

Interventions/Outcomes Involving Teacher Leaders Providing Leadership to Teams of Teachers and Administrators

Excerpted from Bliss, T., Fahrney, C., & Steffy, B. (1995). *Secondary department chair roles: Ambiguity and change in systemic reform*. Lexington, KY: Institute on Education Reform. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED410 649).

What appears to be prolonged neglect of the department chair role in professional development is mirrored in formal research. “Departments are emerging as one fundamental part of the organization of schools which researchers have disregarded” (Johnson, 1990). Despite the momentum of restructuring efforts, the research on discipline area departments in the American high school is still scant with very little attention given to the role of department chairs (Siskin, 1994). The prominent descriptions we do have of departments were developed for another purpose, such as describing good teachers or exemplary high schools, as in *The Best Teacher in America* (Matthews, 1988) and *The Good High School* (Lightfoot, 1985).

While the role of the department chair remains largely unattended, this role is unique in its official inclusion of both teaching and administrative responsibilities. The potential of this position is largely untapped and, in the context of systemic reform, unknown, thus creating a definite gap in the transition to more inclusive and facilitative leadership at the school site.

Any appearance of newly emerging leadership roles of secondary chairs in a reform context would shed light on policy and training issues associated with high school restructuring. Will chairs have central roles in restructured schools, given the strong emphasis on collegial planning and interdisciplinary teaching (Task Force on High School Restructuring, 1993; Sizer, T., 1992) or is the position destined to become obsolete given its traditional lack of attention?

What are the noteworthy aspects of the roles of department chairpersons involved in implementing both mandatory and voluntary reform initiatives in Kentucky? In the present study, we undertook a two part investigation in order to determine how secondary department chairs are currently functioning in reform efforts and how teachers feel department chairs could function more effectively. We surveyed a representative sample of department chairs concerning general roles and responsibilities. Additionally, teachers within selected departments were surveyed for their perceptions of three areas: actual and desired responsibilities of department chairs, degree of involvement in innovation, and collegiality within departments.

Excerpted from Burch, P., & Spillane, J.P. (2003). Elementary school leadership strategies and subject matter: Reforming mathematics and literacy instruction. *Elementary School Journal*, 103(5), 519-535.

In order to explore interactions between leadership and subject matter, we studied patterns in how administrators and curriculum coordinators across eight elementary schools in a large urban school district identified expertise for improving mathematics and literacy instruction. In particular we looked for patterns in leaders' emphases on internal expertise such as the practical insights of fellow faculty relative to external expertise such as university-designed staff development. Leaders not only enacted subject-matter views through their reform strategies, they also reported that their leadership strategies affected these views. Based on this evidence, we argue that leadership practice and leaders' subject-matter views have a reciprocal relation. What leaders do to improve instruction depends in part on their views of the subject matter. Nevertheless, leaders' views of teachers' subject-area needs also emerge through their leadership practice.

Excerpted from Coggins, C.T., Stoddard, P., & Cutler, E. (2003). *Improving instructional capacity through field-based reform coaches*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

This paper describes a new capacity-building role designed to promote tighter connections between the macro aspects of instructional leadership and more micro-level classroom practices. Positions for “reform coaches” have been developed in a number of schools and districts in the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative (BASRC), a foundation-funded non-profit school reform organization that provides grants and professional development support to schools and districts in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Here, we examine the reform coach role, the functions it provides to the system, and its potential as a capacity-building strategy. Because the coach role is focused on *capacity-building*, it is important to clarify how we define this term at the outset. Building capacity in a school refers to the development of skills and knowledge in both individuals and in the organization as a whole. It often involves creating new structures and roles to broaden participation. Building capacity for changed practice is a critical, though often under-specified, aspect of instructional leadership. It involves:

- Building capacity for instructional leadership at the school level
- Managing knowledge resources by, for example, connecting teachers to relevant academic research or organizing student data into a format that is accessible to teachers
- Direct coaching of teachers on topics related to their practice, such as literacy or differentiated instruction
- Building capacity for instructional support amongst teachers to support their peers

These functions are based both on our observations of the actual enactment of the role by the coach, as well as our interpretation of the roles they play that are distinct from other factors in their schools.

