∞CPRL

Seminar in Structural Change in Public Education

Seminar Faculty:

Jim Liebman: jl32@columbia.edu
Elizabeth Chu: emc2170@tc.columbia.edu

Class TA:

Sarah Guest: smg2287@columbia.edu

Class Location (unless otherwise noted): Jerome Green 304
(link to map of exact location)

Important Links:
Class Zoom
Google Calendar

The Seminar's purposes, content, norms, class modalities, assignments, and grading are introduced below. **Please read this introduction carefully before the semester begins**.

==Assignments and course readings for each Seminar Session are in the Coursework Modules tab.==

INTRODUCTION TO THE SEMINAR

The central task of the Seminar portion of the course is to provide a conceptual framework for achieving fundamental change and improvement in how public school systems serve their client populations. This framework consists of three lenses on public education. The first, overarching lens is equity: how to achieve the fundamental changes needed to assure that school systems understand and meet the needs of all students, especially students of color, in poverty, or otherwise traditionally underserved. Our second lens is what we call governance: how public school systems and other organizations go about deciding what substantive policies to implement in given circumstances and how they implement those policies. Our third lens is democracy (or, more broadly, politics): how and to what extent public systems involve their field staff, client populations, and other stakeholders in making and carrying out substantive decisions. Notice that we do not focus primarily on particular substantive policies. This is because achieving equity is so highly dependent on context—demanding different substantive strategies for different communities, schools, classrooms, families, and students—that it is only by improving governance (how we identify, choose among, and implement strategies) and democracy (how fully we enable affected populations to drive those choices) that we can assure that public institutions effectively align different policies to each of the many different contexts in which they operate.

In developing this framework, we draw on perspectives from a variety of fields, including education, law, management, organizational design, policy, sociology, and political science.

Likewise, we consider case studies from many public- and private-sector domains in and well beyond public education. We incorporate such a broad range of disciplines, domains, and perspectives given the complexity of—and the insufficiency of any single approach to solving—the problem of educational inequity at the level of each child, classroom, school, and the system as a whole.

The framework we develop in the Seminar is vital to our research and consulting projects because it helps us understand our clients, their organizational contexts, the problems they have asked us to help solve, and solutions that may be available. In turn, we encourage you to use your observations and experiences in the project work as a basis for critically assessing the framework as a mechanism for leading fundamental change and enhancing public education equity.

To clarify our discussion of the framework, we have created a glossary of key terms that we use in the Seminar. You'll receive a hard copy of the glossary at the start of the term, and the glossary also is in the CPRL Resources Folder on Courseworks (Canvas). **Please review the glossary at the beginning of the semester and refer to it throughout the semester as each term becomes relevant**.

In Part I of the Seminar (Sessions 2-5), we consider the historical and current state of public education in the United States and elsewhere. We build this discussion around (1) different stances and responses to the racial segregation of schools in the US over the past 200 years, and (2) variations in student learning outcomes among different countries and US states and across different time periods over the past several decades. In addition to providing context, the goal of Part I is to show that crucial learning inputs and outcomes do respond to the intentional decisions that schools and school systems make. This conclusion is good news for kids, because it means that their fate is not inexorably determined by their or their family's or nation's history, demography, culture, or socio-economic conditions. But the conclusion also reveals that advances in educational equity are difficult to achieve and require far more than good intentions or "silver bullet" policy prescriptions that suffice for all times and places.

We confess from the start that we have more confidence in our understanding of Governance and Democracy than of educational Equity itself. We thus will work alongside all of you to imagine and define that end state at the interpersonal, organizational, and systemic/society-wide levels. Like so many others in the US, we are only beginning to understand how even to address that question, much less how to answer it and how to make a reality of that answer in our own work and in public education generally. Even more than the others, therefore, our use of this lens in class will require mutual patience, support, and courage to try out things that may not fully succeed.

Parts II (Sessions 6-12) and **III** of the Seminar explore the hypotheses we note above and will raise again at the end of Part I: that different modes of governance (Part II) and different forms of democratic engagement (Part III) have a lot to do with whether school systems' intentional decisions do or do not systematically improve educational equity. We begin Part II by discussing the pros and cons of the most common form of governance of large public school systems over the past century: bureaucracy. Finding that bureaucracy has largely failed school children since at least the 1990s, we consider several important governance alternatives to bureaucracy, including "managerialism," "professionalism," "craft," and "evolutionary learning." Although the focus of Part II is on alternative forms of governance (i.e., on how organizations go about making and

implementing decisions), we use one or more particular substantive policies (i.e., what an organization has decided to do) as an illustration of how each governance model works. This enables us, in the context of discussing governance (the "how"), to explore important policy debates about such strategies as teacher evaluation, charter schools, and mastery learning (the "what"). Part II concludes that evolutionary learning governance holds out the most promise as a pathway to educational equity but that evolutionary learning cannot succeed without substantial organizational flexibility, learning, and discipline. Part II ends with our consideration of two tools—qualitative review and structured inquiry—that school systems committed to evolutionary learning governance often use to achieve the necessary flexibility, learning, and discipline.

Part III (Sessions 13-14) then considers the role different forms of democracy and politics play in enabling public school systems and other public agencies to serve their client populations equitably and effectively. After offering a critique of existing forms of "interest group" and "tamped down" democracy and noting their connections to different governance forms (with bureaucracy linked to interest group politics and with tamped down politics linked to managerialism and professionalism/craft), we introduce an alternative form of what we call "problem-solving democracy" and link it to evolutionary learning governance. Problem-solving democracy aims to break down hierarchy, status distinctions, and racial and cultural barriers to the free flow of knowledge between leaders at the district and school levels and teachers, and between educators and the students, families, and communities they serve. Put the other way around, it aims to equalize and maximize influence over the process and its products across all of those actors. We end Part III by considering how combinations of governance and political reforms can contribute to the effective application of an equity lens to all phases of public education reform, including our own projects. As in Part II, in Part III we use a variety of policy debates (i.e., debates over what to do in order to achieve goals in particular contexts) to help illustrate the different forms of democracy under discussion (i.e., to illustrate different answers to the question of how to decide what to do to achieve success).

Part IV (Sessions 15-17) addresses transition questions: (1) how organizations that *choose* to do so can transition from bureaucracy to evolutionary learning and from interest-group or tamped down to problem-solving forms of democracy; (2) how failing organizations can be *made* to change through litigation or other forms of public advocacy; and (3) how non-profit organizations worldwide have effectively transformed themselves and their governance, stakeholder engagement, policy focus, and impact or scale.

Part V ends the semester with project team presentations and a last Session 18 in which a guest speaker joins us to consider the future of public education transformation.

Questions the Seminar addresses include:

1. What is the current state of public education in the U.S. and the world, and what are the causes of differences in educational inputs and outcomes from one place and time to another?
2. How should we define educational equity?

3. What factors affect educational equity, and to what extent are those factors subject to deliberate public efforts to alter or manipulate them in service of greater educational equity?

4. In taking deliberate steps to enhance educational equity, what is the role of governance and democracy (i.e., *how* organizations go about deciding what to do to improve educational equity) and what is the role and importance of policy (i.e., *what* substantive steps are chosen and implemented)?

