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The purpose of this study was to analyze strategies utilized by high school department heads in initiating or implementing change. The study focused on department heads in English, social studies, foreign language, science, and math in high schools in the Chicago metropolitan area having an enrollment of more than 2,000 students, and persons serving as department head in each of these five departments. Department heads were interviewed extensively in nine high schools.

Variables studied were:

1. Strategies utilized by department heads in attempting change.
2. Involvement of significant others, especially the building principal, in the change effort.
3. Success or failure of the change effort as perceived by the department head.

Thirty-eight department heads were interviewed. Responses were scripted and additional interviews or telephone calls were made as needed. Results were presented in narrative form.

Findings:

1. Most high school department heads perceive themselves as lacking enough time to play an active role in the change process.
2. Department head perceptions of the expectations held for them by building and central office administrators influence their sense of political efficacy.

3. Department heads concentrate most of their change efforts in the area of curriculum.

4. Department heads are more successful in implementing change initiated above them in the hierarchy than in implementing changes initiated themselves.

5. Department heads work with and through the administrator they perceive as most knowledgeable and interested in their change efforts.

6. Those department heads most successful in change efforts understand the political nature of change.

7. Most department heads do not consciously develop strategies for change, but develop them intuitively.

Recommendations:

1. Principals and others who expect department heads to be leaders and active in the change process must communicate these expectations to the department heads.

2. Department heads should be given training in performing a leadership role in change.

3. Department heads should look to improvement of instruction as one of their primary duties.

4. Department heads need to become aware of schools as political institutions.
CHAPTER I

Change occurs whether we like it or not. We may agree or disagree with its direction, its pace, or its substance. We may decide to work toward facilitating the change or make an effort to hinder it. We may even be passive about the entire process.

Much change in high schools occurs over a period of time without planning and with no sense of direction. Schools could benefit much better from change implemented via planned strategies.

Much has been written about change in general or change in entire systems or schools. The literature has focused on the role of the building principal, justifiably so, for the person in that position is certainly one key to any change effort within a high school. Assistant principals and central office administrators have much influence on the change process and have also been studied.¹

The high school department head stands on middle ground between the building principal and the classroom teachers. This person has both teaching and administrative responsibilities and is in a critical position from which to either facilitate or hinder change efforts. However, there have been few studies on the role of the department department

head, and fewer even on the role of the high school department head in the change process.²

The purpose of this dissertation is to analyze the strategies utilized by high school department heads in initiating or implementing change. Findings should aid in better understanding the process of change at the high school level and why some efforts succeed and others fail. These findings should also aid in developing future strategies that involve the department head at the high school level in an active role in the change process.

The study concentrates on the following variables:

1. Strategies utilized by department heads in attempting to change the curriculum or instructional program.
2. Involvement of significant others, especially the building principal, in the change effort.
3. Differences in strategies depending upon whether the change is initiated by the department head or someone else.
4. Relationship of demographic characteristics of the department head to the change strategies/efforts.
5. Success or failure of the change effort as perceived by the department head.

Definition of Terms

1. DEPARTMENT HEAD: That person at the high school level who has both teaching duties in a specific subject field, e.g., math, and administrative duties within that department as assigned by the building principal. This person reports to and is responsible to the building principal and coordinates activities within the specific department. This person may teach one, more than one, or no classes, but is designated as the department head by the building principal.

2. STRATEGY: "...a general set of policies underlying specific action steps ('tactics') expected to be useful in achieving the durable installation of a particular innovation." Further, it considers the innovation itself, the change process, characteristics of target individuals or groups and the nature of the adopting system. It can be considered a "planned and systematic attack on a problem."

3. CHANGE: "...a making or becoming distinctly different, an alteration, a variation, a modification, a transformation,

---


or a conversion.\textsuperscript{6} It is a movement away from the status quo.\textsuperscript{7}

**Theoretical Framework**

Jacob W. Getzels, James M. Lipham, and R. F. Campbell argue that each organization has cultural, structural, and personal elements. These are not static but dynamic values, expectations, and dispositions.\textsuperscript{8} Each exerts pressure on the others and a change in any one affects the others. For every pressure for a change there is a counterpressure against the change. A person's or institution's behavior is influenced by these pressures for and against change. An organization tends toward equilibrium. It reacts to modify the change by bringing it into balance with the present or status quo.\textsuperscript{9}

Daniel E. Griffiths also states that organizations resist change and tend toward stability. When organizations change, the change will be either in small increments or it will be radical. He argues that:

...change is an alteration in the structure of the organization, in any of its processes, or in its goals or processes....There are different degrees of change; a variation in a teacher's lunchroom assignment might be considered a minor change, and the recon-


\textsuperscript{9}Ibid., 152-155.
stituting of a public school system to include a junior college might be considered a major change.

Since systems tend to keep themselves in a steady state, change is infrequent. Major impetus for change comes from outside the system rather than from within. Organizations tend to have a self-regulating mechanism which causes them to revert toward the original state following a minor change. Because of hierarchical structure change usually occurs from the top down; it is almost impossible to change the organization from the bottom up. The degree and the duration of change is directly proportional to the level of pressure from outside the system. Change is more likely to occur if the successor to the chief administrator comes from outside the system rather than from within. The longer the tenure of the chief administrator the fewer the changes. The more hierarchical the structure of the organization the less likely there will be the possibility of significant change. And, the more the subsystems (e.g., high school departments) are involved in dynamic functional interplay, the less likely the change. This is because a change in one subsystem leads to change in others, and the others thus resist the original change. 11

If Getzels et al., and Griffiths prove correct, high school departments will resist change. The building principal or superintendent should play an important role in creating change, and the department


11Ibid., 425-436.
head should utilize persons above him in the hierarchy, at least minimally, in any change effort.

**Scope Of The Study**

This study concentrates on strategies utilized by department heads in attempting to change the curriculum or other aspects of the instructional program within respective departments at the high school level in the Chicago suburban area. High school department heads are in positions whereby they must implement change mandated from above them in the hierarchy, may attempt to initiate or implement their own changes within departments, or may hinder or facilitate changes originating from classroom teachers.

This study focuses on department heads in high schools with more than 2000 students because these schools are large enough to have departmental divisions and heads. These schools and departments tend to offer quite similar curricula and instructional programs.

Departments studied are limited to those of English, social studies, math, science, and foreign language, because these are most likely to have department heads, and they are under almost constant pressure from the public to change.

**Guiding Questions**

1) Have department heads developed and utilized strategies to initiate or implement change?

2) Are most successful departmental change efforts those in which the department head has the definite support of the building principal?
3) Do department heads tend to view minor change efforts as more successful than major change efforts? A minor change effort could be considered changing the shades in a classroom; a major change could be adopting team teaching or a different teaching style. Do department heads tend to concentrate on changing "minor" things at the sake of "major" things?

Procedure

In determining which high schools should be selected for the study of the role of the department head in the change process, it was decided to consider only schools with an enrollment of two thousand or more students. Schools of that size are large enough to have separate divisions called departments. These schools are complex institutions that have rather large departments. Schools with an enrollment of under two thousand students might tend to operate without department heads. It was determined to study high schools in the Chicago suburban area, for many of the large high schools in the state are there.

The Illinois High School Association listed a total of eighty-one high schools in the state, outside the city of Chicago, with an enrollment of two thousand or more students at the beginning of the 1987-1988 school year. There were thirteen high schools in Chicago with an enrollment of two thousand or more students.

An analysis of the high schools in suburban Cook and DuPage counties found thirty-five high schools meeting the criterion of an enrollment of two thousand or more students. This represented approximately 43.2% of all high schools in the state outside Chicago,
with an enrollment of more than two thousand students. If Chicago were
included in the state total the same thirty-five high schools repre­
tsented approximately 37.2% of the large high schools in Illinois.

Further analysis of the data demonstrated that there were a
total of fifty-eight high schools in suburban Cook County and a total
of twenty-one high schools in DuPage County. Limiting the study to
high schools with an enrollment of two thousand or more students cre­
ated a sample of each of the counties as well as the state. In subur­
ban Cook County twenty-six of the fifty-eight high schools had an
enrollment of two thousand or more. In DuPage County nine high schools
had an enrollment of two thousand or more. Limiting the study to
schools with two thousand or more enrollment meant that approximately
45% of the suburban Cook County schools and approximately 43% of the
DuPage County schools qualified.

The second of the criteria utilized in limiting the study was
that each high school sampled had to have department heads in each of
the five academic areas - math, science, foreign languages, English,
and social science. These departments were selected because they are
common in most high schools having department heads and these are areas
most likely to be under constant pressure to change. The pressure to
change in recent years has come from the "back-to-the-basics" movement
as well as reform legislation on the state level.

A survey was developed to use as a device to validate enroll­
ments and to determine whether the school utilized the departmental
organization. Further, the survey asked each building principal for
permission to interview department heads in the building. It also
asked the principal to check whether the department head was male or female, had been in the position for three years or longer, and if the department head was allowed to be a member of the teacher collective bargaining organization for that school. Data collected assisted in understanding the strategies utilized by department heads in initiating or implementing change within their departments.

Surveys were mailed to the thirty-five principals. Included was a letter outlining the purpose of the study, a letter from the department head of Leadership and Policy Studies at Loyola University assuring principals that the study was part of the requirements for the doctorate, and a stamped, self-addressed envelope in which to return the survey.

Twenty-nine of the thirty-five surveys were returned. A second request to the remaining six schools was mailed, with a return request of ten days later. Four additional responses were received as a result of this request. This brought the total response to the survey of building principals to thirty-three out of the thirty-five that had qualified by enrollment. This represented a 94.3% response to the survey.

Of the twenty-six surveys mailed to high schools in suburban Cook County, twenty-four were returned, a percentage of approximately 92.3%. Of the nine surveys mailed to DuPage high schools, all were returned, a percentage of 100%.

Analysis of the results of the survey eliminated several schools from the study. Five high schools were eliminated because their enrollment had dropped to below two thousand students. One of these was
in DuPage County; four were in suburban Cook County. Six additional schools were eliminated from the study because they did not have a department head in each of the five subject areas. One of these was from DuPage County; five were from suburban Cook County. Three schools were eliminated because the principal did not grant complete permission to interview the department heads. All three that denied permission were in suburban Cook County. One principal indicated that his department heads were involved in long-range strategic planning and that he did not wish to burden them with additional duties at the time. One principal would allow interviews with only two of his department heads. Another principal neither refused nor granted permission, stating that he could not speak for his department heads. An additional high school in suburban Cook County was eliminated because there was not a foreign language department head for that single school, but one person who served as department head for all three high schools in the district.

The remaining twenty-one high schools met all the requirements. They had an enrollment of more than two thousand students, utilized the department head in the five departments under consideration, and the principal granted permission to interview each of the department heads.

Of these twenty-one high schools seven are in DuPage County and fourteen are in suburban Cook County. One of the DuPage County schools was eliminated from the study to eliminate bias, for it was the high school of the person conducting the study. This reduced to twenty the total number of schools qualifying.

It was further determined to conduct interviews at only one high school in any one district. Random sampling of schools within each
district reduced the number of schools where interviews would be conducted to a total of nine. Five of the high schools were in suburban Cook County and four of the high schools were in DuPage County. Geographically the schools ranged from the south suburbs to the north suburbs, with a majority of the final nine schools being in the west suburbs.

Letters were mailed to each of the department heads in each of these nine high schools — introducing the researcher, indicating the purpose of the study, acknowledging that the building principal had approved the interview, and alerting them that a phone call would be made to establish an interview time and date.

Interviews were scheduled by school. In six of the nine high schools all department heads were interviewed on the same day. In three high schools interviews with department heads had to be scheduled on two separate days. Each department head was guaranteed confidentiality and anonymity. The researcher developed a list of coded names for the high schools and department heads in advance of the interviews, and utilized these codes in sorting, analyzing, and describing schools and department heads.

The high schools and names of department heads were coded as follows (these are not actual names):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH SCHOOLS</th>
<th>NAMES OF DEPARTMENT HEAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>Unger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Buren</td>
<td>Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Fischer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>Miner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all department heads in all nine schools were able to keep their interview appointments. Several decided to cancel and not re-
schedule interviews. However, out of a possible forty-five interviews, thirty-eight were actually conducted.

Each department head was interviewed in the department office. Interviews were scripted as completely and thoroughly as possible. Telephone calls were made later, if needed, to clarify any unclear points or to obtain a more thorough answer to questions.

Each department head was asked to spend a short time in providing such basic information as the number of years as department head, sex, number of teachers in the department, number of classes taught by the department head, whether the department head evaluated teachers, and whether he or she could join the teachers' union or association.

The largest part of the interview consisted of obtaining information on the role of the department head in the change process. Each department head was asked five open-ended questions and encouraged to expand upon any answers. Other questions were asked to clarify, to get the department head to illustrate points, to delve deeper, or to bring the department head back to the basic questions.

The following five questions, based on the variables of the study, were asked of each department head interviewed:

1. Can you think of and explain several changes within your department in which you have played a role in the past few years?

2. What strategies did you utilize in making these changes? How did you plan and carry out your change effort?
3. What problems or resistance did you encounter? How did you attempt to overcome these?

4. What was the role of the principal relative to the changes attempted? What role did others play?

5. What would you do differently the next time you plan to change something within your department?

Interviews ranged in length from forty-five minutes to two hours. Scripts were typed verbatim that same day. Phone calls were made the following day to clarify the data as needed.

Analysis of the data occurred as they were collected and trends and patterns noted for further study. The data themselves and conclusions and recommendations for further study were then written in narrative form. Specific examples of changes and strategies were interspersed throughout the narrative to give insight into conclusions and recommendations.

**Summary**

Change occurs in high schools and the department head can play an instrumental role in that change. It is important to understand that role and the strategies utilized in order to better understand the process of change. This knowledge can be utilized in efforts at strategic planning in the future.
CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE.

Most department heads are classroom teachers, with responsibil-
ities in the classroom as well as department-related duties. The de-
partment head has five major functions in addition to that of teach-
ing. First, the person serves as a communication liaison. This
function includes communication within and throughout the department.
The department head serves as the link between teachers and school
administrators, meeting with both groups periodically. He or she
carries information upward to both building principal and central
office administration, and downward to the department level. He or she
coordinates course schedules and assists in placing students in ap-
propriate classes.

The second major function of the department head is to serve as
department manager. Activities involved are conducting meetings, des-
igning the department budget, selecting textbooks, maintaining material
and equipment systems, assisting teachers in using equipment, supervis-
ing aides, obtaining, monitoring, and helping substitute teachers,
assisting in teacher evaluation and conferences, helping in the hiring
and termination of teachers.

12Shirley M. Hord and Sheila Murphey, The High School Department
Head: Powerful or Powerless in Guiding Change, A paper presented at
the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association,
The third major function is to assist teachers in improving instruction. This function includes observing and assessing instruction, conferring with teachers, assisting teachers, planning in-service, and planning and encouraging teacher professional growth.

The fourth major function is to participate in program improvement and change. This function requires that the department head assess program quality, review and evaluate materials, keep informed of innovations, stimulate teachers to improve, and lead in curriculum change.

The fifth major function is to foster cooperative relationships within the department, the school, and the community.

Department heads do not uniformly perform these functions in this order. Communication is performed more often than evaluation but the latter is the most powerful function, for it places the department head in a line rather than a staff position.

The department head has been called an advocator, innovator, investigator, administrator, promoter, reporter, teacher, and politician. This person is the essential link between the faculty and the administration, having powers delegated by the principal. One study shows that 80% of administrative decisions are made at the level of the department head. Some department heads view themselves as line personnel in an administrative role. This view is shared by principals but teachers view department heads as teachers and staff personnel.13

---

13 Gerald E. Marcial, "Department Supervisors – Are They Line or Staff Administrators?" NASSP Bulletin 68, no. 472 (May, 1984), 87-90.
The position of department head was created in part by increased managerial and supervisory functions as high schools grew in size, and the result of increased departmentalization accompanying this growth. The department head's role is essentially as defined by the building principal. It was common as recently as 1976 for department heads to have only one released period from teaching duties, and to have this filled with administrative duties. This lack of time to perform instructional leadership activities appeared to be a problem that was nationwide and persistent since the 1950's. Paul High argued in 1965 that the department head could be an instructional leader if expected by the principal to be so and is given time during the day. In 1970, in a study of North Central Association high schools, it was found that 91% of the schools had department heads, and that the number of heads per school ranged from 8 to 12, depending upon the size of the school. Approximately two out of three had job descriptions; only one out of four had received any training for the role; two out of three received released time; two out of three received additional pay; four out of five were appointed; and seven out of eight reported to the principal directly. Approximately 82% of the department heads had only one released period, while 16% had two released periods. Only 2% had more than two released periods.

In a survey of department heads in South Carolina in 1983, it was found that only one in four had a job description, and one in four had qualifications beyond those required to teach. Forty-two percent received release time, and of those receiving released time, ninety-six percent received one period. 17

In 1983 Harold Turner reported that the department head could be a leader but that this would require changing the role description and giving this person more released time and more training. 18 Increasing the involvement of the department head in the instructional program is more likely to have greater impact on student achievement than efforts that focus directly upon increasing classroom performance of teachers. 19 Yet teachers do not have strong perceptions of the department chair as instructional leader. 20 In a study done in 1974, department chairs viewed themselves as teachers, were likely to belong to the teacher's union, and were probably not selected on the basis of leadership ability. 21


21 Frederick M. Raubinger, Merle R. Sumption, and Richard M. Kamm, Leadership in the Secondary School (Columbus, OH.: Charles E. Merrill, 1974), 276.
Another constraint in addition to lack of time is contractual. Negotiated teacher contracts limit the power of department heads; and often these heads are members of the bargaining unit themselves. Department heads do not see their roles as carrying power or authority. Other constraints may be found in the principal's or district's formal or informal policies. Further, the lack of adequate monetary compensation may serve to depress the motivation to assume a more active role. The lack of proper training means that each department head role will be idiosyncratically developed. Finally, the political process of selection and seniority as the criteria of selection, tend to hinder the effectiveness of the role. 22

In summary, there have been studies during the past three decades that demonstrate that the department head could be a leader in the high school and that the department head could be active in the change process. At the same time these studies cite many constraints upon the person in fulfilling these expectations. Since these studies consistently cite the lack of leadership there appears to be little difference in the leadership role of the department head over the past twenty-five years.

General Models Of Change

There are many models or theories on change in an educational setting. In 1964 Matthew B. Miles stated that the success of innovations (changes) is influenced more by the characteristics of the local

system, individuals, and groups than by the merit of the change itself. However, there are important qualities of the change itself that help or hinder its chance of success:

1. cost
2. technological factors such as convenience of use
3. adaptability by the local system
4. implementation supports such as guides to use
5. innovation/system congruence.\(^{23}\)

Further, the innovation needs the support of either an internal or external group. Most change comes from pressure outside the system. Administrators are in a critical position and their support is essential. The support of other high status individuals within the system should also be recruited.\(^{24}\)

Forces within the system can facilitate or hinder the implementation of an innovation. A system tends toward equilibrium and resists change. Internal pressures for change such as growth, conflict among sub-systems, and discrepancies between real and ideal practices, set a climate for change. Other internal factors such as finances, readiness, and the culture of the organization could serve to inhibit change.\(^{25}\)

Change often fails for several reasons:

1. incongruence with existing norms

---


\(^{24}\) Ibid., 639-643.

\(^{25}\) Ibid., 643-647.
2. inadequate planning
3. failure to prepare teachers for change
4. lack of commitment
5. deficiencies in resources or power
6. sheer ignorance
7. lack of a compelling reason for change
8. experience with innovations. 26

Theodore Herbert argues that we need to understand the process of change in order to manage change, because improperly managed change can bring resentment, sabotage, and diminished work effectiveness.

There are three types of change - intentional, imposed, and adaptive. Intentional change is the decision to change a situation to help achieve goals. Imposed change is that which is forced upon the organization by others. Adaptive change is informal modification. Two factors favoring change are recognition that a problem exists, or the emergence of a crisis. Factors hindering change are organizational and human needs for predictability and stability. 27

Zaltman, Florio, and Sikorski believe there are five factors influencing change:

1. organizational climate
2. organizational environment
3. relationship between the system and the environment
4. individual characteristics of the members

26 Ibid., 657-660.

5. the nature and attributes of the change.\textsuperscript{28}

Forces for change in education are:

1. perception of a performance gap
2. unrealistic expectations
3. upward adjustment of expectations
4. new personnel
5. new treatment of existing personnel
6. change in power relationships
7. reference group
8. social value of output
9. client group
10. external forces
11. personal frustration
12. other – such as money, need for security, etc.\textsuperscript{29}

Forces resisting change in education are:

1. cultural barriers
2. social barriers
3. organizational barriers
4. psychological barriers
5. the innovation itself.\textsuperscript{30}

Some forces may hinder or facilitate change:

1. the politics of peer and authority relations


\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 21-29.

