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ABSTRACT

This research is a historical examination of Arne Duncan’s leadership styles as Chief Education Officer of the Chicago Public Schools and as U.S. Secretary of Education. This analysis highlights the correlation between Ronald Heifetz’s Adaptive Leadership (2009) and Arne Duncan’s leadership style as he implements initiatives to expand educational opportunities for students in the Chicago Public Schools and his national reform initiatives to improve college readiness among high school graduates.

This research also presents Arne Duncan’s challenges and successes in the implementation of the Renaissance 2010 program that closed 70 schools, Chicago Public Schools exit from the Consent Decree, the No Child Left Behind Act, the amendment of the NCLB Act called Every Student Succeeds Act, and the execution of the Race to the Top initiatives. The study concludes with reflections on Arne Duncan’s styles as a leader, so as to suggest effective leadership for future education administrators.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Soon after his appointment to U.S. Secretary of Education in 2009, NAECOP Director Gail Connelly interviewed Secretary Arne Duncan to discuss President Barack Obama’s administration's vision, initiatives, and goals for America's elementary and middle-level education and the impact on the nation. In *The Principal* (2010), Arne Duncan responded:

Our goal is easy to articulate and hard to get there. It's to make sure every child in this country has access to a world-class education. Race, social and economic status, zip code, the neighborhood shouldn't matter. Every child today desperately needs and deserves a chance to get a great education. There are no jobs for high school dropouts, and there are almost no jobs for young people who just have a high school diploma. Some form of higher education has to be the goal of every single child in this country. Our collective job is to get students ready to take that next step in their education journey (Connelly, 2010).

Arne Duncan’s ongoing mission is to offer quality programs in every neighborhood school no matter one’s address. All students should be ready to go to college or get a competitive job.

In order to reach those goals, Arne Duncan continuously modified his administrative styles. After years working as a grassroots education organizer, then as
Chief Executive Officer of Chicago Public Schools, and later as the U.S. Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan’s understanding of respected and proven leadership styles could be compared to adaptive leadership model from Ronald Heifetz to guide his administration of effective education reform.

**Background to the Study**

This study examines the historical influence of Arne Duncan’s leadership in the Chicago Public Schools as chief executive officer and in the United States of America as the national secretary of education. According to Heifetz and Linsky (2002),

> To lead is to live dangerously. Leaders are remembered, admired, and copied for what they do at the most climactic, brief moments when everything is on the line. Leadership counts when one leads people through difficult change; he or she challenges what people hold dear - their daily habits, tools, loyalties, and ways of thinking - with nothing more to offer perhaps than a possibility. (p. 23)

Arne Duncan’s tenacity to transform schools can be examined using Heifetz’s description of what an adaptive and technical leader should be when faced with adversity. According to Heifetz, Grashow, and Linsky (2009),

> Making progress on these problems demands not just someone who provides answers on high, but changes in our attitudes, behavior, and values. To meet challenges such as these, we need a different idea of leadership and a new social contract that promotes our adaptive capacities, rather than inappropriate expectations of authority. (p. 2)

Arne Duncan became Chief Executive Officer of the Chicago Public Schools in 2001. Mayor Richard M. Daley named Arne Duncan, who had served as deputy chief of
staff for the 430,000-student system since 1999, as its new CEO in 2001. Mayor Daley said he chose Arne Duncan because of his “passion and commitment” and his ability to bring together disparate groups (Crain’s, 2001).

When President Barack Obama named Arne Duncan as Secretary of Education in 2008, educators and teacher unions anticipated progress in educational reform and success because of shared ideals and goals with their new education secretary (NSTA, 2008). The American Federation of Teachers President Randi Weingarten observed (2008),

As Chicago Public Schools’ chief executive officer, Arne Duncan has shown a genuine commitment to what we see as the essential priorities for an incoming education secretary. There may be times when we will differ, but we believe we will agree fully that America’s students and teachers need an education secretary committed to focusing on real solutions for closing the achievement gap and providing every child with a rigorous, well-rounded education that prepares him or her for college, work, and life. (p. 12)

In a statement announcing his choice for education secretary, President Obama (2008) stated,

We need a new vision for a 21st-century education system—one where we aren’t just supporting existing schools, but spurring innovation; where we’re not just investing more money, but demanding more reform; where parents take responsibility for their children’s success; where we’re recruiting, retaining, and rewarding an army of new teachers; where we hold our schools, teachers, and government accountable for results; and where we expect all our children not only
to graduate high school, but [also] to graduate college and get a good-paying job.

(p. 14)

In the Crain’s Chicago Business section, Hinz (2008) mentioned that President Obama’s vision of a national school system responsible for keeping students educated through secondary school and preparing them for competitive jobs are goals Arne Duncan had been working towards throughout his career. Furthermore, Arne Duncan had a breadth of experience in leadership positions in which staff accountability, and community involvement played an increasingly important role in student education.

**Problem Statement**

In 2010, Michael Fullan, an international advisor of leadership in education, pointed out that for most of the 20th century the USA led the world in educational achievement scores, high school graduation rates, and university attainment; however, in the new millennium, USA ranked 24th of the 70 countries in educational attainment according to the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). The results from the newest survey shows, “U.S. students are falling behind much of the world in reading, math and science” (Fullan, 2010).

As school districts both large and small, urban, suburban or rural evolve to meet the changing needs of their communities, so too evolve the demands on school, district, state, and national educational leaders. 21st Century education administrators must have the ability and willingness to take on American student performance successes, problems, trends and goals not previously achieved in the United States while inspiring, involving and motivating employees in various positions from office personnel to curriculum developers to front-line classroom teachers and school building staff and students.
Research Questions

The research answers the following questions:

1) What impact does Arne Duncan’s leadership style have on implementation of educational initiatives?

2) What aspects of the adaptive leadership framework does Arne Duncan employ as the CEO of the Chicago Public Schools from 2001-2008 and SOE of the United States of America from 2009-2015?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze Arne Duncan’s leadership during large-scale educational initiatives beginning with his term as CEO of the Chicago Public School District and concluding with his role as America’s Secretary of Education during President Obama’s first term in office. Through study of the adaptive leadership framework and analysis of Arne Duncan’s leadership and educational impact of initiatives in CPS and U.S. Department of Education, the researcher identifies Arne Duncan’s leadership style as adaptive or technical, and highlights successful leadership moves in order to inform future educational directors of how effective leadership techniques can be achieved.

Data supplied in the research demonstrates Arne Duncan’s impact on American education. Research also enables one to match Arne Duncan’s management with that of Heifetz’s adaptive leadership framework, from early implementation when he leads the school district through the Renaissance 2010 program, expands magnet schools and magnet cluster programs throughout the district as required by the Consent Decree and concluding with his role as chief of the national education system. The researcher
hypothesizes that Duncan relies significantly on adaptive leadership to improve academic achievement and real-world preparedness for twelfth-grade graduates.

**Significance of the Study**

Perceptions and issues facing public education in the United States recur almost annually: not enough money to finance education initiatives, a widening achievement gap between minority and non-minority students and disagreement on defining and measuring academic excellence. The significance of this research is to learn about how Arne Duncan’s leadership style impacted implementation of initiative on American education. Additionally, the study allows the researcher to draw conclusions about Arne Duncan’s leadership style and its consistency with Ronald Heifetz’s adaptive leadership, technical style or both. Adaptive leadership involves transitions and adjustments, it consistently produces resistance. As Heifetz and Linsky (2002) argue, “leadership requires not only reverence for the pains of change and recognition and the manifestations of danger but also the skills to respond.”

Arne Duncan’s willingness to try and adapt to competing leadership techniques is an inspiration to current and future educational professionals united by two major goals. According to Arne Duncan (2015), the first goal that many professionals have made it their ultimate career objective is to eliminate the achievement gap, therefore, ensuring equity and access to quality learning programs for all students, regardless of their socioeconomic or racial backgrounds. The second goal is to adequately prepare students to perform and handle employment and post-secondary workloads and compete in a global workforce.
Overview of the Methodology

The methodology for this study is historical research. The author uses primary and secondary sources including professional insights from pioneers of workforce leadership; archived periodicals, review of relevant historical student data using the No Child Left Behind and Illinois Report Card, district profiles and international education rankings.

This historical research on Arne Duncan as well as that of the adaptive leadership style presented by Ronald Heifetz allows the researcher to highlight effective leadership practices that have impacted the American education system.

While leadership does assume there is a hierarchy or chain of command, a functioning organization requires an elaborate system that involves more than merely one person taking on the task of directing others. Successful leadership can be observed as a process in which progress or change is in the hearts and minds, and is the act of several key stakeholders within the organization (Hassel & Hassel, 2009). According to Heifetz et al. (2009), adaptive leadership was originally explored because of “efforts to understand in practical ways the relationships among leadership, adaptation, systems, and change” (p. 2). Furthermore,

Adaptive Leadership is the practice of mobilizing people to tackle challenges and thrive. Leadership then must wrestle with normative questions of value, purpose, and process. Adaptive success is an organizational sense that requires leadership that can orchestrate multiple stakeholder priorities to define thriving and then realize it.
In short, Adaptive leadership encourages management to prioritize people as problem solvers rather than taking on sole authority. In the adaptive leadership framework, management creates a setting in which struggles take place; management facilitates continued conversation between diverse stakeholders so that challenges can be worked through and progress continues.

**Objectives and Outcomes**

The objective of this research is to demonstrate that an effective 21st Century leader in the education field is to be adaptive and can influence a future generation of education leaders. No matter the outcome of leadership styles Arne Duncan employed, the research aims to explain that a leader in today’s education field values wide-scale education reforms to bring about progress in student learning and be daring and experimental in how he or she tackles challenges.

**Biases**

The researcher worked under Arne Duncan’s administration while he was CEO in CPS. The researcher worked in the Office of Academic Enhancement, which played a key role in developing and implementing the Magnet School Assistance Program grants designed to satisfy the Consent Decree to eliminate segregation in Chicago schools.

**Limitations**

Currently, there are resources available that offer an in-depth analysis of Arne Duncan’s impact on education. However, there are no professional studies of Arne Duncan’s leadership style or transcripts from interviews in which Arne Duncan outlines his preparedness and reflections on the work he did as Chicago CEO and U.S. SOE.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Leadership Theory

According to Heifetz et al. (2009), a pervasive leadership failure plaguing politics, governments, business, or school districts is that more traditional leaders who hold dearly their authority, and those that “treat adaptive challenges like technical problems” (p. 7). He describes technical problems like those, “for which they do, in fact, have the necessary know-how and procedures” to correct them (p. 33). Short-sighted, one-size-fits-all corrections will bring profound negative impacts to any organization or system. Instead, Heifetz’s adaptive challenges, “require experiments, discoveries, and adjustments from numerous places in the organization or community” (p. 7) (see Table 1 below.

Table 1

Technical and Adaptive Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Challenge</th>
<th>Problem Definition</th>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Locus of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive</td>
<td>requires learning</td>
<td>requires learning</td>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical and adaptive</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>requires learning</td>
<td>Authority &amp; stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Heifetz et al. (2009, p. 8).
In the table above, it charts the difference between approaching and resolving challenges as either technical or adaptive. Technical problems are clear and ready to be resolved by someone who has the necessary know-how and procedures to address. On the other hand, Adaptive challenges require learning to understand their origins and require experiments, discoveries, and adjustments from numerous places in the organization or community (Heifetz et al., 2009, p. 33).

What is adaptive leadership? According to Dr. Ron Heifetz, it is “the activity of mobilizing adaptive work and addressing challenges arising in the context of complex problems” (Heifetz et al., 2009, p. 14). Additionally, he says, the world's best leaders do not influence others to perform their jobs in a particular way; instead, leaders and their teams “work together, much as do doctors and nurses when major life-changing forces need to be faced” (p. 26). And finally, he says, “Leadership...does not so much provide direction as help people find it for themselves” (p. 74). However, a leader must realize that people can learn only so much so fast, so a leader must attend to three fundamental tasks in order to help maintain a productive environment. First, he creates the conditions for diverse groups to talk to one another about the challenges, to frame and debate issues, and to clarify the assumptions behind competing perspectives and values. Second, a leader has to have the emotional capacity to tolerate uncertainty, frustration, and pain. Third, in order to maintain productivity every task or challenge a leader encounters should be broken down into five core responsibilities: (1) direction, (2) protection, (3) orientation, (4) conflict, and (5) norms (p. 16). A leader must use all these elements to create an environment where employees carry appropriate levels of stress and value change (see Table 2).
According to Heifetz and Laurie (2001), an effective leader is responsible for creating, monitoring, and modifying a pace for work to be done and also laying out a goal for sequence of accomplishments. Ideally, this means not overloading employees with several initiatives at once, nor starting new ones without pausing others. Both technical and adaptive situations require the leader to take on the five core responsibilities, but the adaptive leader uses his or her, “authority to fulfill them differently” than routine situations already experienced.

Direction includes identifying the challenge at hand, framing key questions and issues presented. An adaptive challenge is one that has not been encountered before, it requires voice and approach from multiple perspectives even to identify the problem as it is not familiar to team members. The situation differs from a technical one because it cannot be immediately defined, there is no previous history with solving an identical challenge.
Protection of employees means allowing them to appropriately struggle with a challenge. The leader must “strike a delicate balance between having people feel the need to change and having them feel overwhelmed by change” (Heifetz & Laurie, 2001, p. 6). The leader’s role in protecting employees from stress and burnout is managing the pace of work and providing a space for diverse groups to talk about challenges they are facing and problem solve. For work groups, the leader is constantly providing information that can help lead to a solution and moderating so as to “clarify the assumptions behind competing perspectives and values” (p. 6). A more technical leader would use his or her authority to be the problem solver and “protect” employees from conflict and threats to their productivity.