5. What are the comparative merits and demerits of bureaucracy and alternative governance models (managerialism, professionalism, craft, decentralization, etc.) in achieving public education equity?

6. How convincing are our reasons for promoting evolutionary learning as a promising alternative form of governance? What would it take for evolutionary learning to live up to its potential for enhancing educational equity?

7. How and how well do qualitative review and structured inquiry contribute to evolutionary learning and enhanced educational equity?

8. What are the comparative merits and demerits of different forms of interest group and tamped down politics in advancing educational equity?

9. How convincing are our reasons for promoting problem-solving democracy as a promising alternative form of politics? What would it take for problem-solving democracy to live up to its potential for enhancing educational equity?

10. How can we use new forms of governance and democracy to help make equity the central organizing principle in our and our clients' project work and in other reform efforts?

11. How can school systems change, or be made to change, the way they govern themselves and how democratically they interact with their stakeholders in service of enhanced educational equity?

12. How do nonprofit organizations change and expand their impact on educational equity?

13. Where do you come out on the variety of educational policy debates we address in the course of discussions of public educational equity, governance, and democracy, e.g., debates over teacher evaluation, charter and other independent schools, mastery learning, teachers unions, etc.)?

14. What is the future of public education reform?

CLASS PREPARATION/PRE-CLASS ASSIGNMENTS

To distribute the intellectual load and participation across the cohort, we have divided you into 3 groups, A, B and C:

Group A	Group B	Group C
Terresa Adams	Isabel Amaro	Shashank Atreya
Sarah Brand	Athena Cao	Marisa Carter
Caroline Connolly		Richard Garcia
Brian Goddard	Mahima Golani	Juliana Gomez de Souza
Jacob Kirschenbaum	Taylor Leppik	Kevin Lissemore
Derrick Luster	Nicolas Milinkovich	Patrice Oseni
Joanna Pisacone	Eni Popoola	Carly Rettie
Margaret Sturtevant	Chethana Mohan Sundar	Jenny Zheng

Courseworks indicates whether your group is "on call" for each Seminar session (referred to below as "Module"). "When your group is on call for a particular session/Module, you must:

- Submit BRIEF answers to the Assignment question(s) (if any) through the Modules tab on Courseworks. These questions explore your understanding of the reading and will be read only by course faculty.
- Post BRIEF <u>responses</u> to the Discussion Board Question(s) (if any) and also offer at least <u>one comment or reply</u> to someone else's response to the same question. The discussion question will explore your judgment or opinion on a topic we will discuss in that class session, which often will be based on the readings for that class. These answers and comments/replies will be read by everyone in the class.

Important notes:

- Assignments submissions and Discussion Board Question posts should be completed *no later than 24 hours before class*.
- Your answers to all assignment and discussion board questions should be BRIEF. We do not want an essay but only enough information, clearly stated, to answer the question or offer your opinion, comment, or reply. If a word or phrase or a few short bullet points are enough for that purpose, that is all you should provide.
- In regard to Discussion Board Question(s), first impressions, half-formed thoughts and reactions, and clarifying or critical questions are fine. The goal is to start or continue a conversation, not fully resolve the matter.

- Even if you are not on call, you should read the Assignment and Discussion Questions before class in order to orient yourself to the class discussion to come. Also, students not on call are free (but not required) before class to submit answers to and to comment on/reply to other students' answers to Discussion Questions.
- Sometimes the Module will identify readings or questions (other than Assignments and Discussion Board Questions) that you or groups of you designated alphabetically are assigned to become experts on. You may, then, be called upon in class or in a small group to provide a brief summary of a reading that some other members of the class have not read.
- Also, the Module or an assigned video sometimes will ask you, as you prepare for class, to make some notes about a reading or video to organize your thinking in support of full-group and small-group discussions.

CLASS

Modalities. Classes will use a combination of the following modalities:

Full Class

- Lecture: Some classes will include an in-person lecture. On occasion, pre-recorded lectures will be assigned (see below) and will be included in the Module for that week along with the readings.
- Structured discussion: When it is important for all students to have a common understanding of a reading (including when readings are split up among different groups of students), we often will work through the reading in class using questions and answers to draw out (i) the factual story the reading is telling; (ii) the conceptual points the reading is trying to make; and (iii) your reactions to both. Students whose Group (A, B, or C) is on call for the session should be especially well prepared to help lead the class through these structured discussions. During these discussions, keep in mind that students in the class come from different disciplines and vary greatly in the kinds of materials and concepts with which they are and are not familiar. You may find during these discussions that the reading under discussion is "old hat" for people in your professional program or, on the other hand, that the material is unfamiliar and unintuitive. We urge those in the former category not to check out of the discussion (*"I already know all this stuff!"*) and instead to engage and help those in the latter category come to grips with the material, no matter how straightforward it all may seem. And we urge those in the latter category (*"This makes no sense at all!"*) to ask the questions you need to understand what's going on. Often, too, you will have strong reactions to a reading and may feel that the effort to understand it implies an endorsement of it. Far from that, our readings are designed to provoke critical commentary, which we expect and urge you to offer as frankly as you can. **Experience shows that student comments that run against the grain of a reading or that are critical of ideas faculty are offering generate the best conversations we will have. So, fire away!**
- Open-ended discussion: Sometimes by design and sometimes not, our structured discussions will evolve into open-ended discussions. We also will draw on the answers and the comments/replies to answers on the Discussion Board as open-ended conversation starters.

We invite members of the class **at any time** to provoke open-ended discussion by disagreeing with a reading, a faculty member's comment or train of thought, or something else said in class. **If you want more open-ended discussion, start it!** We'll all be grateful to you for doing so.

Small Groups

- Clarifying and sharing discussions: Another technique we will use to assure students have a common understanding of key readings—especially when we assign different readings to different sets of students—is to break you up into small groups in which you will be asked to share your understanding of one or more readings or to discuss your reactions to readings. Faculty at times will listen in to small-group discussions to keep up with the ideas that are emerging, but will act as observers only unless you have questions for us.
- St. Paul exercise: In several sessions during the semester, we will ask you to work in small groups to apply ideas from the readings and class to an ongoing hypothetical example of a school district contemplating and designing structural change in service of improved equity. During these exercises, we will ask you to stay "in role" either as leaders of the district or as consultants during this part of the session. Typically, we will ask each small group to generate a product—usually, an outline of a design or plan. We often, but not always, will debrief these products in the full class, but we may not have time to get to every group. We may ask each group to post its product on the Discussion Board after class for other students to review. (These products will not be graded!)
- The composition of your small groups will change from class to class. However, your St. Paul exercise group will remain the same throughout the sessions devoted to that exercise.

Class Norms for Seminar

Participation in all aspects of class is strongly encouraged. Think of this as a responsibility you owe each other and the community. Typically, we will proceed in full-class and small-group discussions with volunteered comments, with the goal of assuring that everyone gets to speak often. We also may call on students in full-class settings to keep the conversation moving and assure that everyone participates. Class participation is not graded. In a small number of cases, however, we will use it to raise (never lower) final grades when participation has been exemplary—meaning when someone has avidly and effectively exercised the responsibility described just above.