Excerpted from Doyle, M. (2000). *Making meaning of teacher leadership in the implementation of a standards-based mathematics curriculum*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Springfield's mathematics teacher leaders, curriculum leaders and superintendent decided in the fall of 1997 to adopt TERC's Investigations to strengthen their district's elementary mathematics program and align the elementary curriculum with the district's previously implemented standards-based middle school mathematics curriculum. Until 1998-99, this school district's elementary school teachers were given considerable autonomy over their classrooms' mathematical content and instructional practice. The mathematics curriculums specialists advocated for the use of Marilyn Burns' replacement units (Correspondence, June 1999) but teachers only requirement was to cover a given number of topics by the end of the school year with whatever text materials they wanted to use. In the fall of 1997 this district, which has a reputation for strong academic achievement, received disappointingly low test scores on the state's new mathematical assessment of student learning, otherwise known as the WASL. To improve their test scores, the superintendent mandated that the whole district move to one coherent mathematics curricular program that reflected the state's Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs). The Springfield district employed teacher leaders at each school to support elementary teachers during the implementation of TERC's Investigations. In 1998, the district created teacher leadership teams in order to provide staff development in a cost efficient manner and get important information about the curriculum to the teachers. Three teacher leaders and their principal from each school participated in professional development programs offered over the course of the academic school year. Teacher leaders were chosen by their principals or volunteered for the position. Each teacher represented a K-1, 2-3, or 4-5 grade cluster.

The school district also provided optional summer and after school workshops for all the elementary school teachers. Attendance at these workshops is by choice and teachers received reimbursement pay for their time. However, the district required that teachers spend 28 hours participating in compensated professional development programs each academic school year, so many teachers use these mathematics workshop opportunities to fulfill the district's professional development requirements. For those elementary school teachers who do not attend these mathematics workshops, the main avenue for staff development on TERC's Investigations was through their teacher leaders or at the all day grade level mathematics staff development meetings offered twice a year. According to the curriculum specialists at Springfield district, teacher leaders were seen as communicators between district leaders and classroom teachers. They were also seen as facilitators of in-house professional development experiences related to TERC's Investigations material.

Teacher Leaders Providing Administrative Support

Providing administrative support for classroom teachers was the predominant role teacher leaders employed. Teacher leaders gathered and organized manipulative materials and curriculum texts for teachers, and they collected assessment pieces from each curriculum

unit for the district's executive directors. They also gathered other needed supplies such as Lieberman, Saxl, and Miles (1988) found in their study.

Excerpted from Feldman, J., & Tung, R. (2002) *The role of external facilitators in whole school reform: Teachers' perceptions of how coaches influence school change*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

The Center for Collaborative Education

To best understand what a coach does, it is imperative to understand the context in which a coach works. As in the previous study (Tung & Feldman, 2001), this study examines coaches at the Center for Collaborative Education (CCE), a non-profit organization whose mission is to work collaboratively with urban schools and districts to improve student learning by promoting and facilitating models of whole school reform. CCE supports approximately sixty schools in New England in the following reform models:

- Turning Points Network, a national middle school reform model. CCE also coordinates the New England Turning Points Network;
- Southern New England Coalition of Essential Schools Network, a regional center of the National Coalition of Essential Schools;
- Boston Pilot Schools, a network of eleven Boston Public Schools with charter-like autonomy;
- New England Small Schools Network, a regional initiative to create small schools in urban districts; and
- Systemic Initiative in Math and Science Education, a network of middle and high schools within the former four networks that are engaged in science and math reform.

CCE Core Practices

Although CCE works with several networks of schools, the theory and nature of the work is consistent across them. Guiding CCE's theory of change are the empirical work of many researchers and practitioners, including Newmann (1996), Sizer (1991), Levin (1991) and the Carnegie Corporation's report on young adolescent education (1989). CCE's theory is that school change is facilitated by collaborative work with schools in the following four school-based practices:

(1) Building Leadership Capacity and a Professional Collaborative Culture:

Schools require strong, shared leadership to promote a professional collaborative culture. Schools in which faculty interaction is collegial, and collaborative work is focused on curriculum, instruction, and assessment, have experienced strong improvements in student achievement. This process includes:

- Creating a democratic school community, including shared decision making through a representative
- Leadership team and involving all faculties in making decisions about high impact issues affecting learning, teaching, and assessment
- Fostering the skills and practices of strong leadership among administrators and teachers to manage and facilitate change, and to stay focused on teaching and learning

