcomes.
   ____ d.   make the implementation of the learner outcomes an important building goal.

13. The response of the teachers in my school to the state learner outcomes in reading has been to:

   ____ a.   ignore them.
   ____ b.   individually implement the district plan.
   ____ c.   discuss them and work together to implement.

14. Because of the state-mandated learner outcomes, my teaching of reading will:

  ___ a. not change.
  ___ b. change somewhat.
  ___ c. change substantially.
  ___ d. probably change, but I'm not sure to what extent.

15. What tests will be used in your district to measure student performance on the district reading objectives?

  ___ a. Standardized general achievement tests (e.g., Iowa Test of Basic Skills)
  ___ b. Standardized reading tests (e.g., Metropolitan Reading Tests)
  ___ c. Tests designed by the publisher of the reading series
  ___.   Tests constructed by the district

16. How will you prepare your students for the state-wide reading test?

  ___ a. I will probably do nothing differently than I have done in the past
  ___ b. I will probably follow the district's learner outcome plan and rely on it to prepare my students for the test
  ___ c. I will probably incorporate the state learner outcomes in my daily instruction so students will be prepared for the test
  ___ d. My reading instruction will probably not change, but I will prepare students to take the test

PART II -- DISTRICT CURRICULA

The following items refer to the classroom in general or to your district in general. They are not limited to discussion of state mandated learner outcomes. There are no right answers. Please mark only one answer for each item. And as before, if you find that more than one response is appropriate, choose the one which most closely describes your situation.

17. In my district the curriculum in most subject areas consists of:

_____ a.   district developed curriculum guides.
_____ b.   teachers' editions of the adopted texts.
_____ c.   district curriculum guides and teachers' editions of the adopted texts.
_____ d.   individual teacher developed curricula and objectives.

18. When I teach reading, my objectives primarily come from a:

_____ a.   district reading curriculum guide.
_____ b.   combination of the district curriculum guide and the reading basal series.
_____ c.   basal series.
_____ d.   curriculum I developed for my own classroom.

ANSWER EITHER QUESTION 19 OR 20

19. In my district, curriculum changes occur irregularly

If irregularly, indicate what causes the curriculum to change:

_____ a.   Outdated textbooks
_____ b.   School Board recommendations
_____ c.   Administration recommendations
_____ d.   Teacher committee recommendations

20. In my district, curriculum changes occur on a regular cycle

If on a regular cycle, how frequently do the major subject areas change?

_____ a. Approximately every 3-4 years
_____ b. Approximately every 5-6 years
_____ c. Approximately every 7-8 years
_____ d. Approximately every 9-10 years

21. In my district, if a teacher proposed a curriculum change he would:

_____ a. be allowed to make the change.
_____ b. need to explain the rationale, then might be allowed to make the change.
_____ c. need to convince the entire building staff to make the change.
_____ d. need to convince the entire district to make the change.
_____ e. need to submit the change so that it could be considered when the curriculum is scheduled to be revised.

22. What district-wide curriculum changes have occurred in your district in the last five years?

_____ a. None
_____ b. Only those which resulted from the adoption of new textbooks
_____ c. Only those mandated by state guidelines
_____ d. One subject area of the curriculum has been reviewed and revised at the district level
_____ e. More than one subject area of the curriculum has been reviewed and revised at the district level

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX D

ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY

In 1985, reform legislation was passed by the Illinois Legislature in an attempt to improve education throughout the state. As part of this legislation, the state established model learner outcomes in all major subject areas. Districts are required to respond to the state learner outcomes with their own learner outcomes, a plan for accomplishment, and a plan for assessment. The state also requires that student progress on local outcomes be reported to the community on the newly mandated "School Report Card".

The items which follow relate to your district's plan in the area of reading. Please respond in terms of your own knowledge about the plan. There are no right or wrong answers, but mark only one response to each item. If you find that more than one response is appropriate, choose the one which most closely describes your situation.