Internet and social media use: Please limit your use of the internet during class to pursuing information of relevance to that class session. Don't check email, text, or use social media for other purposes. Doing so runs counter to the exercise of the responsibility to your classmates and the community that is described above. (Also, we have a secret, non-electronic way of knowing when you're on your email or social media. Ask us at the end of the semester, and we'll tell you how we know.)

Attendance, daily attestation, masks, food restrictions, and other COVID-related requirements: The University is monitoring public health conditions and enforcing regulatory requirements tied to the current level of COVID-19 risk. The University will reassess those requirements on at least a monthly basis. The requirements are **not summarized in full in this**

document and can be access <u>here.</u> Please review those requirements regularly and carefully. As currently projected by the University, classes during the first week of the semester will be entirely remote, via Zoom. Thereafter, all classes are currently slated to take place in person. Under University rules, once in-person classes resume, **attendance in class in person is mandatory** unless you are ill or are required to quarantine because of exposure to someone else who is ill. *The University has directed faculty not to excuse students from in-person attendance and not to allow them to participate remotely for any reason other than ones associated with the academic program itself* (e.g., if you are off campus and unavailable to attend class while performing required work on your assigned CPRL project). Keep in mind that to be permitted on campus and thus to be able to attend class each day, you must make an attestation that day on the Reopen CU App. We often will provide for Zoom participation for students who are unable to attend class in person for one of the authorized reasons noted above. Additionally, we will record audio for all class sessions and post on Courseworks, so if you have to miss class and are not able to participate by Zoom, you still can keep up with classwork by listening to the recordings,

Until the University determines otherwise, **when in class (and when you are inside any Columbia building), you must wear a mask at all times**, whether or not you are vaccinated or have been officially excused from being vaccinated for religious or health reasons. Under University rules, you may not remove your mask in class in order to eat or drink, so eating or drinking is not allowed in class. Our classroom is immediately adjacent to the outdoor Wein Terrace, so you may be able to step outside to eat or drink during class breaks, and you may quietly step out of class and outside if necessary for you to do so while class is being conducted. We greatly appreciate your compliance with these restrictions, recognizing the inconvenience and discomfort they may at times create.

Being heard in class. Masks will make it more difficult for each of us to hear the comments of other members of the class. We hope to have microphones sufficient to address that issue, but if you are unable at any time during class to hear anyone, including faculty, please let us know by word ("louder, please") or gesture (e.g., hand to ear).

ASSIGNMENTS

Students will complete three sets of Seminar assignments over the course of the semester:

1. Answers to **Assignment and Discussion Questions Before Class (due 24 hours before the class session in question, when your group is on call).**

2. **An Evolutionary Learning Framework in two stages (PART I due on 2/18; PART II due on 4/8):** You will develop a framework that an existing K-12 organization you identify could use to determine whether it is meeting its goals for promoting enhanced equity and student learning and development and, if not, that the organization could use to help it fill the performance gaps. This assignment is divided into two parts, each part due on a different date. Students will complete this assignment in pairs. **The assignment details and grading criteria will be discussed in Skills class and posted on Courseworks.**

3. **A Final Team Presentation (dates: 4/15, 4/22):** In this 55-minute presentation, your project team will lead a discussion in class of an educational issue (ideally one relevant to your project work) using the three Seminar lenses of governance, democracy, and equity as frames for addressing the issue. **Toward the middle of the semester, we will discuss assignment details and grading criteria in class, post them on Courseworks, and let you know when your team will present**.

GRADING

CPRL has a variety of arrangements with participating graduate schools as to the allocation of credits to particular courses. For some graduate schools, all of the credits are counted towards a single course; for other schools, the credits are divided among multiple courses or subject areas. Please be in touch with the registrar at your school to determine how the credits are allocated. Similarly, CPRL uses each partner school's grading system (e.g., A, B, C, or H, HP, P) and curve in awarding grades. For all students, however, the course credits and grades are tied to one or a combination of three categories of work—the Seminar, Skills, and Project Work. We use these criteria when calculating Seminar grades:

1. Quality of answers to Assignment and Discussion Questions
2. Quality of Evolutionary Learning Framework (each of three parts)
3. Quality of team's Project Presentation as a whole
4. Quality of individual contributions to Project Presentation
5. Exemplary quality of classroom participation (which in a small number of cases can boost but can never lower a grade)

Grading is described in more detail in the Course Expectations document.

Session #1 (January 18, 9am-11am): Orientation and Expectations

EVERYONE

1. [Assignment]: there are no assignment questions for this session
2. [Discussion Board]: Share 1-6 words describing your reasons for participating in CPRL this semester.

Readings:

1. Overview of U.S. Education System [NOTE: This reading is optional for students familiar with the US system of public education. Students new to that system should read this Overview]
2. Jennifer A. O'Day & Marshall S. Smith, Quality and Equality in American Education: Systemic Problems, Systemic Solutions, in The Dynamics of Opportunity in America: Evidence and Perspectives (ETS 2016), at 298-319. [NOTE: For students new to U.S. public education, we strongly recommend that you read this entire chapter, through p. 351.]
3. This Syllabus: read the introductory sections (Introduction, Class Preparation/Pre-Class Assignments, Class, Assignments, Grading); skim the rest
4. Course Expectations

PART I. HISTORICAL AND CURRENT STATE OF EDUCATIONAL EQUITY

Session #2 (January 20, 9-11:30 am): The Current State of US Public Education – Culture, Demographics, and Socio-Economic Conditions vs. Policy vs. Governance as Causal Factors

GROUP A

1. [Assignment]: What is the difference between treating education as a "public good" and treating it as a "private good"?
2. [Assignment]: What is the difference between "policy" and "governance" as the focus of actions by school systems that we might seek to modify in order to achieve better and more equitable learning outcomes for all students?
3. [Discussion Board]: Labaree identifies 3 objectives of public education and has a strong view about which of the 3 he prefers. Reflect on any one (or more) of the following questions: What do you think of the 3 options Labaree proposes? Do these 3 options cover the objectives most people have for public education in the US? Which of the

objectives he lays out--plus any you would add--strikes you as the most important one? Must we choose among the 3 options or might we pursue more than one principal objective at the same time?

Readings:

1. Review O'Day & Smith reading from Session 1
2. David Labaree, D., Public Goods, Private Goods: The American Struggle of Educational Goals, 34 Am. Educ. Res. J. 39, (1997) (excerpts)
3. Patrick McGuinn & Paul Manna, Education Governance in American: Who Leads When Everyone is in Charge? (2016) (excerpts)
4. OECD, PISA 2018 COMBINED EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES, p. 17-18
5. Variation in Educational Outcomes Slides

Session #3 (January 24, 9am-12:30pm): The History and Current Reality of Segregation and Educational Inequity in the US

Introduction:

This session uses school segregation—particularly racial segregation—to introduce the challenges presented by efforts to understand the causes of and address educational inequity. School segregation is not the only form of inequity we will address this term, nor is racial segregation the only form of segregation of interest. But this form of educational inequity has received more attention than others over centuries in the US, as a matter of law and policy, and there is much to be learned by focusing on that history, this form of inequity, and what should and can be done about it.