Adaptive tasks require employees to regularly take on new roles and responsibilities rather than stay within the box of their job descriptions. A technical situation might be sent to a specific department or worker to be addressed as it has in the past; however, an evolving challenge requires diverse groups working as a collective, employees demonstrating flexibility and developing new competencies. In these situations, the leader facilitates, models and encourages questioning, challenging one another and experimentation while managing pace and employee workload.

When facing conflict in the workplace, a leader familiar with resolving technical matters prioritizes restoring order. However, in an adaptive challenge, conflict is exposed and used to problem-solve. Exposing conflict allows it to become an “engine of creativity and learning” (Heifetz & Laurie, 2001, p. 6).

An adaptive leader values operational norms and must be willing to keep them fluid. He or she helps “maintain norms that must endure and challenge those that need to
change” (Heifetz & Laurie, 2001, p. 6). This may include shifting focus and mission, prioritizing voice and feedback, experimenting with new measures of performance and compensation, developing new data systems.

In his leadership guide, Heifetz describes important matters that effective leaders must anticipate. He asserts that accompanying leadership are various levels of frustration, resentment from others; an effective leader must be able to “stomach hostility.” While a leader is open to suggestion, a well-intentioned question to learn from another’s perspective can be dangerous when subordinates react defensively. A leader’s legacy begins when they can rally staff around a cause, a change, an outcome that is important to society. This may include creative explanations, numerous illustrations, and modifications in broadcasting; it also includes telling people what they need to hear to make a matter professional rather than personal. A leader must further understand that change “challenges a person’s sense of competence. Habits, values, and attitudes, even dysfunctional ones, are part of one's identity” (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). Though all stakeholders approach work with a professional attitude and bring expertise, there is a significant personal component brought to a project as well. A great leader recognizes the effort their employees bring to their role, praising them for adjustments and encouraging them to persevere through failures and initial attempts. Anticipating these challenges and understanding that there is no universal, predetermined response to any one of them is the underlying principle of adaptive leadership.

Dr. Ron Heifetz, founding director of the Center for Public Leadership at the Harvard Kennedy School, is a graduate of Harvard Medical School, where he initially trained to be a surgeon before devoting his career to the study of leadership. Heifetz’s
(1994) article, “Leadership without Easy Answers,” suggests that business and government leaders must have the ability to be adaptive. Today’s leaders must be willing to help others change and expect resistance while in the process.

As school districts both large and small; urban, suburban or rural evolve to meet the changing needs of their communities, so too evolve the demands on school, district, state, and national educational leaders. Twenty-first century education administrators must have the ability and willingness to take on American student performance successes, problems, trends and goals not previously achieved in the United States while inspiring, involving and motivating employees in various positions from office personnel to curriculum developers to front-line classroom teachers and school building staff and students.

The Chicago Public School District is an example of one organization that faces significant principal turnover. Principals admitted to leaving CPS in search of leadership roles requiring less paperwork, less micromanagement, and more autonomy (Oberman, 1996). During the period of 2016, there were resignations among the exiting principals signaling dissatisfaction with leadership methods of district administrators (Karp, 2016). According to Karp, the number of principal retirements in Chicago Public Schools was approximately 110 (16%) in 2012. In 2016, another 60 school principals retired or resigned. Of those 60, many left the district but chose “other jobs rather than sticking around to make what could be severe budget cuts” (Karp, 2016).

The Chicago Public School district cycled through six leaders in eight years (Chicago Tribune, 2015). Between the years 1995 and 2008, CPS’s two Chief Executive Officers (CEO) were: Paul Vallas, from 1995 to 2001, and Arne Duncan from 2001-
2008. During this period, there were two waves of large principal turnover because of early retirement incentives and new principal retention procedures. According to the University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research, CPS retirees of the new millennium cited the Five Plus Five early incentive program as “too good to pass up” (Conrad, 1993). Five Plus Five allowed CPS employees to boost their pension benefits by buying credits to add five years in service. Another turnover factor during this time was “implementation of the 1988 Chicago School Reform Act, which eliminated principal tenure and allowed LSCs to hire and fire principals.” Nearly half of CPS principals retired in 2007 as a result (Stoelinga, Hart, & Schalliol, 2008). In 2006, 70 principals retired, and the following year, 120 principals gave notice of their retirement (Karp & Forte, 2008).

Unfortunately, there is a hesitancy to “step up” in the American education system; “when opportunities to exercise leadership call, many often hesitate. Any leader who has stepped out on the line, leading part or all of an organization, knows the personal and professional vulnerabilities” (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002).

In addition to the United States’ need to fill traditional leadership vacancies, administrators must also take effective steps to improve student academic performance. Michael Fullan (2010), an international advisor of leadership in education, pointed out that for most of the 20th century the USA led the world in educational achievement scores, high school graduation rates and university attainment; however, in the new millennium, USA ranked 24th in educational attainment according to the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). The results from the newest survey shows U.S. students are falling behind much of the world in reading, math, and science. Gwen Ifill
interviewed Education Secretary Arne Duncan about the state of American schools (PBS, 2010). Arne Duncan expressed his frustration:

This is a devastating problem, the longer our children are in school, the worse they do. Year after year after year, our children in America are falling further behind. Our 3- and 4-year-olds enter kindergarten okay, and they fall further and further behind. Each year, children in other countries are learning more than children in this country. And so the gap between American student performance in Singapore and Finland and South Korea and Canada and these other countries, the gap widens year after year after year. (Duncan, 2009)

In an Organization for Economic Cooperation (OECD) 2001 report, U.S. students finished in the bottom half of 31 nations in reading (15th), math (19th) and science (14th). The study measured literacy levels of 265,000 students in each of the subjects; Finland, Japan and Korea were the top finishing countries (Lyne, 2001).

Concurrent with unsatisfactory performance nationally, the majority of students in Chicago Public Schools in 2001-2002 were performing below average as well. The data shows that 38% of elementary students met or exceeded the Illinois Learning Standards (ILS), and 16.5% of high school students were college-ready as compared to the rest of the state of Illinois. In addition, 69% of students in Chicago finished high school while the State had an 85% graduation rate (ISBE, 2002).

Analysis of the Illinois Report Card (IRC), the No Child Left Behind (NCLB), and the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) reports spanning the years 2001-2015 shows how the education system uses student performance to measure, design and improve classroom curricula to outperform students within Illinois, nationally
and internationally:

1) Illinois Report Card (IRC) - Illinois State Board of Education issues the IRC to every public school to measure student achievement and compare its students to others throughout the state of Illinois.

2) No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), with the implementation of the federal NCLB, the U.S expands its reliance on standardized testing as a way of measuring school performance as well as individual academic achievement.

3) Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), though less frequent, the USA also uses the PISA standardized testing to measure student achievement. Seventy countries worldwide report student performance through PISA, a triennial international survey of test results that uses data to evaluate education systems worldwide every three years.

When CPS implemented the NCLB Act for the first time in 2002, only 38% of elementary students met or exceeded the ILS, while only 16% of high school students were college-ready when they took the ACT (ISBE, 2002).

According to the Illinois State Board of Education’s Illinois Report Card (IRC) from the 2001-2002 school year, the majority of students in Chicago Public Schools were performing below average as well. Figure 1 shows the yellow bar shows that nearly 38% of Chicago elementary students met or exceeded the Illinois Learning Standards while at the state level (in blue), 60% of students met or exceeded state learning standards. In Figure 2, the yellow bar shows 16.5% of Chicago high school students were college-ready. In addition, 69% of students in Chicago finished high school while the State had an 85% graduation rate (ISBE, 2002).
Figure 1. Comparison of Illinois Learning Standards between Chicago and Illinois

Figure 2. Comparison of ACT Assessment between Chicago and Illinois

The Organization for Economic Cooperation (OECD) 2001 report (see Graphic #5 in the Appendix section), U.S. students finished in the bottom half of 31 nations in reading (15th), math (19th) and science (14th). The study measured literacy levels of
265,000 students in each of the subjects; Finland, Japan, and Korea were the top finishing
countries (Lyne, 2001).

**Arne Duncan as CEO**

In June 2001, Arne Duncan assumed leadership of the Chicago Public Schools and served as its chief executive officer until December 2008. At that time, lead the district through significant reform milestones.

Haney (2011) highlighted some of Arne Duncan’s initiative as CPS CEO in Chicago:

- Opened 75 new schools under the Renaissance 2010 initiative; Improved CPS first day attendance levels from 76 percent to 93 percent;
- Led the district to steady incremental gains on state standardized tests, with 65 percent of CPS’s elementary students meeting or exceeding standards (the national average is 50th percentile) by 2008;
- Improved the high school graduation rate by six percentage points.

He united teacher union members and Chicago Public school board members in an unprecedented five year contract with the Chicago Teachers Union (CTU) (Sadovi, 2007). Of the agreement, Marilyn Stewart, CTU president from 2001-2010, remarked the contract furthers a, “continuous 20 years of labor peace between the CTU and the Chicago Board of Education” (p. 2). School CEO Arne Duncan similarly praised the contract as “historic” because of its five year length. Most previous contracts had been between three or four years long (p. 3).

He won support with reform efforts including reducing teacher vacancies and employing high caliber teachers in schools throughout the city. According to the CPS
Annual Financial Report (2007), Arne Duncan’s team reduced teacher vacancies to three percent of the workforce. Among elementary school teacher applicants, he focused on employing those who had content area endorsements on their teaching credentials. He formed partnerships with the New Teacher Project to recruit and train certified teachers, and the New Teacher Center Santa Cruz to discover more about coaching and supporting new hires (CPS Annual Report, p. 12).

Despite reaching agreements with CTU and filling teacher vacancies, Duncan angered many by challenging and forcing underperforming schools to close through the Renaissance 2010 program. With the goal of opening 100 new schools by the year 2010, schools were shuttered or transformed into new programs including magnet schools that impacted attendance boundaries and enrollment requirements. The Chicago Coalition for the Homeless sued the district, alleging it broke its promise to “provide educational stability to homeless children” (Chicago Tribune, 2004).

Arne Duncan further aligned programs to ensure instructional excellence. In Chicago, Arne Duncan shifted priorities to early childhood education with the belief that strong pre-school programs are key in students landing in college. In 2006, 54% of three- and four-year-olds were enrolled in early childhood programs, and Arne Duncan’s administration added 5,000 full day kindergarten spots in 2007 (Chicago Tribune, 2004, p. 15). He strengthened and expanded The Chicago Reading Initiative Framework, offered multi-tiered support in the classroom including core curriculum reading materials, teacher and school-wide coaching and resources for adding extra time and materials for quality learning (CPS Annual Financial Report, 2007). As a result, overall Reading and Math scores of 3rd-8th graders in elementary schools increased from 36% in 2003 to 53%

While CEO, his major goals were to increase high school graduation rates and Advanced Placement enrollment, allow equal access to magnet programs, and to create desirable educational programs out of underperforming schools. Under Arne Duncan’s leadership, schools were closed and new charters opened in their places as part of the Renaissance 2010 initiative. Impacted schools experience staff from principal to teacher replaced. Arne Duncan searched for new Renaissance 2010 principal candidates specifically; CPS posted principal job descriptions for Renaissance School Principals to lead these programs (Chicago Tribune, 2003). Charter schools with new leaders including quality teachers as leaders was Arne Duncan’s ultimate priority in turning around a failing education system.

Arne Duncan as SOE

In 2009, Arne Duncan was appointed the ninth U.S. secretary of education. An archived biography with the U.S. Department of Education credits the SOE with the following initiatives:

Duncan's tenure as secretary brought educational initiatives on behalf of American students and teachers. He helped to secure congressional support for President Obama's investments in education, including the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act's $100 billion to fund 325,000 teaching jobs, increases in Pell grants. He invested time, effort and significant Federal funding in reform efforts such as Race to the Top, classroom innovation, and interventions in low-performing schools. Additionally, he helped secure $10 billion to avoid teacher layoffs, ended the precedent of student loan subsidies paid to banks, and formed a

**Arne Duncan’s Implementation of Initiatives**

On the subject of investment in socioeconomic disadvantaged school communities, Arne Duncan was quoted (Ed. Gov., 2010),

> The United States currently spends more per student than almost any nation in the world on education. Yet we are only one of three OECD nations—along with Turkey and Israel—that do not devote at least as much resources or more resources to schools with the greatest socioeconomic challenges. We must question our priorities and strategies if we are serious about closing achievement gaps.

During Arne Duncan's tenure as SOE, he endeavored to improve the American education system. His efforts focus on identifying labor and management as stakeholders in a system both are motivated to reform resulting in meaningful transformation, strengthened teaching, expanded school choice, and improved learning. Outlined on the website of the U.S. Department of Education (2015), Secretary of Education Arne Duncan organized the following initiatives on behalf of American students:

- Reauthorized the ESEA which consolidated 38 programs into 11 new funding streams;
- Funded the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act's $100 billion to support 325,000 teaching jobs;
- Reformed education through Race to the Top;
- Invested in Innovation called the i3 fund;
- Secured an additional $10 billion to avoid teacher layoffs.
Nationally, Arne Duncan is recognized for his collaborative efforts with all levels of educators and teaching professionals during his tenure as U.S. Secretary of Education. His legacy in that post includes strides in collaboration with teachers in the classroom, recruiting and hiring highly skilled educators, increased education options for students and families and improved student learning.

**History of Education in Chicago**

While the Brown v. Board of Education case may have brought national awareness of educational inequality brought on by segregation, it alone did not bring about total desegregation. Schools across the United States started integrating after the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1954 (Rothstein, 2014). In Jonathan Kozol's book, “Savage Inequalities,” he disclosed the disgusting conditions of schools in minority communities and demanded immediate action. He argued that the Supreme Court decision in the Brown v. Board of Education in 1954, in which the court had found that segregated education was unconstitutional because it was unequal, did not improve much for minority students in the schools (Kozol, 1992).