PART I -- DISTRICT READING PLAN FOR LEARNER OUTCOMES

1. Indicate the level of your knowledge of the state learner outcomes in the area of reading.

    ___ a.   I have not read them
    ___ b.   I am generally aware of their content
    ___ c.   I have examined them in some detail
    ___ d.   I have analyzed them in terms of our district objectives

2. To what extent do you feel the 1985 reform legislation will improve the quality of reading instruction throughout the state?

   ___ a. It will probably make very little difference in reading instruction
   ___ b. It may have some effect on reading instruction
   ___ c. It will improve reading instruction
   ___ d. It will greatly improve reading instruction
   ___ e. I don't know much about it

3. Do you think the state's model learner outcomes in reading are appropriate?

   ___ a. Yes
   ___ b. No
   ___ c. I'm not sure
   ___ d. I haven't read them

4. What impact do you feel the state learner outcomes will have on your district's reading instruction?

   ___ a. There will be no changes in instruction
   ___ b. There will be minor changes in instruction
   ___ c. There will be major changes in instruction
   ___ d. I'm not sure

5. Who developed your district learner outcome plan?

   ___ a. Central office personnel
   ___ b. Building administrators
   ___ c. A committee with a majority of teachers
   ___ d. Others _____
   ___ e. I'm not sure

6. What was the extent of teacher involvement in the process?

   ____ a. All teachers in the district had input
   ____ b. A majority of teachers in the district had input
   ____ c. Only the teachers on the committee had input
   ____ d. No teachers had input
   ____ e. I'm not sure

7. The source of the district's learner outcomes for the plan was the:

   ____ a. text book series.
   ____ b. state learner outcomes, basically unchanged.
   ____ c. state learner outcomes, modified to meet the district's needs.
   ____ d. district developed learner outcomes.
   ____ e. I'm not sure

8. As a result of the state learner plan for reading submitted by my district, the reading curriculum:

   ____ a. remains unchanged from last year.
   ____ b. was discussed at great length but remains essentially the same as last year.
   ____ c. was modified by the district to meet new district objectives.
   ____ d. was modified to more closely approximate the state learner outcomes.
   ____ e. I'm not sure

9. How closely do the state learner outcomes compare to your 1986-1987 (last year's) reading outcomes?

   ____ a. Very similar in approach to reading instruction
   ____ b. Somewhat different in approach to reading instruction
   ____ c. Very different in approach to reading instruction
   ____ d. I'm not sure

10. If you anticipate that there will be changes in the reading program, what will be the nature of the changes?

  ____ a. Teaching methods
  ____ b. Curriculum changes
  ____ c. Changes in the types of tests
  ____ d. I'm not sure
  ____ e. I don't think our reading program will change

11. In response to the state learner outcomes in reading, our teachers will probably:

  ____ a. make no changes in reading instruction.
  ____ b. place more emphasis on specific phonic skills.
  ____ c. place more emphasis on specific comprehension skills.
  ____ d. place more emphasis on student's awareness of the reading process.

12. The response of my principals to the state learner outcomes in reading has been to:

  ____ a. ignore them.
  ____ b. expect teachers to meet the learner outcomes in whatever ways they can.
  ____ c. encourage and support as they work to meet the learner outcomes.
  ____ d. make implementation of the learner outcomes an important building goal.

13. The response of the teachers in my district to the state learner outcomes in reading has been to:

  ____ a. ignore them.
  ____ b. individually implement the district plan.
  ____ c. discuss them and work together to implement.

14. Because of the state-mandated learner outcomes, the teaching of reading in my district will:

  ___ a.   not change.
  ___ b.   change somewhat.
  ___ c.   change substantially.
  ___ d.   probably change, but I'm not sure to what extent.

15. What tests will be used in your district to measure student performance on the district reading objectives?

  ___ a.   Standardized general achievement tests (e.g., Iowa Test of Basic Skills)
  ___ b.   Standardized reading tests (e.g., Metropolitan Reading Tests)
  ___ c.   Tests designed by the publisher of the reading series
  ___ d.   Tests constructed by the district

16. How will your teachers prepare students for the state-wide reading test?

  ___ a.   They will probably do nothing differently than they have done in the past
  ___ b.   They will probably follow the district's learner outcome plan and rely on it to prepare students for the test
  ___ c.   They will probably incorporate the state learner outcomes in their daily instruction so students will be prepared for the test
  ___ d.   Reading instruction will probably not change, but teachers will prepare students to take the test

PART II -- DISTRICT CURRICULA

The following items refer to the classroom in general or to your district in general. They are not limited to discussion of state mandated learner outcomes. There are no right answers. Please mark only one answer for each item. And as before, if you find that more than one response is appropriate, choose the one which most closely describes your situation.

17. In my district the curriculum in most subject areas consists of:

    ____ a. district developed curriculum guides.
    ____ b. teachers' editions of the adopted texts.
    ____ c. district curriculum guides and teachers' editions of the adopted texts.
    ____ d. individual teacher developed curricula and objectives.

18. When our teachers teach reading, their objectives primarily come from a:

    ____ a. district reading curriculum guide.
    ____ b. combination of the district curriculum guide and the reading basal series.
    ____ c. basal series.
    ____ d. curriculum developed for the individual classroom.

ANSWER EITHER QUESTION 19 OR 20

19. In my district, curriculum changes occur irregularly

If irregularly, indicate what causes the curriculum to change

    ____ a. Outdated textbooks
    ____ b. School Board recommendations
    ____ c. Administration recommendations
    ____ d. Teacher committee recommendations

20. In my district, curriculum changes occur on a regular cycle

If on a regular cycle, how frequently do the major subject areas change?

_____ a. Approximately every 3-4 years
_____ b. Approximately every 5-6 years
_____ c. Approximately every 7-8 years
_____ d. Approximately every 9-10 years

21. In my district, if teachers proposed a curriculum change they would:

_____ a. be allowed to make the change.
_____ b. need to explain the rationale, and then might be allowed to make the change.
_____ c. need to convince the entire building staff to make the change.
_____ d. need to convince the entire district to make the change.
_____ e. need to submit the change so that it could be considered when the curriculum is scheduled to be revised.

22. What district-wide curriculum changes have occurred in your district in the last five years?

_____ a. None
_____ b. Only those which resulted from the adoption of new textbooks
_____ c. Only those mandated by state guidelines
_____ d. One subject area of the curriculum has been reviewed and revised at the district level
_____ e. More than one subject area of the curriculum has been reviewed and revised at the district level

23. What reading program are you presently using?

24. How did your district utilize the money allocated by the state for reading improvement?

25. When the state reading assessment was administered in April, 1988, how were your teachers informed and involved?

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX E

ISBE ASSESSMENT DATA

Following are assessment portions of the Instructions for Completing the Learning Assessment Plan sent to each district in the spring of 1987 by the Illinois State Board of Education.

Section A -- Types of Assessment

Use the codes listed below to indicate the type(s) of assessment(s) which the district will use to assess each objective. The spacing on the form allows for three entries, but fewer or more codes may be entered, depending on the district's assessment system.

A = Publisher's standardized shelf test

B = Publisher's customized test

C = Publisher's textbook test

D = District's locally developed test

E = Standardized direct writing examination(s) scored according to a uniform rating scale

F = Standardized performance scored according to a uniform rating scale

G = Other (Describe on a separate sheet)

Section B -- Validity and Reliability

Use the following codes(s) to indicate the assessment's validity and reliability.

1 = Publisher's assurance

2 = Assurance of district personnel who have matched the assessment with the district's curriculum

3 = Emperical data and results

4 = Other (Describe on a separate sheet)

Section C -- Commercial Test(s)

This section must be completed if a district has indicated in Section A that it plans to use a publisher's standardized shelf test (Code A) for any objective.

Use the codes listed to indicate the commercially developed test(s) which the district will use to assess the objectives.

Commercially Developed Standardized Test Batteries

001 Basic Educational Skills Inventory

002 California Achievement Tests

003 Comprehensive Assessment Program

004 Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills

005 Criterion Tests of Basic Skills

006 Everyday Skills Test

007 Individualized Criterion-Referenced Test

008 Iowa Test of Basic Skills

009 Iowa Test of Educational Development

010 Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement

011 Metropolitan Achievement Test

012 National Educational Development Test

013 Objective-Referenced Banks of Items and Tests (ORBIT)

014 Scholastic Testing Service Educational Development
Series

015 Sequential Tests of Educational Progress

016 SRA Achievement Series

017 Stanford Achievement Test Series

018 Stanford Test of Academic Skills

019 Survey of Basic Competencies

020 Wide Range Achievement Test

021 Woodcock Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery

099 Other (Specify on separate sheet)

Commercially Developed Standardized Reading Tests

101 California Reading Test

102 Degrees of Reading Power (DRP)

103 Durrell Analysis of Reading

104 Gates-McGinitie Reading Test

105 Nelson Reading Skills Test

106 Peabody Individual Achievement Test

107 Performance Assessment in Reading

108 Prescriptive Reading Inventory

109 Senior High Assessment of Reading Performance (SHARP)

110 Slosson Oral Reading Test (SORT)

111 Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test

112 Stanford Reading Achievement Test

113 Woodcock Reading Mastery

199 Other (Specify on separate sheet)

APPENDIX F

APPENDIX F

STATE SAMPLE LEARNING OBJECTIVES FOR GOAL 1 (READING)

Given the readers' prior knowledge and reading material with appropriate vocabulary demands, sentence complexity, organizational plan, and concept load, students should be able to:

A1 Locate information that is explicitly stated in the text.

A2 Remember the information that is explicitly stated in the text and restate this information in their own words.

A3 Summarize the important ideas of the text and the important supporting details.

B1 Ask questions and make predictions about a passage prior to reading, based upon prior knowledge and the limited information about the passage contained in the title, pictures or other introductory material.

B2 Ask questions and make predictions about a passage while reading taking into account all of the important information available up to that point in the reading.

B3 Ask questions after reading that take into account the entire text read and are used to clarify and to review the information.

C1 Understand a variety of reasons for reading such as learning of new information, use of text to accomplish the readers'

goals, social interaction, entertainment, and self-exploration.

C2 Use appropriate texts such as fiction, nonfiction, poetry, letters, directions, and reference material to accomplish the various purposes for reading.

D1 Understand the difficulties of the text (vocabulary demands, content, organization, author's purpose), requirements of the task (what is expected as a result of reading), and their own knowledge, abilities and motivation.

D2 Adjust their strategies for reading and understanding, using decoding skills, context clues, self-questioning, predicting, reference materials, rereading, and adjustment of reading speed based on the demands of the reading situtation.

E1 Make inferences about the text such as unknown vocabulary, causal relationships, author's purpose, characters' emotions and motives, mood and tone using information from the text and prior knowledge.

E2 Explain the rationale for inferences made using the information from the text and from the readers' knowledge.

F1 Use, synthesize and analyze information from a variety of sources to enhance understanding, e.g., form opinions based upon a variety of information, to compare/contrast, to verify information and to expand knowledge.

G1 Explain and verify answers to questions about what has been read.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Kathleen Becker Jensen has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Barney M. Berlin, Director
Associate Professor, Curriculum, Loyola

Dr. Robert C. Cienkus
Associate Professor, Curriculum, Loyola

Dr. Jack Kavanagh
Professor, Curriculum, Loyola

Dr. Diane Schiller
Associate Professor, Curriculum, Loyola

Dr. Ralph W. Tyler
Visiting Professor Emeritus, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Nov 21, 1988
Date

Director's Signature