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 29-44.
2. personal attitudes, including ambition, and talent
3. characteristics of the change
4. physical and temporal arrangements. 31

Most changes in education are externally generated. Zaltman believes that there are four general models of change – environmental, organizational, a combination of the two, and individual. 32

The environmental model is essentially a political one in which society controls change, including goals, resources, and outcomes. The steps are: development of concern, diffusion, legitimation, adoption, and adaptation. 33

The organizational change model has two major steps: initiation and implementation. Initiation is the stage in which people gain awareness and knowledge, form attitudes, and make a decision regarding change. The implementation stage includes initial implementation, and continued sustained implementation. Organizational characteristics such as complexity, formalization, centralization, interpersonal relations, and ability to deal with conflict affect the stages of a change. Many changes are initiated, few implemented. 34

The authoritative/participative models vary according to the origin of change. The authoritative model includes the stages of knowledge, persuasion, decision, communication, and action. The col-

31 Ibid., 30-31.
32 Ibid., 54.
33 Ibid., 54-56.
34 Ibid., 56-61.
lective (participative) model includes stimulation, initiation, legitimation, decision, and action.\textsuperscript{35}

There are eight stages of change that can be collaborative or non-collaborative:

1. planned change
2. indoctrination
3. coercive
4. technocratic
5. interactional
6. socialization
7. emulative
8. natural.\textsuperscript{36}

The individual change model is one in which the person becomes aware of a need, gains knowledge, comprehension, conviction, and adapts.\textsuperscript{37}

Loucks-Horsley and Herget list seven steps for improving (changing) a school system:

1. establish the school improvement project
2. assess the situation and set goals
3. identify the ideal situation
4. prepare for implementation
5. implement the change
6. review

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., 61-62.
\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., 62-64.
\textsuperscript{37}Ibid., 64-66.
7. maintain and institutionalize the change.  

Another model of change is the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) developed by the Southwest Regional Education Lab in Texas. For each stage of concern upon the part of people there is an appropriate intervention:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE OF CONCERN</th>
<th>INTERVENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0—Awareness</td>
<td>Share info; decree use; encourage discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1—Informational</td>
<td>Provide info; enthusiasm; opportunity to observe use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2—Personal Concerns</td>
<td>Create rapport; encourage; gradual introduction; support; legitimate expression of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3—Management Concerns</td>
<td>Concentrate on &quot;how-to-do-it.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4—Consequence Concerns</td>
<td>Encourage; reinforce; provide info; send to conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5—Collaboration Concern</td>
<td>Arrange meeting of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6. Refocusing Concerns

Help focus energy in positive direction and encourage teachers to be trainers. 39

The Rand Study of Implementation of several federal programs such as Title III, Title VII, and the Vocational Education Act determined three stages of change—initiation, implementation, incorporation. The key is whether the change was implemented through "mutual adaptation." The receiving school had to change but the innovation had to be changed to meet local needs. 40

Czajowski and Patterson, in discussing curriculum, state three stages—initiation, development, and implementation. Critical to any change is readiness to change. 41

Approximately two decades ago three studies of change emphasized concepts that are still relevant today. William Alexander outlined the five steps needed:


1. identify needs
2. determine priorities
3. select the innovation
4. try the innovation
5. diffusion of the innovation.  

J. Lloyd Trump believed there are four types of change: take away, add to, bolster, or basic change. Some of the key resisters to change are sacred traditions and beliefs, lack of energy, faddishness, and the defeatist attitude of those among us. For change to occur someone must provide the leadership.

Norman Heard thought that most change occurs during fiscal adjustments, personnel changes, during media attention, or as a result of crisis. For change to occur, someone must want to change. Frequently the superintendent spearheads the change but someone else could. Whoever leads must understand that change is threatening, must understand the process of change, and work early to establish group support.

Ivor Morrish explained the three types of change most often introduced into schools as those of hardware, software, and interpersonal relations. A change in any one of these areas affects the other.

---


areas. Things are more easily changed than are people. Innovations tend to occur slowly as new ideas are infused and assimilated. There are four general principles of change in schools:

1. Schools have a tendency to maintain order and stability on the one hand, to improve and innovate on the other.

2. The variables involved in whether a change will be accepted are cost, complexity of the innovation, the possibility of dividing it into parts, the relationship between the source of the change and the target group, and congruence between the change and the environment.

3. Most changes come from outside and are received in a rather superficial manner.

4. Critical to the change effort is the perception of the adopters as to how they will have to change themselves.  

There are three groups of factors that inhibit change: input factors, output factors, and throughput factors.  

Input factors are:

1. Environmental resistance to change — the community usually does not push for a major change unless there is a major crisis; teachers usually support this.

2. Outside agent incompetence — most parents and govern-

---


46 Ibid., 56-60.
ment agents do not really understand the process of teaching and learning.

3. Centralized power — power is usually concentrated in the hands of a few who could feel threatened by a change.

4. Defensiveness of staff — teachers usually resist any change in which they have had no voice.

5. Absence of true change agent — most change agents are from universities, must filter changes through administrators and lack credibility with teachers.


7. Lack of accepted scientific base — many theories coming from outsiders lack validation.

8. Conservative nature of schools — as institutions schools resist change.

9. Invisibility of teachers — teachers work behind closed doors and this makes assessment difficult.\(^47\)

In addition to those input factors above, output factors also serve to inhibit change:\(^48\)

1. Lack of goal clarity — there may be contradictory goals within the system among teachers, administrators, and students.

\(^47\)Ibid., 56-60.

\(^48\)Ibid., 60-68.
2. Absence of reward for changing — organizations tend to reward stability and dependability, not creativity or innovativeness.

3. Lack of individualized approach — schools tend to treat all students in similar ways.

4. Lack of competition — public schools have no competition other than from private or parochial schools; there is no drive to improve; often heard is schools are doing what society expects them to do.

5. Lack of use of research — there is little in the way of application of learning theory.

6. Lack of financial investment in research — seventy to ninety percent of funds spent by schools is on salaries, with a very small percent spent on technology and research.

7. Resistance to diagnosing weaknesses — teachers resist the idea of others visiting their classrooms and recommending improvements.

8. Difficulty in measurement — goals are often ambiguous and outcomes are not easily measured.

9. Orientation to the present — schools are burdened by day-to-day immediate problems, leaving little time for research and experimentation.

10. Little investment in professional growth — lack of legitimate staff development.
11. Lack of innovative models — teachers and administrators tend to be non-innovative.

12. Low degree of efficacy — teachers and administrators tend to feel they have little power to change things.

Throughput factors also inhibit change: 49

1. "Separation of members and units" — there is a low level of communication among the parts of the school system.

2. "Hierarchy and differential status" — there is a higher rate of innovation among professional organizations than among bureaucratic organizations because of differences in stress upon expertise rather than position or rank, greater flexibility of members, more precise goals and output criteria, more demands for production. Hierarchies tend to distort the flow of information upward — depending on the amount of hard data, how favorable it is to the sender, and relevant to the receiver. Most innovation comes from the top down, whereby people are ordered to change. This becomes an act of compliance rather than one of internalization and identification.

3. "Lack of procedure and training for change" — until recently teachers have not been required to continue their education.

49 Ibid., 70.
Morrish states that research shows that certain conditions, when present, are conducive to change.\textsuperscript{50}

1. Teachers tend to be favorably disposed toward innovation.

2. Teachers clearly understand the innovation.

3. The change is one teachers are capable of performing.

4. Resources are provided in sufficient amounts.

5. Necessary arrangements, both administrative and organizational, are made.

6. Full diagnosis of pupils is conducted.

7. Channels of communication are open and used.

8. In-service education is available and adequate.

9. Adequate time is allowed.

Morrish summarizes his work on change by grouping all change efforts into three categories. First is the "theory-into-practice" model (others have called this research and development), in which there is an attempt to translate basic research into applied knowledge. There is a rational sequence of phases, ranging from invention to dissemination. The innovation is usually not analyzed from the point of view of the user. Frequently the developer will "market" the product.\textsuperscript{51}

The second model is the "social-interaction" model. This emphasizes the movement of messages from individual to individual. Concern is over interpersonal networks, opinion leadership, personal

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., 70.

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 109-115.
contact, social integration. For example, one person will innovate and bring others into contact with the innovation and encourage its usage. 52

The third model is the "problem-solving" model. This model builds upon the user of the innovation. It assumes that there is a need and that the change will satisfy this need. Steps here are identification of the problem, diagnosing the problem, trial, and adoption. Some have called this the participatory approach to change. 53

In summary, the Research and Development model stresses the innovator, is closely planned; the Social Interaction model stresses the communicator, tends to be more spontaneous; and the Problem Solving model tends to stress the receiver, focusing on the interaction of the change agent with the user. 54

David A. Shimana and Ann Lieberman propose a "non-model" for school change, saying that most models ignore the reality of the school situation. Most models focus on what should be done and ignore the individual teacher, school, or values and demands of the job. Change sometimes occurs irrationally, in no particular order. After studying 18 California schools for five years, they found that change occurred when people got together and talked; someone got excited and began to do something; people continued to talk and some others changed. Many variables affect change, including the culture and norms of teachers, the nature of the teacher's isolated life in the classroom, the prin-

52 Ibid., 116-120.
53 Ibid., 120-124.
54 Ibid., 125-134.
cipal's leadership style, the community orientation and values, and undefined fears concerning change. Persons wanting to change something in schools must understand the school itself to be successful. 55

J. Lloyd Trump argued during the 1970's that the realities of change lead to change in name only or only a partial change. He considered barriers to change to fall into two groups – factors inside the school and factors outside the school. Within the school there is a range of principal and teacher experience. The more experience and success these persons have had with a particular change, the more the school may progress with that change, and vice versa. An open climate is more conducive to change than is a closed climate. Change in one aspect of a school creates change in other aspects. Leaders must recognize this and cope with it. Different individuals and departments change at different rates. It requires stamina and enthusiasm to sustain the change.

Trump claims that several factors outside the direct control of the school affect the success of change efforts. One factor is the financial condition of the school district. A second factor is the attitude of teacher organizations toward change. A third factor is the attitude of the central office and community. Further, any change effort relying on the leadership of only one or two persons is hindered if these individuals leave the district for employment elsewhere. 56


Many new ideas in organizations are generated at a distance from the center of power, but the structure of the organization itself serves as a screening device to keep many of these ideas from reaching the top where their support is usually crucial. Even though top level support is usually necessary it is not always sufficient to ensure the implementation of a change. Radical change occurs most often as response to a crisis or external threat. Crises produce anxiety and people may be willing to change in order to reduce the anxiety. 57

Herbert A. Shephard categorized resistance to change into forces within the individual personality and forces within the organization. 58

As individuals we tend toward homeostasis. We tend to return to the way things were. We are creatures of habit and prefer the familiar. The way we first cope with a situation is usually persistent. We practice selective perception and retention, screening out ideas that do not fit with our present ideas. We tend to learn basic values and attitudes and hold on to them. Many have self-distrust, questioning their own right or ability to suggest a change. Finally, many individuals are insecure and look for security in the past and in tradition. 59

Within the social system group pressure for conformity to norms is strong. Change in one part has repercussions throughout. Vested

57 Ibid., 24-25.


59 Ibid., 488-492.
interests will oppose change because they stand to lose autonomy, prestige, or money. The higher something is valued, the harder it will be to change it. Finally, social groups tend to reject outsiders. Most change comes into schools from outside. People on the inside tend to reject it with statements such as "it won't work here." 60

Ronald and Mary Havelock describe change as different processes. Three of the processes are similar to those described by Morrish above and others — problem-solving, research-development-and-diffusion, and social interaction. They go further and explain the "linkage" process as a fourth possibility of change. This situation is essentially one wherein a resource person links the users with a change usually initiated outside the system. This person has to know the local situation, must understand how knowledge is generated and validated, be able to provide feedback to the users, be a good listener, and be able to work with different groups. 61 The Havelocks list seven propositions regarding change:

1. If the user expects the change to be rewarding it usually will be; this is the self-fulfilling prophecy.
2. Successful change requires the willingness to take risks.
3. Willingness to try new ideas is a prerequisite to successful change.
4. Anticipated rewards are motivators for change.

60 Ibid., 492-499.

5. Reward for one change increases the possibilities of further successful changes.

6. Changes contradicting existing values will not be very successful; changes that do not conflict with existing values have a much better chance of success.62

In summary, over the past three decades several different models for change have been proposed. These models are available for school personnel to utilize in initiating or implementing change. They provide theoretical as well as practical suggestions on how to carry out change in the school setting. Some models assume that the agent of change will be an outsider and that those inside the system will be facilitators in implementing change. Others assume that the most successful change comes from within and that persons inside the system will have to be the agents as well as the facilitators. Some view change from the "top-down" while others view change from the "bottom-up." There are models that may be utilized by department heads in initiating or implementing change within their departments. They have been developed over a period of time and are still useful.

**Strategies For Change**

Matthew Miles described strategy as the planned means for accomplishing change.63 The strategy may involve the use of existing structures or the creation of new structures; it may be initiated internally or externally. Strategies initiated internally using the

---

62 Ibid., 32-37.

existing structure could involve curriculum committees, in-service activities, etc. The focus could be on the design of the change, awareness of a change, mental pre-evaluation of change, or a small scale trial of change. There is local control and active involvement by those affected.

An example of a strategy initiated internally but using a new structure would be the creation of special committees to study a change. Strategies initiated externally, using the existing environment, could come from teacher organizations, foundations, journals, government, and universities. Strategies initiated externally, using new structures, can be found in national curriculum study groups, regional research centers, and university-school collaboration. 64

In discussing strategy Ivor Morrish referred to studies of Gordon Watson in arguing that structural changes are most successful. 65 Change the structure first, interaction processes next, and attitudes last. Trying to change one teacher at a time will not work. Any strategy for change must consider the forces of resistance in the adopters and develop tactics to overcome this resistance. There are five pre-conditions for change that must be considered when developing a strategy. First, participants must feel the project is their own. Second, senior officials must support the change. Third, change must not greatly challenge existing values and attitudes. Fourth, partic-

64 Ibid., 18-29.

Participants must have trust in each other. Fifth, participants must not feel threatened in their autonomy or security.  

Morrish also discussed E. G. Guba’s six different strategies that may be used:

1. value strategy — appeal to the teacher’s values.
2. rational strategy — use reason, logic, hard data.
3. didactic strategy — provide training for willing users.
4. psychological strategy — use adopters need for acceptance, inclusion, involvement, to influence persons.
5. economic strategies — use resources to gain acceptance of change.
6. authority strategy — compel by orders from the hierarchy.  

Educators need to develop different strategies for different types of change. Neal Gross reasons that any attempt to change must have a strategy that reflects a "hard-headed assessment of the matrix of forces...that could block...the change process. It also needs to specify specific courses of action to overcome the obstacles if they arise."  

66 Ibid., 359-364.
67 Ibid., 116.
Anyone contemplating a change should plan as to how teachers, building administrators, central office administrators, and outsiders are to be involved. The best strategy to use depends upon the degree of commitment to change that is needed, the incentive for change, and the setting in which the change is to occur.

Zaltman argues that models describe the general process of change, but the mode becomes strategic with the planning of an approach for executing change. Deliberate, conscious change implies the selection of a strategy. Such a strategy may evolve from a model of change or may be intuitive, and is usually called change planning. One who understands the change process can develop optional strategies. Most educators do not invest time in developing and applying change strategies, and, as a result, change is unsystematic and disruptive. Most change management is intuitive, with strategies selected and developed without enough consideration of factors influencing their success. This might include failure to see possible complications of an approach, or the tendency to go for immediate change when an incremental approach might be better. There tends to be too much emphasis on changing individuals and not enough concern with the fact that the setting is social and organizational, involving formal and informal factors.

---


informal relationships in the organization that has goals, rewards, decision-making substructures.\textsuperscript{73}

Often the change process is uncoordinated, poorly planned, and works against school autonomy and self-renewal.

If schools are to become viable self-renewing institutions, decision makers must achieve a better understanding and acceptance of the strategies and tactics than can be and are being used to promote change.\textsuperscript{74}

Zaltman defines change strategy as "an approach taken to mediate appropriate change behavior by relevant actors."\textsuperscript{75} There are three basic types of change strategies - power, manipulative, and rational. The power strategy uses rewards and punishments. The manipulative strategy deliberately rearranges the environment. The rational strategy utilizes logic and data to justify change.\textsuperscript{76}

Power is the easiest strategy to apply, through the use of rewards and punishments. Influence can come from funding, legal sanctions, and status. Activities include communication about rewards and punishments and specific behaviors upon which they depend. Tactics include passing bills or laws, funding or withholding funding, having directions come from legitimate leaders, material rewards, prestige, and status. Success depends on whether sources of power are important, valued, and compelling. If the consequences of not changing are insig-

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., 71-90.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., 73.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid., 73.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., 74-77.
significant, there will be no change. If rewards for changing are incon-
sequential, there will be little effective change. 77

The manipulative strategy involves changing the environment to
allow the target to see the change differently. The person wanting
change may send biased messages or use facilitative approaches to make
change easier and more desirable. Motivators are tied to the change
itself (unlike power). Funding as a reward is the use of power; fund-
ing to implement a change is manipulative. Activities include rear-
ranging the environment, biasing the environment, adding to the en-
vIRONMENT, subtracting from the environment. Tactics include producing
and developing materials and making them easily available, persuasive
communication, training, and organizational development to change
social norms and values. 78

A rational strategy is based on the nature of the change itself
and the extent to which it appeals to user self-interest. This strat-
egy provides a justification for change. The effort here is to get the
user to accept change for itself rather than for some other reason.
Activities include communication about the nature of the change and why
it is a just one, giving evidence, and giving attention to the impor-
tant actors. Tactics include education via in-service, knowledge
production, information dissemination, demonstrations, and using field
agents to fit the change to local needs. Success depends on the qual-
ity of the change itself and whether target group needs are addressed
and satisfied. The effect of change using this strategy could be long

77 Ibid., 78-82.

78 Ibid., 82-86.
lasting because the motivation for the change is in the change itself. 79

Other researchers have classified change strategies in different words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCHERS</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kester and Hull</td>
<td>Coercive, Persuasive, Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guba</td>
<td>Values, Rational, Didactic, Psychological, Economic, Political, Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin</td>
<td>Empirical-rational, Normative-reeducative, Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Coercive, Normative, Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sieber</td>
<td>Rational man, Powerless participant, Cooperative. 80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three of Zaltman's strategies require knowledge of the user system. Power may be imposed with little knowledge of the system, but manipulative requires subtle and detailed knowledge. The manipulative approach requires spending time in the system and familiarity with it. Product development approaches often fail just because of this.

All three approaches require some commitment to change. 81

---

79 Ibid., 87-90.
80 Ibid., 76-80.
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requires commitment because reward is attached to it. Manipulative requires commitment because of the time involved. Rational requires commitment because the approach is to the change itself. When an individual is seeking rewards the change will last as long as the rewards last. If the individual is avoiding punishment the change will last as long as the vigilance lasts. When commitment is to the change itself, change will be more enduring. When manipulation is used, commitment will be fickle — until a better competitor comes along. 82

What are the appropriate settings for each of the change strategies? Power could be used when participants cannot agree on the form the change should take. An example of this would be state laws on school accountability. Power could be used when change must occur rapidly, where resources are limited, where attitudes are strongly opposed to the change. The weakness of this approach is that it requires continuing rewards or punishments; it tends to create subversion and sabotage. 83

Rational approaches should be used when there is a clear performance gap, when failure to change is due mainly to lack of knowledge about alternatives, when system goals are clear and well defined, when the communication system is clear and open. Zaltman believes that the appropriate setting for the purely rational strategy is rare. 84

The manipulative approach is the most generally appropriate. In most situations there are forces for and against change. The power

82 Ibid., 82-85.
83 Ibid., 85-86.
84 Ibid., 86-87.
approach would use force to overcome resistance; the rational approach would mobilize forces for change; the manipulative approach is to structure and restructure the environment to capitalize on the forces for change. 85

Zaltman concludes his discussion on strategy with a recommendation:

It is particularly appropriate that change strategies be developed from within, since the success of a strategy usually depends in great measure on a knowledge of the relevant resources, constraints, motivations, and resistances of the target system. 86

Baldridge and Deal believe there are seven rules for changing organizations. First, a serious assessment of needs is necessary. Second, a proposed change must be relevant to the history of the organization. Third, organizational changes must take the environment into account. Fourth, serious changes must affect both the organizational structure and individual attitudes. Fifth, changes must be directed at manipulative factors. Sixth, changes must be both politically and economically feasible. Seventh, the changes must be effective in solving the problems that were diagnosed. 87

Berman and McLaughlin, based on their work with the Rand Corporation, suggest that implementation strategies selected are critical. 88

The amount of planning is not so important as the quality of the plan—

85 Ibid., 87-88.
86 Ibid., 88-89.
ning. Persons implementing change must establish channels of com-
munication, get participation of potential users in setting goals, hold
frequent and regular staff meetings. Staff training must be keyed to
the local setting. Teachers must be given practical, "how-to-do-it"
instructions. More than a few teachers must support the change; if
only a few teachers support it they will be labeled as deviant by their
colleagues. The professionalism and compartmentalism of secondary
school teachers are not ideal conditions for significant change. The
change leader must recognize and cope with it. For change to be suc-
cessful there must be mutual adaptation - local change must be coupled
with change in the innovation itself. 89

Benne and Birnbaum state the case for viewing change as forces
at work in organizations. 90 There are driving forces and restraining
forces and change occurs when they become imbalanced. When these
forces are equal the condition is equilibrium; when these forces are
unequal the pattern becomes unfrozen. Planned change should use these
forces to "unfreeze" the pattern to influence change in a desirable
direction or to prevent a return to the previous situation.