GROUP B

1. [Assignment]: What is "redlining" (look it up on the internet if you don't know), and how did it contribute to racial segregation of US schools from, say, 1900 to 1970?
2. [Assignment]: In what year did racial desegregation of schools actually start occurring in a substantial way in the US? In what year did racial desegregation of schools actually start occurring in New York City?
3. [Discussion Board]: Why should we, or why should we not, have more racial integration of public schools in the US? Why don't we have more racial integration of public schools?

Readings:

1. Richard Rothstein, The Color of Law: The Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America (2017), Preface
2. Butler, Buksinski, Liebman, Mine the Gap (2020), Introduction and Part II.D pp. 2-5, 37-45 (text only, not footnotes)

3. *Nice White Parents*, a 5-part podcast about efforts over decades to bring racial integration to a single school in New York City and others like it. [Note: we will assign portions of this podcast throughout the semester. If you have time, it is well worth listening to the entire series. You can read the transcript (where available) or listen to the video.]
   a. Introducing: Nice White Parents, audio (there is no published transcript for this segment)
   b. Episode Two: 'I Still Believe in It,' or transcript

Session #4 (January 28, 9am-12:00pm). Difference and Diversity in our Lives and in our CPRL Cohort

Guest Session Leader: Richard Gray, Deputy Executive Director, NYU Metropolitan Center for Research on Equity and the Transformation of Schools; Susan Sturm, George M. Jaffin Professor of Law and Social Responsibility, Columbia Law School

EVERYONE - THERE IS NO WRITTEN ASSIGNMENT OR DISCUSSION BOARD FOR THIS CLASS. While viewing the video and doing the reading for the class, write down some notes on your reflections and questions about how to create and maintain working relationships that are sensitive and responsive to and are respectful and sustaining of racial, class, cultural, and other important identities of yourself and others in this class, in your project work, and in public education generally. Bring those notes with you to class.

Readings:

1. Parent Power (film)
2. Yolanda Sealey-Ruiz, Learning to Talk and Write about Race: Developing Racial Literacy in a College English Classroom (2011)
3. Ijeoma Oluo, So You Want to Talk About Race 8-52 (2018)

Session #5 (February 2, 9am-12:00pm): Three Course Lenses – Equity, Governance, Democracy

GROUP C

1. [Assignment]: The readings identify different governance models: Which model focuses mostly on inputs to achieve success and accountability? Which model focuses mostly on outcomes to achieve success and accountability?
2. [Assignment]: Some of the readings show that student learning outcomes vary from one nation to another, from one US state to another, and from one time period to another. Identify one condition or action generating stronger-than-average learning outcomes in some nations, states, or time periods that you think:
   a. is very difficult to replicate or achieve in other places or time periods in order to improve weaker-than-average student learning outcomes;

      b. can more easily be replicated or achieved in other places or time periods in order to improve weaker-than-average student learning outcomes.

3. [Discussion Board]: Among the governance models discussed in the readings, which do you think would work best as a way for public schools and school systems to achieve racial equity? Write a phrase or sentence explaining why you think that.

EVERYONE: Write down and come to class with one reason why you like and one reason why you dislike the governance models described in the reading by Liebman, Cruikshank & Ma: bureaucracy, marketization, managerialism, professionalism and craft.

Readings

1. Liebman, Cruikshank & Ma, Governance of Steel and Kryptonite Politics in Contemporary Public Education Reform, ,69 Florida Law Review 365 (2017) (Governance Model Excerpts)
2. Jal Mehta & Sarah Fine, In Search of Deeper Learning : The Quest to Remake the American High School (2019 (Chapter 2 and pp. 362-378 of Chapter 8); Optional: pp. 12-16
3. OECD, PISA 2018 COMBINED EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES, p. 17-18 (review from Session 2)
4. Variation in Educational Outcomes Slides (review from Seminar 2)
5. Excerpts from
   a. Ludger Woesmann, The Importance of School Systems: Evidence from International Differences in Student Achievement, 30 J. of Econ. Perspectives 3, 24, 27 (2016) and
   b. Brian J. Caldwell, School Autonomy and Student Achievement: Case Studies in Australia, Educational Transformations v-vii, 73, 76-77 (June 11, 2015)
6. RE·Center Race & Equity in Education (2018). 5 Shifts to Co-Create Equity

PART II. ORGANIZATIONAL GOVERNANCE

Session #6 (February 4, 9-11am): Bureaucracy (Illustrative Policy Context: Grade Levels and Grades vs. Mastery-Based Learning)

Group A

1. [Assignment]: Why do bureaucracies have trouble getting field-level employees to do what the organization wants them to do? (Or, if you prefer: Why do field-level employees have trouble serving bureaucracies well?)

2a. [Assignment, Last names A-G only]: How do Chubb & Mo claim that bureaucracy hampers school leaders' ability to serve students? Who or what do they blame for that problem?

2b. [Assignment, Last names L-Z only) How does Sizer claim that bureaucracy hampers high school teachers' ability to serve students? Who or what does he blame for that problem?

3. [Discussion Board:] Address one of these three questions:

   a. In what ways has bureaucracy helped or hindered public school systems in responding to the COVID-19 public health crisis?
   b. In what ways is the organization of schools into grade levels (e.g., K, 1st grade, 2nd grade, etc.) bureaucratic? What would be gained by replacing grade-levels with competency- or mastery-based learning? (Or, if you prefer, what would be lost by replacing grade-levels with competency- or mastery-based learning?)
   c. In what ways are grades (e.g., A-F) bureaucratic? What would be gained by replacing grades with determinations of whether students have obtained mastery? (Or, if you prefer, what would be lost by replacing grades with determinations of whether students have obtained mastery?**)**

EVERYONE - Come to class prepared to describe the thesis of Chubb & Mo, or Sizer, or Youngblood, whichever you read.

Readings:

Bureaucracy

1. Rudi R. Volti, An Introduction to the Sociology of Work and Occupations (2007), at 83 (1st full paragraph: "Modern bureaucracy . . .")-93
2. Michael Lipsky, Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services (1979), at 13-25, 48-53

Bureaucracy in education

3. [Last names A-G only:] John E. Chubb & Terry M. Moe, Politics Markets and America's Schools (1990), at 3-6, 38-45, 47-51 (through the end of the first full ¶ on p.51), 56-64 (through the end of the first full ¶ on p.64)
4. [Last names L-Z only:] Theodore R. Sizer, Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School (2004), 205-13.
5. [EVERYONE:] Johnny Ray Youngblood, Draining the School Swamp, N.Y. Daily News (1992)

6. [OPTIONAL:] Judith Warren Little, <u>The Persistence of Privacy: Autonomy and Initiative in Teachers' Professional Relations,</u> Teachers College Record, v91 Summer 1990

Grade levels/grading vs. master/competency-based learning

7. Chris Berdik, <u>What's School Without Grade Levels?</u>, Heckinger Report, July 30, 2018
8. Kyle Spencer, <u>A New Kind of Classroom: No Grades, No Failing, No Hurry</u>, N.Y. Times, Aug. 11, 2017

Session #7 (February 7, 9-11am): Managerialism (Illustrative Policy Context: High-Stakes School and Teacher Evaluation)

GROUP B

1. [Assignment]: Coglianese & Lazer identify three styles of government regulation: technology-based; performance-based; and management-based (which we will often refer to as "plan-based" regulation going forward). Describe a requirement that government regulatory agencies using each of the three styles of regulation might impose in order to protect consumers from salmonella contamination of peaches sold in supermarkets.
2. [Assignment]: In the midst of doing a lot of bad things, the Atlanta school district achieved one good outcome. What is it, and how do you think the district achieved it?
3. [Discussion Board]: Write 1-3 sentences about what DCPS's experience with IMPACT suggests about the value of, and/or the best mechanisms for, identifying desirable public educational outcomes and incentivizing educators to achieve those outcomes? Does (and, if so, <u>how</u> does) DCPS' approach solve problems with doing so?