In Chicago, like other urban areas, the city also experienced racial segregation through neighborhoods and housing (N.D. Ill., 1984). After World War II, 90% of the city’s population of 3.4 million was White; many started moving to the suburbs due to city housing shortages and convenient new roads, and new transportation between city and suburbs. By 1960, 70% of the population was White. At the same time, “other minorities began to migrate to the city, Chicago’s population became more diverse. Eventually, the neighborhoods within the city became segregated based on race, ethnicity, and religious identity” (N.D. Ill., 1984). The Chicago Public Schools embraced
the concept of the neighborhood school; once neighborhoods became majority single-race, public neighborhood schools followed suit. Ninety-one percent of elementary schools along with 71% of high-schools were made up of a single race by 1956 (Jackson, 2010).

In 1960, approximately 25% of Chicago’s population was African American living in neighborhoods located mainly in the South and West sides of the city. These communities were densely populated and characterized as low-income. In these areas, Chicago faced significant overcrowding. Chicago school superintendent Bill Willis erected portable buildings, referred to as “Willis Wagons,” for additional classroom space on school property rather than sending black students to white schools in neighboring areas (Pulliam, 1978).

In 1980, the majority of public schools in Chicago had black enrollments of more than 70%. One hundred schools among 605 schools total, had white enrollments between 70-100% by the end of 1970. In the case of USA vs. CBOE, the United States Justice Department sued the Chicago Board of Education for violating the desegregation order stemming from Brown and Civil Rights laws. The United States complaint alleged that Chicago’s Board of Education “engaged in acts of discrimination in the assignment of students and otherwise, in violation of federal law” and that “such acts have had a continuing system-wide effect of segregating students on a racial and ethnic basis in the Chicago public school system” (USA vs. CBOE, 1980). Chicago was once again ordered to desegregate, this time under detailed federal supervision.

In September 1980, the Chicago Board of Education committed itself to student desegregation by signing a consent decree with the United States Department of Justice.
The mandate required the Board of Education to “develop a comprehensive student desegregation plan to alleviate the effects of historic segregation on black and Hispanic students” (Steele & Levine, 1994). Measures outlined in the contract addressed both student assignments and educational equity issues. According to the decree, desegregation objectives would be achieved through two designs: create a greater number of schools that are desegregated in student population; and, in schools remaining racially identifiable, provide compensatory educational and related programs to move minority students toward equity of outcomes (USA vs. CBOE, 1980).

The goal of the Board of Education through the consent decree was to offer special schools and educational programs in or near previously underserved neighborhoods that would attract students from all neighborhoods, therefore, having students of multiple races comprise the population and ending Chicago’s pattern and history of attendance at racially isolated schools.

The Federal government and the Chicago Board of Education established parameters for eliminating racially isolated schools. Chicago Public schools that were 15-35% White, 65-85% non-White were deemed compliant according to the mandate. Language in the consent decree limited race categories to “White” and “non-White,” so African-Americans, Latinos, Asians, and Native Americans were “non-White” regarding school enrollment.

To achieve these numbers, CEO Arne Duncan expanded the magnet schools offered and applied the racial requirement of 15-35% White and 65-85% minority to all of the district’s magnet schools (Allensworth & Rosenkranz, 2000). Each magnet school offered a programmatic focus (i.e., foreign language, math, science, and humanities
programs), and information about the magnet schools was advertised in a publication called the Options for Knowledge Guide. In order to be considered for available spaces each year, students were required to submit applications to the schools in which they were interested. Only a few of the schools had academic requirements (high school selective enrollment, classical schools, and regional gifted centers); the other magnet schools selected students through a lottery system, which was computerized in the late 1990s. Even though the expansion of the magnet program was somewhat successful in reducing racial isolation in the schools, the limited number of enrollment spots available and geographic locations of programs prohibited the majority of students in the district from desirable choices (Allensworth & Rosenkranz, 2000).

In the 2001-2002 school year, there were only 31 magnet schools in Chicago: 28 elementary and three high schools, serving the entire school district. Over 29,000 applications were filed at the elementary schools, and 6,310 at the high schools. Of these, only 2,625 (10%) were accepted at the elementary schools and 771 (12%) at the high schools (CPS, 2002). Many of the schools were clustered within a few miles of each other, in predominantly white neighborhoods; meaning minority students traveled great distances daily (MSAP, 2002). In order to fulfill the Consent Decree agreement, more programs were necessary to provide educational equity to all ethnicities (Trotter, 2006).

The proposed budget of Chicago District 299 for the school year 2001 would reduce school funding (Martinez & Washburn, 2001), which made the task of opening new specialty schools of choice to increase racial integration even more challenging, yet it was mandated by the Agreement (Dell’Angela, 2004). Arne Duncan prompted to seek
additional funds through a federal grant administered by the Magnet School Assistance Program (p. 2).

**Magnet School Assistance Program (MSAP) Federal Grant**

The Federal MSAP was created in 1984 through Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Ed. Gov., 2017). The Magnet Schools Assistance Program Grant was developed to assist school districts in enhancing school choice program options for parents by developing new ‘magnet schools that are part of an approved desegregation plan’ (Ed. Gov., 2017). The resources provided by the grant were used to enable all elementary and secondary students to achieve high standards and hold schools, local educational agencies, and States accountable for ensuring that they do in accordance with the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The three-year grant was awarded through a competitive process. School districts from across the country completed grant proposals that were submitted to the Department of Education.

The Chicago Public Schools would develop and design ‘innovative educational methods and practices’ in the new schools developed under the MSAP Grant. Each magnet school was to have an enrollment between 65-85% minority (Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, or American Indian/Alaskan Native) and 15-35% non-minority (White).

The Chicago Public Schools Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) Grant aimed to accomplish several goals:

1) Reduce and end the pattern of racially isolated schools throughout the city
2) Provide and maintain desegregation in student assignments consistent with the District's desegregation obligation in the U.S. vs. Board of Education of the City of Chicago;

3) Change the educational focus of the school by enhancing programming during the school day and in extended day programs (before and after school), providing professional development for school staff related to innovative programming, and to increase parent participation and buy-in;

4) Improve the capacity of schools through professional development for school administrators, teachers and so that magnet schools would continue operating “at a high-performance level after Federal funding for the magnet schools is terminated”;

5) Provide a unique or specialized curriculum or approach, and to improve achievement for all students participating in a magnet school program;

6) Develop “courses of instruction within magnet schools that substantially strengthen the knowledge of academic subjects and the attainment of tangible and marketable vocational, technological, and professional skills of students attending such schools”;

7) Assist the district in achieving systemic reforms, and to provide all students the opportunity to “meet” state academic and performance standards;

8) Ensure that all students enrolled in the magnet school programs have equitable access to a high-quality education that provides a basis for secondary school instruction that would enable the students to succeed academically; and
9) Establish and maintain excellent academic programs that promote strong “academic performance” according to standardized tests and national norms in reading and math. (Ed. Gov., 2019)

The Chicago Public School district describes their magnet program as those that attract, where possible, a diverse population of students who are interested in schools outside of their attendance areas. These programs provide the standard required curriculum of general education to students while encompassing specific learning themes, such as math/science, fine and performing arts, world language, and the International Baccalaureate Programme. They are designed to offer a variety of options that will meet the needs, interests, talents, and skill levels of all students (Christenson et al., 2003).

Once enrolled, all students, no matter the grade or class, were exposed to the magnet focus for that school. Magnet schools did not have traditional attendance boundaries like neighborhood schools; instead, applicants participated in a computerized lottery system or were selected after completing a testing process for advanced or gifted programs. Selected student populations were subject to the racial desegregation requirement (between 15-35% White, 65-85% minority).

The MSAP 2004 Grant expanded three additional International Baccalaureate diploma options into city neighborhoods where nearly all students traditionally fed from neighborhood K-8 into neighborhood secondary schools. On the west side, where nearly all students qualify for free or reduced lunch, elementary and high schools provided a K-12 IB magnet school continuum (Ed. Gov., 2007). Chicago also created two early childhood Montessori programs through the MSAP grant. Two elementary schools became Chicago’s first public Pre-k through 8th grade Montessori magnet programs.
One was located in the near northwest side, which provided quality education options to a predominantly Hispanic community; while the other school located on the south side hoped to spur the development of similar improved educational options (CPS, 2001).

Announced in 1997, Chicago Public Schools reorganized its magnet school program. Major renovations included a new “comprehensive magnet school policy” to manage all programs and schools, no matter the size or type, holding the “magnet” title (Ahmed & Germuska, 1999). Included in the policy was the “neighborhood set-aside.” Neighborhood set aside refers to an allowable percentage of students outside the neighborhood attendance boundary that can enroll in a magnet school. The set-aside limit was raised from 15% to 30% beginning in the 1998-99 school year (CPS, 2000).

The Consent Decree over Chicago Public Schools ended after thirty years on September 24, 2009 (Karp, 2009). With the end of the consent decree, Chicago was considering moving from race as a factor in selective-enrollment to socioeconomic status to ensure equity (p. 1). United States SOE Arne Duncan reaffirmed his confidence that the Chicago Public School District would remain committed to racial integration even after the oversight was lifted and furthermore and end to the consent decree, “means more money will go toward improving learning in the classroom, rather than to lawyers making reports to the court” (Trotter, 2006).

When Mayor Daley chose Arne Duncan as the Chief Executive Officer, he expected that the demands to be daunting as the CEO (Duncan, 2018). He was to turn around failing schools or close them and hope to satisfy the requirements of the Federal Consent Decree by spreading new magnet programs throughout the city within significant budget restraints when he took the job. Arne Duncan immediately focused on
changing the status quo in Chicago and later in the national education field as U.S. Secretary of Education. D’Orio (2009) described Arne Duncan’s work reputation as one who, “straddled extremes” (p. 58). He earned the reputation as “a reformer who loves radical ideas yet understands the importance of working with labor unions and educational staff” (p. 59).

After Arne Duncan left CPS, he was appointed by former President Obama as his U.S. Secretary of Education. Arne Duncan prioritized conscientious thinking of organizational needs on national levels. Despite the great recession in 2009, he pushed an agenda, including the Race to the Top competition, and encouraged several states to change education laws (Pascopella, 2010). Race to the Top was a national competition for education funding. Grants were awarded to districts using student outcomes to demonstrate progress in teacher effectiveness and professional development programs. While his tenure did come with challenges, his initiatives and methods are a worth-while study in providing an effective educational leadership model (Karp & Forte, 2008).

**Arne Duncan in Chicago**

Arne Duncan began his professional career working for the Ariel Education Initiative. He ran the nonprofit education foundation aiming to fund college education for under-privileged children. During his time there, the foundation helped fund a college education for a class of inner-city children under the I Have A Dream program. As a result of his investment, 80% of the eighth-grade graduates from the academy were accepted at elite area high schools.

Before hiring Arne Duncan as CEO of Chicago Public Schools, Chicago Mayor Richard Daley reformed the public school system in two major ways, both overhauling
the system's governing structure (Haney, 2011). First, the 1988 Chicago School Reform Act decentralized central office authority and established local school councils (LSC) as the primary decision-makers for each school. The school principal, two elected teachers and eight elected parents comprised the LSCs for each facility. LSCs were responsible for approving their school budgets and leading the search for, as well as approving or hiring school principals. With the 1995 Chicago School Reform Amendatory Act, the school superintendent of Chicago District 299 was replaced with Chief Executive Officer (CEO). The change gave the administration room to transform the management of the schools from a traditional educational format to a corporate style and appointed CEO does not need to have earned an educator’s credential. However, there was always an identified educator with appropriate credentials per state law (Public Act 85-1418, 1988, 1995).

Former Mayor Richard M. Daley appointed Arne Duncan as the new CEO of CPS. Previously, he was CPS, who had served as Deputy Chief of Staff under Paul Vallas. Mayor Daley said he chose Arne Duncan because of his "passion and commitment" and his ability to bring together disparate groups (Crain’s, 2001).

When Arne Duncan took on the Chief Executive Officer position in 2001, the Chicago Public Schools was facing closing underperforming schools, a budget deficit, a mandate to implement the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act, and a 20-year old consent decree. Arne Duncan served as Chief Executive Officer of the Chicago Public Schools from 2001 to 2008, leaving the district just one year before it reached Unitary Status which is when a federal court relinquishes jurisdiction over the case and allows the
district to continue its work without oversight, and was freed from compliance with the Consent Decree (Olszewski, 2002).

During his tenure as CPS CEO, he united education stakeholders within the classroom and outside by transforming more than 100 under-attended, underperforming schools into attractive, competitive new academic programs; augmenting and developing additional after-school and summer learning programs, shuttering underperforming schools, and increasing early childhood and college access. He won even more support with reform efforts including employing a higher caliber of teachers in schools throughout the city, and by forming public-private partnerships within the district to support community buy-in (Connelly, 2010). In the 2007 CPS Annual Financial Report, Arne Duncan is credited with increasing graduation rates and the number of students taking Advanced Placement courses, and boosting the total number of scholarships secured by CPS students to more than $150 million (CPS, 2007). Also, during his leadership of CPS, the district was recognized for its efforts to bring top teaching talent into the city's classrooms, where the number of teachers applying for positions almost tripled (Connelly, 2010).