- Establishing regular common planning time to talk about learning and teaching
- Embedding professional development in the daily practices of the school, through practices such as action research to explore important classroom questions, peer observation to promote collegial feedback, and looking at student work
- Building the faculty's capacity to look critically and constructively at work

(2) Improving Learning, Teaching, and Assessment: Ultimately, student learning does not increase unless there is a continual focus on setting high expectations for each and every student, and providing ongoing support for teachers to improve their practice of teaching and assessing student learning. This process includes:

- Setting standards for important things that all students should know and be able to do in grade spans
- Creating an explicit goal of closing the achievement gap between white students and students of color, and between low-income and more affluent students, and setting in place instruction and academic support that will achieve this
- Standards-based curriculum development, framed around essential questions, to ensure that the curriculum assists students to meet standards
- Adopting effective, focused approaches to teaching literacy and numeracy to all students
- Promoting habits of mind that create life-long learners and democratic citizens
- Looking collaboratively at student work to assess student progress and improve instruction
- Developing authentic and reliable assessments (e.g., rubrics, exhibitions, portfolios, exemplars), with clear performance criteria, to ensure that students know and can do important things

(3) Creating Structures to Support High Achievement: High performing schools create structures that promote the conditions for high quality learning and teaching. This process includes:

- Fostering school cultures of decency, trust, and respect
- Establishing small learning communities with common planning time for faculty teams
- Eliminating tracking and rigid ability grouping (equity)
- Lowering student-teacher ratios (no more than 80:1 secondary and 20:1 elementary)
- Building parent and community partnerships, including greater involvement in decision making and students' learning

(4) Data-based Inquiry and Decision Making: Ongoing analysis of data from multiple sources provides a comprehensive picture of a school's strengths and challenges. School-wide participation in this inquiry process results in thoughtful decisions for improvement. This process includes:

- Setting a vision for the school, and what students should know and be able to do upon exiting the school
- Ongoing collection and analysis of multiple sources of data, including disaggregating data by race, gender, and income status
- Analysis of differences between vision and reality
- Inquiry into priority areas for change that most impact learning, teaching, and assessment, leading to identification of causes and development of solutions and a plan of action
- Setting of annual measurable goals for improving learning, teaching, and assessment

Guiding Questions

This paper presents results from an ongoing, long-term study of the role of CCE coaches in facilitating whole school reform. In this study, we focused on the following questions:

- 1) How do teachers and administrators perceive the role of the coach
- 2) How often do teachers and administrators work with coaches, and in what contexts?
- 3) How do teachers and administrators perceive coaching activities as helping to facilitate change?
- 4) In what ways do teachers see coaching activities as related to the reform model?
- 5) What barriers do teachers see in implementing the reform model

Excerpted from Hammerman, J.K. (1997). *Leadership in collaborative teacher Inquiry groups*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Mathematics for Tomorrow (MFT) is a systemically embedded, four-year, National Science Foundation funded project through the Center for Development of Teaching and Education Development Center in Newton, MA. Two cohorts of teachers have worked with the project for two years at a time starting in the summer of 1993. They participated in intensive summer institutes in each of two summers: biweekly, district-based, academic year “inquiry groups” which take place after school in schools during each of two school years: four day-long workshops through the school year; and several consultation visits by project staff to each teachers’ classroom each year.

The first cohort of 23 teachers worked with us from 1993-1995 and came from three Boston area communities: Arlington (white working- and middle-class suburban), Brookline (ethnically diverse urbanized suburb with a large immigrant population) and Cambridge (racially mixed urban with two prestigious universities). The second cohort of 34 teachers began work on the project in the summer of 1995 and included these three communities as well as teachers from the city of Boston. For the most part, teachers came to the project in school-based teams. They received a stipend and professional development points for their participation, and were offered an opportunity to receive course credit for work in the summer institute. Their building principal and district administrators committed support to the project and most administrators have participated in a monthly Administrators Inquiry Group that we began in 1994. Districts also committed money for classroom materials and for release time for day-long workshops.

MFT was designed to build district capacity to continue the inquiry groups (started under the auspices of EDC) after project funding ends. Our plan was to work with a small set of teachers from the first cohort during the second two year cycle for them to become “Teaching Facilitators”—teacher leaders of inquiry groups who would gradually take over staff responsibilities for leading inquiry groups and would continue to do so under the auspices of the Educational Collaborative of greater Boston (EDCO) into the indefinite future. Teaching facilitators attend regular district-based inquiry group meetings discussing them afterwards with project staff. They also attend a monthly “Teaching Facilitators’ Inquiry Group” where we discuss issues arising in the facilitation of inquiry groups. They work with project staff to plan inquiry group sessions and some of the day-long workshops. The “Teaching Facilitator” aspect of the project has been complex and interesting. This paper reports on research done on the experiences of facilitators over the course of these past two years, and identifies some issues and themes that are of interest to those trying to understand and design programs for collaborative teacher-leadership.

Excerpted from Keedy, J.L. (1999). Examining teacher instructional leadership within the small group dynamics of collegial groups. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15(7), 785-799.

Teacher collegial groups: concepts and practice

A teacher collegial group is a variant of the larger family of “teacher study groups” (Paquette, 1987). All variants share the premise that teachers themselves are the best resource for professional growth and support as they engage themselves in changing and improving classroom practice. Teacher collegial groups (TCGs) in particular are designed to maintain a tight focus on individual teacher instructional improvement. (Six to eight teachers per group are an ideal number.) Teachers first formulate year-long foci. Examples are: setting up learning stations, conducting writing conferences, and assessing student work. Teachers then develop achievable meeting-to-meeting “gameplans” (incremental steps in achieving their year-long foci) over the course of eight meetings. At each meeting teachers update peers on progress made on gameplans conceptualized at the previous meeting. Through this collegial interaction teachers conceptualize another gameplan for experimentation during the two or three weeks preceding the next meeting. Teachers become analysts, problem-solvers, and action researchers of their classroom practice. They learn instructional strategies both individually from experimentation cycle and collectively through group interaction. Table 1 contains a year-long focus and gameplans from one teacher.

The 3 hour meeting format consists of: a critique of a journal article related to the year-long focus as a “warm-up” activity (15 min); 20 min presentations by individual teachers on their gameplans; and debriefing and journal writing (45 mins). Presentations, the core of the TCG, follow these six steps: (a) presenter year-long focus and current gameplan; (b) action research on gameplan implementation; (c) colleague analysis and feedback; (d) group assessment on progress toward the year-long focus; (e) colleague suggestions for the gameplan; and (f) presenter selection of gameplan.

Method

This particular study is part of a line of inquiry during which salient features and implications for TCGs (teacher intellectual growth [Keedy & Achilles, 1997]; department chair leadership [Keedy & Robbins, 1993]; and principal leadership [Keedy & Rogers, 1991]) have been examined. These data were collected from two TCGs conducted in the same high school in consecutive years. The unit of analysis was the TCG facilitator. This study has two purposes. First, how effective was the instructional leadership of the two TCG facilitators? That is, did each facilitator engage teachers in using their own classrooms as a basis for improving student learning? Second, what were the teacher mediation effects upon the two facilitators’ leadership?

Excerpted from Little, J.W. (1995). Contested ground: The basis of teacher leadership in two restructuring high schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96(1), 47-63.

In this article, I employ the image of “contested ground” to characterize tensions surrounding the evolution of teacher leadership in two high schools engaged in ambitious forms of restructuring—those that go beyond shifts in school-site governance to envision “reinventing” the educational enterprise itself (e.g., Fine, 1994; Meier, 1992). My analysis is rooted in the legacy of subject specialization in secondary schools and its import for defining legitimate forms of teaching and learning. In these schools, teachers and those with whom they work (including students and parents) wrestle with competing views of what does and should count as valued knowledge and with competing rationales for the social organization of the school. Embedded in these competing views are corresponding assumptions about legitimate leadership, the limits and bases of initiative among teachers, and the institutional and collective control of teaching.

Although I concentrate on the context of high school, I speculate that the image of contested ground may also prove useful as a way to describe and analyze some of the characteristic tensions of teacher leadership in elementary and middle schools. The specific nature of the contested ground would differ, reflecting the traditions, norms, and conditions of teaching in those settings. Among elementary teachers, leadership might be judged on the basis of teachers’ expertise with and interests in primary versus intermediate grades. Questions of legitimate leadership might also arise over the role of “resource teachers” in the fields of special or bilingual education and their relationship to “regular” classroom teachers. At the middle school level, where the disparate traditions of elementary and secondary teaching converge (or sometimes collide), leadership roles may become the site for struggle over fundamental questions of school purpose (e.g., the balance between academic press and socioemotional support for early adolescents) and school organization (e.g., subject departments or interdisciplinary teams). In these instances, the heuristic of contested ground becomes a means for illuminating dilemmas of role ambiguity and conflict that mark the evolution of teacher leadership.

The claims I make here are necessarily provisional, based on preliminary analysis of a small body of data collected over 2 years (1992-1994). I have drawn principally on the experiences of teachers and teacher leaders in two moderately large high schools, both in relatively matured stages of school-level restructuring. Both schools enroll approximately 2,400 students and employ a teaching staff that numbers more than 100; in both of the schools, teachers encounter a student population that is ethnically, linguistically, and socioeconomically diverse. In attempting to restructure both schools started from an altered conception of what a school might look like, what the learning experience might entail, and what it might mean for young people to be educated as a result. Neither school embraces one reform model exclusively, but both pursue changes that would fundamentally alter traditional conceptions of subject teaching.

Our research team selected these schools for the nature and scope of their reputed efforts to transform secondary education, as evident in the text of funded proposals and as

reinforced by nominations from state officials and others. Eligible schools were those state-funded demonstrations sites in which three currents of reform visibly coincided: (1) efforts to create a rigorous curriculum in the core academic subjects for all students, (2) moves to develop greater coherence and connectedness across the curriculum, and (3) steps to strengthen the transition from school to work. That is, we did not set out to study teacher leadership, but rather discovered the shifting and contested ground of leadership in the course of pursuing other questions. (We began each of our teacher interviews, for example, with a broad question on the order of “What’s important for us to understand about this school as a place for you to teach?”) Although we did not make leadership the direct focus of our inquiries, we found it a recurrent theme implicated in and by the main strands of restructuring. We learned about teachers’ views and experiences of leadership from our open-ended and semistructured interviews (53 teachers, including 21 present and former teacher leaders); from observing teachers at work with one another in committee meetings, teacher planning sessions, in-service education activities, and informally throughout the work day; and from our review of key school documents, including demographic profiles, restructuring plans and reports, yearbooks, and teachers’ work assignments. Although this analysis focuses on teachers’ experiences, the broader study also supplied data from administrators, counselors, and local business partners, together with a small substudy of students.

Excerpted from Madsen, A.L., Gallagher, J.J., & Lanier, P.E. (1991). *A new professional role for junior high school science and mathematics teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.¹

The Science and Mathematics Support Teacher Program in The Toledo Public Schools is a collaborative project of the Department of Teacher Education and the Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT) of the College of Education at Michigan State University (MSU), the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), and the Toledo Public Schools (TPS).

The goals of this program are to increase teachers' science and mathematical knowledge, improve instructional practices, and prepare teachers to conduct staff development activities in their schools with their colleagues. It requires a new staff development model containing the components of three other staff development models, these are the: Developmental Model, Linking-Agent Model, and the Peer-Coaching Model.

The Developmental Model as described in the works of Knowles (1984), Oja (1980), Glassberg & Oja (1981), Andrews, Houston, & Bryant (1981), and Tallerico (1987) includes four components necessary for this program: The first, that inservice programs contain concrete experience followed by reflective periods for assimilation of new learnings; second, that participants need continuous support and advising; third, that participants need to be encouraged to assume more responsibilities and more complex roles in the program; and finally, that longitudinal support needs to be provided during the period when new techniques are being practiced. The Developmental Model supports and encourages the mentor teachers as they develop new curricula and implement instructional changes.

The Linking-Agent Model developed through the works of Carlson (1965), Havelock (1967), Howsam (1967), Seiber, Louis, a& Metzger (1972), and Caruso (1985) uses a person designated as a change-agent whose responsibility it is to institute specific curricular practices in their schools and with their colleagues. This model is useful for the mentor teachers as they work in their schools with their colleagues.

The Peer-Coaching Model developed by Showers (1983, 1985) AND Joyce & Showers (1988) is a special application of the Linking-Agent Model utilizing teachers trained in particular instructional techniques to act as coaches for their colleagues. This model is useful for two phases of the proposed program—when the Science and Mathematics Support Teacher pair work to implement instructional changes in their schools and when they support their department colleagues who will be in turn implementing curricular and instructional changes.

¹ Madsen & Lanier (1992) is a report on a subset of the data contained in Madsen, Gallagher & Lanier (1991).

Features of these staff developmental models have been included in the Science and Mathematics Support Teacher Program and have as their goals the improvement of science and mathematics teaching and learning.

The program aims at implementing and studying this new professional role for science and mathematics teachers. This new role develops teachers as leaders in instructional improvement and change in the structure of schools. The innovative features of the model being piloted in Toledo include:

- 1) Collaboration of school personnel, union officials and university-based researchers in the development and evaluation of the model.
- 2) Grounding of the model upon results, conclusions and implications of extensive research on teaching including studies of actual classroom actions.
- 3) Establishing a new professional role in schools and preparing a cadre of junior high school science and mathematics teachers to work in their schools in that new role as exemplary practitioners and leaders in professional development activities with their colleagues.
- 4) Producing a framework for both introducing and implementing concepts and structures for improving classroom actions in specific subject areas.

The overarching goal of the project is to improve the opportunities of students' access to understanding of science and mathematics. The means of attaining this goal are: a) implementing instructional changes of the individual teachers; and, b) creating collegial working relationships among the school's science and mathematics faculties that support instructional improvement changes, experimentation, reflection and peer interaction in and out of the classroom.

During the fall of 1987, eight teachers were selected by their peers and administrators, one in science and one in mathematics from each of four Toledo junior high schools. From February to August 1988, these teachers were provided with over sixty hours of intensive preparation that included:

- a) Updating their knowledge about current research on teaching and learning science and mathematics; and
- b) Providing background and guided practice in working with professional peers in supportive role.

Excerpted from Neufeld, B., & Woodworth, K. (2000). *Taking stock: The status of implementation and the need for further support in the BPE-BAC Cohort I and II schools*. Cambridge, MA: Education Matters, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 483 020).

ILTs. At the start of participating in Cohort I or II, schools were required to establish ILTs, structures through which schools would have teacher and administrator representation in identifying an instructional focus and selecting ways to address that focus through professional development and other activities. The idea was that ILT members, who ideally a) had a solid and growing understanding of the reform, and b) represented each team, cluster, department, and/or grade level, would get input from teachers on instructional issues that they would share in focused discussions at the ILT meetings. ILT meeting agendas would be shaped by teachers' and administrators' concerns and questions with respect to the school's instructional focus. ILT members would have input into the reform and would shape its particular incarnation at their school. The theory posits that a school with a well-functioning ILT would be in a strong position to develop focused informal professional development programs that included collegial work groups focusing on improving instruction, for example LASW groups.

LASW Groups. All Cohort I schools were required to establish grade-level, team, or cluster LASW groups during the first year of reform and most were provided with at least some professional development on how to do this work. Cohort II schools were asked to implement LASW during the first year, but did not necessarily have professional development related to this component of their work. LASW is intended to help teachers use work produced by their own students to make informed decisions about their instruction. Its implementation is structured by the use of a protocol that directs teachers' attention to a) the students' **work** (rather than the students themselves), b) the standards to be addressed by the assignment, c) the quality of the students' work considered against a rubric reflecting those standards, and d) what needs to happen next in the classroom if the work is to improve. In our July 15, 1998, evaluation report we wrote:

The BPE has consistently made clear that they expect looking at student work (LASW) to be a central component of schools' professional development. The purpose has also been clear: to stimulate instructional improvement by using discoveries made when looking at work to plan instruction, choose professional development, and establish annual goals. (p. 30)

Excerpted from Petzko, V.N. (2002). *Teachers in middle level schools: Implications and recommendations from a National Study*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Chattanooga, TN.

The purpose of this paper is to summarize and synthesize the data on teachers as reported in a recent national study of middle level schools (Valentine, Clark, Hackmann & Petzko, 2002, *national Study of Leadership in Middle Level Schools (NSLMLS), Volume 1*). This paper begins with a summary of the characteristics of the middle level schools at the dawn of the new millennium followed by the characteristics of middle level teachers, the instructional context in which they work, and their involvement in school leadership. Implications are discussed and recommendations made with reference to several significant areas: the recruitment of future middle level teachers, the implementation of professional development programs designed to expand teacher knowledge of early adolescence, the development of skills required for teachers to be effective team members and teacher leaders, the development of curriculum which is truly interdisciplinary as well as instruction which is effectively integrated, and the assurance of mastery for all middle level students.

The research design for the NSLMLS was constructed as the third of three “decade studies” which focused on middle level schools and their leadership, sponsored by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) (Valentine, Clark, Irvin, Keefe & Melton, 1993; Valentine, Clark, Nickerson, Keefe, 1981). Consistent with the previous NASSP studies, middle level schools were defined as those serving young adolescents in any structural combination of grades five through nine. Principals of all middle level schools in the United States were initially contacted with a letter of invitation to participate in the 2000 study, and provided with the URL and a password for the survey. The questionnaire consisted of five sections: all principals were asked to complete the first four sections and were randomly assigned to one of the four subdivisions of the final section. Over 1,400 principals completed the on-line questionnaire during the 2000 spring and summer months. Each of the major areas of study, the context and environment of middle schools, the leaders and leadership structures, educational, programs and instructional practices, and school improvement methods is report in *The National Study of Leadership in Middle Level Schools, Volume 1* (Valentine, et. al., 2002). Data explicitly pertaining to the teachers in middle level schools were extracted and analyzed for this paper.

Excerpted from Wallace, R.C., Jr., Radvak-Shovlin, B., Piscoish, M., & LeMahieu, P.G. (1990). *The instructional cabinet and shared decision making in the Pittsburgh Public Schools: Theory, practice and evaluation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

The Instructional Teacher Leader role grew out of the role of the Clinical Resident Teacher (Bickel et al., 1987) implemented in the three Pittsburgh teacher centers. The Instructional Teacher Leader serves as a liaison between teachers in his/her area of responsibility and administrator, a collegial monitor of instruction, and a program coordinator. Instructional Teacher Leaders are nominated by the teachers whom they serve and appointed by their school administrators. The Instructional Teacher Leader role replaced the department head role in the high schools and the team leader role in the middle schools. It is a new role for elementary school teachers. Instructional Teacher Leaders are trained by the Staff Development Team and Clinical Resident Teachers from the Schenley and Brookline Teacher Centers. This paper focuses solely on the Instructional Teacher Leader's role as a member of the Instructional Cabinet.

As a member of the Instructional Cabinet, the Instructional Teacher Leader participates in the process of shared decision making with his/her peers and administrators, dealing with topics previously described. The Instructional Teacher Leader is responsible for maintaining communication between members of his/her department, team, or grade level; the Instructional Teacher Leader brings topics and issues relating to instruction from his/her peers to the Instructional Cabinet for appropriate discussion and decisions.

Training

Prior to the inception of Instructional Cabinets, leadership training was provided to principals in Pittsburgh. Since 1981, principals have attended annual summer "academies" followed by several days of follow-up training during each school year. Training topics have included: observing and analyzing effective instruction; conferring about teaching; supervising content areas; developing individual school based staff development programs; using data for educational decision making; and evaluating styles of leadership.

In 1984, the foundation was built for the initiation of the Instructional Cabinet: principals learned communication skills for effective decision making. Since then, summer "mini courses" have addressed conflict resolution, goal setting for professionals, building high performance teams, collegiality as a component of school improvement, shared decision making, adult developmental stages, and data driven instructional leadership.

Situational leadership training has helped principals to lead and share leadership with teachers in the Instructional Cabinet. Situational leadership was examined in relation to the following topics: analyzing roles in groups; effective listening; group processes; and the relationship between shared decision making and situational leadership. One of the most important training strands was "How to Promote Consensus Building." The Staff Development Team developed the training programs for Instructional Cabinets and

shared decision making; provided training for principals and other “trainers” of Cabinets; coached trainers; and coached Instructional Cabinets. Additional coaching of secondary school Cabinets was provided by the Director of the Schenley High School Teacher Center.

During the summer of 1989, all Cabinet members were trained, with their respective principals, to enhance their effectiveness as a shared decision making body. Instructional Cabinets also spent time developing action plans for the 1989-90 school year.