There are three basic strategies for change: increasing the
driving force, decreasing the restraining force, or a combination of
the two. The principles of strategy for change in an institution are:

1. To change a subsystem or any part of a subsystem, relevant
aspects of the environment must also be changed....

89 Ibid., 345-359.

90 Kenneth D. Benne and Max Birnbaum, "Principles of Changing,"
in Warren G. Bennis, et al., eds., The Planning of Change, 2nd ed, (New
2. To change behavior on any one level of a hierarchical organization, it is necessary to achieve complementary and reinforcing changes in organization levels above and below that level.

3. The place to begin change is at those points in the system where some stress and strain exist.

4. ...One should ordinarily avoid beginning change at the point of greatest stress.

5. If thoroughgoing changes in a hierarchical structure are desirable or necessary, change should ordinarily start with the policy-making body.

6. Both the formal and the informal organization of an institution must be considered in planning any process of change.

7. The effectiveness of a planned change is often directly related to the degree to which members at all levels of an institutional hierarchy take part in the fact-finding and the diagnosing of needed changes and in the formulating and reality-testing of goals and programs of change.

Warren G. Bennis, in his book on organizational change, says that the system should fully understand the change and its consequences, have as much influence as possible in controlling the fate of the change, and trust the initiator of change. People should view the change effort as voluntary and legitimate. Top management support is critical. A change program must take into consideration emotional and value elements as well as cognitive elements. Relying on rational persuasion is seldom successful because it often conflicts with consciously or subconsciously held values and attitudes. It is important to get intellectual commitment but that alone is not sufficient for change. The change agent has to provide emotional support for the people undergoing change.

---
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Change can occur anywhere in the organization so long as the change agent at that level has support from the next higher echelon and other subsystems are kept informed.94

Change can be effective in the short-run by using a power or authority strategy; change in the long-run is more effective by using education and involvement strategies. Often the best procedure is to combine short-run and long-run strategies.95 No one strategy is best for all situations.96

The Department Head And Change

The literature on strategies used by high school department heads in initiating or implementing change is sparse.97

Sergiovanni studied the role of the department head in depth. He agrees with others that the role of the department head is largely determined by the principal.98 The principal should be an educational leader (instructional leader) but is spending more and more time on management and organizational affairs. The principal should be viewed

94 Ibid., 57-58.


as an "educational statesman" rather than an educational leader. His concerns are with the overall program, basic philosophy, goals, objectives, structure and design, assessment of community needs, and communication of the school's mission. He should be concerned with developing policy and a broad educational posture. Educational leadership includes concern for curriculum and teaching objectives, educational encounters, teaching styles, methods, procedures, classroom learning climate, teacher evaluation, student evaluation, program evaluation, curriculum coordination, alternatives, lesson and unit planning, scheduling, grouping, the structure of knowledge, and innovations. Most principals delegate these to the department head. For the department head to be effective in these areas he must expand his role as instructional leader and must be provided with more responsibility and authority. 99

In order for a department head to be effective in directing change efforts, the person must know the change process and be able to function as a change agent or change facilitator. A change agent has change as his primary goal; a change facilitator helps others to change. 100 The more the department head acts as a change agent, the lower the level of acceptance he can expect from teachers. If a minimum level of acceptance of a change is acceptable the department head may function as a change agent. If a higher level of acceptance is needed, the department head should function as a change facilitator. Chairpersons tend to be more familiar with the change agent role, which

99 Ibid., 3-5.
100 Ibid., 209.
requires formal and/or functional authority to act. This also requires planning, strategy building, communicating, and supporting. The department head should plan what is to be changed and why; develop a strategy that includes the level of acceptance required; be aware of the forces for and against the change. 101

As much as department heads may wish to act in a more direct change role, most situations will require them to act as a facilitator. In this role the department head will not be able to mandate change, but will have to work with and through teachers to implement change. 102

A strategy should include changes in the structural, technical area and changes in human relationships accompanying structural or technical change. The strategy should make sense, be legitimized, incorporated into the school’s structure, and accepted by those who will implement it. A person’s first reaction to a proposed change will be that of “How does it affect me?” 103 When planning a strategy the department head should consider the questions that teachers will ask themselves:

How will my advancement possibilities change?
How will my salary change?
How will my future with the company change?
How will my view of myself change?
How will my informal influence change?
How will my view of my prior values change?
How will my ability to predict the future change?
How will my status change?
How will the amount of work I do change?
How will my interest in the work change?
How will the importance of my work change?

102 Ibid., 211-213.
103 Ibid., 217.
How will the challenge of the work change?
How will the work pressures change?
How will the skill demands on me change?
How will my physical surroundings change?
How will my hours of work change?
How will my relationships with my co-workers change?
How will my relationships with my superiors change?
How will my relationships with my subordinates change?
How will what my family thinks of me change?

Hord and Diaz-Ortiz argue that although the principal of a school is the primary change agent, there are second and even third level change leaders. These could be assistant principals, teachers, department heads. In their study of what department heads actually do, the researchers found the most common function was communication with the members of the department. Other functions that were widespread were providing information from the administration to the teachers within the department, conferring with other departments, participating in textbook selection, reviewing and evaluating instructional materials, staying informed of new trends, and fostering cooperation within the department. Interestingly, fewer department heads placed students in appropriate classes, supervised aides or clerical staff, evaluated teachers, hired and terminated teachers, or communicated directly with the community.

The majority of department heads surveyed had job descriptions and received an additional stipend. Most had been appointed by the

---

104 Ibid., 218.

105 Shirley M. Hord and Elia Mar Diaz-Ortiz, Beyond the Principal: Can the Department Head Supply Leadership for Change in High Schools?, A paper presented at the International Research Seminar on Internal Change Facilitators, (Belgium: June 2-5, 1986), 10.

106 Ibid., 11-14.
principal and were evaluated by that person. More than nine out of ten reported that they had received no training for performing the duties of department head. 107

We should not be surprised that most department heads are not instructional leaders:

In summary, with no incentives, scarce facilities, little time allocated, no professional growth and development opportunities, and a mixed view of the provision of the DH role evaluation, it is no surprise that the DHs serve in the district primarily to transmit information. 108

In summary, the survey of the literature has demonstrated that there are models for change that may be used in the high school setting. Change may come from within the system or from outside the system. Central office administrators as well as the building principal are in key positions from which to initiate or implement change. However, the department head is also in a position from which to initiate or implement change. Department heads need to understand the change process and to develop strategies which they utilize. There are many models of change and strategies available.

Do department heads understand the change process and the strategies available? Are they able to initiate or to implement change? Are some department heads more adept at this than are others? Are some strategies more successful than others? How exactly do department heads attempt change within their departments?

The rest of this study is an attempt to answer these questions.

107 Ibid., 14-15.

108 Ibid., 22.
CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF DATA

Interviews were conducted with selected department heads in nine high schools in the Chicago metropolitan area. Each school had department heads in English, math, science, social studies, and foreign language. The principal at each school granted permission for the interviews. Questions focused on strategies utilized by department heads in initiating or implementing change. Each school and each department head interviewed was given a fictitious name to assure anonymity.

This chapter is organized by high school. For each high school there is a brief description of the school, data gathered in the interview with each department head at that school, and a general summary of the data collected at that school.

Washington High School

Washington High School is located in the suburbs south of Chicago. The student enrollment during the 1987-1988 school year was just under 2,100. Washington High School is one of three high schools in its district. Department heads in this school are not allowed to join the teachers' association. Three department heads in this school were willing to be interviewed.
Ms. Anderson is the foreign language department head at Washington High School. She has been department head for more than fifteen years. Her department has nine teachers, including herself. She evaluates teachers and teaches three classes. She is not allowed to be a member of the teachers' association.

Ms. Anderson has worked on change for some time. Her primary change effort has been to get teachers to trust each other and to share ideas. She felt that she has accomplished this but that it took more than five years to do so. The school has had two "bad" strikes during the past ten years, accompanied by "a lot of firing and hiring." Some administrators have returned to the classroom. At the time of the most recent strike department heads were not members of the teachers' union, and they crossed picket lines to return to work. Teachers became very private and did not trust anyone, including department heads. In the past ten years there have been several principals at the school.

During this same time period the superintendent has initiated peer coaching. Teachers were given the option of getting involved in this or being evaluated. The principal has supported this option. While this has been implemented, Ms. Anderson has worked to improve trust and cooperation within her department. She has held informal meetings, "open" department meetings, and several "gripe sessions." She has encouraged all teachers to join in helping any teacher who has had a problem of any type.

About five years ago she took all teachers to the conference room, closed the door, and asked them to "vent" their feelings. That
was the turning point. Ms. Anderson stated that there are no longer any long department meetings filled with items that could be handled in a memorandum. She felt she "went the back way rather than a frontal assault."

The strategy she used was persistence and manipulation. She was determined to create the trust needed. She took her time. Ms. Anderson feels that today trust has been restored between the teachers in her department and herself.

The different principals over the past ten years have been supportive of her efforts. The current principal is "laid back," and Ms. Anderson feels this has been most helpful. The previous principal was more authoritarian. He would always back the department head but did not participate in the effort to improve trust and sharing. The current principal is more supportive of her efforts. He especially has helped in the area of peer coaching, and through the combined efforts of the principal and the department head, they have actually improved the teaching of one of the department members.

She has learned that she has had to be more realistic about the change process, that change does not come quickly but takes time. Ms. Anderson now believes that you must gain trust before you can change behavior.

She felt that the change process as well as other aspects of her job could be improved if she did not have so many meetings and committees on which she serves. She also felt guilty about having to "squeeze in" her teaching between meetings and committee work.
Ms. Brown

Ms. Brown is the science department head at Washington High School. She has been department head for five years. There are sixteen teachers in her department. She evaluates these teachers and teaches two classes herself. She is not allowed to be a member of the teachers' association.

She has been involved in trying to improve communication within the department and trying to keep the faculty up-to-date on the latest research. She has gathered materials and distributed them to the faculty. She has also created a file of the different types of lab experiments and has put it on the computer. She has simply told the faculty that the file is there and the teachers have used the labs.

Another change in which she played a role was in trying to upgrade the facilities in the department. Rooms and equipment were old and worn out. The electrical system itself was faulty. Department heads prior to her had not been interested in upgrading the facilities. She submitted a capital development proposal for $250,000 to include new plumbing, electrical work, space, etc. She got input from the staff and then did some "headramming" with the principal and assistant principal. Then she used this same technique with district administrators. All she received from this was an improved electrical system. She stated that "I learned to pick my battles."

In another change effort she wanted to add a new course to the science curriculum. She got the approval of the principal and the district curriculum committee. Then the assistant superintendent for curriculum disapproved the addition of the new course. She was willing
to pilot the class but all three high schools could not agree. In this district all three high schools must offer a uniform curriculum. The assistant superintendent said all three had to pilot the new course or no one could.

Ms. Brown stated that the administration of the past had been supportive in words only. The principal at Washington is too new for her to really know how supportive he will be. He appears to support change but he is very "laid back" and it is difficult to get him to commit himself on change.

She considers herself a facilitator of change, using logic as her approach. She has learned that she spends 80% of her time trying to convince 20% of her staff to try anything new. She feels that this is too frustrating and that she should learn to be happy that the majority of the staff is willing to change. She stated that it has been just too frustrating to try to change all of the staff. Change can be modeled. She concluded by saying that "if you want teachers to change, the department head can serve as the model."

Mr. Connor

Mr. Connor is the head of the social studies department at Washington High School, serving in his first year in that position. He has eleven teachers in his department, evaluates them, and is not allowed to be a member of the teachers’ association. He teaches only one class but serves as the district gifted coordinator as part of his assignment.

He has accomplished little if any change thus far. He would like to see ACT scores improved and has been trying to do this by
attending meetings and holding discussions with the faculty of all three high schools in the district. He does not believe in dictating, for that is not his style. He "throws the problem out to the faculty" and "hopes" that they cooperate.

Mr. Connor does say that since the strike in this district, the teachers have closed the doors to their classrooms and done what they want to do. He has tried visiting classes but the teachers oppose this. The former department head never visited classes. The principal is new in this school also and has not been able to help him clarify his role at this time.

He felt that the key to successful change lies behind those closed classroom doors. He claimed that the department head is not really an educational leader and cannot be unless the classroom doors are opened. His teachers did not trust the former department heads; he was hired from the outside and has had to earn trust. He has utilized a rational, problem-solving approach to change.

In summary, department heads at Washington High School consider themselves as having to earn the trust and respect of the teachers. The department heads are no longer members of the teachers' union. They crossed picket lines in a recent strike, and are considered administrators by the teachers. These department heads are unsure of their role and of the principal's expectations for them as leaders. Most hope that the new principal will help them clarify the duties and responsibilities they have as department heads.
Adams High School

Adams High School is located in the suburbs west of Chicago. The enrollment at Adams for the 1987-88 school year was 2,031. There is one other high school in the district. Department heads in this district are allowed to be members of the teachers' association. All five department heads at Adams were interviewed.

Mr. Davis

Mr. Davis is the head of the math department at Adams High School. He has been in this position for fifteen years. He evaluates each of the sixteen teachers in his department. He teaches three classes himself and is a member of the teachers' union.

Mr. Davis has been involved in two changes in the past three years. First, he wanted to get the math teachers to allow students to use calculators in learning logarithms. He asked some teachers if they would volunteer to "pilot" the use of calculators in their classes. They agreed to the experiment, while the rest did the activities the traditional way. The pilot was a success. Students appeared to have the same if not better understanding of the processes when using calculators. Mr. Davis then told his staff: "It works - do it." He tried to incorporate the use of calculators as smoothly as possible. He stated, however, that when the new way showed that it could be more successful than the old, he told his teachers that they must use the calculators.

Older teachers in particular posed a problem. They resisted the use of calculators. He tried persuasion and when that did not work he simply told them that they must do it.
The principal was receptive to the use of calculators but was not active in promoting them. Mr. Davis believed the principal to be a manager, leaving instructional leadership to the department heads. He stated: "That's the way it should be."

Mr. Davis was involved in a second change effort. He wanted the department and school to sponsor a math team that would be involved in inter-scholastic competition. He convinced the principal of the benefit of the math team. The principal was cooperative, seeing this as good public relations and as a creative outlet for the better students. The principal went to the district office for money for the team. He has been supportive and remains so, even to the point of sending notes to the students after competitions.

Other teachers were not interested in the math team at first. Mr. Davis went forward with it anyway. As the team did well more and more teachers became interested in it. His strategies were manipulation and power.

Mr. Evans

Mr. Evans is the science department head at Adams High School. He has held this position for eleven years. He has fourteen teachers in his department. He teaches three classes and evaluates his teachers. He is a member of the teachers' union.

Mr. Evans has been involved in two recent changes. He has changed the procedure utilized in selecting textbooks. He cannot remember how it was done before he became department head but thinks that it "just happened." He has given each teacher a specific assignment in the process. Each has to complete an evaluation sheet on any
text under consideration. Then all teachers of a specific subject meet as a group to discuss the evaluations. A teacher must be able to cite reasons why he or she favors or dislikes a particular book.

There have been minor problems - some teachers have not returned their sheets. There has been no direct resistance to the change. It appears to be working well. The principal has not played an active role, but merely passed on the recommendation to the district office.

He has also been involved in getting teachers to actually use the course objectives they have written. In the past teachers wrote objectives, stuck them in a file cabinet, and forgot about them. Now they must use them. He convinced the district to allocate money for summer curriculum work. Most of the objectives were written during the summer. The assistant superintendent for curriculum has been more involved than the Adams administration. The assistant principal has monitored the process but has not played an active role. The principal has not been involved in any way at all.

There was some opposition within his department. Mr. Evans stated that one teacher "dragged his heels." He felt that there is not much hope of changing this teacher. However, this teacher will be retiring at the end of the year and Mr. Evans will work with the new teacher to help him "see the light" and be more cooperative.

Ms. Ford

Ms. Ford is the English department head at Adams High School. She has held this position for seven years. She has a department of twenty-four teachers. She teaches two classes herself and evaluates all teachers. She is a member of the teachers' union.
Ms. Ford has been involved in three changes in recent years. First, she initiated a plan that would prevent students from taking advanced classes until they had satisfied all the prerequisites. For example, a student would not be able to take sophomore English until he or she had passed both semesters of freshman English. Prior to instituting this change a student might have taken a semester of freshman English at the same time as taking sophomore English.

She took the issue to the department for discussion. They gave her their support. She kept statistics on how students were doing when taking two English classes simultaneously. She showed these to the administration for approval and then initiated the new program.

The guidance department had opposed her plan on grounds that it would make it harder for them to schedule students. Further, the counselors wanted to do whatever was needed to get the students through four years and "graduated."

While her proposal was being considered the district hired a new superintendent who felt that both schools in the district had to have uniform requirements and expectations. The principal at Adams had supported the change but he was "pressured from above." Adams High School had to modify its plan to correspond with that of the other school within the district. Thus, the program of the second school in the district is the one in effect now.

A second change involved the reading program. The teachers at Adams wanted to require a reading class for each freshman. The teachers designed the program. However, the superintendent had his own ideas as to what a reading program should be. The superintendent and
English teachers were able to reach a compromise. "Reading" became a separate department.

A third change resulted in hiring "theme graders" for the English department. Ms. Ford had to convince both the principal and superintendent of their need. The superintendent would only approve the use of theme graders for doing "mechanical things, not to include making comments on the papers." Ms. Ford felt this "hamstrung" the program. Some teachers do not even use the graders. She felt that if theme graders are used in the fashion demanded by the superintendent they are of no practical value. The principal has been "caught in the middle," getting pressure from both sides. However, the superintendent is retiring at the end of this school year and Ms. Ford hopes the new one is more willing to "listen to reason." She has concentrated her strategies for change on reason and logic.

Mr. Grant

Mr. Grant is the social studies department head at Adams High School. He has been department head for nine years and evaluates the eleven teachers in his department. He teaches three classes and is an active member of the teachers' union.

Mr. Grant considers himself a "rubber stamp" for textbook and course changes. The teachers within the department who teach the same subject have been empowered to select the text for the course and to collectively determine any changes in the course itself. Those teachers have simply passed on to him their recommendations, which he approves, and "forwards them to the administration." His strategy has been "let the people decide." He argued that those involved should be
he persons making the decisions. He has not needed a strategy for
textbook changes for they change every five years automatically.

He has succeeded in getting an additional semester of social
studies as a requirement for graduation. He had been trying this for
approximately ten years. In the past the proposal had been approved as
high as the assistant superintendent's office. But the Educational
Planning Committee had vetoed it for financial reasons. There is a
"fairly new" assistant superintendent in the district. The department
head called together the social studies teachers to back up their
request with data and logic. The new assistant superintendent sup-
ported this but the Educational Planning Committee was not too recep-
tive. Further, there was "turf" resistance from other departments.
These other departments were afraid that if social studies got addi-
tional graduation requirements their own jobs might be in jeopardy.

Mr. Grant discussed this issue with the principal. He felt that
"some heads might have to be knocked." The principal and assistant
superintendent supported him and the board of education approved. Mr.
Grant felt the biggest reason the course was approved was the mood of
the country - a back-to-basics movement. His proposal was made just
after the publication of the Nation at Risk report. The Secretary of
Education has proposed strengthening graduation requirements. Mr.
Grant says "these set the stage; things came together at the right
time." He was able to use manipulation and power strategies success
fully.
Mr. Harris

Mr. Harris is head of the foreign language department at Adams High School. He has served in this position for sixteen years. There are seven teachers in his department. He teaches four classes, evaluates teachers, and is a member of the teachers' union.

He stated that he has not played a major role in the change process. The biggest changes have been in textbooks and course descriptions. He has discussed these with the teachers and has final approval within the department of any recommended change. The principal "simply accepts the recommendation." Mr. Harris argued that he is a democratic leader, deferring to the expertise of his teachers. The biggest obstacle to his taking a leadership role has been time. The time constraints have been more oppressive than people. He has taken teaching work home, having to use his planning period to conduct department business.

He was concerned over the power of the Educational Planning Committee. He believed that not all departments are represented equally on this committee and that this arrangement gives too much power to certain departments.

He has had the support of the building principal, for he hired him to teach in the foreign language department many years ago.

In summary, department heads at Adams High School vary in their abilities to get change implemented. Those who are more politically aware and astute have learned how to proceed. They know who should become involved and who should not. Those less aware of change as a political process have not been so successful in implementing change.
The department heads at Adams perceive the principal to be less involved in change than administrators at the central office. In many situations they work more closely with the central office administrators that they do with the building administrators. In a school district in which both schools must have the same program, cooperation between the two schools and the superintendent is essential.

Jefferson High School

Jefferson High School is located in the suburbs northwest of Chicago. There are four other high schools in its district. The enrollment at Jefferson is 2,577 students. Department heads are allowed to be members of the teachers’ union.

Ms. Johnson

Ms. Johnson is head of the foreign language department at Jefferson High School. She has served in this position for twenty-two years. There are eleven teachers in her department and she evaluates all of them. She teaches four classes herself and is a member of the teachers’ union.

Ms. Johnson has been involved in textbook changes for Spanish and French. A problem of changing texts in this district has been and is that all five high schools must use the same text. She insisted that each Spanish teacher at Jefferson look at all the proposed new texts. Then all the Spanish teachers at Jefferson had to vote on their top choice. This same process occurred at the other four high schools. Since all schools must use the same text, teachers then must reach a consensus in all five high schools. This process has been long and
"drawn out." Some teachers have not done their homework. She feels that this gives other teachers more power.

Once the teachers in her department have approved a text she takes the choice to the principal for approval. He serves on the district curriculum committee where he has supported her choice for the text. The assistant superintendent chairs the committee and has control of the agenda.

Ms. Johnson has not been unhappy with the procedure for changing texts. She stated however, that "If you've done your homework there is really no problem."

Some changes are "handed down." The foreign language department must revise course objectives in order to "line up" with state requirements. They have no choice in this. The district administration told this to the principal who then passed the message on to the department heads. They have had to work half-day institutes and other days as well to get this done. Ms. Johnson has delegated this duty to "lead teachers" within the department and holds them responsible for getting things done.

The largest obstacle has been that the teachers are tired. They simply have run out of energy. Much work has had to be done after teaching all day. There has been little if any released time during the day. Ms. Johnson has given herself the duty of coordinating and monitoring the work. Another obstacle has been that all five high schools in the district must have the same objectives. Thus, she has not been able to just revise objectives at Jefferson, but has had to
work with the foreign language department heads at the other schools to make certain all five sets of objectives were uniform.

The principal has provided time to travel to other schools and has "covered" some classes for teachers to allow them to do some work during the day. He has been supportive but Ms. Johnson felt that even more released time is needed. She is not pleased at all with the pressure to change objectives. This is because, she feels, the state has changed its mind so often. Just as the teachers seem to be getting on the "right track" new changes are handed down.

In summary, there has been little time for "teacher development." Many improvements and changes have not been feasible due to the lack of time.

Mr. Lane

Mr. Lane is head of the Science Department at Jefferson High School. He has held this position for eighteen years. He evaluates the seventeen teachers in his department and teaches three classes himself. He is a member of the teachers' union.

Mr. Lane opposed one major change in the district. Several science department heads wanted to pilot new classes in Advanced Placement Biology and Advanced Placement Chemistry. The change had to be approved by the district curriculum committee, made up of the five principals, the five department heads, and the assistant superintendent. Each member of this committee had one vote and any change had to receive a majority of the votes cast. Department heads had equal voting power with administrators because the union was able to get this included in the teacher contract.
He "got on the phone and whispered in the ear" of other department heads. He tried to convince them that there was no need for this change. It did not work. Even the principal of Jefferson voted with the other schools on the AP Biology class. The vote was 10-1, with Mr. Lane's vote being the only negative one. As to the AP Chemistry class, he "saw the writing on the wall" and actually voted for it, making the decision unanimous.

Mr. Lane felt that there were several factors at work here. First, the times had changed. People in the community wanted higher ACT scores, tougher classes, etc. Also, the assistant superintendent has been the dominant force on the committee, getting what he wanted. For example, the assistant superintendent was absent from a meeting once. The committee made a decision which the assistant superintendent did not like. When the assistant superintendent saw the outcome he had the decision voided on a technicality.

Mr. Mills

Mr. Mills is head of the math department at Jefferson High School. He has held this position for twenty-one years. There are nineteen teachers in his department. He evaluates these teachers and teaches three classes himself. He is a member of the teachers' union.

Mr. Mills has been generally pleased with the change process in his district. The fact that all five high schools must use the same text has not been a major problem. The procedure is well known. The Jefferson principal, as well as Mr. Mills himself, serves on the district curriculum committee. The two of them "keep communication open." Text changes are taken to the committee only after teachers in all five
schools have had a chance to make a recommendation. Some changes are "handed down." For example, the district office has announced that all five high schools must pilot a new class in Algebra next year. He stated that there is really little that can be done when change is "handed down."

Most opposition to change in the district has come from other math department heads. The math department heads meet on Friday evenings throughout the year. These meetings have become quite vocal. One factor that offsets this problem has been that the other four math heads had at one time taught in his department at Jefferson. Equally important has been that the assistant superintendent was a former math teacher at Jefferson.

He has very little contact with the superintendent. Most changes are "handed out." He has seen very few changes from the "bottom up." Within the high school itself most change is subconscious and simply evolves. He stated that there is not enough time to plan improvements and changes and that most of the time he just responded to district orders.

Mr. Niven

Mr. Niven is head of the social studies department at Jefferson High School. He has been in this position for fourteen years. He evaluates the fourteen teachers in his department and teaches three classes himself. He is a member of the teachers' union.

He is quite proud of one change he has been able to get instituted. He was able to get a community service requirement for students during their senior year in high school. This was first
piloted in 1973, at a time when the district did not require all high schools to have a uniform curriculum. He talked to teachers who had senior social studies classes to get their support. The district was skeptical of the entire program, but the principal was open to suggestions. He "just walked into the principal's office and presented the program." The fact that the program was not costly helped convince the principal and the district. With the principal's help he was able to get the district to approve this program for Jefferson alone. Mr. Niven stated that the district was "less rigid" then and doubts whether such a plan would be approved today.

Another change was generated by a classroom teacher. One teacher in his department had a background in law. He asked Mr. Niven if it were possible to pilot a class in law at Jefferson. The principal and district curriculum committee approved and now it is offered at all five high schools within the district.

He has mixed feelings about the district curriculum committee. The eleven members - five principals, five department heads, and the assistant superintendent - have much power. However, if the five department heads can reach consensus and convince just one of the administrators they can usually get what they want. There are two major difficulties; getting the five department heads to agree on anything, and preventing the principals from being "underhanded." Further, Mr. Niven believes the process to be too slow. The entire procedure could be better were there some curriculum knowledge and leadership at the district level. He feels the entire change process
is controlled by the building principals through the district curriculum committee.

Mr. Olson

Mr. Olson is head of the English department at Jefferson High School. He has been in this position for sixteen years. He teaches three classes and evaluates the twenty-six teachers in his department. He is a member of the teachers' union.

The biggest change for Mr. Olson has been mandated by the state of Illinois. It involves a more comprehensive system of teacher evaluation. With twenty-eight teachers in his department the new system of evaluation has taken him too much time. But he had no voice in this — it was simply handed down by the district office.

He has been working on getting teachers to utilize computers more frequently in teaching writing. He has held department meetings, sent teachers to conferences, and conducted workshops. Much of the teacher opposition has occurred because they are afraid of computers. Much of this fear has been due to lack of knowledge of technology. Thus, a large part of his strategy has been to get teachers to become more knowledgeable about how the computer can work for them. The district has been most supportive. It has offered classes in computers that teachers can take for advancement on the salary schedule. The district has approved travel money to visit other schools to see how they use computers.

Mr. Olson stated that he has not had time to initiate many changes, and that he is certain the new teacher evaluation program has hurt his teaching effectiveness.
In summary, the change process at Jefferson is complicated by the mandated uniformity among the five high schools in the district. Department heads must develop strategies for their own department, school, other schools, and the district office. They must realize that the central office administration is critical to any significant change. Curriculum change is channeled through standing committees. With more people involved in the decision-making process attempts at change demand more political knowledge and skill. It has been difficult to reach consensus on some proposed changes. Many changes have been initiated from the top levels of the hierarchy and the department heads have had to implement them.

Department heads at Jefferson are "tired." They perceive themselves as not having enough time to teach and handle their responsibilities as department head. Thus, they feel that performing a leadership role in the change process is quite difficult.

Madison High School

Madison High School is located in the suburbs south of Chicago. It is one of three high schools in its district, and has an enrollment of 2,428 students. Department heads in this school district are allowed to be members of the teachers' union, but do not evaluate teachers.

Mr. Peterson

Mr. Peterson is head of the social studies department at Madison High School. He has held that position for twenty-one years. He has
fourteen teachers in his department and teaches four classes himself. He is a member of the teachers' union and does not evaluate teachers.

He explained that the role of the department head has changed in his district within the past three years. At his school there are now four assistant principals. These four assistant principals are responsible for teacher evaluation. The department head is consulted but has little power in the evaluation process. Since department heads no longer evaluate teachers their released time has been reduced. He used to teach three classes but now teaches four.

The administration had wanted department heads out of the union: the union had wanted department heads in the union. The entire issue was settled through the most recent collective bargaining agreement when it was decided that department heads would remain in the union but would not evaluate teachers and would have less released time.

Mr. Peterson stated that he now handles curriculum as his main duty and works through one of the assistant principals. Each department head at Madison reports to one of the four assistant principals. This change has not affected his relationship with the teachers in his department. In fact, both he and the teachers would prefer a return to the old way - when he evaluated them.

He is heavily involved in curriculum. He and three teachers from his department have been working with teams from the other two high schools to complete the state mandated work on objectives and assessment. They developed a proposal that would increase the social studies requirements at all three high schools from two years to three years.
Other departments at Madison felt threatened by this proposal. Since students are not required to take classes in business education, vocational education, music, and art, teachers in these areas were afraid that additional classes in social studies would "rob them" of students. Meetings of the curriculum council at Madison, where each department has one representative, were "quite vocal and heated."

Opponents of the third year of social studies went to the principal, the superintendent, and even spoke before the school board. However, the board supported the new requirement as part of its new emphasis on academic requirements.

Social studies has now proposed that economics be a class required of all sophomores. At present students may satisfy the state consumer education requirement by taking economics, a social studies class, or consumer education, a business education class. The business education department has opposed the proposed change to make economics required.

The superintendent and assistant superintendent supported the third year requirement and have supported the proposal for requiring all sophomores to study economics. They have convinced the school board to pay the tuition for any teacher who wishes to take classes in world history or geography in order to get certified to teach them. The administration originally offered this opportunity only to teachers of social studies. Now they have expanded it to allow any teacher in the district to get tuition reimbursement for these classes. The industrial arts head has opposed this for fear that teachers there
would be transferred to the social studies department. However, there are now forty teachers in the district taking advantage of the plan.

Mr. Quincy

Mr. Quincy is head of the math department at Madison High School. He has held this position for three years. Prior to that he was a teacher in the math department. He has sixteen teachers in his department and teaches four classes himself. He is a member of the union and does not evaluate teachers.

He became department head when the former head became assistant principal three years ago. He has to propose any change to a committee and "sell it to them." If that committee approves it, he "must sell it to the district." Mr. Quincy stated an example of this was when he and the department heads in the district wanted to go from a three semester requirement in Algebra to a four-semester requirement. He had to get it approved at his school and then approved by a district committee.

Most change in the district has been handed down and it has been his role to implement it. He has had a say in hiring of new teachers but the assistant principal has a bigger voice. He felt that this is wrong, because the district tends to hire the cheapest teacher and not necessarily the best teacher.

Prior to the most recent teacher contract each department head taught two classes and did teacher evaluations. He disagreed with Mr. Peterson as to how the change in status and role of the department head occurred. Whereas Mr. Peterson stated that it was negotiated, Mr. Quincy stated that the superintendent simply met with all department heads and told them of their new status.
Prior to three years ago it was rare to see any teacher receive a poor evaluation. Now "they go after the bad ones." Even though the department head no longer evaluates teachers, the benefit of this change is that now the role of the department head has been clarified. Before, the department head was not sure whether he was an administrator or a teacher. Now he knows he is a teacher.

Ms. Reston

Ms. Reston is head of the English department at Madison High School. She has held this position for three years. She has twenty-eight teachers in her department and teaches three classes herself. She is a member of the teachers' union and does not evaluate teachers.

She became department head the year the district changed the status of department heads. She is called "instructional leader," but having only two released periods and no power to evaluate has severely restricted her "leadership" function. She has no responsibility for nor time to work toward improving the department. She chairs the district English committee which has been working on the state mandates.

She has delegated much of the work on objectives and assessment required by the state to committees of teachers. This way the teachers are required to participate and perhaps "buy into" the system. However, she was out for six weeks recovering from surgery. While she was gone several teachers in her department refused to write test items that had to be submitted to the district committee. The principal and assistant principal met with those teachers and told them to "do it." They grumbled and delayed. When Ms. Reston returned to work and dis-
cussed the problem with the teachers the grumbling stopped and the work began.

The principal has been very supportive of her and any changes she made. He is a "curriculum man." He has been working with department heads to determine ways to improve ACT test scores. The superintendent is new and Ms. Reston has not had time to form an opinion of him.

Ms. Smith

Ms. Smith is head of the foreign language department at Madison High School. She has held the position for one year. She teaches three classes and serves in a district coordinator position. She has six teachers in her department, is a union member, and does no evaluations.

One of the first changes she tried was to get the three Spanish teachers to join the Spanish teachers' professional association. She had been a member for a long time and found membership valuable and rewarding. The German teachers in the department had been members of a similar association in the past (there are no German teachers in the department now).

At her first department meeting she "pushed" for the Spanish teachers to join the association. There was no response. She then posted materials in the office and began to provide the teachers with as much material as she could. She consistently emphasized the benefit to students of having their teachers involved. Two teachers then joined and took their students to several meetings. When these stu-
dents won some competitions and got newspaper coverage the other teacher was convinced. Peer pressure led her to join.

Ms. Smith also tried to change the room assignment of a teacher. The teacher was new and had to teach in five different rooms. She went to the principal asking if he could help her. He said he could not ask teachers in other departments to help when all the other teachers in the foreign language department were unwilling to help. So Ms. Smith went to two teachers in her own department, and they were willing to cooperate. She felt that had she ordered the change it would have led to resentment and lack of cooperation on other issues.

Mr. Thomas

Mr. Thomas is head of the science department at Madison High School. He has held this position for twenty years. He has sixteen teachers in his department and teaches four classes. He is a union member and does not evaluate teachers.

When enrollment was increasing he wanted to increase the number of laboratory science classes. One of the assistant principals supported him. The principal was skeptical. He wrote his proposal and submitted it to the principal. He met with the principal to discuss his proposal and found that "You cannot get change by just proposing it." He had to meet with another assistant principal to convince him that the change would not be detrimental to the building's master schedule. After persuading him that this would not hurt the master schedule, Mr. Thomas went back to the principal and had his proposal approved.
The most difficult thing about making changes has been that all three high schools must do the same thing. This has made it difficult for a high school to develop a program specifically suited for its student body. A second difficulty is that you must get the teachers to "buy into" the change. If they do not do this it will be difficult to get it implemented. However, the principal of Madison is a former science teacher and this has helped him tremendously.

Mr. Thomas stated that he has been involved in a second change also. He and the other teachers have had to modify their teaching techniques and expectations "as the quality of student has declined." Some teachers opposed this but they had to change "in self-defense." The assistant principals, who do the evaluation, insured that all teachers will change when needed. Mr. Thomas is opposed to the system of evaluation used now, calling it a "menu" or checklist. He argued that the assistant principal does not understand the content of a science class; if a teacher has an orderly room the teacher is considered to be teaching well. He felt that the new evaluation system has destroyed morale in his department. It has been difficult for him to make changes recently because he has had neither time nor power.

In summary, department heads at Madison High School perceive themselves as lacking the power and authority needed to be educational leaders. They feel that their authority and status have been diminished since the building administration assumed the teacher evaluation responsibility. Most believe that change must be brought about by "selling" it. They lack the power to mandate change within their own departments.
They have had their teaching responsibilities increased also. Their role has been clarified – they are teachers. Most attempts at change have been in the area of curriculum.

Monroe High School

Monroe High School is located in the suburbs west of Chicago. It has an enrollment of more than 2,600 students and is one of two high schools in its district. Department heads in this school are allowed to join the teachers' union.

Mr. Unger

Mr. Unger is head of the science department at Monroe High School. He has held this position for nineteen years. He has twelve teachers in his department. He teaches three classes. He evaluates teachers and is a member of the union.

Mr. Unger stated that one change he wanted was to create a college-prep biology class for freshmen. Freshmen had been allowed to take biology before, but they had been placed into classes with sophomores, juniors, and seniors. He felt that freshmen would fare better and learn more in a class of their own. The two high schools in the district have to have the same curriculum and the other school was opposed to creating a separate biology class for freshmen.

Mr. Unger went to the assistant superintendent for curriculum and asked if Monroe High School could pilot the class for one year. He was given permission to do this. He then put one-half of those freshmen taking biology into separate classes; he put the other half into the traditional classes. He pre-tested and post-tested each group. At
the end of the year the freshmen in the separate class not only had made the greater improvement in scores, but had attained the higher overall scores. He then took this information to the assistant superintendent, who took it to the school board. The board then required that there be separate biology classes for freshmen at both schools the following year.

According to Mr. Unger, the principal at Monroe has not been an educational leader. He stated that the principal was hired to improve public relations, that he is not knowledgeable about curriculum, but that "he is a nice guy." He stated that change has not come from the principal's office but from that of the assistant superintendent. The superintendent has not been involved in change either. He has a business background and was the business manager of the district prior to becoming superintendent. The principal was a successful athletic coach prior to attaining his present position.

Mr. Unger asserted that when a department head wants change, he "bypasses" the principal and goes to the assistant superintendent. The principal doesn't want to be "involved." The principal has not held regularly scheduled meetings with the department heads, and allows them "to do their own thing."

Ms. Villard

Ms. Villard is head of the foreign language department at Monroe High School. She has held the position for nine years. She supervises and evaluates seven teachers and teaches four classes herself. She is a member of the union.
She elaborated on several changes accomplished within the past few years. First, she wanted to computerize the foreign language lab at Monroe. At the time the lab needed major improvements just to maintain its traditional function. She decided to get computers for the lab while it was under consideration for remodeling. She felt that a request for a large number of computers would be turned down for financial reasons. Thus, she asked for one computer that was not being used. She taught herself how to use the computer and then asked for a second computer. She was able to back her request for the second computer by demonstrating how the first one was being used. She said that she "showed hard data to the right people." Further explaining her strategy, she said: "Sometimes I was just a ---. You do what you have to do." Since she had little confidence that any administrator at the building level even knew what was occurring in foreign language classes, she worked with those "persons who hold the purse strings." She was able to get some computers for the lab from the principal, some from the assistant superintendent, and the rest from the superintendent. She summarized this change effort when she stated that "I started campaigning four years ago. I got my last computer two weeks ago."

Ms. Villard has instituted many other changes within her department in the past five years. These changes include a Mardi Gras as a fund raiser, a foreign language "olympics," roller skating parties, and a variety of activities.

She hired all the teachers in the department and was able to select teachers who "go along with her." The assistant superintendent
for curriculum has been very supportive. In fact she convinced him of the desirability of awarding credit toward graduation for those students who were able to show proficiency in the first year of a foreign language without taking the class. The assistant superintendent went to the superintendent "to fight her battles for her."

She claimed that she has had very little contact with the building principal. She stated that he is excellent in conducting public relations and has made all persons around him "happy." She bypasses him and goes directly "to the source." Ms. Villard said that the principal knows this but does not care.

Ms. Wilson

Ms. Wilson heads the English department at Monroe High School. She has held this position for nine years. She has thirty teachers in her department and teaches one class herself. She evaluates teachers. She is allowed to join the union but has chosen not to do so.

Ms. Wilson has been involved in several changes in the past five years, using different strategies for each. She worked to incorporate thinking skills into all English classes. She instituted a writing center. She has increased teacher use of microcomputers for teaching writing.

Her basic strategies have been in-service, group meetings, committee work, modeling, professional reading, and, "when all else fails, requiring the change."

Some teachers have been resistant to change, whether it be trying a new technique, using a computer, or piloting a new text. But
Ms. Wilson asserted that she has persisted, observed, monitored, discussed, and even issued directives.

The principal has always approved any changes but has not become involved himself. She stated that "basically I operate alone." For example, she "holds teachers accountable through evaluation. If they are not teaching the curriculum, it shows up on their evaluation." In getting the teachers to use microcomputers she "had to get pushy." The central office personnel supported her in this effort and provided time and money for in-service. One "grump" was vocal about refusing to use computers. Ms. Wilson said "I talked to him about leaving this school. He now is involved."

Mr. Yount

Mr. Yount is head of the math department at Monroe High School. He has held the position for two years. He has seventeen teachers in his department and evaluates them. He teaches three classes and is a member of the teachers' union.

Mr. Yount shared several changes in which he has been involved. First, he did not like the final exam schedule and system that had been used in math at Monroe for twenty years. He delegated responsibility to teams of teachers to revise and improve it. This was the first time teachers had ever been asked their opinion on the exam schedule.

Another change involved getting pay for the math team coach. Until Mr. Yount became department head the coach had not been paid. Mr. Yount went to the principal who "sat on the proposal." Mr. Yount was upset at first, but not later. The principal told him that he would hold it "until the time was right." The principal took the
proposal to the superintendent just before the school board released its state mandated "report card" showing how the district was doing in several categories. The principal told Mr. Yount that this was the time to do it because the administration could go to the public with some positive news to offset the negative news of the report card. The principal remarked to him that "timing is of the essence." When the principal presented the proposal to the superintendent, Mr. Yount was able to back the proposal with supporting data. He was successful in getting a salary for the math coach.

Mr. Yount wanted to build a display case outside the math office to honor students from math classes. The idea had come from a teacher. Mr. Yount pursued this for the teacher. When the display case was built, he gave all credit to the teacher. The teacher felt good about the entire process and learned that the math department head will listen to him.

Another change was implemented as a side effect of the state mandated focus on objectives, assessment, and teacher evaluation. Mr. Yount used this opportunity to concentrate on teaching techniques in both pre-observation and post-observation conferences with his teachers. At each of these he has focused discussion on research-based effective teaching techniques. The result of this has been that teachers are now talking to each other about teaching. It has had "incredible results." His teachers have been changing the way they teach and letting him know about it.

Mr. Yount said that the strategy he favors is to select a few catalysts, convince them, and let them convince others. He has re-
ceived no resistance in most of his change efforts. His biggest problem has been lack of time to be as thorough as he should be.

The principal has left him alone to solve his own problems. Mr. Yount stated that "he does not give much direction but lots of encouragement. He knows when and how to do things." The superintendent is "almost a God." He has not seen him often, but the superintendent also gives the department head a lot of "leeway."

Mr. Yount stated that his main strategy in all things has been to try to remove as many impediments from teachers as possible. He claimed that "you must get teachers involved and one way to do this is to delegate responsibility and authority. But you must give teachers recognition." Further, he asserted, "You must get teachers involved early in the change process...It gives them ownership in the change."

In summary, department heads at Monroe High School perceive themselves as educational leaders having the power to initiate and implement change. They do not view the principal as involved in the change process but that he stands aside and allows them to lead. These department heads have learned the politics of change. They have learned to seek the support of those persons in the hierarchy who can help them get things done.

Van Buren High School

Van Buren High School is located in the suburbs west of Chicago. It had an enrollment of more than 2,500 students in the 1987-88 school year. There is one other high school in the district. The principal stated that if a department head spends less than one-half of the
school day teaching he or she may not join the union; if he or she spends more than one-half of the day teaching, he or she may join the union.

Mr. Allen is head of the science department at Van Buren High School. He has served in this position for longer than fourteen years. He supervises twenty-six teachers and teaches three classes himself. He evaluates teachers and is a member of the union.

Mr. Allen stated that he is active in the change process, primarily by selling his ideas to others. There used to be just one track in science at Van Buren. Teachers complained that grades were bi-modal, falling at the two ends of the bell-shaped curve. He discussed this with the department head at the other high school in the district. The two of them studied the grade distribution at both schools and then surveyed the students as to how they felt about a possible tracking program. The students were split. He and the department head at the other school wanted to institute the new system at the beginning of the present school year but the other school was not ready. The district office has insisted on uniformity between the two schools and stated that both schools must wait for one more year. Mr. Allen stated that "the district office did not want to create community problems between the two schools."

He stated that he uses one basic change strategy—hire the best teachers available and then use the staff as a sounding board. Mr. Allen has always viewed himself as a facilitator of change. The administration in the building has always supported him and he has had
little if any resistance from the teachers. He felt that this was because he has given them "trust, responsibility, and authority."

He has had a change in the number of teachers he supervises. The department head in industrial technology no longer wanted to hold that position but to return to the classroom as a full-time teacher. The principal asked Mr. Allen if he would be interested in bringing the industrial technology teachers into the science department and call the department that of Science and Technology. Mr. Allen had some classes in industrial technology and did not mind. He stated that the principal could have done it without asking him, but that the principal "is just not that kind of guy." He stated that his department was not the first to be combined with another. The social studies department head has had the music and art teachers added to his department.

Mr. Allen stated that he was pleased that the new teachers to his department - the industrial tech teachers - have responded to his change efforts. He has concentrated on sending them to conferences. They came back recently with an idea to teach robotics. He accepted their idea, took it "higher up" and now there is a robotics program at the school.

Mr. Baker

Mr. Baker is head of the English department at Van Buren High School. He has held this position for more than twenty-one years. There are twenty-four teachers in the department. He evaluates them. Until this year he taught three classes. He now teaches only one class but has other duties. He is a member of the union.
For the past several years he has been trying to increase the in-service time for his teachers "from zero to something." He had been successful in getting three early morning sessions for staff development activities. On these days teachers had to arrive at their regular time but students would arrive later. However, Mr. Baker claimed, these days have been "usurped" in the past two years for working on state mandates and preparation for a North Central evaluation.

The strategy that he had used to get these in-service days was to "lobby" the new assistant superintendent. She had been enthusiastic and agreed with him that there was a definite need for some time during the day. The two of them were able to persuade the superintendent to set aside three mornings during the year for teachers to work on staff development. He had been working on this for years but the district had taken the position that staff development was essentially that of finding ways to reduce the stress on teachers. He was really pleased that the new assistant superintendent viewed staff development differently.

In May of 1986 he received permission to establish a writing lab aimed at improving the composition skills of juniors. He wrote the rationale and presented it to the assistant principal. The two of them were able to get a room and a teacher for four periods a day. The next year they were able to get a teacher and room for seven periods and hired an aide. He ran into opposition from several teachers who were insecure that their teaching would be evaluated by the teacher in the writing lab. Lab teachers themselves could not agree on the proper techniques for teaching writing. The regular classroom teachers viewed
the writing lab teachers as "elitist" and resented their not having a full teaching load.

The assistant principal for instruction and administrators from the central office helped him to overcome this resistance. The principal did not become involved at all. He has still not overcome all resistance to the lab, but, were he to do it again, he would rotate all teachers into the lab. He has learned that teachers do not like receiving any information that indicates that they might need to improve or change their teaching.

He found non-tenured teachers to be more cooperative in utilizing the writing lab. These teachers have been "less structured" and have not had a set philosophy developed over the years.

He has proposed a semester elective program in English but has been opposed by the guidance department. He felt that the reason this department opposed this was that it would make their job more demanding. This issue has not been resolved.

Ms. Crown

Ms. Crown is head of the foreign language department at Van Buren High School. She has held this position for fifteen years. She teaches three classes and evaluates the eleven teachers in the department. She is a member of the union.

Ms. Crown has been active in change in the past three years. A North Central Association evaluation had pointed out the need for enrichment programs in Spanish at the sophomore, junior, and senior levels. She used this recommendation to push for change. The former principal had been "laissez-faire." Neither he nor any other person in
the district had given her any training in how to be a department head. The new principal has provided training in evaluation, budgeting, observing, and in other areas as well. She used this training as well as the North Central proposal as "weapons." This was much more successful than when she had been "crusading" alone. She felt that "the North Central Association is a tremendous instrument for change."

She went to the assistant superintendent, whose son had been bored in an advanced level Spanish class, and convinced him to allow her to try a pilot program. She started with twenty students in the second year of Spanish and now has as many as twenty seniors taking the Advanced Placement exam in Spanish.

There was opposition at the start and there has been opposition all along. Teachers who were not involved in the enrichment classes disliked having their brighter students removed from class. Ms. Crown stated that most of the Spanish teachers in her department are really "journeymen." She has taught the enrichment classes herself.

She has also established an exchange program with Costa Rica. Teachers in her department had mixed feelings about this. She discussed this with her "best" French teacher. They went to the new assistant superintendent for help. He supported them and the three took the proposal to the board. It was approved. Ms. Crown stated that "you must find the key person and the two of you plan together."

Further, she stated, the people must be able to work together well because change requires time. The principal was not involved at all in this proposal but "he trusted us and gave us responsibility."
She argued that "the department head has to sell." She knows that she is "not a diplomatic person." She prefers telling people just where she stands.

Mr. Dunn

Mr. Dunn is head of the math department at Van Buren High School and has held the position for nineteen years. He evaluates the eighteen teachers in his department and teaches two classes. He stated that he is a member of the union.

He and the department head at the other school jointly lead a curriculum revision project. They completely changed the course structure for the junior and senior years. This required hundreds of hours and tremendous dedication and commitment.

The principal has been supportive but not involved. He has asked to be kept informed but has deferred to the assistant superintendent for curriculum in working on change in class offerings.

Mr. Dunn and his counterpart at the other high school have worked well together and with the teachers and assistant superintendent.

He felt that there have not been many changes initiated by the principal or superintendent but that most changes have been initiated by department heads or teachers. This has even been true to a limited extent in fulfilling the state mandates. The assistant superintendent called him to ask his advice as to how the district should proceed.

In summary, department heads at Van Buren High School view the change process as a team effort. They have learned to work with their counterpart at the other high school in the district in the area of
curriculum change. They have worked with the assistant superintendent when applicable. Most perceive the building principal to be supportive of their efforts more than directly involved in them. They have utilized a variety of strategies successfully. Some have "sold" a change; some have forced a change; others have manipulated a change.

Jackson High School

Jackson High School is located in the suburbs north of Chicago. It is one of two high schools in its district and has an enrollment of approximately 2,050. Department heads in this school district are not allowed to be members of the teachers' union.

Mr. Fischer

Mr. Fischer is head of the foreign language department at Jackson High School. He has held that position for more than eighteen years. There are thirteen teachers in his department. He teaches three classes and evaluates teachers. He is not a member of the union.

Mr. Fischer said that until 1972 department heads were allowed to be members of the union. But in that year there was a strike. Following the strike the position of department head was reclassified and given more authority. He became responsible for the department budget and for hiring new teachers. He has run the department since then as the principal has run the school. There have been small changes and these have occurred slowly. He has brought in ideas from his professional associations and shared them. There have been no "revolutionary" changes during his tenure as department head. Instead, he has worked to change things through trying to reach consensus in the
department. He has never imposed a change and teachers have at times reached consensus on changes that he has opposed.

His only requirement has been that any change proposed by a teacher be well researched and documented. He has a veteran staff and has not had to worry about "weeding out" bad teachers. His teachers have been cooperative and the principal and superintendent have granted him freedom to run his own department.

Mr. Fischer has been trying to gain a high tech lab for foreign language for years. He has "screamed" with no success. He stated that Jackson does not need to do the same things as the other school in the district. In fact, Mr. Fischer states, "We are autonomous, quite independent."

Mr. Gable

Mr. Gable is head of the science department at Jackson High School. He has held this position for sixteen years. He evaluates the seventeen teachers in the department. He teaches one class and is not a member of the union.

Mr. Gable stated "I have an incredible amount of power as an instructional supervisor." He controls the budget, does evaluations, hires and fires, schedules the staff and classrooms, and has a department custodian. He received the separate custodian because he "asked for him." He has autonomy within curriculum matters but has to abide by district policy. He even handles disciplinary matters for teachers within his department.

One change he has initiated has been to "create a physics teacher." He hired a biology/chemistry teacher. He assigned this person to
teach one physics class his first year and another physics class his second year. He required him to observe the physics class of a veteran teacher. This became the fifth assignment of the new teacher. He has successfully urged him to begin a masters program in physics.

He has also changed an earth science teacher into a chemistry teacher. He used similar tactics. There has been no resistance.

He has provided in-service for all teachers at every opportunity. He has used his power of assigning teaching duties. The principal has left supervision of the science department to him. He must assign several teachers each year to building duties, such as hall or study hall duties. He has used this to assure cooperation.

Change has occurred through the evaluation system. He has tied each year's evaluation of a teacher to goals for the year. If he wished a teacher to change he made that the goal for the teacher and evaluated him as to how well he has implemented the change.

Most changes in the curriculum have been accomplished through the team leader of a particular subject. He has held the team leader responsible for implementing changes. He has had good success in this, and change has occurred slowly.

Mr. Gable stated that most change at Jackson has occurred through the leadership of the "instructional supervisor." He stated that the principal has not operated "at our level."

Mr. Henderson

Mr. Henderson is head of the social studies department at Jackson High School. He has held this position for sixteen years, and now has responsibility for the gifted program as well. He has seventeen
teachers in his department. He evaluates teachers but is not a member of the union.

Mr. Henderson, as are others at Jackson, is called an instructional supervisor rather than a department head. Mr. Henderson states that is because the instructional supervisor at Jackson has not filled the traditional role of the department head. The principal at Jackson has called the instructional supervisors "little principals." He stated that most department heads in other schools have really performed only clerical duties. Mr. Henderson handles the budget, publicity, procurement, planning, and summer school for his department. He stated that he likes this because department heads at other schools have become "emasculated."

Mr. Henderson stated that there has been only one rule of change at Jackson High School — "Don't surprise the boss." The "boss" has hired people to do the job and if they have not done the job he has "gotten rid of them." The principal has allowed each supervisor to interpret his job responsibilities differently.

Mr. Henderson has created teams for each subject area in social studies. He has allowed and even demanded that they take responsibility for their own curriculum. He has insisted that they create consistency in the teaching of their subject. His teachers have responded in a professional way and have been cooperative. He has even asked his teachers to help him define his supervisory role. Mr. Henderson has always viewed his job as that of "gofer" for his teachers. He has disliked the hierarchy of a bureaucracy and worked to eliminate that in his department. As a result, team leaders have been given authority as
well as responsibility. He has succeeded in getting one released period for each of his team leaders.

He stated that there has been constant, steady change in the social studies department. It has occurred at the "grass roots" level and has not been mandated from above. Because change has occurred this way teachers have "bought into it."

He stated that he tried to initiate and implement change as a "little dictator" at first, but that it did not work. He has now changed to a more democratic mode, claiming that he grew tired of "popping a valium every day."

Mr. Jones

Mr. Jones is head of the math department at Jackson High School. He has held this position for sixteen years. He evaluates the seventeen teachers in his department and teaches only one class himself. He is not a member of the union.

Mr. Jones stated that department heads used to be in the bargaining unit, but that they are now administrators. He could not remember the year of the strike, but stated that it was "somewhere in the past." The principal has called him "little principal" and given him much discretionary power as well as responsibility. The instructional supervisors meet with the principal weekly to get "communication from the top down."

He has been and still is involved in one major change. Since the early part of this decade he has been working with the University of Chicago in their math project. He has co-authored a new text in Algebra with a teacher from York High School in Elmhurst. He has
worked with teachers in his department to get them to recognize the changes that must occur as the result of technology.

One change has been to allow students to use calculators in math. He had to change the attitudes of teachers to get this accomplished. He has also insisted that teachers utilize the University of Chicago math program in their classrooms. So far thirteen of the seventeen teachers have done so. He has also worked to get the new math program (and his text) incorporated into high schools nationwide.

He felt when he became department head that math was the dullest part of the curriculum. He immediately worked to get teachers to re-assess the program. He encouraged teachers to be creative yet maintain the sequence in math.

He has very cooperative teachers in the math department. This has come about through the work of the superintendent. The superintendent "stole" these teachers from farming communities. He and the superintendent went to math institutes held at the University of Chicago and lured these teachers from all over the Midwest to teach at Jackson.

Mr. Jones has made certain that teachers in his department get released time during the day to work on changing the curriculum. He felt that asking a teacher to stay after work to do this would automatically make the teacher hostile to any change.

The administration has been very supportive. Due to this support he has been able to incorporate the "new math" at all levels at Jackson High School. Mr. Jones stated that Jackson is "expected to be a first rate high school" and that it has lived up to expectations.
The superintendent is "an idea person" who has constantly "fed us new ideas." He has "rewarded innovation and achievement." The building principal is "incredible." He has been the "cheerleader and a wonderful crap detector." The principal has "energized the building and given us authority and decision-making power." Further, the principal has operated without a rigid chain of command. The superintendent has even called "just to chat."

Mr. Lewis

Mr. Lewis is head of the English department at Jackson High School. He has held this position for four years. He has thirty-three teachers in his department. He evaluates these teachers and teaches one class himself. He is not a member of the teachers' union.

Mr. Lewis claimed that he is called an "instructional supervisor" rather than department head. The principal has even called him a "mini-principal." He has complete authority and responsibility within the English department. His biggest complaint has been that he does not have enough time to think, and his biggest satisfaction has come from improving morale within his department.

His greatest attempt and success at change has occurred in the area of curriculum. When he became "instructional supervisor" the department curriculum was still rooted in the sixties and seventies. There was no consistency from year to year. He has turned this around to the point that there is now a consistency from year to year. Concepts and objectives must now be taught by all teachers of a particular subject. There is a core curriculum which all teachers must teach.
Mr. Lewis was hired for his present position because he had a program for change. He had taught English at Jackson for years. The administration at Jackson "turned the reins over to him" when he was hired. Since then there has really been no pressure upon him to actually implement his program.

To change the English department he used a "gradual selling program." He took a calculated risk in the eleventh grade program. Before he became department head the curriculum for juniors at Jackson had depended upon the teacher. He told the teachers he wanted a uniform curriculum for the next school year and that "that was the end of the discussion." The teachers were shocked. He understood that this was not the "textbook way" of creating change. About half of the teachers balked at this and the other half were delighted. During the year he met with the teachers for some of their meetings and allowed them to meet without him for others. He knew that he had to stand aside and allow the teachers to do the work.

The team leader of the eleventh grade curriculum had been one of the persons most resistant to change. Mr. Lewis told the teacher that she could either implement the change or find another area in which to teach. He did this tactfully and diplomatically while never really giving the teacher a choice. He stated, "The bottom line was that she would go along or I'd find someone else to replace her." As she began to "come around," Mr. Lewis gave her more authority. She has learned that this is "her curriculum" and has now become the most ardent proponent of the change.
The principal has played almost no role in the changes. He has complimented the department head for his work but has left the change work to the department. Mr. Lewis stated that the principal is "a fabulously effective delegator. Once he hires you he leaves you alone. But if you don't do the work he will remove you."

Most supervisors do not work closely with the superintendent, but have to go through the principal. The superintendent has allowed Jackson almost complete autonomy, and has not pressured anyone for uniformity with the other high school in the district. There has been very little communication between the two schools.

Mr. Lewis stated that the most valuable lesson he has learned in four years is that many teachers are more concerned about where their desk will be located than what they will teach.

In summary, department heads at Jackson High School consider themselves highly professional and powerful. They play an active leadership role in the change process. They perceive themselves as "little principals" and have the confidence to be assertive leaders. Department heads have strong loyalty to the building principal, and believe that the building administration and district superintendent have high expectations for them. They do not even consider themselves as department heads in the traditional sense but rather that they are instructional supervisors and members of an administrative team.

Tyler High School

Tyler High School is located in the suburbs west of Chicago. It has an enrollment of approximately 2,150 students and is one of four
high schools in its district. Department heads are allowed to be members of the union in this district. (Although this school has department heads in English, math, social studies, science, and foreign language, only two were willing to be interviewed.)

Ms. Miner

Ms. Miner is head of the foreign language department at Tyler High School. She has held that position for one year. She evaluates the eight teachers in her department and teaches four classes herself. She is a member of the union.

Ms. Miner became department head when the person who had held the position for more than twenty-one years retired. She had been a teacher for more than twenty years when receiving the promotion.

She has been working on one significant change within the department — to get teachers more involved in decision-making. The former department head had made unilateral decisions. She had resented that as a teacher and has no plan to follow his style. She has tried to hold an individual discussion with each teacher in the department at least once a week, trying to anticipate problems before they occur.

She has been preparing the documentation necessary to dismiss a teacher. This has never been done in her department. Ms. Miner stated that there have been some "bad" teachers but no one had ever done anything for or to them. She has a second year teacher who does not interact well with the rest of the department. She had shown some improvement toward the end of her first year but has "slipped" in her second year. Ms. Miner stated that she must show "just cause" for not recommending tenure for the teacher. She has informed both the prin-
cipal and the district superintendent. They have stated they will support her but that she must do her homework and be prepared. Ms. Miner claimed to be "quite nervous" about the entire situation.

She has had to handle a situation in her department with which she feels even "veteran" department heads would have to struggle. During the year it became known that one of the teachers has AIDS. Even though the teacher has been suspended from teaching for the rest of the year, the teacher will return to the school in the spring to do "administrative" duties. Ms. Miner is concerned that the teacher will ask to be reinstated as a classroom teacher for the following school year. She has worked well with students, other teachers, building and district administrators to keep the name of the teacher out of the newspaper and other media. Students and parents have been very understandable and supportive of her position. She is most worried about minority groups of parents in the community who might put pressure on the school board not to reinstate the teacher next year. She felt that the situation is out of her hands.

She has changed the nature of determining when department meetings will be held. In the past the department head simply picked a date and a time. She has allowed her teachers to pick the date and time. She stated that this has been successful - teachers appear to be more willing to participate in meetings than in the past.

Mr. North

Mr. North is head of the science department at Tyler High School. He has held this position for almost twenty-one years. There are fifteen teachers in the science department. Mr. North evaluates these
teachers and teaches three classes himself. He is a member of the union.

Mr. North described several changes within the past two or three years. He has succeeded in getting science teachers to use computers both inside and outside the classroom. He has gotten them to experiment with using an interactive video disk, videotaping of class activities, converting old film to videotape. He has been able to upgrade his computer capability as new equipment has become available. He has streamlined course offerings and improved the quality of content. He has recruited students for science both at Tyler High School and at the "feeder" junior high schools. He has actively recruited female teachers and has them teaching all levels within the department. He has worked with the math department head to implement a team-teaching situation in math and science.

When he needed a new physics teacher he looked to the Physical Education department. There was a teacher certified in science who was "bored teaching P.E." He was able to get that teacher shifted to the science department. He scheduled him so that the "new" teacher would have a free period at the same time that a veteran physics teacher did. He did the same thing when he needed a chemistry teacher - "raided" the PE department. He stated that he "did not care what the PE department thought - anyone can teach PE!"

All these changes were his ideas. Mr. North stated that he has "made change on the run." He felt that under ideal conditions he would have had time to plan and organize for change. However, he has not had
ideal conditions. He has tried to change from the bottom-up because he has seen change implemented from the top-down fail too often.

One strategy he has utilized has been to model what he wants others to do. For instance, he brought in a computer from home and demonstrated to the rest of the department what it could do. The members of the department then requested that the school purchase computers for their use. He did the same thing with his camera. He showed his teachers how they could produce pictures and slides for use in their classes. The teachers then requested that the school purchase cameras for the department.

He has tried to run an "open" department where teachers will share with each other and learn from each other. He has been fortunate to have a hard working group of teachers. For example, one teacher arrives at work before 6:00 a.m. each day. He has encouraged and supported innovation and creativity. Teachers have failed in many of their experiments but he has always insisted that they keep trying. Mr. North stated that there "is a need to be competitive with other departments but cooperative within my own department."

He has hired all the teachers in his department. One of the most important criteria in selection was that he wanted a "team player" who listens to the "coach" (himself). He stated that since he has no money to reward teachers, he uses praise, recognition, and persuasion. However, he stated that he controlled the scheduling of his teachers and would use that power if needed.

The present principal was assistant principal when Mr. North came to Tyler. He has always been supportive of change within the
science department. Mr. North stated that he must show "need" to get extra money. He plans, organizes, and gathers data. He knows that there is always extra money beyond what appears in the budget. After the budgetary process has supposedly been completed he goes to the principal with his request for additional funds. He believed that "if the other department heads were not so lazy they could also get additional money."

The administration has practiced the philosophy of "hire the best people, give them resources, and stay out of their way." He stated that "the principal has always allowed me to sing my song." The principal has always supported his choice for hiring a new teacher. That way, Mr. North said "the new teacher is loyal to me and not the principal." He had five "bad" teachers in the department when he became the head, but he "worked at them until they left."

In summary, the department heads interviewed at Tyler High School tend to be quite active at change within their own departments and less active in change outside the department. They plan a leadership role in the instructional program and model behaviors that they want others to practice. The perceive the administration as supportive of their efforts at change, whether the effort be to help a teacher to improve or to encourage teachers to upgrade their use of technology.

Polk High School

Polk High School is located in the suburbs west of Chicago. It has an enrollment of more than 2,100 students. There is one other high
school in the district. Department heads are allowed to join the union.

Mr. Robbins

Mr. Robbins is head of the social studies department at Polk High School. He has held this position for fifteen years. There are twelve teachers in his department. He teaches three classes and evaluates his teachers. He is a member of the union.

Mr. Robbins stated that he has worked to increase graduation requirements from two years to three years. He has gotten a world studies class added to the required curriculum. The other school in the district now has the same course. He achieved this through talking, discussing, and overcoming some difficulties.

This world studies class must be the same at both high schools. This need for uniformity has created difficulties. There have been philosophical differences between the social studies staffs at the two high schools since he has been department head at Polk. He attributed this to the fact that when the second high school in the district was opened it was staffed by newer, younger teachers. No one was transferred from Polk. The staff at the second high school uses different methods to teach social studies; in fact, they "have never been on the same wave length" as Polk.

Mr. Robbins stated that former superintendents "just let it happen." Mr. Robbins said that the new superintendent has "put us under the gun." The superintendent has insisted upon uniformity in texts, materials, and courses. There had been attempts at doing this in the past but the district administration had not been so dedicated
to seeing it succeed. The superintendent and assistant superintendents had been older and tired, near retirement. They had lacked the energy to really battle for the uniformity. The new superintendent is younger and has been in the district only two years. He hired an assistant superintendent with the same philosophy. Mr. Robbins believed that with these two in the central office "it is going to happen."

His teachers have resented the amount of time spent on creating the uniformity between the schools. There have been too many meetings in the effort to reach consensus. Mr. Robbins felt that "the wheels are turning slowly." He asked: "Why don't they just tell us what they want and let us do it" He claimed that he is not "hung up" on ownership. He argued that two years of working on this has been too long, and that the central office does not have to be that democratic. His teachers have become alienated and are grumbling.

The principal at Polk used to be the principal at the other high school in the district. The principal at the second district high school is new and serves on the social studies task force. The Polk principal has not been involved at all but has asked to be kept informed.

He repeated that his teachers are tired. Every social studies teacher has also been involved in the extra-curricular program and the meetings "are killing them."

Mr. Robbins felt that the meetings were hurting his classroom teaching as well as his department head duties. He claimed that the principal has been trying to implement too many changes too fast. In
addition, the administration has been holding meetings on "teacher time" and not on "school time."

Mr. Stevens

Mr. Stevens is head of the math department at Polk High School. He has held this position for thirteen years. He has seventeen teachers in his department. He evaluates them. He teaches two classes and is a member of the union.

Mr. Stevens stated that the superintendent has required that both schools in the district be the same. Teachers and department heads have been given "carte blanche" to create this uniformity. Department heads have been given the leadership role. He has viewed this requirement as an opportunity to really improve the curriculum and sequence of classes in math.

He "called in" three nationally known figures in math education for a "math weekend." The district paid for a weekend for all math teachers and the three consultants at a nice local hotel. Teachers were invited to attend but did not have to come. All but one teacher attended and that one had a prior commitment. Mr. Stevens felt that the weekend was "phenomenal." They were able to achieve their goal of designing the framework of the new math curriculum.

He had opposed the idea of a task force in math at first. But the administration demonstrated research that showed him the concept worked. He has become quite pleased with the work. He has delegated responsibility to teams of teachers and they appear to be getting the work done.
There was an unexpected side effect to that weekend. Prior to this there had been a lack of cooperation between the two math departments. The weekend gave the teachers a chance to get to know each other. Since then they have been able to work together.

The Polk principal has served on the math task force. He has been task oriented and gets the job done. He has set timelines and checked to make sure the task force meets them.

The math teachers have been cooperative in all this but they feel the process has been too long. His teachers are involved in extra-curricular activities and the "meetings are killing them." Mr. Stevens has mixed feelings about this. He understands his teachers but feels that the process has forced teachers from both schools to work together.

The superintendent was directed by the school board to create uniformity. He has been the dominant force behind all the task forces. The assistant superintendent has had the role of monitoring but not dominating.

Mr. Taft

Mr. Taft is head of the foreign language department at Polk High School. He has held this position for seventeen years. He teaches four classes and evaluates the nine teachers in his department. He is a member of the union.

Mr. Taft claimed that he has not been very involved in much curriculum change. His biggest change has been to implement the new stated mandated evaluation system. Polk had been evaluating teachers in a manner that was different from what the state wanted.
He had opposed the new additional year requirement in social studies because he was afraid it would hurt enrollment in foreign language. Now he has seen that it has had no effect at all. He stated that this is probably because of the new emphasis by colleges that high school students study more foreign languages.

He was more apprehensive of the English task force. He was concerned that it might recommend four semester classes of English for all freshmen. He knew that would destroy enrollment in foreign languages. However, the task force settled on two semesters only of ninth grade English. He has now relaxed. Other "elective" departments have not.

The two schools in the district have always had similar requirements in foreign language and he does not expect any difficulty in creating the uniform curriculum.

The former principal at Polk was "kicked upstairs." The two principals in the district had been leading their schools in separate directions and the superintendent "would not stand for this." The principal at the other high school was moved to Polk. A new person was hired at the other school. The new superintendent believes "there is one right way to do things." Mr. Taft disagreed but claimed he has no power to do anything about it.

The union has played no role in the changes at all. It has gotten department heads relieved of supervisory duty (such as halls, cafeteria, etc.) but little else. He does not want the union to push for having the department heads teach fewer than three classes. He is concerned that he might have to resign from the union if that happened.
If the administration really expected the department heads to be leaders it would move to reduce all the "extra" duties they have at present. Actually, the department head is caught in the middle between teachers and administration.

Mr. Watson

Mr. Watson is head of the science department at Polk High School. He has held this position for eighteen years. He teaches three classes and evaluates the eighteen teachers in his department. He is a member of the union.

Mr. Watson is engaged in a complete and thorough revision of the science curriculum. He viewed this in positive terms as an opportunity to improve. He served on the district steering committee for the science task force. He felt that the steering committee has not controlled the process but has guided it. He stated that there will be no real change unless the teachers want it and "buy in" to the new curriculum.

He has "reserved judgment" on the new principal. The superintendent has been "the driving force" behind all the task forces. He stated that the superintendent has been in the district for three years but that "it seems longer."

He stated that the science task force has drained all the energy from his teachers. They have had to work mostly after school on their own time to get the job done. This has been time worked for no additional pay. He stated that if it is up to him "we'll be through by this fall."
Ms. Underwood

Ms. Underwood is head of the English Department at Polk High School. She has held this position for four years, but previously was head of another department at Polk. She evaluates the eighteen teachers in her department and teaches three classes herself. She is a member of the union.

Ms. Underwood has been working with the English task force for two years. She became department head as the school was restructuring its departments and curriculum. When she took over as head of the English department each school in the district, each department at each school, and each teacher in each department was "doing his own thing." The previous department head in English had not been a leader and things had been chaotic. There was no consistency to the program at all.

Frustrated with that situation, she interviewed for the position of department head. In the interview she stated that if she were hired she would move immediately to create a consistent English program at Polk. Ms. Underwood believes that is why she was hired.

In her first year she created a committee to study and recommend changes in the freshman curriculum. She talked individually with all teachers of ninth grade English. At this time she was not concerned with the curriculum at the other high school. There was no "push" from the administration at that time to create one uniform curriculum throughout the district.

She tried to get her teachers to "buy in" to the new ninth grade program. She had created a committee of the five teachers involved.
Two of the five rebelled at being told what to teach. The assistant principal sat in on some of their meetings, listened, and "did not say one word." The teachers complained so much that Ms. Underwood proposed a revision in the curriculum to give teachers some options in what they would teach. This was a greater compromise than she had been prepared to make but it "got the change approved." Thus, during her first year she accomplished part of her goals. She stated that she had no help from the principal and was frustrated with him. She appointed one of the ninth grade teachers as coordinator of the team of teachers. She tried to get one released period for that person but was not successful.

In her second year as department head the district hired a new superintendent. By October the district had hired a new assistant superintendent. They were both given the mission to bring the two high schools into uniformity. Ms. Underwood stated that "the board had allowed thirty years of drift and now decided to change us overnight."

The problem was that as Polk was ready to begin work on its sophomore curriculum the other high school had not even started. Ms. Underwood explained that there are three department heads at each school in what might be traditionally called English. There is a speech department head, a "developmental education" department head, and an English department head. The superintendent placed the three of these from each school on a committee to do the work. The superintendent ordered them to create a uniform curriculum for the ninth and tenth grades.
One major problem was that speech had been taught in tenth grade at one school and ninth grade at the other. When the committee could not reach agreement the superintendent stated that speech would be taught in ninth grade. Ms. Underwood then abandoned her plans to work on the tenth grade curriculum and devoted her time to again working on the ninth grade curriculum.

The structure, philosophy, and methods of the two high schools were so different that reaching a consensus was very difficult. This "opened the way" for the superintendent to make some "arbitrary" decisions.

In her third year as department head, Ms. Underwood continued to work with the other five department heads on the English task force. They "fought" through October before finally taking a recommendation to the superintendent. The superintendent turned down their proposal, inserted his, and took it to the board. The board approved his proposal. This past year the new English curriculum was instituted. The board never consulted any of the department heads who worked on the task force.

Given the superintendent's plan, the six department heads fought over how to implement it. One of the heads just quit coming to meetings. They submitted a proposed change in the reading program but it was turned down by the superintendent. Department heads were not even informed of this until summer.

In January, 1987, the principal from the second school was transferred to Polk. The teachers at both buildings took this as a sign that the superintendent "meant business." Teachers at Polk have
been hostile to the new principal. Principals now chair the task forces, whereas in the past they had not even been involved. It might have been better to have had them involved from the beginning. Ms. Underwood has sympathy for the other departments engaged in task force work. She is "winding down" her task force, but wonders if it "will really ever end."

In summary, department heads at Polk have resented and opposed change handed down from the state of Illinois and from the superintendent’s office. Superintendents prior to the present one had allowed each school and department in the district a large degree of autonomy. This has been replaced by a strong drive toward uniformity. The department heads have not openly opposed this. They perceive the superintendent as having the power of the school board behind him and as being willing to use his power to "get things done." They complain of fatigue and frustration at the changes which they must unhappily implement.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This study has concentrated on strategies utilized by high school department heads in initiating or implementing change. Focus was on the heads of the math, science, English, social studies and foreign language departments in high schools in the Chicago metropolitan area. Each high school studied had an enrollment greater than 2,000 students and had department heads in each of the five areas. Further, each principal granted permission to interview each of the department heads.

Questions guiding this study were:

1) Have department heads developed and utilized strategies to initiate or implement change?

2) Are most successful change efforts those in which the department head has the definite support of the building principal?

3) Do department heads tend to view minor change efforts as more successful than major change efforts? A minor change effort could be considered changing the shades in a classroom; a major change could be adopting team teaching or a different teaching style. Do department heads tend to concentrate on changing "minor" things at the sake of "major" things?
For this study department heads in nine high schools in the suburbs of Chicago were interviewed. Of the total, nine were head of the foreign language department, nine were head of the science department, six were head of the social studies department, seven were head of the math department, and seven were head of the English department. There were a total of thirty-eight interviews.

The average length of service in the position of department head was more than twelve years in foreign language. The range in foreign language was from as short as one year in the position to as long as twenty-two years. In science, the average length of service as department head was seventeen years, with the shortest term five years and the longest term twenty-one years. In social studies the average length of service as department head was fourteen years, with the shortest term one year and the longest term twenty-one years. In math the average term of service was twelve years, with the shortest term three years and the longest twenty-one. In English the average term was nine years, with the shortest term three years and the longest term twenty-one years. The average term as department head for all departments considered was more than thirteen years. Persons interviewed were experienced as both teachers and department heads. All but one had been teachers in their present school prior to becoming the department head. Most had had enough time in their school to have gained an understanding of the school, its people, and its policies. (See Table 1. Years of Service As Department Head.)
### Table 1

**Years of Service as Department Head**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Adams</th>
<th>Jefferson</th>
<th>Madison</th>
<th>Monroe</th>
<th>Van Buren</th>
<th>Jackson</th>
<th>Tyler</th>
<th>Polk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department heads studied supervised from as few as six teachers to as many as thirty-three teachers. The average number of teachers supervised by foreign language heads was nine, with the range being from six to thirteen. The average number of teachers supervised by science department heads was seventeen, with a range from twelve to twenty-six. The average number of teachers supervised by social studies heads was thirteen, with a range of eleven to seventeen. The average number of teachers supervised by math heads was seventeen, with a range from sixteen to nineteen. The average number of teachers supervised by English heads was twenty-six, with a range from eighteen to thirty-three. The average number of teachers supervised for all department heads was sixteen. These department heads in the high schools studied supervise as many teachers as do many suburban elementary school principals. Supervision by itself takes up much of the time of the high school department head. Traditional duties such as budgeting, coordinating, and teaching take up much time also. (See Table 2. Number of Teachers Supervised By Department Heads.)
Table 2
Number Of Teachers Supervised by Department Heads

| Department     | School       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|----------------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                | Washington   | Adams   | Jefferson | Madison | Monroe  | Van Buren | Jackson | Tyler   | Polk    |
| English        | -            | 24      | 26       | 28       | 30      | 24       | 33      | -       | 18      |
| Social Studies | 11           | 11      | 14       | 14       | -       | -        | 17      | -       | 12      |
| Math           | -            | 16      | 19       | 16       | 17      | 18       | 17      | -       | 17      |
| Science        | 16           | 14      | 17       | 16       | 12      | 26       | 17      | 15      | 18      |
| Foreign Language | 9            | 7       | 11       | 6        | 7       | 11       | 13      | 8       | 9       |
Department heads studied taught as few as one class or as many as four classes. The average number of classes taught was approximately 2.6 classes. In foreign language the average was 3.6; four taught three classes and five taught four classes. In science the average number of classes taught was 2.8; one science department head taught one class, one taught two classes, six taught three classes, and one taught four classes. In social studies the average number of classes taught by the department head was 3.1; one taught only one class; four taught three classes, and one taught four classes. For math department heads the average number of classes taught was 2.6; one person taught one class, two taught two classes, three taught three classes, and one taught four classes. English department heads taught an average of 2.1 classes; two taught one class, two taught two classes, and four taught three classes. Most of the department heads studied had a significant teaching responsibility in addition to their supervision and management responsibilities. (See Table 3. Number of Classes Taught By Department Heads.)
Table 3

Number Of Classes Taught By Department Heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the thirty-eight department heads studied, thirty-three evaluated the teachers under their supervision. Most said that they had to observe each teacher two or three times as well as hold pre-observation and post-observation conferences for each observation. Evaluation procedures have been time consuming for all department heads charged with that responsibility. In the single school where department heads did not carry out teacher evaluation, there were four assistant principals charged with the responsibility.

Each of the nine schools had an active teachers' association or union. Seven school districts had collective bargaining agreements permitting department heads to join and be represented by the bargaining unit. Thirty of the thirty-eight department heads had the option of joining the collective bargaining unit, and of those thirty-eight all but one have joined and are represented by the teachers' "union." Those department heads in schools where they were not allowed to join the teachers' union taught fewer classes than did the majority of department heads in the study. At Washington and Jackson, where the department head was not allowed to join the teachers' union, the head of the foreign language department taught three classes. The average for all foreign language heads studied was 3.6 classes. The science department head at Washington taught two classes and the science department head at Jackson taught one class. The average for all science department heads studied was 2.8 classes taught. The social studies department head at Washington High School taught one class and had two periods of additional assignment; the social studies department head at Jackson taught one class. The average for all social studies depart-
ment heads studied was 3.1 classes. The English and math department heads at Washington were not interviewed, but the English and math department heads at Jackson taught only one class each. The average for all English department heads was 1.8 classes; the average for all math department heads was 2.6 classes.

Table 4
Average Number of Classes Taught By Department Heads At Schools Where Department Heads Could Not Join The Teacher Union Compared To Classes Taught By Department Heads At All Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Average Number Of Classes Taught By Department Heads At Schools Where They Could Not Join The Teacher Union</th>
<th>Average Number Of Classes Taught By Department Heads At All Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy-one percent of the department heads were male; twenty-nine percent of the department heads were female. The social studies and math positions in all schools were held by males. Males held eight out of nine positions in science, five out of nine in English, and three out of nine positions in foreign language. As a group, males had held the position of department head longer than had females. Analysis of the data indicates that in the Chicago suburban area most department heads are male, have more than thirteen years of experience in the
position, supervise an average of sixteen teachers, teach approximately three classes, evaluate teachers, and are members of the teachers' union. The data suggest that lack of time might be one constraint upon department heads becoming more effective at initiating or implementing change. Department heads have so many teachers to evaluate and supervise that this takes much time that could be used for change.

Types of Change Attempted by Department Heads

Department heads were involved in initiating or implementing different types of change at all nine high schools. These changes are grouped under the categories of curriculum, interpersonal relations, instruction, facilities, and "other." Most attempted changes occurred in the area of curriculum, with fewest attempted changes in the area of facilities.

There were thirty-eight efforts at change in curriculum (see Table 5), two attempts at change in the area of interpersonal relations (see Table 6), sixteen attempted changes in the area of instruction (see Table 7), five attempted changes in the area of facilities (see Table 8), and nine attempted changes outside the previously listed categories (see Table 9).
### Table 5

Attempts Made By Department Heads to Change the Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>ATTEMPTED CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Course addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Textbooks, Course addition, Tracking, Reading program, Textbooks, Course objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Course addition, Law class, Course objectives, Textbooks, Course objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Course addition, Course objectives, Course addition, Course addition, Course addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>Final exams, Course addition, Credits, Course objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Buren</td>
<td>Levels, Writing lab, Semester electives, Enrichment program, Sequencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Course addition, Consistency in curriculum, New math program, Consistency in curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>Course objectives, Course objectives, Course objectives, Course objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
Attempts At Change In Interpersonal Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>ATTEMPTED CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Build trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tyler  | Increase teacher participa-
|        | tion                      |

Table 7
Attempts at Changing Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>ATTEMPTED CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Peer coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class visitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Use of calculators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Teacher evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Improve teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove poor teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>Improve teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Buren</td>
<td>In-service for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creation of &quot;lead teachers&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>&quot;Creation of a teacher&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Creation of a teacher&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>Teacher use of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dismiss a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>Teacher evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8
Attemps At Changing Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>ATTEMPTED CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Upgrade science facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Change rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>Display case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computers in lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Lab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9
Other Attemps At Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>ATTEMPTED CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Improve ACT scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Theme readers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Teachers organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>Math team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Buren</td>
<td>Combining departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exchange program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>Increased funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIDS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Strategies Utilized by Department Heads

Schools are political as well as educational institutions. Department heads who were most successful in initiating change understood this. They were politically astute, understood the power structure, and knew how to utilize and manipulate the system. No department
head had actually taken time to consciously develop an advanced plan or strategy for achieving change. Some department heads had a higher level of political efficacy than others, but most used their experience in the school and knowledge of district politics to gain an intuitive "feel" as to the best way to proceed.

Department heads used a variety of strategies in attempting curricular change. Those efforts that were most successful were based upon knowledge of the "politics" of the system and an ability to get the support of those persons with power. Department heads successful in changing the curriculum used manipulation, personal friendships, and any way they could to get that support from those above them in the hierarchy. Those department heads who were less politically astute have, with few exceptions, been less successful in gaining favorable curriculum change.

In attempting to gain an additional course added to the science department, the department head at Washington High School used a logical, data gathering, and data presentation strategy. She earned the support of the building principal but could not convince the other two high schools of the need. The assistant superintendent insisted that all three high schools in the district offer the same curriculum, and since all three high schools could not reach agreement, he denied her request. Therefore, she should have developed a strategy that would have built consensus on the issue prior to submitting it to the assistant superintendent.

A more successful change effort was initiated by Mr. Evans at Adams High School. He wanted to change textbooks used in the science
department. He required his teachers to participate, kept communication open with the department head and teachers at the other high school in the district, and reached consensus on the change prior to submitting it to the central office. The superintendent approved the new textbook. The science head at Adams demonstrated knowledge and understanding of the politics of change. He knew that he had a better chance of successful change if he convinced others of its desirability prior to submitting it to the central office.

Ms. Ford, at the same high school, has been less successful in gaining curriculum change which she has initiated. She and her teachers gathered data to justify a change in the sequencing of English classes. She convinced the principal, but before she could submit her proposal to the central office the district hired a new superintendent. He insisted that both high schools have the same curriculum and sequence. When the other high school resisted the change he denied her proposal. She had not discussed her proposal with either the other school or the superintendent before submitting it. She also wanted to change the reading program at Adams. Her teachers did a lot of research to gather data in support of change. She submitted it to the superintendent who denied it and instituted his own plan. Ms. Ford used the same strategy in attempting to gain theme readers for English teachers. The superintendent again turned down her proposal and implemented his own. Ms. Ford might have achieved greater success had she worked for consensus prior to submitting her proposals. Also, she should have had discussions with the superintendent and those around him prior to formally submitting her request for change. Her efforts
also demonstrate the weakness of the rational, logical approach to change. To her, the changes were reasonable; to the superintendent they were not.

The social studies department head at Adams had been unsuccessful ten years ago in gaining an additional requirement in social studies. He waited for the "right time" to try again. He felt that last year was the right time because the mood of the country had changed. He felt that the philosophy of President Reagan's administration, the "back-to-basics" movement, and the new state of Illinois mandates in education created the proper climate for renewed efforts on his part. He discussed his proposal with the building principal and the department head at the other school. They then conferred with the assistant superintendent. He made his official proposal and the new requirement was approved. His efforts demonstrate sophisticated knowledge of the politics of change.

The foreign language head at Adams has been successful in gaining minor changes because, he stated, he originally hired the current principal as a teacher many years ago. He knows that the informal network can be more significant than the hierarchical structure.

The single biggest impediment to curriculum change initiated by department heads at Jefferson High School has been the district curriculum committees. There are five high schools in the district and each school is represented on a subject matter committee by the principal and department head. The assistant superintendent is a member and chairman.
Mr. Lane learned that logic and reason might not be the best strategy to use in his district. One of the other high schools had proposed that the district create new advanced placement classes in biology and chemistry. Mr. Lane opposed this departure from tradition and "got on the phone to whisper in the ear" of committee members. When the committee vote was taken his was the only negative vote on the biology class, and even he voted for the chemistry class. Community and public opinion, and the spirit of the times can be powerful incentives for change.

The foreign language head at Jefferson demonstrated political insight when she said that consensus building is the best strategy for her to use. If all five department heads can agree on any issue they need to convince only one principal to get it approved.

The math department head at Jefferson stated that "you have to play the political game and try to psych out the assistant superintendent." He stated that the committee structure had made it difficult to change the system from the bottom-up and that teachers have to realize this. Most change has been handed down from the superintendent and he has had to implement it. Change within one building has been possible and he has made a "conscious effort" to be certain the principal supports him.

Mr. Niven, in social studies at Jefferson, was able to get his major changes approved before the district began its "new drive for uniformity." He viewed the power structure differently than did the other department heads at Jefferson. He believed that the principals held the real power and resisted curriculum change through "under-
handed" methods. He held to this position despite admitting that five
department heads and just one administrator could get change accom­
plished. He refused to view the political nature of change in a real­
istic manner, and is probably not successful in changing things today.

At Madison High School department heads have little power in
initiating curriculum change. They understand these constraints and
have tried to "sell" change and manipulate the system as much as pos­
sible. There is a pervasive attitude at Madison that the only sig­
nificant change comes from the superintendent's office.

Mr. Peterson, at Madison, has overcome the resistance of other
departments to get an additional social studies course added to gradua­
tion requirements. He and the social studies heads at the other two
high schools in the district met, talked, and designed a detailed plan.
They then met with the assistant superintendent who "bought" their
plan. That person then "educated" the school board. The board not
only approved the proposed addition of one class, but approved funding
for teachers from other departments to take graduate classes in social
studies to be offered in the district. The purpose of those classes
was to get teachers recertified to teach social studies. Other depart­
ments opposed this chance for teachers to become re-certified, but in
the winter of 1988 there were forty teachers enrolled in the classes.
Mr. Peterson claimed that he did not "play politics" with this change
and that the superintendent has told him the central office wants to
use the change process utilized by social studies as the model for
other departments to follow. Mr. Peterson has seen the success of
change when agreement is reached with other department heads prior to submitting a proposal to the central office.

The science head at Madison used "salesmanship" to get a reduction in the number of required semesters of science. This change was approved because other departments at his school and the other schools were very willing to support such a proposal. Teachers in these departments understood that fewer students taking science classes could mean more students taking their classes; thus, there would be more job security.

Mr. Thomas of math stated that it is difficult to get approval for changes initiated at any one school. Each of the three high schools in the district serves such a different population that it has been hard to reach consensus. Even the department heads have difficulty agreeing on the math curriculum.

The English department head has initiated very few changes because she feels she lacks the power to see them completed. The department head has had the power to evaluate teachers transferred to the assistant principals. Most change is now handed down and she has to implement it. This reinforces the idea that teacher evaluation is one of the more important instruments for change. It gives the evaluator a powerful tool to utilize in implementing change.

At Monroe High School department heads understand the politics of power and have used this knowledge to gain curriculum change. The principal has not been active in the area of curriculum, and has neither supported nor opposed changes. Central office administrators have been much more involved. This is true not just at Monroe, but at
other high schools. Where building administrators do not become involved, politically astute department heads work with persons in the central office.

Mr. Yount, a new department head at Monroe, wanted to change the final exam structure in math. He "acted as a change agent" within the department and told the teachers how the new system must be done. This change was not important to the teachers and Mr. Yount was able to get immediate action.

The English department head at Monroe has initiated changes such as adding critical thinking skills to all levels of English, development of a literary magazine, development of an arts week celebration, and the creation of a writing center. She has used a variety of strategies — in-service education, committee work, modeling, and encouragement. But she has used power when she needed it. She told one teacher who opposed one of her proposals that he "simply must do it." She stated that she enforces the teaching of any curriculum change through the evaluation system. She had to be "pushy" to get teachers to use microcomputers. She stated that the principal always approves the changes but has not participated in making sure that they are really implemented. She stated that "I operate alone" in that area. She is very assertive and gets things done at a cost. Her teachers are not cooperative. Other department heads do not like her style and do not cooperate with her.

Ms. Villard has good insight into curriculum change at Monroe High School. She wanted to grant credit for students who demonstrated proficiency in a foreign language without actually taking the course.
She went to the assistant superintendent, convinced him, and "he fought my battles for me." Ms. Villard's success is an example of how a department head who knows the politics of the system, is assertive, and is willing to spend the time required, can achieve change.

Mr. Unger wanted to create a college prep biology class for freshmen only. He stated that the principal is a "nice guy" but does not get involved in curriculum. He knew that he had to bypass the building administration and deal with the assistant superintendent. He did not worry about the superintendent, who was a former business manager and did not get involved in curriculum either. He knew that he would not be able to get the new course approved this year because the teachers at the other high school in the district were skeptical. He convinced the assistant superintendent to allow him to "pilot" the class this year. He hopes that the success of this class will convince the teachers at the other school. If both schools support the proposal the assistant superintendent will ask the school board to make it a requirement. Mr. Unger simply bypassed the Monroe principal and worked with central office personnel. In fact, in districts with more than one high school this was a common strategy. Department heads most successful in change efforts understood the need for uniformity, identified the proper person at the central office, and worked diligently for that person's support.

Department heads at Van Buren have combined power with reason and manipulation to effectively change the curriculum at that school. They are aware of the difficulty of getting both schools in the district to agree to a uniform curriculum, but understand how to get
support when it is needed. Department heads at this school have learned from past failures at change and have confidence that they can successfully initiate change when it is needed.

Mr. Allen, in science, argued that the department head at Van Buren has to "sell" his ideas to others, but that all department heads have been active in the change process. He has utilized patience and reason in trying to add an additional "track" or level in science. He, his teachers, and the department at the district's other high school have met to discuss this. Mr. Allen wanted to implement the change next year but the other school felt it needed one more year to be ready. They talked it over with the assistant superintendent and agreed both schools would be implementing an additional tracking plan within the next two years.

Mr. Baker lobbied with the assistant superintendent to achieve in-service time for teachers at Van Buren. He had tried the same strategy in the past with a different assistant superintendent but to no avail. The new assistant superintendent was willing to consider the idea and even suggested more days than he proposed. They set up the in-service days but they have had to be used to take care of recent state mandates on curriculum. Mr. Baker also wanted to create a writing lab in the department. He convinced the assistant principal by showing him how other schools had used the lab concept to improve student writing. He was able to get a lab for part of the day last year and will have one for the entire day next year. Teachers had resisted sending students to the lab for they were "afraid" that other teachers would be able to judge their teaching skills. He had the
support of the assistant principal for instruction, and the teachers have begun to feel less threatened by the lab. He found non-tenured teachers to be less threatened and more cooperative than tenured teachers. He has used the strategy of gaining the support of those higher in the organization, working with a few teachers willing to take a risk, and allowing others time to see the benefits of the change.

Ms. Crown used the North Central Evaluation report on her school to help her change the foreign language department at Van Buren. She stated that the North Central report "is a great instrument for change." She had been trying for years to get an enrichment program in Spanish with no success. The North Central study recommended enrichment and she has used this as "ammunition." This appears to be a strategy that any department head could use at any school. North Central Association reports and recommendations provide, as Ms. Crown states, important "ammunition."

Another strategy involved the assistant superintendent. Her son had been bored in Spanish. Ms. Crown convinced her that an enrichment program was just what her son needed. She got her enrichment program. She stated that in any change effort "you've got to find the key person and plan together." She was able to utilize the self-interest of others to achieve changes that she desired.

Mr. Dunn, math department head at Van Buren, stated that most changes there are initiated by teachers and department heads. He has not had to have the approval of the principal for curriculum change, but has kept him informed. He has worked with the department head at the other school in the district and then with the assistant superin-
tendent. Actually, Mr. Dunn is probably incorrect in his assessment of change at Van Buren. No other department head mentioned any change initiated by teachers. However, his strategy of working with the other math department head and the assistant superintendent has been successful.

"Department heads" at Jackson High School might be a misnomer. They do not fit the traditional definition of department head, nor do they view themselves as such. Individuals in those positions at this school are called Instructional Supervisors. They view themselves as the principal has called them - "mini-principals." They have tremendous confidence in themselves as change initiators and facilitators. They are proud professionals and consider themselves as much a part of the administration as a part of the teaching staff. Prior to a strike in 1972 department heads at Jackson were members of the teachers' union. After that time their role was re-classified, they were given more authority, and were not allowed to join the union. At many schools department heads do not view themselves as having power. At Jackson High School the "instructional supervisors" view themselves as powerful. This is due in large part to the high expectations held for them by the building principal, and his communication of these expectations to them.

These supervisors used a variety of strategies, some more successful than others. Mr. Fischer, head of the foreign language department, stated that he moves slowly in initiating change. He attends professional meetings and brings back ideas to share with teachers. He "works things in slowly, trying to reach consensus." He has imposed
few if any curriculum changes on his teachers. In fact, the teachers vote on any change in the curriculum and they had adopted several to which he had been opposed. His philosophy and personality have led him to use this strategy because he "has the power to impose change."

Mr. Gable said most changes in the science curriculum are initiated by the teachers at Jackson. They do not have to have an identical curriculum with the other high school in the district. Due to this level of semi-autonomy he does not have to meet with his counterpart at the other high school. He utilizes a subject matter team to coordinate course content and teaching. He has appointed lead teachers for each subject in the department and has held them responsible for conduct in that area as a "mini-supervisor." He has been pleased with the science curriculum and said that most changes have occurred slowly over time. This ability to create a program just for Jackson, without concern for the other high school in the district, when combined with the confidence and self-perception of the department heads, empowers these people to be creative and play an active role in change.

The teachers in social studies also worked as teams. Mr. Henderson has viewed his role in curriculum change as that of a "gofer." He stated this to mean that he goes for materials and resources to help his teachers do their jobs. He serves as a member of the teams to help them reach consensus on consistency as well as to monitor what is going on in his department. He has given team leaders responsibility and authority. He said that change occurs slowly and naturally and has not been imposed. He stated that he "tried to be a dictator at first but did not like it." He "popped a valium even for department meetings."
He learned from unsuccessful change efforts and has changed his strategies accordingly.

Mr. Jones has been active in the University of Chicago Math Project, even writing a textbook which is used at Jackson. He has been working with teachers to get them to use modern technology in teaching math. He has modeled the new curriculum, achieved released time for teachers to work on curriculum, procured money for materials, etc. The administration at all levels has been supportive of change, and his department has changed all its textbooks within the past five years. He felt that the expectation of the principal and superintendent that the instructional supervisors be leaders has allowed him the power to run his department in a professional manner. Actually, it is his perception that he is expected to be a leader, that encourages him to perform such a role.

Department heads at Polk High School have not been successful in initiating many changes in recent years. A new superintendent in the district has mandated that the curriculum at both high schools in the district be "tightly uniform." As a result the department heads have been busy in implementing curriculum change dictated by others in the system. Polk High School is in a situation almost the reverse of that at Jackson. The requirement for uniformity throughout the district reduces an individual department head's power to achieve changes that he or she individually desires. The need for uniformity requires compromise and gives central office staff more power.

In summary, department heads who understood the political system and were politically skillful had more success in achieving curriculum
changes which they initiated. There were differences by school and district. In those districts where curriculum had to be uniform at all schools, the department head had a much more difficult time in changing the curriculum. Examples of this are Polk, Madison, and Jefferson. In a school such as Jackson, where schools are more autonomous, curriculum change is easier.

As perceived by department heads, the role of the principal in curriculum changes initiated by the department head has tended to be minimal. For example, department heads at Adams and Monroe bypass the building principal and work with administrators in the central office. Department heads at Polk perceive the building principal as involved through the requirements of the superintendent. Yet, department heads at Jackson view the principal as supportive and knowledgeable of curriculum.

The key administrator in curriculum change at most schools is the central office assistant superintendent. If department heads were able to gain his or her support they were much more successful in achieving their proposed change. Department heads at Van Buren have worked to get the assistant superintendent for curriculum to support their change efforts. When the assistant superintendent has done so, most efforts have been successful. At Adams, department heads who have had success at change have learned that the assistant superintendent for curriculum is the critical administrator. When there is a requirement of uniformity throughout the district's schools, central office personnel become more important in the change process for individual departments than when there is no requirement for uniformity. For
example, department heads at Jackson were less concerned with "selling" to the central office than were department heads at any other school.

Department heads who met with their counterparts at other schools in the district to try to reach a level of consensus prior to submitting a proposed change tended to be successful. The math heads at Polk and Jefferson were especially skilled at doing this. However, most department heads were not so successful in reaching consensus in all district high schools prior to submitting a formal proposal to the district office. At Jackson the department heads did not even consider the other school, but worked almost independently.

Department heads who utilized the strategy of logic and reason were seldom successful in achieving their goals. The science department head at Washington stated that she had learned this lesson the hard way, when her request for improved facilities was denied. She had expected the logic of her argument to carry the day and was surprised when it did not. The science head at Madison learned the same lesson when he tried to get a new course. He discovered that what he considered reasonable, others saw as a problem. There were very few situations where logic and reason, used alone, were successful.

The strategy of consensus building was much more successful. Thus, department heads who built a base of support at the department level, consulted with their counterparts at other schools in the district, met with the central office administrators, and understood the power structure in the district were much more successful in achieving changes which they initiated. For example, Mr. Grant at Adams used this approach to get an additional class added to the social studies require-
ments. Ms. Harris, at the same high school, did not try to build a consensus and was not successful in her attempt to change the English curriculum. At Jefferson High school, where there are four other high schools in the district, consensus building is essential. Mr. Mills, in math, has always worked at insuring that all math department heads perceive changes in the same way. He even meets on Friday evenings with them to gain agreement. Mr. Lane has not concentrated on creating consensus among the district department heads in science. He has not been so successful in achieving changes he proposes.

Strategies Utilized in "Implementing" Curriculum Change

Much curriculum change has not been initiated by the department head. Rather, it has been mandated by the state legislature, the school board, or the superintendent's office. When proposed change has been handed down from above, the department head has been more successful in implementing change. He or she knows that the change must occur. Many of the changes have not been liked by the department heads but they have implemented them. Most of the resistance to these "top-down" changes has come from teachers. This has created a challenge and a frustration for department heads who have felt "caught in the middle." In many cases the change itself has been modified informally. Department heads were concerned that mandated change would not be fully implemented by teachers.

All department heads were in the process of implementing changes mandated by the state legislature. These included writing objectives and assessment items throughout the curriculum. Department heads and teachers resented the time and effort involved, but understood that it
must be done. The state mandates have been passed on to the department level with the approval of the school board, the superintendent, and the building principal. Department heads have no choice but to implement them. These state mandates are an excellent example of "top-down" change initiated outside the school itself, utilizing power to implement. Department heads have no choice but to implement the changes. However, they do so without enthusiasm and the state of Illinois will need to be vigilant to assure that its mandates are actually enforced.

Some astute department heads have used these state mandates as opportunities to push for additional courses in their area. For example, the social studies head at Adams High School has utilized the "spirit of the times" as well as state mandates to add an additional required course in his department. Mr. Peterson, at Madison, has used the new mandates to get the superintendent and school board to approve a new class in social studies. Others have complained of the time and energy needed. They have stated that implementing these changes has robbed them of the time needed to handle their department head responsibilities as well as their time to plan for teaching. At those schools where the central office has required a uniform curriculum this process has been especially painful. Department heads and teachers alike have argued that it has been too demanding. They have done the work grudgingly. However, department heads have operated from a power base in that they have told teachers that the state, board, and superintendent required the change. Department heads understood that those above them will support them in requiring teachers to "do the job."
At one high school, Polk, change has been mandated by the superintendent. The department heads have not been pleased and are implementing the change grudgingly. The superintendent is new and wanted to create a uniformity between the two high schools in the district. This emphasis on uniformity is a major change, because the two high schools have been "drifting their own separate ways for longer than twenty years." Mr. Watson, science department head, stated that the new superintendent has been in the district only a short time, but that it seemed longer. Departments had a set curriculum and had become comfortable in not having to worry about what the other school was doing.

Ms. Underwood, English head at Polk, explained the frustration she has encountered trying to implement the superintendent's plan. She became department head four years ago, before the drive for creating uniformity was initiated from the superintendent's office. She saw a lack of consistency in the English program at Polk, and made it her goal to bring some "order out of the chaos that was Polk." In her first year she created a committee to study and recommend changes in the freshman English program. There was no effort at coordinating change with the other high school because the administration did not seem concerned with doing that. She had to overcome resistance at her own school, as teachers did not like being told what content and sequence they would have to teach. At one meeting the principal attended but did not participate. Teachers were so opposed to the recommended freshman curriculum that she had to make some changes in it to get them to "buy in."
She was working on the sophomore curriculum when the district hired a new superintendent. He then "brought in" a new assistant superintendent who shared his philosophy. These two were given the mission by the board to create uniformity throughout the district. Ms. Underwood felt that their plan of implementation has been a mistake. She said that "the board had let us drift for thirty years and was now trying to change us overnight." Just as Ms. Underwood was preparing to change her sophomore curriculum, the superintendent told her she had to work with the department at the other high school to create consistency in the ninth grade curriculum. The structure, philosophy, and methods of the two schools were so different that trying to reach consensus was extremely difficult. She said this "opened the way for the superintendent to make some arbitrary decisions."

In her third year as department head she "fought" with the teachers and department head at the other school until October. They finally developed a proposal and took it to the superintendent. He denied it, inserted his own, and took it to the board for approval. The superintendent even denied their reading plan proposal last year, without informing the department heads until the middle of the summer. He then placed building principals on each of the curriculum committees. Ms. Underwood felt they should have been there from the beginning but not added in the middle. She viewed it as a sign that the superintendent is not pleased with the work of the committee.

The math department head at Polk saw the new emphasis on uniformity as both an opportunity and a "pain." Even though he opposed it at first he has "seized the opportunity" to get his teachers to cooperate
with the teachers at the other school. He achieved this by having all teachers attend a weekend workshop at a hotel that was paid for by the central office. His math teachers have been cooperative but have felt that it has been a waste of time.

Mr. Robbins, in social studies, stated that prior superintendents had attempted to create a uniform curriculum but that they "had been too tired." He suggested that the new superintendent simply tell teachers what he wanted and that they would do it. His teachers are tired and are "being killed" by all the meetings. It has even cheated the department head of any time for concentrating on his classes.

Problems and attitudes at Polk High School illustrate the difficulty in achieving major change. The school board brought in a new superintendent who is using power to create uniformity. He has alienated the teaching staff and department heads at Polk, who give grudging acquiescence. He will have to keep tight control on the new uniformity. Department heads were part of the old tradition and have lost power to run their departments almost autonomously. They will probably support the implemented changes only so long as required to do so by the superintendent.

Ms. Ford, at Adams, saw many of her proposals denied by the superintendent, who then implemented his own. She has been upset by this, but has had no choice but to implement them. She and her teachers have not been very loyal to the superintendent's plans, have implemented them only partially, and look forward to the day he retires.

Many of the department heads have not liked the new system of
evaluation mandated by the state. They had their own system in effect and have only "halfheartedly" implemented the new one.

In summary, change in the curriculum "handed down" from above is usually successful. However, teachers and department heads have not been very supportive of such change and have not enthusiastically implemented it. Much of the change has been accepted verbally. Teachers and department heads have complained of being tired and angry at changes handed down. As the social studies department head at Washington said, teachers still go into their classrooms and close the door. It is probable that the change is altered inside the classroom.

Strategies Utilized in Improving Instruction

Even though the department heads at one school were called "instructional supervisors," there were few attempts by department heads at any school to be leaders in the improvement of instruction. It had been anticipated that department heads, being teachers themselves, might have played a more active role in that area. However, they tended to view themselves more as curriculum leaders, department managers, and coordinators.

Several department heads at different schools viewed evaluation as a tool for implementing the curriculum, but few discussed evaluation as a method for actually improving the teaching that takes place inside the classroom. The English department head at Madison stated that she is not really expected to be an instructional leader but a curriculum leader. She claimed that her lack of power to evaluate teachers has denied her the tool most needed to improve instruction. At Monroe High School the math department head, who does evaluate teachers, has used
this as an opportunity to discuss effective teaching techniques with individual teachers. He feels that he has indeed improved classroom instruction this way. The science department head at Jackson has also used teacher evaluation as a way to improve teaching. But these are the exceptions rather than the rule. With the research currently available, department heads should be knowledgeable as to effective teaching techniques. Perhaps staff development activities in this area would lead to more involvement by department heads inside teacher classrooms.

At Van Buren the English department head viewed utilization of the writing lab as one way to improve teaching. He stated that teachers were reluctant to send students to the lab for fear that any shortcomings in their teaching might be demonstrated.

At Tyler the science head modeled the use of technology for his teachers. He was successful in getting them to use videotape machines, cameras, and other equipment as part of their teaching techniques.

Mr. Davis, at Adams, worked to get his teachers to use calculators in their math classes. He piloted a program, found it to be successful, and required math teachers to use the calculators to improve learning.

At Washington High School the superintendent has implemented peer coaching as an alternative to evaluation. Teachers get to choose. Yet only one department head even mentioned this effort to improve instruction. At the same school the social studies department head has trouble in even visiting classrooms.
In summary, although much has been published in the past decade on effective teaching techniques, department heads seldom mentioned improvement of classroom instruction as one of their change activities. Many may not be aware of the research; many may not feel it is their responsibility; many may feel that attempting to change teaching will lead to too much teacher resistance. In an area so appropriate for the department head to take a leadership role in the change process, it has not happened. Department heads, regardless of title, viewed themselves as curriculum leaders, department managers, and coordinators. If there is leadership for actually improving teaching, it must come from either the teachers themselves, principals, or central office administrators.

The Role of the Principal and Other Administrators

Department head perceptions of the role of the building principal influence how they attempt change. If they feel the principal to be supportive and willing to help them, they work closely with the principal. If they perceive the principal to be opposed to or uninterested in the change, they work with other department heads and central office administrators, bypassing the principal as much as possible.

The role of the building principal in the change process, when change was initiated by the department head, depended upon the school. Some principals were heavily involved in departmental change efforts while others were involved little if any at all. It is certain that the principal is critical in creating the "climate" of the school, but some preferred to remain outside the departmental change process, while others became heavily involved. Some principals have expected their department heads to be leaders and facilitate change; others have not
expected department heads to be leaders. In schools where principals have not been actively involved in departmental change, most department heads who were successful in the change process have worked closely with someone in the central office.

At Tyler the principal has been actively involved. He has approved and supported such changes as the use of technology in the classroom, allocating additional money on the basis of need, supporting a department head in her attempt to dismiss a teacher, and working with the central office in developing a plan to handle publicity regarding a case of AIDS in one of the departments.

At Jackson the principal has "empowered" the department heads by telling them that they are "mini-principals." He has supported them in practically all change efforts. One department head at this school said he is "incredible" and that he has a marvelous "crap detector." Jackson has a degree of autonomy lacking in most high schools that are members of a district with more than one high school. The principal has supported his department heads, given them authority as well as responsibility for the program in their subject area. In return, department heads assume leadership roles and are actively involved in the change process.

At Van Buren the principal has tried to help department heads become more effective in their jobs but has chosen which change efforts to support, which change efforts to oppose and those on which to remain neutral. He supported curriculum changes in science and math, opposed an in-service proposal by the English department head, and has been neutral in changes proposed by the foreign language head. This has had
a direct impact on how department heads view the role of the principal in change efforts.

At Monroe the principal has been uninvolved in change efforts initiated by the department heads. He has remained neutral and allowed the department heads to work directly with the central office. At this school department heads have viewed him as "a nice guy" who is lacking in knowledge about their department. Department heads have bypassed him in most change efforts, and worked closely with the assistant superintendent.

The principal at Madison has been neutral in most changes initiated by department heads. He has supported some curriculum revisions, opposed some changes, and stayed out of the process entirely in most changes. As a result, department heads have had to form alliances with others in the district to achieve successful change efforts.

At Jefferson the principal has been actively involved in departmental change efforts. His involvement has ranged from supporting the implementation of a new evaluation system, to the addition of new courses in several departments. Perhaps the fact that all five high schools in the district must have a uniform curriculum, that principals must serve on all subject matter district committees, and that most change at Jefferson has been in the area of curriculum, would explain the active role of the principal at Jefferson.

The principal at Adams has not been actively involved in change proposed or implemented by department heads. He has stayed out of the entire matter. Department heads have worked with other department
heads and the central office. Many feel the principal is not aware of the real curriculum at Adams.

At Washington the principal has been actively involved in change. He has supported the peer coaching plan handed down by the superintendent, additional courses to be added to the curriculum, and the effort to improve ACT scores. He has remained neutral in other change efforts but the department heads know that he has not opposed any change they initiated. They have learned to count on his endorsement of their efforts, or, at least, his implicit acceptance.

At Polk, principals have been required to be active in the change process. The principal has served on several task forces designed to create a uniform curriculum throughout the district. Department heads at Polk have appreciated the involvement of the principal in the change process, and have understood that the real power has been held by the superintendent.

Administrators other than the building principal have been more involved in the departmental change process. They have been active in change initiated by department heads, change mandated by the state legislators, or change initiated by the district superintendent. The assistant superintendent for curriculum has played an active role, since most department heads have been more involved in changing the curriculum than in changing any other area. Department heads at most high schools have learned that the assistant superintendent is the key to changing the curriculum and have tried to work closely with this person in either initiating or implementing change. In many cases they bypass the building principal completely.
At Tyler, the assistant superintendent has supported all change efforts initiated by department heads. At Jackson, because the school has a degree of autonomy, the central office administrators have not been heavily involved in the change process. At Van Buren the assistant superintendent has been actively involved in the change process. She has discussed change with the department heads, worked to get the superintendent and school board to adopt proposals, and worked to get funds for many change efforts. At Monroe the assistant superintendent has played a critical role in the change process. He has supported changes initiated by department heads, worked to get extra resources for departments, argued the proposal before the superintendent and school board, and worked closely with department heads in implementing change. At Madison the central office has tended to be neutral in the departmental process. It has required a degree of uniformity among the three high schools in the district, but no one individual has worked with department heads in initiating or implementing change. As a result there is continuing conflict among the schools in the district as to the appropriate curriculum. At Jefferson the central office has supported any change effort that has been approved by the district curriculum committees. The assistant superintendent heads all the district curriculum committees and is perceived as having a great amount of power over any changes in curriculum. At Adams the central office has tended to oppose change efforts of all department heads. The superintendent "is being retired at the end of this year," and there is hope at Adams that the new superintendent will be more supportive of the change effort. The person at Adams most involved in the
change process is the assistant superintendent. At Washington the central office has been ambivalent in the change process, approving some as recommended by the principal, disapproving others, and simply not getting involved in others. At Polk the central office administrators have been not only involved in the change process, but have taken the lead. The superintendent has played the key role here, demanding that all high schools in the district have a uniform curriculum. The English department head at Polk said that the new superintendent wants change and "he has shown us that he means business."

In summary, the role of other administrators in change efforts initiated by the department head has depended upon the school. Principals have not been directly involved in most curriculum change, but have chosen to participate fully in selected efforts. Most department heads have learned that the assistant superintendent holds much power in the change process, and have learned to work with that person, especially in districts with more than one high school and where uniformity is required. The superintendent has not had a major role in change initiated by department heads, but has required department heads to implement change initiated by the school board or the superintendent himself.

Department heads have been actively involved in the change process. Those department heads who understand that change is a political process, who know the system, who feel that they can create change, and who are willing to work at it, can be successful in initiating change. Department heads have no choice in implementing change handed down from above, but can "interpret" the change so that
it is implemented purely or so that it is completely different when put into effect. The role of department heads depends, in part, upon their perception of the principal and his or her interest in becoming involved in departmental change. Central office administrators hold power over change, and those department heads who understand this and "play the system" are successful. Those who do not understand the politics of change or are unable to "play the system" are not so successful. Curriculum change has been the most predominant type of change initiated by department heads. In districts where there is more than one high school, change becomes even more complicated, and is highly dependent upon the superintendent or assistant superintendents.

Department heads need to be aware of the politics of change. They need to develop strategies based upon the reality of the school (political) system. They need to know whom to lobby, whom to bypass, and when to just accept that some change is beyond their power to achieve. Department heads who are sophisticated in their knowledge of the change process have been more successful than those who have assumed that reason and logic are all that is needed.

Most department heads view themselves as teachers first. This tendency holds true in high schools where department heads perceive themselves to have less power and in those high schools where department heads consider themselves to be more powerful. The department head role has been clarified in some schools but has been left unclarified in most. Department heads allowed to join the teachers' union identify with the teachers and their loyalty continues to be more with the teachers than with the principal or superintendent. Thus,
changes implemented from above the department head - by the principal, central office, or outside the system - will receive, at best, modest support from the department head. Those not members of the teacher union tend to have more loyalty to the administration, less role ambiguity, and to consider themselves as partial members of the administrative team.

The attitudes and expectations of building and central office administrators, as perceived by department heads, are a significant factor in determining the leadership role of the department head in the change process. In schools where administrators expect department heads to be leaders, such as Jackson, the heads view themselves as leaders. In schools where administrators consider department heads to be less active in a leadership role, such as Madison, the department heads tend to perceive themselves as less powerful.

Department heads perceive a lack of time as the main constraint upon their ability to lead in the change process. This perception occurs regardless of whether the department head teaches four classes or one class. The number of classes taught is directly related to the number of teachers in a department. The reason for assigning department heads fewer or more classes to teach is that the department head with fewer teachers needs less time for evaluating teachers; the department head with more teachers needs more time for evaluating teachers. Yet department heads who teach fewer classes have been assigned additional duties outside the classroom. The state has made the evaluation process more burdensome. Most department heads felt that their teaching has suffered from this lack of time. They would like to be
instructional leaders but they perceive themselves as lacking time, or training, to make more than the minimal effort in that role. Perhaps lack of time is not so much the problem as placing priorities on their duties so they can use the time they do have more efficiently.
This study has concentrated on the role of the department head in the change process and the strategies that person utilizes. The focus of the study was on high school department heads in the Chicago, Illinois metropolitan area. In-depth interviews were conducted with English, math, science, social studies, and foreign language department heads in nine suburban high schools whose enrollment each exceeded two thousand students. Data and analysis were presented in narrative style. The literature demonstrated that there are many different models of change and strategies associated with those models. Analysis of the data showed that department heads have utilized a variety of strategies in attempting to initiate or implement change. It has also shown that change is not a simple process but a complex one. The department head must at times work with teachers, other department heads, principals, and central office administrators in initiating or implementing change. Department heads who are politically aware and astute have more success in change efforts than are those less astute.

Conclusions

Several conclusions are drawn from the study of the role of the department head in the change process and the strategies utilized by that person:
1. Department heads are involved in the change process. Some play a more active leadership role than others. Some have been successful in achieving major changes while others have been able to accomplish only minor changes.

2. At most high schools department heads perceive themselves as lacking enough time to play a more significant role in the change process. Department heads teach as many as four classes and have other "management" duties as well. Often, those department heads teaching as few as two or three classes are given additional duties in place of teaching.

3. Department head perceptions of the expectations held for them by building and central office administrators influence their sense of political efficacy. Where department heads believe expectations to be high they feel more empowered in the change process. Where they perceive those expectations to be low, they tend to be less active as change agents or facilitators, believing they have little if any power to lead.

4. Department heads have not received training for fulfilling the responsibilities of their positions. They may have been excellent teachers but may lack the skills needed in the role of department head. These persons can and need to learn how to perform both the management and leadership functions of the role.

5. Department heads concentrate their change efforts in the area of curriculum. Most successful changes occur in
textbook selection, course additions, and in writing objectives. There is less leadership by department heads in improving classroom instruction.

6. Department heads are more successful in implementing change initiated above them in the hierarchy than in implementing changes initiated themselves. Changes initiated above the level of the department head are those mandated by the state legislature, the school board, the superintendent, or the building principal.

7. There is a general lack of role clarity for the department head. Most see themselves as teachers first and administrators second. In some schools the role has been clarified by taking the power of evaluation away from the department head. In those schools the department heads perceive themselves as teachers only. In some schools the principal has communicated his expectation that department heads are administrators and leaders. In others schools the department heads have been denied the right to join the teachers' organization. In most schools, however, the role of the department head has not been clarified.

8. Where department heads view the principal as knowledgeable and interested in their change efforts, they work with and through the principal. In situations where department heads view the principal as disinterested or lacking knowledge, they work with other department heads and central office administrators directly.
9. Change is a political process. Department heads who understand this and are able to view change in this way are more successful than are those who view change as a rational and logical process. Department heads who are more politically aware and astute have more success at change than do those lacking in these qualities.

10. Most department heads do not consciously develop strategies for change. Instead, they tend to develop strategies intuitively, based on past experience and knowledge of the school and district.

Recommendations

1. School boards, superintendents, and building principals must provide time-management training or give department heads more released time in order for them to effectively function as leaders. Providing more released time would be costly but would permit leadership by the person most knowledgeable in a particular subject area.

2. Principals and central office administrators who expect department heads to be change agents or facilitators must communicate those expectations to the department heads. Department heads who perceive this expectation tend to be more active in a leadership role.

3. Department heads must be given training (staff development) in performing a leadership role in change. Most have been hired "to do the job" and given responsibility with little if any preparation for fulfilling the role. With so many
duties, including teaching, most have to "learn by doing." Department heads can be effective leaders if properly selected and trained.

4. Department heads should look to improvement of instruction as one of their primary duties. Improving teaching is a challenging change process. Perhaps department heads are not knowledgeable about the research on effective teaching or do not perceive it as their responsibility.

5. Department heads need to become more aware of schools as political systems. Those who understand the political process and develop a base of support have a greater degree of success in change efforts than do those who do not understand the political process or the need of a support base.

6. Department heads should become familiar with the literature on change and strategies of change. This would enable them to develop strategies and tactics for change in advance of the actual effort itself. Too many change efforts are attempted intuitively alone. Department heads who combine intuition with previously developed strategies should meet with more success.

Suggested Questions for Further Study

1. This study concentrated on high school districts. Do high school department heads in unit districts perceive themselves to be more or less effective in creating change? Does the central office administrator play a different role
in supporting the department head? How does the politics of change differ when department heads have to work with elementary and junior high principals rather than with their counterpart at a different high school?

2. This study focused on the way department heads perceived themselves and administrators in the change process. How do building administrators perceive the role of the department head in the change process? Do principals expect department heads to be primarily initiators of change? Do they see them as mainly implementors of change? Or do building principals view department heads as managers and coordinators?

3. Are department heads familiar with research on effective teaching strategies and techniques? If so, how do they go about using their knowledge to improve classroom instruction?

4. What training, if any, is provided for department heads to increase their effectiveness in all of their responsibilities?

5. What is the relationship between the sense of political efficacy possessed by department heads and their leadership style?

6. Many districts have combined departments into divisions as enrollment has declined. Do division heads view their role in a different way than do department heads? Do these division heads see themselves as administrators or teachers?
What strategies are utilized by division heads in the change process?
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