Through a 2006 Federal DOE incentive grant, Chicago is able to create its first merit pay program, the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) which connects professional development with performance evaluation. The five-year $2.7 million grant aligns with Arne Duncan’s desire to attract and reward highly effective teachers by offering merit pay to an entire school staff based on student performance. TAP also fit Arne Duncan’s line of thinking, “that a school either succeeds or fails as a whole” (D'Orio, 2009).
**Consent Decree**

In a 2006 hearing over a final proposed settlement between the Chicago Board of Education and the U.S. Department of Justice, U.S. District Judge Charles P. Kocoras indicated the government believed Chicago had complied with the desegregation consent decree. Under Arne Duncan's leadership, the Chicago School District expanded or created additional education programs to reach minority students, including pre-school, after-school, summer school, English Language Learner programs, and various reading enrichment offerings (Trotter, 2006). Of the release from the consent decree, Arne Duncan said, "the proposed settlement would relieve the district of the significant financial burden of producing regular compliance reports, the district remains firmly committed to desegregation" (p. 2). District officials claimed Consent Decree compliance costs more than $300 million a year (p. 1).

Under Arne Duncan’s leadership, the Chicago Public Schools Office of Academic Enhancement received nearly $10 million through the MSAP Grant in August 2004 (Dell’Angela, 2004). Chicago Public Schools opened additional magnet choices available to students in communities lacking quality program options. Five new magnet programs provided high-quality academics to underserved communities, the mostly south and west neighborhoods of Englewood and Belmont Cragin. Over 2,500 new student seats were added in the magnet lottery system. According to the U.S. Deputy Secretary of Education Eugene Hickok, the newest magnet programs were centered on unique, innovative themes that could improve educational options not found in most CPS schools (Trotter, 2006, p. 3).
The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act

In the year 2000, the U.S. Federal Government spent more than $7 billion on education initiatives for disadvantaged students, an increase of over $4 billion from 1980 (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). Before the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), schools received funding whether or not their students learned to read or perform basic math skills.

The U.S. Department of Education describes the NCLB Act as a “groundbreaking” measure that introduced America to education reform, “based on stronger accountability for results, more flexibility for states and communities, puts an emphasis on proven education methods, and more options for parents” (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). NCLB authors and President George W. Bush, who signed it into law, believed holding schools accountable for the academic achievement of all subgroups ensured that no child is left behind. President Bush signed the bill into law on January 8, 2002. The Department of Education distinguished it saying, “The law represented the most comprehensive revision of federal education programs since the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965” (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). Four major components of NCLB were Title I, Reading First, Improving Quality Teacher Grants, and English Language Acquisition Education Programs (U.S. Department of Education, 2005).

In Congressional debate, the bill received bipartisan support and popularity because American taxpayers were demanding to see tangible results in closing the achievement gap and improving American competitiveness; it also meant that schools must show proof of their education gains in order to obtain federal funding. The law
included educational reforms that mandated accountability from schools by requiring regular student testing and disciplining poorly performing schools and schools that did not show sufficient academic gains. Slow improvement and chronic underachievement in schools were not given funding awards (U.S. Department of Education, 2005).

The No Child Left Behind Act was devised to “improve the academic achievement of the disadvantaged” (USA v CBOE, 2004). In section 1001 of the act, the statement of purpose is outlined:

The purpose of this title is to ensure that all children have a fair, equal and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on challenging State academic achievement standards and state academic assessments. (Public Law 107-110)

Renaissance 2010

The Renaissance 2010 initiative was Mayor Richard M. Daley and schools CEO Arne Duncan’s response to the NCLB Act; the plan was to close 100 underperforming schools and re-open them by the year 2010 to offer all students in Chicago a real choice in quality educational plans. Renaissance 2010 prioritized expansion of diverse educational options and to address priority communities (CPS, 2007).

The NCLB stipulated that students in 3rd through 8th grade would be measured on state standards in reading and math. Using the existing report, “Adequate Yearly Progress” (AYP), schools and districts received their progress which focused on the percentage of students taking state tests, as well as their proficiency in reading and math and graduation rates (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). Schools that measurably improved, but perhaps experienced a one-year dip in academic achievement were given a
timely opportunity to show the dip was an anomaly. Schools unable to demonstrate adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years were identified as underperforming or needing improvement and subject to immediate interventions (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). Every year that a school did not meet AYP, it was moved to the next category of school improvement in which a different intervention was introduced at the school.

School improvement categories and the required interventions for Chicago Public Schools not meeting AYP is below:

Table 3

*Chicago Public Schools’ Improvement Categories and Interventions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Years Not Making AYP</th>
<th>School Improvement Category</th>
<th>Required Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>School choice transfer offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Choice-SES</td>
<td>School choice transfer and Supplemental Education Services (SES) tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Corrective Action</td>
<td>School choice transfer, SES tutoring, and school implements one of the following: -- Extended day/year -- Staffing changes -- Implement new curriculum -- Decreased school-level management authority -- Restructure school organization; or -- Appoint outside experts to advise school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Restructuring Planning</td>
<td>School choice transfer, SES tutoring, and school develops a restructuring plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Restructuring Implementation</td>
<td>School choice transfer, SES tutoring, and school implements its restructuring plan, which may include: -- Replace principal and/or staff -- Select outside management agency to operate School -- Other major governance change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: https://www.cps.edu/Programs/DistrictInitiatives/NCLB/Pages/NCLB.aspx.
If academic interventions were ineffective and Adequate Yearly Progress was not made, then more serious corrective actions were taken, including closing of the schools. Under NCLB, states had some autonomy regarding the development of accountability measures. All schools within CPS school district 199 were held to a common accountability.

Part of Arne Duncan’s legacy as CEO of CPS was the closing of 70 underperforming schools and rebuilding them into desirable educational programs through the Renaissance 2010 initiative. Low-enrollment and low-performing schools were converted into new schools; complete school staff, from principal to janitors, lost their positions or became “displaced” (Duncan, 2006). With goals to be achieved by the year 2010, the district wanted to offer high-quality schools citywide. According to Arne Duncan:

> Closing and reopening schools is both educationally sound and morally warranted. We are hired to fight for kids—not for bureaucrats, reform groups, teachers, principals, or local school councils. We close schools when kids are getting hurt. Under Renaissance 2010, the adults involved are held accountable because the school ceases to exist. (p. 458)

**Arne Duncan in Washington D.C.**

Under the Obama administration, the U.S. Department of Education was tasked with restoring America's economic growth through the middle-class. The key to middle-class growth is a solid education preparing students to work and compete for jobs both locally and globally. To achieve this, Obama prioritized two ambitious goals: “that the United States would once again lead the world in college completion, and that every
student would receive at least one year of college or specialized training after high school” (U.S. Department of Education, 2010).

In a prepared statement announcing his choice for education secretary, President-Elect Obama criticized Congressional ineptitude at improving the national education program,

For years, we have talked our education problems to death in Washington, but failed to act, stuck in the same tired debates that have stymied our progress and left schools and parents to fend for themselves: Democrat versus Republican; vouchers versus the status quo; more money versus more reform—all along failing to acknowledge that both sides have good ideas and good intentions. Continuing to work like this is morally unacceptable for our children—and economically untenable for America… A new vision for a 21st-century education system is needed—one where we aren’t just supporting existing schools, but spurring innovation; where we’re not just investing more money, but demanding more reform; where parents take responsibility for their children’s success; where we’re recruiting, retaining, and rewarding an army of new teachers; where we hold our schools, teachers, and government accountable for results; and where we expect all our children not only to graduate high school but also to graduate college and get a good-paying job. (NSTA, 2009)

For American public schools, from kindergarten through 12th grade, Education Secretary Arne Duncan implemented initiatives that married traditionally proven instructional and community support services with innovative technology and instruction to benefit students of all racial and economic backgrounds. On the national front, Arne
Duncan is recognized for his collaborative efforts with all levels of educators and teaching professionals during his tenure as U.S. Secretary of Education. His legacy in that post includes the valuable Teaching Ambassador Fellows program (TAF), which was created under his administration. TAF is a partnership between outstanding teachers and the Department of Education. Teachers share their expertise with the Department and allow for a national dialogue among education professionals of all levels and policy-makers on critical issues facing students and schools in the fast-paced, changing world of today. Of the TAF program and receiving feedback from teachers “on the forefront,” Arne Duncan, “truly values their voices in the national conversation about education reform, including how to best recruit, prepare, recognize, and support teachers for the hard work of ensuring all students are prepared for success in college and careers” (Herbert, 2010).

**Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)**

NCLB is replaced in 2015 by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA); federally mandated standardized tests remain but punitive consequences for poor performance are minimalized. In 2011, President Obama and Secretary Arne Duncan announced a directive that would allow states to seek relief from strict mandates in the law provided they are willing to “embrace educational reform.” In December 2015, President Obama signed into law a rewrite of NCLB which returned significant power and autonomy to states in determining how to improve their most troubled schools. State or local school boards are once again allowed to set their own performance goals, school rating systems, and reforms for schools that do not reach benchmarks. The new law requires federal oversight in bridging the achievement gap for the lowest-achieving 5% of elementary
schools in the states and high schools in which more than one third of the graduating class does not graduate on time.

In the 16 years since NCLB was first implemented, education in the United States has been in a state of “perpetual” reform. With the implementation of ESSA, America was introduced to The Common Core Academic Standards (Common Core) and the Race to the Top program through which the U.S. Department of Education awarded financial grants to states willing to adopt Common Core in order to bridge the widest achievement gaps.

**American Recovery and Reinvestment 2010**

In a 2010 address to UNESCO, U.S. SOE Arne Duncan touted the accomplishments of his department under President Obama's administration, indicating that the four assurances from state Governors were the correct drivers for change. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Bill of 2010 required states to make four promises to reform education in exchange for money from a Recovery Fund. These assurances included implementing an educational standards system, improved data and assessments, a robust teacher preparation and evaluation program, and dramatic interventions for each state's lowest-performing schools. The monetary incentive of Recovery/Reinvestment created competitive application processes, including Race to the Top and Investing in Innovation Fund (known as i3). As a result,

Forty-six states submitted applications—and the competition drove a national conversation about education reform. Thirty-two states changed specific laws that posed barriers to innovation. Moreover, even states that did not win awards now have a state roadmap for reform hammered out. (Ed. Gov., 2010).
Arne Duncan was not surprised by the size of the application pool, nor was he impressed by the amount of funding dispensed. Instead, he is most excited by the national dialogue about education reform activity inspired by these projects. He concluded,

the special window that America has had to drive reform is not because of the dollars, it’s because of the courageous state and local leaders who have taken the lead in collaborating on problems that the experts said were too divisive to resolve…. in the end, transforming education is not just about raising expectations. It has to be about creating greater capacity at all levels of the system to implement reform. (USDE, 2010)
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Method of Research

The researcher relies on historical documents for the methodology of this study. Howell and Prevenier (2001), in their book *From Reliable Resources: An Introduction of Historical Study*, propose that while actual records of historical events do not change, every historian approaches its study and subject with its own perspective and experiences. Each generation of future researchers, scientists, and learners gain a new understanding of past events shaped by the generations and their environments before them, “therefore, researchers must explore the methods employed by historians to establish the reliability of materials; how they choose, authenticate, decode, compare, and, finally, interpret those sources” (Howell & Prevenier, 2001).

According to the book (2012), *Getting it Right: The Essential Elements of a Dissertation*, in qualitative research, it is common to organize by patterns that emerge from data analysis. The researcher includes a section on the differences discovered in the patterns emerging from the data, indicating how the patterns support or do not support the research questions (Berkowitz, 1997). (Calabrese, 2012) Qualitative data selected for this study is gained through research of both primary and secondary sources including review of various policies ranging from the Consent Decree
in Chicago, the Renaissance 2010 initiative in Chicago, the national No Child Left Behind education reform law, and the national Race to the Top educational incentive while Arne Duncan is the CEO of Chicago Public Schools and Secretary of Education for the United States. According to Heifetz et al. (2009), “most problems come mixed, with the technical and adaptive elements intertwined.” Categorizing Arne Duncan’s actions as either technical, adaptive, or both. The researcher analyzes how Arne Duncan uses his authority by categorizing whether his actions to implement those policies fall under technical or adaptive authority.

Part of identifying the challenges faced by the Arne Duncan administration is measuring the satisfaction of the impacted parties. In this historical research study, the affected parties expressed their satisfaction or dissatisfaction in public arenas including newspaper accounts, professional educational resources, thus requiring analysis of qualitative data. Additionally, the analysis of Chicago Board of Education public reports and Government resources including court decisions are analyzed qualitatively to highlight patterns in actions Duncan takes to best impact student success.

**Research Design**

According to Heifetz and Laurie (2001), “a leader faces several key responsibilities and may have to use his or her authority differently depending on the type of work situation” (p. 7). When appointed to CEO and U.S. SOE, Arne Duncan was given the task to bring improvement to the education systems he supervised. During his tenure, he implemented and supervised several major policies to improve education in Chicago and then nationally. The design of this study is to analyze his actions throughout each of five educational reform measures using specific adaptive or technical leadership.
lens: the Consent Decree in Chicago, the Renaissance 2010 initiative in Chicago, administering the No Child Left Behind Act in Chicago, and nationally the amendment to No Child Left Behind Act (ESEA), and the national Race to the Top educational incentive.

Subject

The subject of this research is Mr. Arne Duncan who served as Chief Executive Officer of Chicago Public Schools from 2001-2008. He was appointed to the position of U.S. Secretary of Education by President Obama in 2009. He resigned as U.S. SOE in 2015. In Chicago, he continued district compliance with the Consent Decree, he administered the Federal No Child Left Behind act and unrolled the Renaissance 2010 initiative. As SOE, he contributed to the amendment of the No Child Left Behind law (also called the Elementary and Secondary Education Act: ESEA) and creation of the Race to the Top reform act.

Measures

According to Heifetz and Laurie (2001), in order to maintain productivity every task or challenge a leader encounters should be broken down into five core responsibilities: (1) direction, (2) protection, (3) orientation, (4) conflict, and (5) norms. A leader must use all these elements to create an environment where employees carry appropriate levels of stress and value change (p. 16).

The design of this study is to analyze Arne Duncan’s actions throughout each of five educational reform measures using Ronald Heifetz’s specific adaptive or technical leadership lens: the Renaissance 2010 initiative in Chicago, the Consent Decree in Chicago, administering the No Child Left Behind Act in Chicago, and nationally the
amendment to No Child Left Behind Act called Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), and the national Race to the Top educational incentive. The researcher interprets Arne Duncan’s actions and words and classifies them as adaptive, technical or both according to Heifetz and Laurie, “The Work of Leadership” framework (see Table 4).

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptive Work Calls for Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Procedures**

The qualitative data guiding this historical study is gained through research of both primary and secondary sources including Chicago Public Schools, Illinois State Board of Education, and the United States Department of Education; professional insights from pioneers of workforce leadership like the Education Innovator, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development; review of relevant historical student data using the No Child Left Behind and Illinois Report Card, and district profiles and international education rankings like the University of Chicago Consortium, Programme for International Student Assessment; various newspaper articles like the
Chicago Tribune, Chicago Sun Times, the Times, Washington Post, Star Tribune, and an on-line newspaper called Newspapers.com also serve as primary documentation to provide a sense of what went on during Arne’s tenure as CEO and SOE.

Data Collection

There are three major reform policies that Arne Duncan spearheaded as CEO of Chicago Public Schools when he was CEO of CPS and two that he led as the American Secretary of Education under President Obama. With the names of these initiatives as search topics and using various credible resources that include school board reports, books, doctoral dissertations, documentary research, journals, newspaper articles, policy manuals, publications, and websites.

The following collection of resources include comments from organizations, companies, parents, teachers, and students to identify as technical or adaptive, then categorize for each reform:

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act

- Rossi, R. (April, 2004). Early results on ’No Child’: progress. Chicago Sun-Times
Renaissance 2010

- Schmidt, G. (January, 2010). Chicago Tribune says 'Renaissance 2010' has failed. Chicago Tribune

Consent Decree

- Trotter, A. (May, 2006). End near for Chicago desegregation decree U.S., district file plan to close 26-year-old case; judge to hear concerns. Education


Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)


- The Baltimore Sun (July, 2011). Fixing no child left behind. Baltimore Sun Media Group Publication


**Race to the Top (RTTP)**


The process of classifying the measures as technical or adaptive starts with doing so in the text of this document. Descriptors of technical or adaptive authoritative approaches are included in Chapter II of this analysis. For each initiative, direct quotes, facts, and summary describing Arne Duncan’s management and implementation of initiatives from resources are analyzed and entered into a table as either technical or
adaptive. Every initiative is reviewed in detail for how Arne Duncan managed each of his core responsibilities: Direction, Protection, Orientation, Conflict, and Norms. Table 5 below illustrates how the findings will be collected.

Table 5

**Analysis of Arne Duncan’s Five Major Initiatives Using Heifetz’s the Five Core Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIVE EDUCATIONAL REFORM POLICIES</th>
<th>Renaissance 2010</th>
<th>Consent Decree</th>
<th>NCLB</th>
<th>ESSA</th>
<th>Race to the Top</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Analysis Plan**

The researcher examines each of the five policies described in the study, dissecting policy implementation according to five core responsibilities listed in Table 2, *Leadership from the Position of Authority*, and rate each (direction, protection, orientation, conflict, and norms) as adaptive or technical. Based on the frequency of use in each educational policy, the researcher concludes that Arne Duncan operated predominantly adaptive or technical leadership during its execution. The researcher analyzes multiple aspects of each policy and reform effort to categorize them as technical or adaptive or both. For example, under the Renaissance 2010 program, he closed 70
underperforming schools against the stakeholders’ wishes which are considered technical leadership. However, the process of re-opening schools later involved input from the community on the type of magnet program within them. Requesting community input would fall under the adaptive source of authority.

**Bias and Error**

The researcher acknowledges that the conclusions drawn may be biased for the following reasons:

1) the researcher worked under Arne Duncan's administration while he was CEO in CPS,

2) the researcher worked as an elementary school principal in Chicago Public Schools from 2014 through 2017,

3) the researcher attended a workshop facilitated by Ronald Heifetz, so she was influenced to use adaptive leadership style when faced with challenges,

4) the researcher subscribed to the on-line newspaper search engine *newspapers.com*, to find archived articles relating to five major initiatives unveiled during Arne Duncan’s educational leadership tenures, and

5) major Chicago newspaper publications were not included in *newspapers.com* subscription, the majority of resources outlining Arne Duncan’s leadership in Chicago are the result of internet searches and archived Chicago Tribune articles.

However, the research questions serve as a guide for discovery in leadership. This study incorporates facts, histories and publications detailing Arne Duncan’s goals, initiatives and impacts on student learning while serving as CEO and SOE. Moreover, to mitigate
the single source bias that may surface in newspaper articles and commentaries, the researcher, with the help of two critical friends, identifies judgmental comments are included in this report and provides assurance that this report contains analysis of objective facts, commentary and quotations that reveal Arne Duncan’s leadership actions so as to conclude his administrative moves as either adaptive or technical. Furthermore, to alleviate bias, the researcher has provided a detailed, objective overview of adaptive leadership and its difference with the technical approach to facing leadership challenges and the 21st century practice of an adaptive approach to problem solving as presented by Ronald Heifetz.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND FINDINGS

For each of the five initiatives implemented during Arne Duncan’s tenure as school district CEO and Secretary of Education for the United States, the researcher recorded evidence displaying Duncan’s actions or comments related to the initiative or evidence describing the impact of Duncan’s moves on the school system. The passages are analyzed and categorized as either technical or adaptive leadership according to Heifetz’s adaptive leadership framework. Additionally, the passages are selected to display evidence that Duncan’s leadership was multifaceted and considerate of a leader’s Five Core Responsibilities also described by Ronald Heifetz. The findings are tallied and patterns of leadership style are presented and discussed.

Renaissance 2010 Initiative

The Renaissance 2010 initiative was a response to the NCLB Act, so the plan was to close 100 underperforming schools and re-open them by the year 2010 to offer all students in Chicago a real choice in quality educational plans. The program started in 2004 with the closing of ten schools based on student performance and the transferring of 4,000 students. The public was outraged because these closing were “sudden, unlawful, unreasonable and precipitous” (Dell’Angela, 2004), especially for the 160 students displaced in that first wave of closings. The Coalition argued: The Renaissance 2010 plan, of which June closings is the first step, is explicitly designed by CPS… to create a
more attractive new school for higher-income families expected to be moving into gentrifying communities.

The researcher found several statements from different stakeholders on how they perceived Arne Duncan’s actions when he closed Carver, Fenger, Harvard, and Orr high schools. The researcher categorized the actions and excerpts under technical or adaptive based on the five core responsibilities:

Table 6

*Renaissance 2010 Initiative: Direction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>“Daley and Arne Duncan announced that the &quot;Small Schools&quot; at Orr had &quot;failed&quot; and Duncan ordered that Orr be one of the first so-called &quot;turnaround&quot; schools. By September 2008, the Academy for Urban School Leadership (which took over Orr and fired most of the teachers in the three small schools that remained) had gotten rid of more than half the veteran teachers at Orr and nearly 300 of the Orr students” (Schmidt, 2010).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Orr High School, located on the near west side of Chicago was one of the original “failing schools” slated to be closed in the Renaissance 2010 program. The school was closed and reopened as a campus of four “small schools” in 2005. In 2008 Duncan ordered Orr’s small schools campus to be closed once again due to failing
performance. The technical leadership approach is illustrated by continuing to close schools when they are failing. Failing schools is a problem the district has experienced prior and the solution to the problem was to close the school through the Renaissance 2010 program.

Table 7

*Renaissance 2010 Initiative: Protection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>“Duncan stood his ground and closed schools. The migration of teenagers across racial, cultural and gang boundaries burdened a high school system already struggling to educate students. Violence escalated” (Schmidt, 2010).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite outcry from the public about potential physical threats to students crossing gang-claimed territory boundaries, Duncan acted technically and continued with closing underperforming schools as part of Renaissance 2010. This additional “burden” placed on the school system may have contributed to students, teachers and school administrators feeling overwhelmed and interfering with the appropriate stress vs. value balance required for progress in a workplace. As Duncan, “stood his ground,” and continued to run the program, unhealthy tension was forming in the impacted communities perhaps continuing to prohibit student progress and endangering well-being and feeling of value among school communities.
Table 8

*Renaissance 2010 Initiative: Orientation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>“This RFP is actively looking for operators with the ability to either propose to lead an entire cluster of Turnaround schools (one high school and two–three elementary schools), or to work in dialogue with other operators, pending Board approval, to lead a cluster of Turnaround schools. Regardless of the number of schools an applicant is proposing to turn around, ONS asks that applicants discuss their ability and vision for operating as/within a cluster in the Proposal answers were deemed appropriate or relevant” (CPS RFP Manual, 2008).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Renaissance 2010 Request for Proposals (RFP) to open a new school program required prospective administrative teams to take on new roles. The RFP process and opening of a new school required proposal teams, usually consisting of the administrative team running the new school to identify the school program and select from a list of school types approved by the board including charter school, small school, or performance school. The team had to present future school’s mission and vision to the board of education through the RFP process and also the community surrounding the physical building. Encouraging administrative leaders to promote their
school to impacted parties rather than traditionally running the day-to-day and academic matters of a school is considered an adaptive leadership move in terms of employee orientation; educators taking on additional job responsibilities.

Table 9

*Renaissance 2010 Initiative: Conflict*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>“Some point to the 2005 closing of Carver High School as the flash point for the September death of Derrion Albert, the 16-year-old Fenger High School student who was beaten, kicked and smashed with large planks of wood about a half mile from school. District officials converted Carver into a military academy, sending teenagers to other schools, including Fenger. The two groups never got along and tempers flared inside and outside the school, culminating with the beating caught on videotape” (Schmidt, 2010).”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the Renaissance 2010 initiative, communities impacted by closing schools publicized their concern about students having to travel long distances through rival gang territories to attend school. Arne Duncan and CPS leadership continued with closing schools and transferring students despite community pleas. This was a ‘technical leadership’ move. Unfortunately, the death of Derrion Albert after Carver High School’s closing illustrated the reality of how short-sighted the formula-based school closings could be. The adaptive model suggests that input from the community
is necessary to ‘expose conflict. If Arne Duncan had approached the problem as an adaptive challenge and acted on the community concerns and suggestions, perhaps violent altercations could have been avoided or minimized.

Table 10

*Renaissance 2010 Initiative: Norms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norms</td>
<td>“Schools that fit the criteria set by NCLB as underperforming for 5 consecutive years were to be closed. The criteria was set; once given the mandate, discussion, flexibility or input from school stakeholders were not considered” (CPS, 2008, p. 37).</td>
<td>“In 2007, Arne Duncan recommended adopting a new policy on the closing of schools: a provision that prevented the closure of a school if that school had a new principal who had been in place for less than three years” (CBOE, 2007).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faced with the NCLB mandate that all states need to spread access to educational opportunities to low-income students coupled with problems of underperforming schools, Arne Duncan created a solution: to close schools and turn them around (CPS, 2008). The move by Arne Duncan to close these schools and transfer or merge students to nearby schools would be considered use of *technical* in the Position of Authority. However, after three years of recurring problems, he amended part of the Renaissance 2010 policy to mediate stakeholders concerns and to protect the affected students in the process, which made his action *adaptive* by definition and type of norms.
Consent Decree Initiative

The federal government of the United States of America and the Board of Education of the City of Chicago jointly requested that the Modified Consent Decree expire in 2006 (USA v CBOE, 2004). The court established that the Modified Consent Decree could not come to an end without the determination being through the court (USA v CBOE, 2004). Extracts from the policies are categorized under the five core responsibilities to determine whether Arne Duncan’s actions to comply with the Consent Decree requirements and therefore achieve unitary status are technical or adaptive.

Table 11

Consent Decree Initiative: Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>“The end is clearly in sight,” U.S. District Judge Charles P. Kocoras said during a May 4 hearing on the proposed settlement for concluding the consent decree, the Chicago Tribune reported...Arne Duncan, the chief executive officer of the Chicago school system, said in a press statement that while the proposed settlement would relieve the district of the significant financial burden of producing regular compliance reports, the district remains firmly committed to desegregation...But Harvey Grossman, the legal director of the ACLU of Illinois, said the proposed plan has too many loose ends. “We are concerned about the lack of justification of the changes that the parties have now agreed to and are seeking court approval of,” he said in an interview last week” (Trotter, 2006).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the first time, CPS could get unitary status if the 26-year old Consent Decree was settled between the CPS and the U.S. District. Segregation was decades-long problem in Chicago for which there was a prescribed solution and target. With the prospect of unitary status and release from federal mandate ahead, Arne Duncan approached the challenge as adaptive. He was able to focus on the aspect of the problem the district was committed to: desegregation, without being commanded to do it in a certain way. He listened to multiple stakeholders including UCLA, parents, local tenant advisory councils, and special education advocates before drafting the proposed plan to the judge and ultimately creating new desegregation assurance policies in Chicago Public Schools (Ed. Gov., 2019).

Table 12

*Consent Decree Initiative: Protection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Finally, I was trying to think ahead. I believed in our kids, and that Barbara and our team could improve academic performance over time. But I didn’t want anyone thinking we were cooking the books: CPS had endured its share of scandal, and I wanted none of it. If we could send an early shot across the bow that we were going to have zero tolerance for cheating...Steven details how his algorithm works in Freakonomics and I encourage you to read it, but the upshot was that about 5 percent of teachers system-wide were changing results in some fashion” (Duncan, 2018).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arne Duncan suspected that some CPS teachers were cheating to inflate the scores of students to meet AYP. He shared the test data from the author of
Freakonomics who used algorithms to verify if cheating occurred. Once confirmed, he did not protect those employees and fired them.