Readings:

1. Cary Coglianese & David Lazer, Management-Based Regulation: Prescribing Private Management to Achieve Public Goals, 37 L. & Soc. Rev. 691 (2003), at 691-706 (read through the preamble to Part III only)
2. Rachel Aviv, <u>Wrong Answer</u>, The New Yorker, July 21, 2014
3. Eric Hanushek, Teacher Deselection, in Creating a New Teaching Profession 165-78 (D. Goldhaber & J. Hannaway eds. 2010)
4. D.C. Public Schools Impact Results (August 2021)

   These readings review a recent self-study of the IMPACT system of teacher evaluation, support, and incentives in place in the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) since 2009-10. IMPACT links measures of teacher performance based on student test scores and frequent professional observations to financial incentives for effective teachers and possible dismissal for ineffective teachers.

IMPACT embeds these evaluations in a comprehensive system of teacher goal setting, review, feedback, and improvement steps.

   a. <u>IMPACT: The DCPS Evaluation and Feedback System for School-Based Personnel </u>(DCPS's overview of the system)
   b. "Essential Findings" of the study in <u>Equity Review memo </u>(pp.1, 4, 9); (p.1); and <u>Performance-Based Compensation memo </u>(p.1)
   c. Perry Stein, <u>D.C. Teacher Evaluation System Has Academic Benefits, but Is Racially Biased, New Study Finds</u>, Washington Post, Aug. 13, 2021
   d. Matthew Yglesias, <u>D.C.'s Teacher Compensation Reform is Working</u>, Slow Boring, Aug. 26, 2021
   e. [Optional: Yglesias' follow-up post <u>here</u>.]
   f. <u>Initial Set of Evolutions to IMPACT</u> (more changes to the program may occur going forward)

5. <u>Optional</u>: Edward Haertel. <u>Reliability and Validity of Inferences about Teachers based on Student Scores </u>(The 14th William H. Angoff Memorial Lecture). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service (2013)

Session #8 (February 9, 9-11am): Professionalism and Craft (Illustrative Policy Context: Teacher-Led Charter and Other Schools)

GROUP C

1. [Assignment]: Are K-12 teachers better described as practitioners of a craft or as professionals? Why?
2. [Assignment]: Liebman & Sabel (starting with the reference to "second interlocking development" on p.4) describe a subtle shift in NYC District 2 away from a focus on "craft" and to something else. How would you (briefly!) describe the shift and why Alvarado made it?
3. [Discussion Board]: Diane Ravitch describes master educator Ms. Ratliff. Dana Goldstein describes master educators Mike Miles and Lenore Furman among others. Tim Clifford describes his understanding of master teaching in general. What is one reason to think that charter or other public schools led by highly autonomous master practitioners can succeed in effectively educating traditionally underserved children? What is one reason to think that we cannot rely on such schools effectively to educate traditionally underserved children?

Readings:

Craft/Professionalism in Education

1. Diane Ravitch, The Death and Life of the Great American School System (2010), at Ch. 9 through p. 178, 2d paragraph

2. Dana Goldstein, The Teacher Wars 231-47 (2015)
3. Tim Clifford, <u>Raising the Bar on Teachers? I'll Pass, WNYC/SchoolBook, (Links to an external site.)</u> March 21, 2013
4. Jal Mehta, From Bureaucracy to Profession: Remaking the Educational Sector for the Twenty-First Century, 83 Harv. Ed. Rev. 453 (2013) (excerpts)
5. Liebman & Sabel, A Laboratory Dewey Barely Imagined: The Emerging Model of School Governance and Legal Reform, 28 NYU L. & Soc. Change 1-6 (2003)

<u>Teacher-Led Charter and Other Schools (read one of the following)</u>

6. David Osborne, <u>To Improve Schools, Let Teachers Run them (Links to an external site.)</u>, Wash. Post, Jan. 15, 2015
7. Emily Langhorne, <u>The Teacher-Powered School Movement (Links to an external site.)</u>, Forbes, July 11, 2018,

<u>Charter Schools in General</u>

8. Elaine Liu, Solving the Puzzle of Charter Schools, 1 Colum. Bus. Rev. 279 (2015) (excerpts)

Session #9 (February 11, 9am-12:30pm): Evolutionary Learning (EL) (Illustrative Policy Contexts: School Improvement in New Zealand and in Post-COVID U.S.)

GROUP A

1. [Assignment]: Write one clarifying question you have about what Evolutionary Learning governance is or about how it works?
2. [Assignment]: Answer one of these three questions:

   a. In what ways is plan-based (aka management-based) regulation as described in Coglianese & Lazer an example of Evolutionary Learning governance as you currently understand it?
   b. In what ways is the New Zealand education review system as described in Ladd an example of Evolutionary Learning governance as you currently understand it?
   c. In what ways does the imagined RISE to Thrive reform as described in the reading seek to implement Evolutionary Learning governance as you currently understand it?

3. [Discussion Board]: Based on your current understanding, what is one thing that excites you about the possibility of redesigning public education systems in the U.S. along Evolutionary Learning lines? What is one thing that worries you about doing so?

EVERYONE -

While viewing the videos, consider these questions:

1. Ansell claims that EL does a better job than bureaucracy and other governance models of avoiding the problem of "bounded rationality." Does it?
2. Ansell claims that EL has a practical solution to the problem of how to determine causation when problems arise or when solutions are tested and appear to succeed. Does it?
3. Ansell claims that EL avoids the need to have agreement on objectives before people can work together effectively to solve problems. Does it?

In past classes we have discussed the failings of U.S. public education systems during the COVID-19 crisis and envisioned ways to transform public education in the wake of the crisis. In a small-group activity in this class, we will reconsider those questions in light of what you have learned about different governance forms--bureaucracy, managerialism, professionalism/craft, and evolutionary learning. How, we will ask, do the ways in which public education systems are governed--i.e., their use of bureaucracy, managerialism, craft/professionalism and/or evolutionary learning--affect their success? **Before class, in preparation for this exercise, jot down a few notes on:**

1. Aspects of public education systems' reliance on bureaucracy, managerialism, craft/professionalism and/or evolutionary learning that have contributed to their failings during the pandemic.
2. Your vision of how public education systems can transform their operations and improve their outcomes through new and different uses of bureaucracy, managerialism, craft/professionalism and/or evolutionary learning.

Readings:

Evolutionary Learning in General

1. James Surowiecki, Better All the Time (Links to an external site.), The New Yorker, November 10, 2014
2. Christopher K. Ansell, Pragmatist Democracy: Evolutionary Learning as Public Philosophy (2011), at pp. 3-19, 84-101
3. Review Coglianese & Lazer (Session 7), pp. 3-9 (first 6 lines) on plan- (aka management-) based regulation

Evolutionary Learning in School Systems

4. Helen F. Ladd, Education Inspectorate System in New Zealand: A Policy Note, 5 Ed. Fin. & Pol'y 378 (2010), at 378-83
5. Elizabeth Chu et al., RISE to Thrive: A Vision for a Transformed and Equitable Public Education SystemLinks to an external site. (March 2021), at 3-9

6. Martha Minow, School Reform Outside Laboratory Conditions: A Response, 28 N.Y.U. Rev. L. & Soc. Change 333 (2003) (excerpts)

Videos (view these videos only after doing all of the above reading)

Video #1: Introduction to Evolutionary Learning

Video #2: Evolutionary Learning Responses to Three Organizational Difficulties

Session #10 (February 18, 9am-12:30pm): Classic Examples of Evolutionary Learning in Action

GROUP B

1. [Assignment]: None this week.

2. [Discussion Board]: Spear presents all of his case studies as examples of systematized individual and organizational learning from the close observation of the results of everyday experience. Describe one way that you think an urban school system with large resource and outcome disparities between white children/middle-class students and students of color/in poverty—or one way individual schools or educators in that school system—could use similar forms of adult and organizational learning to overcome those inequities?

EVERYONE – Below, each of you is assigned to one case study/model that is covered in your assigned reading. By 8 am on the day of class (Fri. Feb. 18), email to Jim, Liz, and Sarah 9-12 bullets (total) that together answer these three questions.

1. How does the model promote learning, by whom?

2. What is/are one or more things that are exciting, nifty, innovative, promising, useful about the way the model works to promote adult learning that you would be interested in finding ways to apply to, customize for, or develop an analogous approach in the public education context?

3. What is your biggest worry about how the feature(s) of the model on which you focus in answering Question 2 would translate to the public education context?

Note: You will use the bullets you develop and send in before class in class exercises, and we will use them to distill insights. They will not be graded.

The model on which you are to become expert, and present to the class:

Alcoa: Carly, Jacob, Jenny, Richard, Sarah
Nuclear Navy: Joanna, Marisa, Patrice, Shashank, Terresa
Pratt & Whitney: Brian, Derrick, Juliana, Margaret
Toyota Jidoka Framework: Caroline, Isabel, Kevin, Mahima, Tay
Toyota Quality Circles and Jishuken Support Teams: Athena, Chethana, Eni, Nick

Readings:

Everyone:

1. Steven J. Spear, The High Velocity Edge: How Market Leaders Leverage Operational Excellence to Beat the Competition (2010), Excerpt 1: Pp. xx-xxi, 1-2

If you are assigned to Alcoa, Nuclear Navy, or Pratt & Whitney:

2. Steven J. Spear, The High Velocity Edge: How Market Leaders Leverage Operational Excellence to Beat the Competition (2010), Excerpt 2: Pp.1-11, 13-28, 29-32

NOTE: you are expected to read all three case studies assigned in the page numbers above and you are expected to become expert on one of the three case studies that is assigned to you above.

If you are assigned to Toyota Jishuken or Quality Circles/Jidoka:

a. Steven J. Spear, The High Velocity Edge: How Market Leaders Leverage Operational Excellence to Beat the Competition (2010), Excerpt 2: Pp. 36-71, 83-91

b. This American Life Podcast on Toyota and GM

NOTE: you are assigned to read about Toyota Jidoka, Quality Circles, and Jishuken and about how GM attempted to adopt the Toyota model to its plants, and you are expected to become expert on either Jidoka or Quality Circles/Jishuken (whichever you are assigned above) and how translatable those techniques seem to have been to GM's Fremont and Van Nuys plants.

Session #11 (February 25, 9am-noon): Evolutionary Learning in Action in Three School Systems; St. Paul Exercise #1

GROUP C

1. [Assignment]: In what ways is the school system you read about for today's session practicing Evolutionary Learning? What other governance styles do you see at work (just list any other governance styles you see in action; no explanation is required)?
2. [Assignment]: What aspect of the reform you read about would you most recommend to St. Paul Public Schools in connection with the district-reform exercise described in the St. Paul Exercise Introduction in the Reading?
3. [Discussion Board]: Do the reforms you read about increase or decrease your confidence in the importance of governance (how policy choices are made and implemented), as opposed to particular policy choices (what policy choices are adopted and implemented), in making schools more equitable and effective? Why? (In writing your answer, keep in mind that two-thirds of your readers didn't read about the same school system as you did, so say a little about it to explain your answer.)

EVERYONE - Come to class prepared to describe the case study/reforms you read for class.

Readings:

1. <u>Introduction to St. Paul Public Schools Exercise</u>

   Please read this first; note that (1) this document divides you all into exercise groups for purposes of the St. Paul Exercise; (2) each of the remaining readings below is assigned only to members of specified exercise groups; and (3) as described in this document, each of you, before class, should identify the role you intend to take as part of your exercise group.

2. <u>New York City Reforms, 2003-2013</u>- Exercise Groups 1 and 2 only:

   a. Maureen Kelleher, <u>New York City's Children First: Lessons in School Reform (Links to an external site.)</u> (Jan. 2014) (pp. 1-34)
   b. NYC Strategy Snapshot (PPT slide)
   c. Butler, Buksinski & Liebman, supra, at 24-26 (first 3 paragraphs of section C; text only, not footnotes); tables and graphs on pp.26-36, keeping in mind that the NYC reform ended in 2013.

3. <u>Finland</u> - Exercise Group 3 only:
   1. Charles Sabel, AnnaLee Saxenian, Reijo Miettinen, Peer Hull Kristensen & Jarkko Hautamäki, Individualized Service Provision as the Key to the New Welfare State: Lessons from Special Education in Finland (Sitra Studies 62 Dec. 2011), at pp. 4-15, 30 ('The next national core curriculum')-53, 57-64

4. <u>Long Beach, CA</u> - Exercise Group 4 only:
   a. Michael Fullan, Long Beach Unified School District (2016), pp.2-11
   b. Desiree Carver-Thomas & Anne Podolsky, Long Beach Unified School District, Positive Outliers Case Study (2019). pp. 1-19

Session #12 (March 4, 9am-1:00pm): Evolutionary Learning Assessment and Improvement Tools (Illustrative Policy Contexts: Assisted Living, Child Welfare Services, Teaching Writing and Long Division); St. Paul Exercise #2

GROUP A

1. [Assignment]: The Braithwaites refer to two "paradoxes"—the paradox of reliability and the paradox of discretion." Describe one of those paradoxes.

2. [Assignment]: Tyre and Frederickson disagree on the lesson to be drawn from the New Dorp High School case study. What do they disagree about, and who is right, in your view?

3. [Discussion Board]: Assume that you are designing a framework for determining and improving how well schools (or, if you prefer, teachers) in your district are accelerating the learning of traditionally underserved students.

   a. What (if any) use could such a framework make of qualitative review of schools (or teachers)?
   b. What (if any) use could such a framework make of structured inquiry?

Readings:

Qualitative Review

1. John Braithwaite and Valerie Braithwaite, The Politics of Legalism: Rules versus Standards in Nursing-Home Regulation, 4 Soc. & Leg. Stud. 307 (1995)

Structured inquiry/making meaning of what's known

2. Peg Tyre, The Writing Revolution, Atlantic Monthly, Oct. 2012
3. Jim Fredrickson, Are We Learning the Right Lessons From New Dorp High School?, Atlantic Blog (2012)
4. Mike Rose, Possible Lives (1999), Chap. 3
5. Erika M. Kitzmiller, From Direct Instruction to Authentic Learning: A Shift to Increase Academic Success and Engineering Competencies among Youth of Color (Grant Proposal)
6. Ted Doomers and Erika Kitzmiller. Students as collaborators in research-practice partnerships: a commentary on Kappan's April 2021 issue (May 3, 2021).

Making Inferences Using Data

7. Low Inference Observation Slide

PART III. ORGANIZATIONAL DEMOCRACY AND POLITICS

Session #13 (March 9, 9am-1pm): Interest Group vs. Problem-Solving Democracy (Illustrative Contexts: School Board Politics, Environmental Regulation, Policing, School Integration); St. Paul Exercise #3

1. [Assignment]: List three differences between traditional politics and problem-solving politics as applied to public services like policing and education.
2. [Assignment]: Answer one of these three questions:

    a. Ansell describes the Clark County NV Habitat Conservation Plan process. What was it about that process that enabled diverse and hostile interests to agree on and commit to steps both to develop and to preserve the land in question?
    b. Fung describes two phases of public deliberation and decision-making in the Traxton community policing context? What changed in the second phase, with what effects?
    c. Together, the two assigned *Nice White Parents* episodes describe three instances of racial integration of schools in which the usual political power imbalance between white families and families of color is radically tempered: Success Academy, the Boerum Hill School, and the District 15 Middle School enrollment plan. How do the three examples differ in terms of how the power of white families and families of color were equalized?

3. [Discussion Board]: The readings present a number of examples of "new democracy or politics" in the environmental, policing, and school contexts, although with doubts raised about their sustainability and scalability. What are one or two design principles you draw from the examples that might support a sustainable, equitable version of participatory democracy for a large urban school district?

EVERYONE

1. The Seminar 13 Video provides one faculty member's controversial view about why (i) traditional interest-group politics, (ii) Alinski-style community organizing, and (iii) traditional constitutional reform litigation are ineffective means of redressing educational inequity. Write down and come to class with a few sentences in which you defend one or more of those forms of advocating for greater educational equity.

Readings: **WARNING: ANOTHER HEAVY READING ASSIGNMENT**

Forms of school politics

1. Jeffrey Henig et al., Parent and Community Engagement in NYC and the Sustainability Challenge for Urban Education Reform,,in O'Day et al., supra, at 33-38, 43-45 (ending with the first paragraph of "The Three Groups" section), 46, 48-54

Failed normal (interest group) politics

2. **Seminar 13 Video** with (opinionated) introduction to representative, interest-group, and Alinski-style politics and "public-law" litigation when normal politics fail

3. Steve Farkas & Ann Duffett, <u>Maze of Mistrust: How District Efforts and Cross Talk are Stalling Efforts to Improve Public Education</u> (FDR Group 2014), at 6-18 (end of the first column), 22 ('A Genuine Attempt at Dialogue')

<u>Failed managerialist politics</u>

4. [Newark - last names A-G only] Dale Russakoff, <u>Schooled (Links to an external site.)</u>, The New Yorker, May 19, 2014
5. [NYC - last names L-Z only]
   a. Henig et al., supra at 43-45 (ending with first sentence of "The Three Groups" section) and Figure 2-2 on p., 46 (focus on the first bullet in the description in the rightmost column of each group's position on mayoral control)
   b. Liebman, Cruikshank, Ma, <u>Governance of Steel (Failed Democracy excerpts)</u>

<u>Alternative forms of politics</u>
6. Christopher K. Ansell, <u>Pragmatist Democracy</u>, at 134-40, 166-83
7. Chicago Policing Politics: <u>Archon Fung, Deliberation and Social Conflict, in Empowered Participation: Reinventing Urban Democracy</u> (2004), entire excerpt
8. *Nice White Parents*:
   a. [Last names A-G only] Episode Four: "Here's Another Fun Thing You Can Do' ("Is it possible to limit the power of white parents"), <u>Audio (Links to an external site.)</u> or <u>Transcript(Links to an external site.)</u>
   b. [Last names L-Z only] Episode Five: "We Know It When We See It," <u>Audio (Links to an external site.)</u> or <u>Transcript (Links to an external site.)</u>

9. <u>St. Paul Exercise #3 Prep. Slides</u>
10. <u>SPPS's Proposed New Governance Strategy</u> (PPT slide)

Session #14 (March 23, 9am-12:30pm): Evolutionary Learning and Participatory Democracy with an Equity Lens (Policy Context: Baltimore School District Reform)

Guest Session Leader: Meghan Snyder, Director of Research Strategy and Policy, School of Law

THERE IS NO WRITTEN ASSIGNMENT OR DISCUSSION BOARD FOR THIS CLASS. EVERYONE SHOULD COME TO CLASS PREPARED TO ADDRESS THESE QUESTIONS:

1. In what ways does Evolutionary Learning help school systems and other organizations and their stakeholders address complex equity issues in education?
2. What are the challenges and potential limitations of this approach?
3. How might you build in equity considerations to enhance the Evolutionary Learning process?
4. How might you build an equity lens for yourself and help your client and others with whom you work build such a lens?

5. What personal and mental hurdles do you anticipate might affect how you engage in this equity work?
6. How will you prepare for what are often difficult conversations around race and equity?

Readings

1. Review RE-Center Race and Equity in Education, 5 Shifts to Co-create Equity (Links to an external site.) (2018) (from Session 5)
2. Council of Chief State School Officers, Leading for Equity: Opportunities for State Education Chiefs (Links to an external site.) (2017), at pp. 16-20.
3. Ed Reports, Redefining Engagement: How Baltimore City Schools Transformed its Approach to Adopting Instructional Materials (Dec. 2, 2019)
4. Sonja Santelises, The Importance of Asking Hard Questions About What Students Learn (Links to an external site.) in Schools, Washington Post, July 17, 2018
5. Tara Garcia Mathewson, How Gaps in Content Knowledge Hold Students Back (Links to an external site.), The Hechinger Report, March 28, 2019
6. Chiefs for Change, Honoring Origins and Helping Students Succeed (Links to an external site.) (Feb. 2019)
7. Liz Bowie & Talia Richman, As New Academic Year Begins, Baltimore Schools Aim to Broaden Offerings Beyond Math, Reading (Links to an external site.), Baltimore Sun, Sept. 2, 2017
8. Talia Richman, "Who Deserves a Monument?" (Links to an external site.) New Lessons Teach Baltimore Students do Find Strength in City's History," Baltimore Sun, Oct. 2, 2019

PART IV: ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

Session #15 (March 30, 11:30am-1pm): Mandating Transition from Outside Through Litigation when Politics Fail (Policy Context: The Right to Literacy in Detroit); St. Paul Exercise #4

Introduction: This session considers whether lawsuits under the U.S. Constitution are a good way to force school systems to transition from failing bureaucracies to effective learning organizations.

U.S. courts have a mixed history when it comes to addressing underserved students' challenges to inequitable or ineffective state and local educational policies and practices. In *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), the U.S. Supreme Court ordered school systems that were intentionally segregating children into schools for black students and schools for white students to transition from "dual" to "unitary" (racially integrated) systems. As we discussed in Session 3, however, it wasn't until 15 years later that courts actually required sustained desegregation to occur, and, then, only in the non-urban South. A few years later, the Court refused to address challenges to racially segregated schools in cities throughout the US. because they did not explicitly require black and

white students to attend different schools and instead assigned children to "neighborhood" schools with attendance zones that mirrored segregated housing patterns.

Then in *Rodriguez v. San Antonio School District* in 1973, the Supreme Court refused to allow federal courts to hear lawsuits challenging school funding schemes that allocated many fewer dollars per student to schools with mainly poor, black, and brown students than to schools with mainly middle class white students. In doing so, the Court refused to declare that underserved students have a right to an education that is "equal" to that received by other children or that is "adequate" according to some legal standard. Explaining that conclusion, Justice Powell wrote that the judiciary is well advised to refrain from imposing on the States inflexible constitutional restraints that could circumscribe or handicap the continued research and experimentation so vital to finding even partial solutions to educational problems and to keeping abreast of ever-changing conditions.

Recently, educationally underserved school children in Connecticut, Michigan and Rhode Island have filed new lawsuits asking federal courts to back away from the *Rodriguez* decision and find a legal right to decent schools. The suit against the State of Michigan-- *Gary B. v. Snyder*—focuses on several egregiously under-resourced schools in Detroit with shamefully poor student outcomes. The *Gary B.* was first heard by a federal district judge in Detroit, who took evidence on the claims in the complaint. That judge found as a matter of fact that:

The conditions and outcomes of schools [attended by the plaintiff school children in Detroit] . . . are nothing short of devastating. When a child who could be taught to read goes untaught, the child suffers a lasting injury—and so does society.

In the next sentence, however, the judge ruled against the plaintiff school children, concluding that they had no right under the US Constitution to better schools.

The *Gary B* case then was heard by a three-judge panel of an appellate court: the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit Court. One of the readings for this session is the April 2020 opinion of that panel of judges, two of whom found that the plaintiff school children had demonstrated a violation of the US Constitution. A third of the three judges wrote a dissenting opinion, arguing that, as bad as conditions in the Detroit schools were, they did not provide the basis for finding a federal constitutional violation of the students' rights.

After the panel of judges ruled, the Governor of Michigan agreed to settle the case by providing more resources to the plaintiff school children. That settlement normally would have ended the case, but other judges on the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals took the extraordinary step of saying that they wanted to "rehear" the panel's decision—a strong indication that the other judges on the court are disposed to agree with the dissenting judge and that they will not allow the panel's decision to stand. The case, thus, remains in litigation. Whatever ruling the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals eventually issues may then be brought to the attention of the US Supreme Court, which either could decide to hear an appeal or could let the lower court judgment remain in place. The case thus will likely not become final for a couple of years or more.

GROUPS A-C:

1. THERE ARE NO ASSIGNMENTS OR DISCUSSION BOARD FOR THIS SESSION.

2. EVERYONE: The plaintiff school children in the *Gary B* case argue that Michigan has a legal duty to provide them with certain things that Michigan is not providing them. After listening to Professor Liebman's video and reading the excerpts from the *Gary B* decision, write and bring to class (i) a list of 3-5 things the plaintiff school children in that case claim the State of Michigan is supposed to provide them, is not providing them, and that they want the courts to order Michigan to provide to them; and (ii) a sentence or two on how much of a difference you think it actually would make to the children in the six schools in question if the court ordered the State of Michigan to make those things available to those children.

Readings:

1. Richard Thompson Ford, Moving Beyond Civil Rights (Links to an external site.), N.Y. Times, Oct. 27, 2011
2. Gary B. v. Whitmer (Links to an external site.) (6th Cir. 2020) (excerpts)
3. James Liebman, Perpetual Evolution: A School-focused Public Law Litigation Model for Our Day, 117 Colum. L. Rev. 2005 (2017)
4. "Video Intro to Litigation to Transform School Systems.". [Please view this video only after (i) reading the introduction to this session above; and (ii) completing the other reading for this session]

Session #16 (April 1, 9am-12pm) Achieving Transition from Within (Policy Contexts: School Reform in Aldine TX and New York City); St. Paul Exercise #5

GROUP C

1. [Assignment]: In answering this question, keep in mind that this Session will discuss two different kinds of strategies: One kind of strategy (the "transition strategy") determines how the district will move its staff and stakeholders from the district's old way of operating to a new way. The second kind of strategy (the "end-state strategy") refers to how the district will operate differently after the transition occurs. Questions a. and c. below focus on the first kind of (transition) strategy. Question b. focuses on the second kind of (end-state) strategy.

    a. [Last names A-C only:] Ansell describes ways organizations tend to change under normal circumstances and ways of change that occur as a result of what might be called "managed disruptions" that eventually transform the organization's "meta-norms" and thus the organization as a whole. Identify an example from the reading of the latter type of change process. In that example, who did the disrupting?

    b. [Last names G-L only:] What governance style(s) best describe the way Superintendent Kujawa intended for schools and classrooms to operate on a daily basis and meet students' needs after she completed her re-make of the district?

   c. [Last names O-Z only:] What governance style(s) best describe the transition strategy that Chancellor Klein used to get actors in the district to change from how they had done things in the past to how he hoped they would do things in the future?

2. [Discussion Board]: If you were putting a large urban district through a major change in governance styles and/or policy, what are two or three principles you would try to follow in order to make that transition work well?

EVERYONE: Be prepared in class to summarize your reading to students who read something else.

Readings:

1. [Last names A-D only:] Ansell, supra, ch. 3, pp. 43-55, 61-62
2. [Last names G-L only:] Heather Zavadsky, Bringing School Reform to Scale (2009), Chapter 2
3. [Last names M-Z only:] Eric Nadelstern, The Evolution of School Support Networks in New York City (Center on Reinventing Public Education 4-20 (2012)
4. SPSS Prep Slides
5. Review:

   a. This American Life Podcast (Session 10) (Links to an external site.) or your notes from it

   b. Jal Mehta & Sarah Fine,   In Search of Deeper Learning: The Quest to Remake the American High School (2019) (Session 5). pp. 87-97 only

Session #17 (April 8, 9am-11am): Transition and/or Scaling Up and Change Management by NGOs: An International Perspective

Guest Session Leader: Connie Lafuente, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Teachers College

Purpose: Students will learn about the main issues in leading and managing change in education NGOs.

Topics:

- