

FINDING TRANSFORMATIVE THEMES ACROSS MULTIPLE SYSTEM CHANGE EVALUATIONS: A WORK IN PROGRESS

Beverly A. Parsons
InSites, Boulder, CO

November 1998

Dr. Parsons is Executive Director of InSites, 1460 Quince Avenue, Suite 101, Boulder, CO 80304-1157, 303-449-1190. InSites is a Colorado-based non-profit 501(c)3 organization that conducts research and evaluation and provides technical assistance to educational and social institutions/agencies and policymakers engaged in major change within their social systems. This paper was presented at the American Evaluation Association 1998 annual meeting, Chicago, IL. © InSites, Boulder, CO, 1998.

Finding Transformative Themes Across Multiple System Change Evaluations

Over the past seven years, InSites has conducted about 20 evaluations of initiatives designed to transform social systems. The bulk of them have been in education with the rest in the social services area. The organizations funding the evaluations have typically been interested in learning how to change social systems in a fundamental and lasting way. Often they were as interested in developing new knowledge for themselves about what they should fund in the future regarding fundamental system change as they were in the specifics of what happened in the sites that were involved in the evaluation.

A first step in designing these evaluations was to establish a theory of the process of system change using the perspective of the funder in combination with research findings. Sometimes funders have a general theory of change and other times they have none. In either case, they are interested in drawing on other theories of change since they seldom feel that they had a definite perspective.

We have used a variety of ways to develop and test theories of change. The basic idea is to focus on the whole system in a way that can produce insights into theme and patterns that can leverage system transformation.

This paper describes four ways we map patterns and themes to help understand if and how the initiative is likely to transform the education or other social system.

There are many other features of the evaluation approach that we use that are important in ensuring a quality evaluation. The tools and activities in this paper are intended to be adapted to other situations by other evaluators as they build their own full evaluation designs.

Maps for Finding Transforming Themes

Transforming social systems requires understanding the context of the system as well as the system's components and general systemic characteristics. We are currently using four ways of mapping situations to understand systems and their context.

The first map focuses on the general forces of change and resistance and how they play out. Four types of responses to change emerge from this analysis. This approach is useful for understanding the likelihood of major change and the course it might follow.

The second map focuses on the future goals, current situation, and strategies for moving the present to the future. This approach works well when the site has very general goals and/or has only a limited strategy in mind for improving the social system. This approach helps people expand their thinking about strategies.

The third map looks at stages in the change process where the system is moving from the current state of being to a desired future. It not only emphasizes stages of change but also looks at the component parts of the system and how they individually and collectively shift as change progresses. This approach requires that people begin with a fairly well delineated vision of their desired system and how it is different from what currently exists.

The fourth map is one that looks specifically at how people move from an emphasis on hierarchy to an emphasis on collaboration. This is a very common issue. By understanding its dimensions,

evaluators can better focus their attention during the evaluation process. We will now look at each of these in turn.

Change Arena

In some situations, people are unsure of what the critical factors are that they should address to transform their social system. To begin to understand this we find it useful to have people list forces both for and against change. Here we drew on an approach presented by Strebel (1992).

From these lists we ask people to roughly assess the relative strength of the forces for and against change. The site then can be positioned in a “change arena.” Appendix A depicts the arena of change.¹ It arena is defined by the forces for change and the forces of resistance to change. We then provide people with research based information about what tends to happen in the four quadrants of the change arena. When resistance forces are strong and change forces are weak (upper left quadrant), there tends to be no change. When both change and resistance forces are relatively weak (lower left quadrant), change tends to be sporadic and leads to gradual turning points. If the change forces are more intense but the resistance forces are still weak (lower right quadrant), a pattern of continuous change is likely to ensue. When both the change forces and the resistance forces are strong (upper right quadrant), discontinuous change or breakpoints occur. Across the arena, when the forces of resistance are dominant, the status quo tends to win out. If the forces of change are stronger than the resistance forces, the change agents tend to dominate.

We emphasize that situations are continually changing and unexpected forces can overwhelm those that seem important at a given point in time. The priority in using this tool is not to determine exactly where a site is located. Rather, it is to provide a tool for people with a stake in the situation to look at the forces of change and resistance. They can then use this new understanding as a basis for refining their strategy to move toward sustained high-quality change.

In his characterization of the four areas of the change arena, Strebel described four intervention approaches that leaders use depending upon where their organization is in the change arena. (Refer to Appendix A.) When leaders decide that the change forces are strong but declining and resistors are closed to change (the “no change” quadrant), the intervention strategy tends to be one of resisting making change in the organization as a whole. If leaders want innovation, they tend to do it through a separate group that is protected from the forces of the status quo. Outsiders are likely to find it futile to spend time encouraging change in the organization as a whole.

If the organization tends to be in the quadrant of “sporadic change,” where change forces are strong but declining and resistance is low, the strategy tends to be one of incremental targeted change. Partnerships and alliances specific to the targeted change are important. Whether or not they move toward continuous change, i.e., go beyond the particular target change to other aspects of creating sustained high-quality system change, will depend on whether the forces of change increase.

If the organization tends to be in the “continuous change” quadrant, where change forces are strong and growing and resistors are open to change, an ongoing revitalization strategy is more likely. It involves long-term investment in organizational learning with slow continuous adaptation to changing conditions. Here there is more integration of functions across the organization.

¹ This figure comes from Strebel (1992), p.72.

If an organization is in the “discontinuous change” quadrant, where change forces are strong and growing and resistors are closed to change, significant restructuring of the organization is likely to be the mechanism for handling the situation. In education, this is where we are likely to see state takeovers, major pushes for restructuring such as charter schools, and other options.

Working with the site to understand where they are in the change arena can help them better formulate their plans for action and thus the focus for the evaluation. As they do this analysis, it is also useful for them to realize that specific features in a given site may be defined as either forces for change or resistance forces.

Strategies to Move to the Future

Another versatile and valuable tool is a simple visual of moving from the present to the future. See Appendix B. This one is designed for use in education. The idea is to focus on what skills, knowledge, experiences, and abilities are desired for the beneficiaries of the system and what supporting characteristics of the system are necessary. A key feature of using this tool is helping people distinguish what is desired for beneficiaries of the system (in this example, students and teachers as represented by the labeled balls) from the supporting features (e.g. administrative practices, policy curriculum as represented by the ellipse²). Once this is clear, the next step is to define the current situation to see the gap between the current and desired future situations. Next, the designers of the initiative look at strategies to move in that direction.

This tool is especially helpful when used with a mixed group of stakeholders. One approach is to have a large version (we use 4’ by 6’) on the wall. Participants then use sticky notes to write aspects of the desired future and put them on the appropriate place on the diagram. A similar approach can be used with the other two parts of the diagram. Numerous ways exist to summarize or analyze the data. The strategies do not necessarily articulate the stages that systems go through. The strategies also may not separate out the actions of the various stakeholders.

Hierarchy and Power Dynamics

We find that power dynamics are an ever present issue in system transformations. Most transformations involve an effort to move away from a highly hierarchical system to one that is more collaborative across levels of the system or across systems. In a recent evaluation that involved university-community partnerships in ten communities across the country, we found that despite a commitment to collaboration and creating new paradigms, most partners had to address issues of power, dominance, and subordination throughout the life of the partnership. The five most common power issues were:

- inequity between small and large partner organizations
- power imbalances between universities, social agencies, and communities
- the distribution of money among partners
- turf issues and competition
- multicultural issues

² See Parsons, B. (1998) **Progress and Promise: Shaping Long Term Social Change Through Evaluation of Professional Development**. InSites: Boulder, CO, for an elaboration of the support structures that are useful to follow to find transformational themes.

As we pieced together information across sites, a pattern of conflict and resolution emerged. See figure in Appendix C. Much of the conflict partners experience stems from the fact that many of them have been involved in either dominant-subordinate or competitive relationships. For example, in one partnership made up primarily of community-based agencies, there was a mix of large organizations with rich human and financial resources and small organizations with small staffs and budgets. These organizations were in a dominant-subordinate relationship with an imbalance of power that infused the partnership.

Another common example of a dominant-subordinate relationship was between universities and communities, especially poor, inner-city communities. Traditional hierarchical relationships also contributed to competitive relationships that brought conflict to partnerships. For example, community-based organizations, such as those that make up the majority of one partnership, traditionally competed with one another for the same grants and corporate support.

As we looked at these situations we found that one could describe the process of moving from hierarchy to collaboration as moving through four stages—conflict, transition, collaboration, and linked collaborations. The initial stage was a time of conflict among those engaged in the partnership. This conflict was not always openly or explicitly articulated. It took many subtle forms: mistrust, hostility, lack of participation, lack of respect, and lack of progress toward goals.

Gradually most partnerships developed some mechanism for airing and resolving conflicts and working through personal and/or organizational feelings of powerlessness, prejudice, or dominance. These mechanisms took many forms. Many partnerships dedicated a portion of their meeting time on a regular basis to discussions of personal and political issues that affect the partnership. Partners called this “nurturing the partnership.”

In the first year, many of the newly formed partnerships were caught off guard by the realization that their members needed to spend considerable time up front developing personal relationships with one another. The work in two partnerships, for example, was slowed when conflicts arose and the partnerships realized they had not developed an environment of mutual trust and respect based on the partners’ norms, values, and expectations.

Gradually the partners acknowledged that they needed to change their mode of interaction from competition to collaboration. The second stage—transition—was characterized by the group’s decision to learn new modes of interaction, acknowledge the need to change, and adopt new, more respectful ways of viewing partners. A long transition period followed as the partners learned to move further toward collaboration.

The values of the collaborative group evolved. In some cases, people viewed a collaborative as a situation where everyone had to be involved in all decisions or where everyone had an equal voice in all decisions. Gradually group norms emerged where partners viewed each other as equals, all with something important to contribute. Interestingly, however, the collaborations still had some type of hierarchy. Roles were distinguished, rules were established, yet there were fewer levels of hierarchy and less distinction among them. The rules were minimal and emphasized retaining equality.

Another key feature of the collaboration phase was that conflict continued. However, it was now more depersonalized, was done in a healthier way, and was being viewed as a type of diversity that was valuable to the group. Before the initiative ended, we were starting to see some partnerships (the ones that started at a more advanced stage) entering a stage in which the

individual partners were able to form mini-collaborations within the partnership as well as with outside organizations that have similar interests.

Since issues of power and the balance of collaboration and hierarchy are present in nearly every situation where system change is taking place, a tool such as this that helps map the situation can be very helpful. Participants can elaborate on the actions and indicators of change that occur at each of these stages of change.

Stages of Change

A tool we use frequently to analyze systemic changes is a matrix that we refer to as a “continuum of system change.” The first one we developed was based on work with a large number of states involved with systemic change in education. See Appendix D. This continuum shows six stages in the process of moving from one form of the education system to a desired new form.³ Over a number of years and a variety of experiences we developed the following definitions of the stages of change.

As an organization/system attempts to change from one state of being to another, we find six roughly definable stages during the progression to the new system’s dominance.

Stage 1 — Maintenance of the Old System

In this stage, people try to improve what they were already doing. They tend to say, “Well, we know that we could do this a little bit better. If we just try harder, I’m sure it will work.” Soon they realize there is something to the adage: “If you always do what you’ve always done, you always get what you always got.” Gradually they begin to say, “Maybe there is something that we need to do differently. Maybe this just doesn’t work.” At this point they begin to enter the Awareness stage.

Stage 2 — Awareness

In this stage, people are aware that what they have been doing is inadequate and that there must be something better. This can be frightening because they recognize the need to give up the familiar, and yet don’t know what to do instead. The awareness can also create a sense of guilt and unhappiness with past performance. Guilt and blaming one another often characterize this stage. For example, as teachers learn about other teaching strategies they may feel that they have failed or have damaged children in the past by teaching in less effective learning methods. Other people may start blaming one another. Teachers and service providers blame the administration, administration blames front line workers, and the front line workers blame students and parents.

Eventually people realize that blaming and guilt do not help. They begin to look at the alternative practices and become more open to the possibility of their own change. This leads into the Exploration stage.

Stage 3 — Exploration

During Exploration, people begin to pick up on new ideas from many sources; this can take different forms. One method to move into this stage is to visit other schools and communities to observe new practices. Simply talking about the new ideas can be insufficient; people need to observe the practices in operation or, at the very least, by watching videotapes of new practices.

³ There are a number of descriptions of stages of change that are available that also have features that are helpful.

Visits are most helpful because of dialogue with their counterparts which gives a more in-depth view of how practices have changed.

Another way to move people into Stage 3 is to set up study groups within the school or agency. These groups identify and read articles on new practices and then discuss what they have read and how to apply it to their situation.

These conversations are extremely important both at the Awareness and the Exploration stages. They show how we learn through interaction (whether adults or children), and that adults' discussion time leads to changes in the mental image and modeling of good teaching, service, administration, or other practice. The ground rules of effective dialogue become particularly important here (see Senge, 1990).

Another useful activity is to encourage people in all parts of the system to actually try out some new approaches. The idea is for different approaches to spring up among those who are interested in trying new things. Some teachers may be exploring cooperative learning; others may be involved in site-based management approaches; others may look at different ways to engage students in conducting projects; and still others may try performance assessment with projects and portfolios instead of multiple choice tests. Service providers may try shifting toward an emphasis on prevention or work out ways that teams could provide better beneficiary service. The focus of this stage is for people to understand at a deeper level, and experience how it works for their situation.

A couple of precautions during this stage: a common problem has been that people adopt one technique on the basis that it will solve the problems of the system; then they often advocate this approach and criticize others for not using it. This undermines the environment of trust and encouragement for learning that is essential to progress. Another problem that can occur is when people try too many things. This results in practices that are tested at only a superficial level instead of at the depth required to judge the usefulness of the approach in their situation.

During the Exploration stage, people often reach a point where so many things are happening that they can't put it all together. They try to choose one technique over another and don't recognize fundamental themes running through many of these approaches.

People need to identify themes and common assumptions that provide the basis for designing their new system. For example, teachers who use cooperative learning may realize that students arrive at jointly shared solutions that are better than individually developed ones. Similarly, a principal who uses site-based management may find that better decisions are made by teachers whose perspective is deeper because of being in the classroom. Teachers are more committed to solutions they understand because they have helped to work them out.

As the Exploration stage progresses, people look more deeply at the commonalities of effective practices and fundamentals that are the characteristics of the new system.

Stage 4 — Transition

People now move into the Transition stage. At this point people begin to make a commitment to some new practices. Until now they have been able to try new things and keep the old. If critics become concerned about new practices, the reformers can lean back on the old approaches. However, in the Transition stage they begin to realize they can't do both. They are faced with the adage "The politics of subtraction are much more difficult than the politics of addition."

Until now it has been relatively easy to keep adding new practices. Perhaps they have been able to find teachers or others in the system willing to contribute extra time (probably with little pay) to try something new. However, now they realize this cannot continue as the main operational mode. Some practices must be eliminated because of cost and because of the confusion they create. Therefore, this stage is characterized by hard decisions of what to keep and discard, personnel requirements, and budget allocations.

Stage 5 — Emerging New Fundamentals

As people move into this stage, they begin to make real commitments to new practices. One indication of commitment is when new teachers or administrators are hired based on criteria reflecting new operating methods. Another indication is when resources are allocated to support new practices, rather than to maintain the old.

A key example is when resources are allocated based on student results rather than on traditional budget categories. At this stage we tend to see 20-30% of schools or communities committed to using new practices and policies.

Stage 6 — Predominance of the New System

This stage is called “Predominance of the New System” rather than “New System,” because as people move closer to their vision of a new system they begin to see beyond to even better possibilities.

Consider the story of a city fellow who went to the country looking for Joe Jones’ house. He stopped at a farmhouse and asked the woman who answered the door if she knew where Joe Jones lived. “Oh yes,” she said, “just go three Cs down this road and turn left.” “Three Cs?” he asked. “What do you mean by that?” “Well,” she said, “you go once as far as you can see, and then you do it again, and then again, and then you turn left.” So too with the shaping of our vision of education and human services. We get a vision as far as we can see based on what our current knowledge is. As we get closer, we see something over the horizon that is even more intriguing and seems more appropriate.

At this point it is unrealistic to expect that everyone will have adopted the “new system” as defined. A state could be considered to be at this stage when about 65-85% of communities are operating according to the definition of the new system.

A continually evolving picture of our direction seems to be a characteristic that will be with us for a long time. Our period of history has so many changes, that we need to become accustomed to change.

It is also useful to look at a number of elements of the system that need to change. (See left hand column of continuum.) For example, in the continuum about education the elements of the system included the vision people have of education, public and political support, networking, teaching and learning changes, administrative roles and responsibilities, and policy.

We have used this basic idea in a number of situations. For example, we adapted this continuum for systemic changes in education that specifically support mathematics and science content area changes. We also developed one that brought together education with human services at a state level. We developed yet another that was designed for looking at the shift from an institutional-based orientation for providing social services within a community to a community-based orientation. These examples are also included in Appendix D.

Each of these was very helpful in developing a sense of where the site is in the process of system change and what actions might be needed by which groups to help move the process through the transition stage to a transformed system. The tools were useful both when co-constructed by the initiative stakeholders and evaluators as well as when the evaluators provided a fairly generic continuum which stakeholders could use to assess the current status of their system and set goals for their next steps. Both processes help people understand what they are expecting as their end result and as the process for getting there. We have yet to find a group, however, that has actually achieved their desired system.

Several themes come out as people are developing the continuum. One is that people realize the broad range of people who need to be involved in changing a system. They also see the many visible and invisible features of the situation that shape the system being considered.

We have recently begun to look particularly at the process of change that groups articulate for the transition stage. We are finding that this is very helpful since people are often trying to move forward in reaction to the past rather than building on the past.

The basic idea that we are using in understanding this stage is to think of entities (including social systems) as holons. A holon is “an entity that is itself a *whole* and simultaneously a *part* of some other whole.... They are whole/parts, they are holons” (p.20).⁴ Holons have a drive to both maintain their wholeness and their partness. Holons also have the capacity to either decompose into subholons, e.g., cells decompose into molecules, molecules decompose into atoms. Holons also have the capacity to evolve into something that is new and more complex than itself. This transcending capacity is characterized by the holon not only becoming something new but going beyond and enfolding that which went before.⁵ We are finding that this concept of enfolding what went before is very important in helping to understand the changes in social systems at the transition phase. All too often people are contrasting the current system with something “that was” rather than thinking creatively about something that is new. Also the tendency is to want to throw out the past rather than enfold it. For example, some people who are working on collaboration want to totally throw out hierarchy rather than enfold it in a healthy and helpful way.

Thus in our work, we are looking more closely at the factors that define if the system is moving toward the status quo with no change, degenerating to some past approach that inadequately takes into account current conditions, or is positioned to creatively transcend what has been. We are still in the midst of incorporating this concept of transcending and enfolding into the approaches we are using. The mapping approaches are now being looked at with this idea in mind.

Summary

This paper provides four tools to help evaluators position themselves to find transformative themes when working in situations where social systems are being changed. They emphasize the importance of considering the forces for and against change, clarity of purpose, power dynamics, and stages of change.

There are many ways that these tools can be used in designing and conducting evaluations. They are especially helpful as a focal point for helping mixed groups of stakeholders in the system

⁴ From Wilber, K.(1996) **A Brief History of Everything**. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, Inc.


⁵ See Wilber (1996) pp 20-30 for further information on these ideas.

clarify their purposes, issues and strategies to transform their ways of operating. They give the evaluator ideas about what themes may be of most importance to track and thus incorporate into the evaluation design. Although this paper emphasizes using these tools during the design phase of an evaluation, they can be used at other points as well.

References


- Anderson, (Parsons) B.L. (1993) *A Framework for Understanding and Assessing Systemic Change*. Fort Collins, CO: InSites
- Anderson, (Parsons) B.L. (September 1993) “The Stages of Systemic Change” *Educational Leadership*.
- Bridges, W. (1991) *Managing Transitions: Making the Most of Change*. New York, NY: Addison-Wesley.
- Land, G. and Jarman, B. (1992) *Breakpoint and Beyond*. New York: HarperBusiness.
- Moore, G.A. (1991) *Crossing the Chasm*. New York: HarperBusiness.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline*. New York, NY: Doubleday/Currency.
- Strebel, P. (1992) *Breakpoints: How Managers Exploit Radical Business Change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Wilber, K.(1996) *A Brief History of Everything*. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, Inc.

Appendix A – Change Arena⁶




⁶ This figure comes from Strebel (1992), p. 72.

Appendix B – Strategies to Move to the Future



Appendix C – Mapping Change From Hierarchy to Collaboration



Appendix D – Continuum of System Change in Education

Elements of Change	Stages of Change		
	Maintenance of Old System	Awareness	Exploring
Vision	<p>Vision reflects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning based on seat time • Teaching as lecture • Mandates and inputs • Education system separate from other systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple stakeholders realize need to change from old system, but unclear on what to change to • Strategic plans, study group reports from influential groups call for fundamental changes getting some attention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives to old system begin to emerge in piecemeal fashion • Stakeholder groups promote new ideas about parts of the system • New examples visited/debated • Growing numbers and types of stakeholders being drawn together around change
Public & Political Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support generally taken for granted • Only becomes of concern when finances are needed • Public informed, not engaged, by educators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports on need for changes in education discussed among policy makers, in news media • Public forums on need for change with input from public encouraged 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task forces formed to recommend changes for district, school • Political/public opinion leaders speaking out on selected issues • Minor resource allocations to explore possibilities • Public involvement in redefining desired student learning outcomes
Networks, Networking, and Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Networking among peers often seen as subversive or insignificant • A few teachers within schools begin to network • Partnerships are one-shot, supplemental 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition of value of networking as a way of learning new operations of education system • A critical mass of teachers in a school explore joining restructuring networks • Realization that partnerships need to be longer term and more integral to school mission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Networks (including electronic) used as a way to speed up sharing of information and new ideas • Networks joined across schools, districts, states • Whole schools join networks • School leaders begin conversations with potential partners on core educational issues
Teaching & Learning Changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis placed on using standard curriculum, instruction, assessment methods more rigorously • High attention to standardized test results and ways to raise scores 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition that traditional teaching and learning methods are not based on current research about learning • Recognition by administrators, public, teachers that education problems are due to social, economic, technological changes that are broader than education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual schools, teachers, districts debating and committing resources to learning and using new ways of teaching • Multi-person and multi-year commitments to try new teaching and learning approaches • New modes of assessing learning explored, developed • Learning outcomes being defined
Administrative Roles & Responsibilities	<p>Role/responsibility seen as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diminish conflict • Emphasize standardization of approaches, following rules, regulations • Serve as major channel, source of information • Top-down decision making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrators (at all levels) recognize need to change roles to better support change & learning by teachers • New roles, responsibilities for administration discussed • Media attention on innovative leaders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site based decision making (SBDM) approaches piloted • Professional development for administrators focuses on new roles/responsibilities • Bureaucratic layers questioned, vacant positions not filled • Administration learning to allocate resources to support learning outcomes
Policy Alignment	<p>State, district policy emphasizes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Textbook selection • Standardization of instruction methods • Standardized test, comparisons among schools on student achievement • Hierarchical organizational structure • Program evaluation results used as bias for blaming and fault finding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition that standardized tests not measuring all desired learning outcomes • Attention directed to performance assessment to support desired • Recognition that low achievement may be due to broader conditions rather than poor teaching • Debates on how to use policy to help lead reform rather than force change • Waivers to regulations made available to promote experimentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools, districts, states explore new modes of student assessment • Policies debated, enacted, piloted to define graduation based on demonstrated learning rather than courses taken • New policies piloted on curriculum frameworks with higher learning for all

Appendix D – (continued)

Stages of Change

Elements of Change

Transitioning	Emerging New Infrastructure	Predominance of New System	Elements of Change
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emerging consensus on new system components Old components disparaged/shed Need for linkages of new components within system is understood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continual vision development seen as major force for change Vision includes student outcomes, system structure, underlying beliefs Recognition of need for continual refinement, development of vision with expanded stakeholder involvement 	Broad agreement that in the desired system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All students can learn at higher levels Learning means achieving and applying skills, knowledge Teacher as coach, critic, facilitator Distributed decision making Vision-setting leadership Connections to other social systems 	Vision
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public debate on specific changes with mixed support Opinion leaders campaign for change Resistant groups vocal More resources allocated for innovation Diversity of population recognized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing commissions, task forces established to maintain momentum for change as political leaders come and go Resources for innovation are ongoing with emphasis on meeting diverse student needs Public engaged in change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public, political, business involvement and connection seen as essential feature of system Allocation of resources based on new vision supported 	Public & Political Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognition that networks are a long term feature of a less hierarchical system Debates on how the district can support ongoing networks Disenfranchised groups (e.g., teachers, ethnic groups) use networks for long term empowerment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Networks seen as accepted practice Networks act as major source of new knowledge Empowerment issues debated Multiple partners support vision and student learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources allocated for networks Effective network operations developed Networks serve as communication and information channels Empowerment issues being resolved 	Networks, Networking, and Partnerships
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant numbers of teachers, schools, districts intensely trying new approaches Teachers given time for planning Recognition of depth of change needed and difficulty, time and resources required Teachers convinced it's not a fad Changes being assessed 	For significant numbers of schools: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State, district teaching/learning assessments encourage continual improvement, recognize uneven progress Graduation based on demonstrations of established learning outcomes Teaching methods actively engage students Heavy and ongoing investment in teacher development 	For most schools in district it's the norm: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To have students actively engaged in learning Student assessments show continual improvement on skills, knowledge established in vision as desired outcomes Outcome focus used in teacher and administrator preparation programs 	Teaching & Learning Changes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods of distributing decision making to lower organizational levels developed Emphasis on outcomes to be achieved with flexibility in how they are achieved Allocates resources to support continual learning by teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrators hired using new criteria for leadership/management Policy supports SBDM Required school-community councils Teachers responsible for instructional decisions Infrastructure supports school change to match vision 	Administrators expected to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage rethinking, improvement Encourage flexibility in approaches to meet needs of all students Allocate resources to support student learning rather than rigid categories Determine SBDM for learning, equity 	Administrative Roles & Responsibilities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Task forces define student learning outcomes, frequently based on national standards Policies enacted that give schools latitude to redesign their teaching and learning approaches Recognition that all policy needs review to determine what system is supports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exit learning outcomes developed by broad based stakeholder groups at state, district, school levels; outcomes emphasize problem solving, more complex learning for all Multiple means of measuring student learning used; inclusion of demonstrated skills, knowledge Major review of policy for realignment to support new system Policies across education, health, social services, etc. interconnected 	Policy at school, district, state supports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing rethinking, continual improvement Allocating resources to support student learning Curriculum frameworks with high student standards Learning outcomes guide decisions at all levels of system including classroom Flexible instructional materials/methods to meet diverse student needs Alternative modes of assessment 	Policy Alignment