Table 13

*Consent Decree Initiative: Orientation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>As Chicago’s consent decree came to a close, discussion about magnet admissions policies intensified. For many years, the district’s magnet schools considered the individual race of students in the application process...After the decree was lifted, however, a new magnet admissions policy needed to be formulated, one that did not hinge directly upon the racial background of individual students...In the months leading up to the implementation of the new plan, the district’s CEO assured the community that an in-house analysis indicated that, “that [no] one group will suffer. We will maintain the same levels of inclusion we have today...Yet the public swiftly reacted against the district’s proposal, spurred in part by a Chicago Tribune analysis showing that the new plan would threaten diversity levels by reducing available slots at magnet schools by as much as 14 percent, and perhaps even more at popular magnets...In response to some of these fears, district officials shifted course, adjusting the magnet criteria slightly to reduce the emphasis on neighborhood proximity. Several months later, in March 2010, CPS also issued guidelines allowing principals of selective enrollment high schools discretion in selecting up to 5% of their entering class. Race could be among one of several factors considered. (Integration Report, 2020).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After release from the Consent Decree, Arne Duncan directed his administration team to formulate a new admissions policy that would continue to integrate schools, which might be considered a technical approach to his assigned task (orientation) as CEO. Upon considering the public backlash and dissatisfaction, his role and that of his top policy designers changed considerably. They took information from the public, local communities and other stakeholders on diversity and available magnet seat openings to the table and worked with these groups to draw the new guidelines on magnet and selective programs. The original policy was drafted by the district officials which was the typical way of conducting business. However, he shifted gears by listening to the concerns of the community and adjusted the policy that reflected a more inclusive process. This change to collaborators is an adaptive approach to job orientation.

Table 14

Consent Decree Initiative: Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Judge Charles Kocoras began hearing testimony Thursday on whether that oversight should continue. “The racial and ethnic makeup of the city of Chicago...has no resemblance to the current [now].” Kocoras said...But as testimony kicked off in federal court, dozens of students, parents and education activities called on Kocoras to keep the decree...District officials pointed to a 2007 U.S. Supreme Court case that barred schools in Seattle and Louisville from using race as a factor of admissions to similar programs (Sadovi, 2009).”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the characteristics of an adaptive leader is to expose conflict and use it to problem-solve, which is what Arne Duncan did at the hearing on lifting Chicago from the Consent Decree. In this case, using race as a factor for admission was the major issue that CPS and the local activists disagreed upon. Rather than focusing on restoring order and moving forward in an authoritarian way, Arne Duncan cited Supreme Court decisions that favored the school district’s side in the matter in testimony. In this adaptive approach to school administration, Duncan used the conflict issue and exposed its use in other urban school districts. This exposure ensured that CPS was being current, progressive, and resourceful as it tried to demonstrate its deserving of unitary status and committed to student integration. Rather than keeping the status quo of using race as a factor for admission, he recommended using socio-economic status as a way to maintain student diversity.
Table 15

*Consent Decree Initiative: Norms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norms</td>
<td></td>
<td>“On September 24, 2009, with the support of Chicago Public Schools’ former CEO Arne Duncan, a federal judge ended a thirty-year consent decree governing the district. The shadow of the 2007 Parents Involved Supreme Court decision loomed over the judge’s action, which quickly resulted in a significant policy shift for Chicago’s extensive system of magnet schools. The magnet admissions process, long governed by race-conscious criteria, switched to a procedure that eliminated the consideration of race altogether, relying instead on socioeconomic indicators” (Integration Report, 2010).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The move by Arne Duncan to put a new magnet admissions process to guarantee equity in its magnet schools, not by race but by socio-economic status of student households would be considered an adaptive review of norms in the position of authority.

The guidelines from the 1981 Consent Decree established the idea that the Chicago Public Schools must actively recruit students from all races to attend its magnet schools to ensure that they were complying to desegregate schools. The 2009 lifting of the Consent Decree was based on the current demographics of the Chicago population. Arne Duncan changed the policy from race-conscious criteria to socioeconomic indicators. As the description of school diversity has changed over time, so did the approach to
achieving it in Chicago with the release from federal oversight; yet, the long-held commitment to school diversity was the goal.

**No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act Initiative**

In July of 2002, Chicago struggled to comply with NCLB’s requirement to allow a student from a failing school to transfer into a higher performing school at family’s request (Public Law 107-110, sec. 1001). At the time, two-thirds of all CPS schools were deemed “failing” according to ISAT results (Lipinski, 2004).

The table below contains excerpts from a variety of sources including the research subject Arne Duncan, CPS employees and journalists providing their perceptions and reactions to Chicago Board of Education actions and policies enacted as a result of the NCLB act. These comments are categorized as either technical or adaptive and an explanation of how it is technical or adaptive is provided.
In its fifth year of implementation, Arne Duncan voiced his frustration about the inflexibility of the NCLB law (Russo, 2008). As he believed in the tenets of the legislation, he instead urged Congress to amend the reform law giving each district the flexibility to tackle issues they see fit. The one-size-fits-all approach to tackling the
challenge of transferring students did not work in Chicago as it could have in other districts. With transfer applicants exceeding the available pupil seats, Duncan acted with adaptability in orientation by requesting flexibility and bringing his administrative team to the table to collectively problem-solve.

Table 17

*NCLB Initiative: Protection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>“At Pope Elementary, which is in restructuring, teachers were not as focused on the NCLB consequences as they were on local consequences and the overall need to improve. “We’re so focused on student achievement; people don’t think of it as NCLB,” said McKinney. Instead, all efforts are directed at reaching students in a variety of ways: through small-group instruction, cooperative discipline, and a combination of after-school tutoring through SES and a federal 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant that keeps almost all students and teachers in school an extra hour and a half four days a week. Still, the threat of school closure, which has just recently lifted at Pope, has created an atmosphere of urgency” (Center for Education, n.d.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rather than closing underperforming schools like Pope, Arne Duncan’s administration provided additional resources to improve teaching and learning. In doing so, he created a safe and supportive environment for Teacher McKinney to be focused and be accountable on student achievement. This educator expressed an appropriate amount of stress and pressure to comply with NCLB accountability but also focusing “all efforts...at reaching students in a variety of ways.” Duncan’s willingness to allow educators to experiment with programs to reach students where they need to be met gives teachers a seat at the table. They take ownership, understand the ramifications and feel valued in their work. This is adaptive leadership in the protection of employee category.

Table 18

*NCLB Initiative: Orientation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>“Shortly after schools’ CEO Arne Duncan took office, when action began in earnest on implementation of NCLB, Duncan opted to develop teams from different departments rather than create a new NCLB department. This allowed the district to build on what it was already doing, rather than viewing NCLB as a new reform that would have to be layered on top of what was already in place” (Education World, n.d.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arne Duncan acted as a technical leader when NCLB became law in 2001 by assembling his team with existing staff who were already doing the same job descriptions within their own departments. For example, the director of the Office of Literacy was in charge of managing the tutoring services offered to students in underperforming schools. NCLB was a new reform which could have been approached as an adaptive challenge. Adaptive leadership in this scenario would include direction to existing staff and departments to take on tasks outside original job description, multi-tasking and cooperating with personnel from other departments. Duncan faced this challenge using a traditional technical approach creating job descriptions specifically for a single department and with a specific task in mind: compliance with NCLB.
Under the NCLB Act, schools not meeting AYP for 3 consecutive years must offer students tutoring services. Despite costly private tutoring companies and a shortage of vendors and service for the two-thirds of students attending underperforming schools requiring it, Duncan respectfully challenged the federal rule in order to provide continued tutoring programs. In 2005, Secretary of Education Spelling gave Arne Duncan the permission to use CPS teachers as tutors. Rather than simply complying with federal mandates regarding tutoring, Duncan used conflict to tackle challenges and get the services needed for best student learning. Using conflict
including exposing it, talking about it with diverse groups to aid in problem solving is an adaptive use of leadership and authority.

Table 20

*NCLB Initiative: Norms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norms</td>
<td>“Chicago is not without blame on the latter point, having allowed just 2,500 of its 120,000 eligible students to transfer...One might hope this news would cause the school system to widen the transfer option, but Chicago Schools CEO Arne Duncan says otherwise: &quot;We refused to overwhelm schools. That's why this worked well.&quot; (Rossi, 2004).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the transfer of students from underperforming to high performing schools, Chicago Schools Chief Duncan was unable to comply with the federal mandate. Of 120,000 eligible students, 2,500 transferred. Duncan did not provide the public with valuable information other than saying the system would have been “overwhelmed.” According to Rossi (2004), Duncan did not consider “widening” the transfer option as public opinion would have liked. The technical approach of keeping the challenge and problem solving in-house, without considering voice or experimentation left many of the impacted parties dissatisfied.

**Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Initiative**

As United States Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan implemented the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) which was signed into law in December of 2015. Its
design reduced the scaled back the use of school waivers and shifted the federal
government’s role in education from its major control established through President
Bush’s No Child Left Behind Act.

NCLB is replaced in 2016 by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA); federally
mandated standardized tests remain but punitive consequences for poor performance are
minimalized. In 2011, President Obama and Secretary Arne Duncan announced a
directive that would allow states to seek relief from strict mandates in the law provided
they are willing to “embrace educational reform.” In December 2015, President Obama
signed into law a rewrite of NCLB which returned significant power and autonomy to
states in determining how to improve their most troubled schools. State or local school
boards are once again allowed to set their own performance goals, school rating systems,
and reforms for schools that do not reach benchmarks. The new law requires federal
oversight in bridging the achievement gap for the lowest-achieving 5% of elementary
schools in the states and high schools in which more than one third of the graduating
class does not graduate on time.
### ESSA Initiative: Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Asked if he will push for passage of a new version of NCLB, Duncan says that he first wants to go on a cross-country listening tour and that he hopes that Congress will reauthorize a new version of the law late in the year. &quot;Having lived with this, I have a good sense of what makes sense and what doesn't,&quot; he says. &quot;But I want to be clear that I want to get out there and learn from people. And I think ultimately we should rebrand [the law]&quot; (Ramirez and Clark, 2009).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An adaptive leader listens to multiple voices before implementing an initiative. Although Arne Duncan planned to rely on previous experiences and implementation of solutions to NCLB challenges as CEO of Chicago Public Schools, he took an adaptive approach to assigning direction in his government department. Before asking Congress to approve a revised version of NCLB by embarking on a cross-country listening tour to “learn from people” (Williams, 2011).
In 2011, the Baltimore School District failed to meet AYP for all its students. The problem was the law's insistence that all students must meet AYP in reading and math by 2014. Arne Duncan chose to act as a technical leader by protecting Baltimore and other school districts from the consequences for failing to fulfill the terms of the act. He solved the problem for the school districts by eventually issuing waivers to them. An adaptive leader moderates a dialogue between Baltimore schools and Congress to so that front-line educators are cognizant of consequences but also that
Congress is aware of local matters that are threats to the productivity of the state’s students and the various needs and strengths of the districts within the state so that the two groups resolve additional interventions for that state's lowest-performing schools.

Table 23

**ESSA Initiative: Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Arne Duncan, the education secretary, said the new bill would “reduce over testing and one-size-fits-all federal mandates.” Senator Lamar Alexander, the Tennessee Republican who is chairman of the Education Committee, said the bill would usher in a new period of experimentation in schools as communities are released from federal control. “Basically we’re back to an era that encourages local and state innovation rather than Washington telling you what to do” (Huetteman and Rich, 2015).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While CEO of CPS, the students in Duncan’s district spent much of class time in NCLB mandated test-taking, special education students and English language learners were required to meet the same progress marks as all students. Upon working as SOE of the United States, he immediately challenged parts of the existing NCLB laws so as to allow greater success for all students, especially those impacted by language barriers and learning differences, by granting waivers to states allowing districts to take these issues into account when measuring progress. With passage of
NCLB reform, renamed ESSA, districts once again became more of education designers rather than data reporters and compliance moderators. State school districts set their own goals and measures for rating schools as well as how to transform schools that underperform. For example, “Maryland developed newer and more sophisticated ways of holding schools accountable, such as revising the methods for evaluating teachers and moving toward a common national curriculum that raises standards across the board, not just in reading and math” (Baltimore Sun, 2011).

Restoring states’ control of education and reform design is an adaptive approach to leadership in orientation. District personnel and community are the first and most impacted by educational programs and progress. By taking on the role of designer and holding themselves accountable, they carry an appropriate workplace balance of valued stake-holder and stress of showing progress so that measurable improvement is achievable.
An adaptive leader exposes the problem. Arne Duncan was in his 3rd year as SOE when he informed Congress that eighty percent of schools in the United States would not meet AYP in 2011 if the NCLB law was not changed. Exposing the potential for such great failure in school districts nationwide forced legislators to not only discuss national school reform but to take steps in resolving the problem. In the end, failure was not as high as predicted, but high-rates of underperformance continued, as did Congressional discussion on reform for an additional three years, until ESSA became law in 2016.
Although the comment from Representative Kline sounded as if Arne Duncan deviated from the rule of the law by issuing waivers to 42 states, his action is adaptive based on the definition of norms. Arne Duncan not only kept the operational norms fluid by offering states a break from many of the law’s mandates through a series of waivers, but also experimented with new measures of performance by adopting the Common Core State Standards as a new accountability measure for students meeting AYP.
Race to the Top (RTTP) Initiative

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Bill of 2010 required states to make four promises, known to the administration as “four assurances,” to reform education in exchange for money from a Recovery Fund. These assurances included implementing an educational standards system, improved data and assessments, a robust teacher preparation and evaluation program, and dramatic interventions for each state's lowest-performing schools. The monetary incentive of Recovery/Reinvestment created competitive application processes, including Race to the Top and Investing in Innovation Fund (known as i3).

Race to the Top was a national competition for education funding. Grants were awarded to districts using student outcomes to demonstrate progress in teacher effectiveness and professional development programs. While his tenure did come with challenges, his initiatives and methods are a worth-while study in providing an effective educational leadership model (Karp & Forte, 2008).
Race to the Top Initiative: Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>“Administration has decided that charter schools are the only answer to what ails America’s public schools—urban, suburban, exurban, and rural—and all must comply with that silver bullet...Assessing student learning is another area where we need more and better options. What is being proposed is simply tweaking the current top-down, federally mandated insistence on hewing to standardized test scores” (Brilliant, 2009).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arne Duncan acted as a technical leader by expecting states that apply for the RTTP grant to implement four core reforms in order to be considered. Top down directives to close underperforming schools and open them as charters is a technical move to solve the long persistent problem of student underperformance. In the excerpt above Brilliant criticizes Duncan’s policy as masked reform as it would still rely on standardized test scores for measuring student growth. It may appear Duncan was attempting to spin the move as adaptive as in the same article, he is quoted saying, and “The good ideas are always going to come from great educators in local communities. And we want to continue to empower them.” However, it is this researcher’s opinion that this is a technical approach as he has previously used community input to conclude that Charter schools are the answer to any school district’s lagging student performance numbers.
Table 27

Race to the Top Initiative: Protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>“The $4.35 billion dollar Race to the Top program that we are unveiling today is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for the federal government to create incentives for far-reaching improvement in our nation's schools...Under the Race to the Top guidelines, states seeking funds will be pressed to implement four core, interconnected reforms. We sometimes call them the four assurances, and those assurances are what we are going to be looking for from states, districts, and their local partners in reform...But I want to be clear that the Race to the Top is also a reform competition, one where states can increase or decrease their odds of winning federal support” (Duncan, 2009).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arne Duncan revealed on his press release in 2009 that RTTP incentive was an opportunity for all 50 states to improve education. In order for states to get the grant, they were required to implement four core reform assurances, otherwise, ‘they decrease the odds of winning federal support.’ His prescribed solutions stifled multiple perspectives which by definition is technical.

Once again, with incentivizing districts and states to create their own data-supported reform and assessment measures, and teacher evaluation systems, educators are included in the design of learning and assessment. They are held accountable to
teacher evaluation systems that they had some part in creating. The work-load, multifunctional skills required to be a valued and high-ranking teacher are not traditional roles but balanced. They require experimentation, consultation to perfect the craft and supervision and feedback from a moderator.

Table 28

*Race to the Top Initiative: Orientation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Georgia has not followed through on promise to establish a merit pay system for teachers, arguing that the fairness and reliability of its new teacher evaluation system need to be measured first. As a result, the U.S. Department of Education has refused to release a $10 million chunk of money. “It’s not like we’re sitting here doing nothing on merit pay. We’ve done a lot of things to move toward merit pay, but we aren’t going to be able to get there within the time frame of the grant,” said Susan Andrews, Georgia deputy superintendent for Race to the Top” (Washington,, 2014).”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Merit pay is a regularly debated issue in the American education system in this 21st Century. As one of the four assurances for RTTP, the matter was included in the teacher evaluation reforms component from applicants.

As an adaptive leader, one must “maintain enough tension, resisting pressure to restore the status quo.” Arne Duncan put pressure on the Georgia school officials by withholding $10 million until they figured out the merit pay. By withholding the funds
on account of one promise not being met may have been overzealous to the Georgia school district impacted, but the move shows Duncan's willingness to keep controversial, conflicting matters on the work table until they are resolved. The move also encouraged Georgia to continue to expose and resolve the teacher evaluation and merit pay matters holding up their funding.

Table 29

*Race to the Top Initiative: Conflict*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Duncan said the federal government has had to step in because of congressional inaction. “Congressional action to change No Child Left Behind, as we all know, is six years overdue,” he said. “But without action, we’re simply not waiting, and neither are our states.”...Nearly four years after the &quot;Race to the Top&quot; education initiative was introduced, an Obama administration report released Tuesday suggests the program has effectively spurred reform in states. Twenty-two million students and 1.5 million teachers in 40,000 schools receive Race to the Top grants from the federal government, the report said. “Although we have so much more work still ahead of us, the report that we released today shows that reforms are having an impact in states across the country,” Education Secretary told reporters in a conference call. Eighty percent of students are now graduating from high school, he said, which is the highest rate on record.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The report also found students’ test scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress are the highest since the test launched 20 years ago.

Rep. John Kline (R-Minn.), chairman of the House Education and Workforce Committee, slammed the administration’s report as a “PR stunt.” “The administration’s latest PR stunt doesn’t prove Race to the Top is working, it proves the administration is clumsily trying to take credit for the extraordinary education reform movement happening in our nation’s schools," he said in a statement. Kline suggested Obama should endorse the bill the House passed last year to amend "No Child Left Behind," which would allow state and local governments to have greater control over their education systems. “The House has approved legislation that will accomplish these goals, helping prepare more students for a successful future," he said. "It’s time for the president and his Senate colleagues to join our efforts" (Shabad, 2014).

Although there was a disagreement between the House and the Senate on whether whose policy improved student outcomes, the impasse on the amendment of NCLB did not preclude Arne Duncan from implementing the RTTP initiative.
Table 30

**Race to the Top Initiative: Norms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Task</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norms</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Georgia has gone to a new set of standards called Common Core, which has run into political opposition. It is replacing one standardized test, and is starting a new system to evaluate teaching and principals...Grant money paid for development of the new teacher and principal evaluation system, which uses student performance growth to calculate success. The old system was largely based on a supervisor’s observation. Educators have praised the new system as an improvement, though they have concerns about the weight it gives to student testing data” (Washington, 2014).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of Arne Duncan’s RTTP grant award guidelines, states need to change the way they evaluate teachers and use a new data system to measure student academic success. Georgia was incentivized to replace teacher evaluation from solely supervisor’s observation to including student testing data. The practice of evaluating teachers is a norm that continues in all school districts; employee evaluation is a vital tenet of any American work-place that seeks growth and client satisfaction. Duncan recognized that the practice of teacher evaluation must continue; however, the shift to allowing districts to create their own evaluation systems and possibly tie it to compensation is a shift in traditional systems as is adding several components, such as observation and student testing results. These modifications are an adaptive way to approach looking at district
norms, specifically the teacher evaluation requirement. Evaluation is a fluid practice that is regularly observed and modified by district administrators and state education boards and it was initially spurred by Duncan’s national reform initiative Race to the Top.

**Results from the Findings**

According to Heifetz et al. (2009), “most problems come mixed, with the technical and adaptive elements intertwined.” The research analyzed how Arne Duncan used his authority by categorizing whether his actions to implement those policies fell under technical or adaptive authority. The researcher examined each of the five initiatives described in the study, dissecting policy implementation according to five subcategories listed in Table 2, *Leadership from the Position of Authority*, and rate each (direction, protection, orientation, conflict, and norms) as adaptive or technical. Based on the frequency of use in each educational policy, the researcher concluded that Arne Duncan operated predominantly adaptive during its implementation. The researcher analyzed multiple aspects of each policy and reform effort to categorize them as technical or adaptive or both.
Table 31

*Arne Duncan’s Leadership Style on the Five Policies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIVE EDUCATIONAL REFORM POLICIES</th>
<th>Renaissance 2010</th>
<th>Consent Decree</th>
<th>NCLB</th>
<th>ESSA</th>
<th>Race to the Top</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norms</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of times technical style was used = 9
Number of times adaptive style was used = 17

-----------------------------------------------
Technical to Adaptive ratio in Direction: 2:3
Technical to Adaptive ratio in Protection: 3:3
Technical to Adaptive ratio in Orientation: 1:4
Technical to Adaptive ratio in Conflict: 1:4
Technical to Adaptive ratio in Norms: 2:4

-----------------------------------------------
Renaissance 2010 Technical to Adaptive percentage: 70% Technical, 30% Adaptive
Consent Decree Technical to Adaptive percentage: 0% Technical, 100% Adaptive
NCLB Technical to Adaptive percentage: 40% Technical, 60% Adaptive
ESSA Technical to Adaptive percentage: 20% Technical, 80% Adaptive
Race to the Top Technical to Adaptive percentage: 40% Technical, 60% Adaptive

-----------------------------------------------
Anomaly: Duncan acted both technically and adaptively in one category, Renaissance 2010 Norms
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND REFLECTIONS ON THE RESEARCH

The purpose of this chapter is twofold. The researcher interprets the findings of the data collected about Arne Duncan’s leadership during large-scale educational initiatives beginning with his term as CEO of the Chicago Public School District and concluding with his role as America’s Secretary of Education; furthermore, the researcher answers two questions: (a) what impact does Arne Duncan’s leadership style have on implementation of educational initiatives, and (b) what aspects of the adaptive leadership framework does Arne Duncan employ as the CEO of the Chicago Public Schools from 2001-2008 and SOE of the United States of America from 2009-2015.

Reflecting on his role as the nation’s highest educational leader, Arne Duncan cited student and school gains as praise for his successful reform programs:

Although we have so much more work still ahead of us, the report that we released today shows that reforms are having an impact in states across the country. Eighty percent of students are now graduating from high school, which is the highest rate on record. The report also found students’ test scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress are the highest since the test launched 20 years ago. (Shabad, 2014)

Through study of the adaptive leadership framework and analysis of Arne Duncan’s leadership and educational impact of initiatives in CPS and U.S. Board of
Education, the research identifies his leadership style as using both adaptive and technical four out of five of the initiatives studied. This correlates with Heifetz’ theory that in today’s working world, “most problems come mixed, with the technical and adaptive elements intertwined” (Heifetz et al., 2009). Consideration of this point, that future educators and system leaders must be ready to tackle challenges and achieve progress by using a combination of technical expertise and historical problem solving, as well as adaptive innovation, diversity and cooperation is the major implication of this study in leadership.

Research also enables one to match Arne Duncan’s management with that of Heifetz’s technical and adaptive leadership framework, from implementation when he led the school district through the Renaissance 2010 program, testified for and led Chicago through its exit from the Federal oversight of the Consent decree and concluding with his role as chief of the national education system. Applying descriptions of Heifetz’s leadership, either technical or adaptive or both to aspects of Arne Duncan’s authority enabled the researcher to determine his leadership style upon recognizing patterns in frequency and occasion of use.

**Discussion of Results**

Arne Duncan seemed to have gone through a transformation as leader of the Chicago Public Schools from more technical to adaptive. In the document analyzed in this study, he started as a technical leader through Renaissance 2010 (70% technical, 30% adaptive) to solidly adaptive as he finished his tenure in Chicago while advocating for the district’s exit from the Consent Decree (100% Adaptive). Renaissance 2010 was Arne Duncan’s first high-profile educational initiative. Like most new leaders, he was
entrusted with the task because of his work experience and history taking on challenges, assigning roles to staff members and ultimately being held accountable for success or failure. According to Heifetz, this traditional view that “providing leadership in the form of solutions,” is a behavior pattern that must be interrupted in this modern world (Heifetz & Laurie, 2001, p. 4). As Arne Duncan became more seasoned in the role of CPS leader, he was more adjusted to criticism and more considerate of the widely-impacted community, he grew into a more adaptive leader.

Review of excerpts from Table 7, Renaissance 2010 initiative, came from Chicago Tribune journalist Schmidt (2010), and public records from the Chicago Board of Education. The excerpts included statements that “Duncan ordered,” and “stood his ground,” during round after round of school closing announcements depicting Arne Duncan as the ultimate school leader and position of authority. Board publications in the same table depicted Arne Duncan as following protocol as a traditional leader would, submitting proposals and recommendations for approval. As a new leader, answering to an elected mayor, the researcher concluded that Arne Duncan “treat adaptive challenges like technical problems” (Heifetz et al., p. 7).

Through compliance of NCLB in Chicago, Duncan adopts a mix of technical and adaptive leadership as he expands magnet opportunities and navigates the public’s response to the lack of pupil seats filled by families exercising the option to seamlessly transfer children from underperforming schools to highly ranked institutions. His use of a mix of styles signals his growing comfort and self-confidence in the CEO position. He moved into the local spotlight as leader of the country’s third largest school district and recognized that progress was more attainable when impacted communities were treated
like stakeholders and their input was valuable enough to impact educational process and policies.

By the end of his tenure in Chicago, with the possible exit from the Consent Decree on the horizon, Arne Duncan demonstrated predominantly adaptive leadership in testimony and comments in court hearings on the matter. Arne Duncan was able to both incorporate criticism wagered by community groups concerned about threats to diversity and also challenged objections for the good of the district. These excerpts included Duncan amending proposed policies after receiving input from impacted, on the ground, community groups in the areas. On the other hand, he challenged some of their demands by citing other urban districts no longer using race as an admissions factor despite members of the public asking Consent Decree Judge Kocoras to keep the practice in place.

As Duncan moved to the national stage, taking the role of President Obama’s Secretary of Education, the data from this historical analysis showed he used a mix of adaptive and technical leadership as he took the country through the final two initiatives studied. In the document analyzed in this study, redesigning the NCLB educational law as Every Student Succeeds Act he demonstrated 20% technical leadership and 80% adaptive; and in his final measure as Secretary, he acted with 40% technical and 60% adaptive leadership styles. While the percentages varied slightly, in national initiatives, Arne Duncan demonstrated adaptive leadership in the majority of leadership moves (not less than 60%, to be more precise). Excerpts from Table 25, ESSA Initiative contained evidence of Arne Duncan going on a listening tour before releasing policy, confronting Congress to act in response to widespread failing schools, and supportive commentary
from members of Congress about revoking federal control over state education districts in the adaptive leadership category. In the sub-category of protection, Arne Duncan’s actions in protecting a school district from NCLB consequences, would be considered technical according to the framework of Ronald Heifetz, for providing a solution, issuing a waiver, and therefore concealing threats to productivity and protecting personnel from failing records.

The researcher concludes that to have the most positive, wide-reaching impact possible, Arne Duncan employed a mix of adaptive and technical leadership styles as he led the American school system. For ESSA to become law, the Education Secretary had to work with Congress. His professional team authored policy, yet there was push and pull on members of Congress to pass the bill. For Race to the Top to work, Duncan had to lead all 50 states in developing reforms for their low performing districts, yet that policy had to be flexible as Duncan recognized that innovation leads to more student progress than “telling you what to do” (Huetteman & Rich, 2015).

According to Heifetz et al. (2009), leaders that take organizations through modern challenges effectively must respond to the new scenarios adaptively. The organization chief or president does not take control and solve problems in the executive office. Instead, management must learn to support their workers as they let “people take the initiative in defining and solving problems” (Heifetz & Laurie, 2001, p. 8). The leader’s role is to manage discourse between diverse groups. By adopting adaptive leadership, Duncan involved diverse groups across the nation have a part in reforming America’s education system. By publicizing unforgiving, rigid policies and challenging Congress to act on reform, Duncan created opportunities where discourse and differing views on
reform were invited and used as a tool for problem solving. He cast the widest “listening”
net yet on the subject of education - embarking on listening tours, amending policies
based on unintended impacts of enacted policies and public criticism, restoring
significant control to states and holding them accountable for reforming local schools,
and incentivizing innovation across the industry through competition in Race to the Top.

Leaders are to approach each challenge as new and different from the last. Each
challenge requires a delicate balance of research, flexibility, authority, and expertise,
utilizing some combination of both the technical and adaptive leadership frameworks to
create a productive environment where employees carry appropriate levels of stress and
value change.

Today’s most effective teaching methods and classrooms are those in which
students are taught to work together to solve problems, question a text, think creatively
and innovate. In Chicago, a proficient teacher facilitates this kind of learning to a point
where students need very little direction from him or her. It is expected that a pupil who
thinks this way in the classroom will transfer this skill to his or her world beyond it.
There are many opportunities for professional development guiding educators to facilitate
this in the classroom, among teacher-committees, local school councils others who wish
to get involved in their school community in an official capacity, yet there very little of
any session is dedicated to classifying or describing a challenge as adaptive or technical.
Additionally, while most committees establish norms guiding their work sessions, there is
very little time dedicated to describing the administrator’s role as facilitator. Perhaps if
subordinates were privy to the principal’s adaptive leadership tasks, they would feel more
valued and empowered when working with dynamic groups in solving adaptive challenges.

**Implications for Practice**

The following are implications for practice in the education field:

New leaders are to pause before creating and unveiling wide-reaching policy on education communities. Before acting, seek input from a variety of stakeholders from all levels of a school community rather than acting and having to react to feedback. This may result in less resistance from others because voices were heard, additional threats and dangers possible through short-sighted and one-dimensional perspectives may be avoided.

Leaders have a tendency to be technical so as to look strong and to keep up the personal of top authority. As new leaders, adaptive leadership training should be incorporated in principal and superintendent training programs. Additionally, all groups in a school community (teachers, custodial, student, families, LSC, state education boards) would benefit from organized training and understanding of Adaptive Leadership.

**Limitations**

Calabrese (2012) noted that limitations require attention when interpreting the results of the study. First, the research had limited excerpts collected than was initially intended, so the analysis is based on resources that are available to the researcher. Second, the research examined only five of the many policies Arne Duncan implemented which might have skewed the results of the findings.
**Recommendations for Further Research**

Principals and elected school boards are most often put in place for established contract periods. In situations where contracts are shorter time-period, there is an expectation that significant student gains in the shortest amount of time prove that a candidate is worth retaining. The person wishing to be retained likely feels pressure to administer technical authority to achieve gains rather than experiment with discourse, experimentation and management of employee work-loads.

The following are recommendations for future actions:

Universities that offer educator credentials (both classroom educators and school administrators) should include in their training an Adaptive Leadership Framework course so that all school professionals are versed in technical and adaptive leadership techniques, the need for being able to switch between the two depending on situations that are presented, and identifying challenges as adaptive or technical.

An additional suggestion for academic study would be a standard survey given to school district leaders to discover leadership styles used specifically in the education field. From this study, patterns may develop of leadership techniques used in a particular geographic region, socio-economic climate, urban or rural setting, degree-bearing courses, or any number of contributing factors. Further analysis might yield aspects of leadership strategies that similar across titles and are most effective in achieving student gains.
APPENDIX A

KEY TERMS
Calabrese (2012) noted that key terms are central to any study, so the following are key terms used throughout the historical analysis project:

**1988 Chicago School Reform Act** - decentralized central office authority and established local school councils (LSC) as the main decision makers for each school (Public Act 85-1418, 1988).

**1995 Chicago School Reform Amendatory Act** - the school superintendent of Chicago District 299 was replaced with Chief Executive Officer (CEO). This gave the administration room to transform management of the schools from a traditional educational format to a corporate style, and appointed CEO does not need to have earned an educator’s credential (Public Act 85-1418, 1988, 1995).

**Adaptive Challenges** - require experiments, discoveries, and adjustments from numerous places in the organization or community (Heifetz et al.)

**Adaptive Leadership** - is designed to assist organizations and individuals in dealing with consequential changes in uncertain times, when no clear answers are forthcoming (Heifetz et al., 2009).

**Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)** - is a measurement defined by the United States federal No Child Left Behind Act that allows the U.S. Department of Education to determine how every public school and school district in the country is performing academically according to results on standardized tests (Adequate Yearly Progress, as retrieved from https://www.isbe.net/Pages/AYP-FAQs.aspx, January 2017).

**Conflict** - when facing conflict in the workplace, a leader familiar with resolving technical matters prioritizes restoring order. However, in an adaptive challenge, conflict is exposed and used to problem solve. Exposing conflict (Heifetz & Laurie, 2001, p. 6).
**Consent Decree** - In September 1980, the Chicago Board of Education committed itself to student desegregation by signing a consent decree with the United States Department of Justice. The mandate required the Board of Education to “develop a comprehensive student desegregation plan to alleviate the effects of historic segregation on black and Hispanic students” (Steele & Levine, 1994).

**CPS Chief Executive Officer (CEO)** - In passing the 1995 Chicago School Reform Amendatory Act, Illinois lawmakers purposely ensured that the law included specific language that shifted the governance structure of the Chicago Public School System. The law eliminated the previous position of “General Superintendent” and replaced it with “Chief Executive Officer.” The CEO position for the Chicago Public Schools did not require candidates to have educational credentials to take the position, but that individual was granted all of the control that the general superintendent had, including over the district’s curriculum (Chief Executive Officer, as retrieved from http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/62, January 2018).

**Direction** - a technical problem includes identifying the challenge at hand, framing key questions and issues presented. An adaptive challenge is one that has not been encountered before, it requires voice and approach from multiple perspectives even to identify the problem as it is not familiar to team members. The situation differs from a technical one because it cannot be immediately defined, there is no previous history with solving an identical challenge (Heifetz & Laurie, 2001, p. 6).

**Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)** - the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed by President Obama on December 10, 2015. This bipartisan measure reauthorizes the 50-year-old Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the
nation’s national education law and longstanding commitment to equal opportunity for all students (Every Student Succeeds Act, as retrieved from https://www.ed.gov/ESSA, March 2019).

**Five Plus Five** - an incentive for city employees to boost their pension benefits by buying credits to add five years in service and as if they were five years older - early retirement incentive program (Conrad, 1993).

**Illinois Report Card (IRC)** - is an annual report released by the Illinois State Board of Education that shows how the state, and each school and district within it, are progressing on a wide range of educational goals (Illinois Report Card, as retrieved from https://www.isbe.net/ilreportcard, January 2018).

**Magnet Cluster Schools** - are open to students who live in the attendance boundary for a particular magnet cluster school. Each school within a magnet cluster implements one of six academic areas of focus: Fine and Performing Arts; the International Baccalaureate Middle Years; the International, the Chicago Public Schools Scholars Program; Literature and Writing; Math and Science or World Language (Magnet Cluster Schools, as retrieved from https://cps.edu/AccessAndEnrollment/Pages/MagnetCluster.aspx, March 2017).

**Magnet Schools** - are schools without fixed attendance areas that can accept students from all over the city. The schools are centered on a specific academic theme (e.g., Math/Science, Fine Arts, Foreign Language, Humanities, International Baccalaureate, and Montessori). Most magnet schools are subject to desegregation goals that promote a racially integrated student body. Unofficially, magnet schools are generally viewed as centers of high quality education and are considered one method of
retaining middle class families in the CPS (Magnet Schools as retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml, March 2017).

**Modified Consent Decree (MCD)** - the creation of the Modified Consent Decree was based on a review by the United States in conjunction with the Chicago Public Schools to determine the Chicago Public Schools compliance with the plan set forth in the original Consent Decree (Modified Consent Decree as retrieved from https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/129, March 2017).

**No Child Left Behind of 2001 (NCLB)** - the Act required states to develop assessments in basic skills. To receive federal school funding, states had to give these assessments to all students at select grade levels (No Child Left Behind, as retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml, January 2017).

**Norms** - unlike a technical leader who maintains norms, an adaptive leader values operational norms and who is willing to keep them fluid. He or she helps “endure and challenge unproductive norms.” This may include shifting focus and mission, prioritizing voice and feedback, experimenting with new measures of performance and compensation, developing new data systems (Heifetz & Laurie, 2001, p. 6).

**Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)** - is a unique forum where the governments of 30 democracies work together to address the economic, social and environmental challenges of globalization. The OECD is also at the forefront of efforts to understand and to help governments respond to new developments and concerns, such as corporate governance, the information economy and the challenges of an ageing population. The OECD member countries are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary,
Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, as retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/about/, February 2018).

**Orientation** - adaptive tasks in orientation require employees to regularly take on new roles and responsibilities rather than stay within the box of their job descriptions. A technical situation might be sent to a specific department or worker to be addressed as it has in the past (Heifetz & Laurie, 2001, p. 6).

**Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)** - is a triennial international survey which aims to evaluate education systems 30 countries by testing the skills and knowledge of 15-year-old students (Programme for International Student Assessment, as retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/pisa/, February 2017).

**Protection** – for work groups, the adaptive leader is constantly providing information that can help lead to a solution and moderating so as to “clarify the assumptions behind competing perspectives and values.” A more technical leader would use his or her authority to be the problem solver and “protect” employees from conflict and threats to their productivity (Heifetz & Laurie, 2001, p. 6).

The Organization for Economic Cooperation (OECD) 2001 report (see Table 32), U.S. students finished in the bottom half of 31 nations in reading (15th), math (19th) and science (14th). The study measured literacy levels of 265,000 students in each of the subjects; Finland, Japan, and Korea were the top finishing countries (Lyne, 2001).
Table 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD/PISA Study Reading Literacy</th>
<th>OECD/PISA Study Mathematical Literacy</th>
<th>OECD/PISA Study Scientific Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Finland</td>
<td>1. Japan</td>
<td>1. Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Canada</td>
<td>2. Korea</td>
<td>2. Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. New Zealand</td>
<td>3. New Zealand</td>
<td>3. Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Australia</td>
<td>4. Finland</td>
<td>4. United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ireland</td>
<td>5. Australia</td>
<td>5. Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. United Kingdom</td>
<td>7. Switzerland</td>
<td>7. Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Japan</td>
<td>8. United Kingdom</td>
<td>8. Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Austria</td>
<td>10. France</td>
<td>10. Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Iceland</td>
<td>12. Denmark</td>
<td>12. France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Switzerland</td>
<td>17. Norway</td>
<td>17. Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Italy</td>
<td>20. Germany</td>
<td>20. Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Liechtenstein</td>
<td>22. Russian Federation</td>
<td>22. Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Hungary</td>
<td>23. Spain</td>
<td>23. Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>29.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Race to the Top** – abbreviated R2T, RTTT or RTT, is a $4.35 billion United States Department of Education competitive grant created to spur and reward innovation and reforms in state and local district K-12 education. R2T ushered in significant change in our education system, particularly in raising standards and aligning policies and structures to the goal of college and career readiness (Race to the Top, as retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/index.html, January, 2017).

**Renaissance 2010** - a bold initiative launched by Mayor Daley and implemented by Arne Duncan, whose goal was to increase the number of high-quality educational options in communities across Chicago by 2010. New schools are created through a competitive, community-based selection process which establishes a set of high standards to which every new school will be held accountable (Renaissance 2010, as retrieved from https://consortium.uchicago.edu/news-item/high-school-reform-chicago-public-schools-renaissance-2010, April 2017).
Secretary of Education (SOE) - The Secretary of Education is responsible for the overall direction, supervision, and coordination of all activities of the Department and is the principal adviser to the President on Federal policies, programs and activities related to education in the United States (Secretary of Education, as retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/os/index.html, January 2018).

Underperforming - schools unable to demonstrate adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years were identified as needing improvement and subject to immediate interventions (US DOE, 2001).

Unitary Status - when the court orders the parties to work toward attaining unitary status so that the court may relinquish jurisdiction over this case and restore to the School Board full responsibility for the operation of its schools (Unitary Status, as retrieved from Chicago Public Schools, Board Action 80-CV-05124, https://cps.edu/Pages/MagnetSchoolsConsentDecree.aspx, April 2019).

Whole-System Reform - focusing on a small number of core policies and strategies, doing them well, and staying the course (Fullan, 2010).
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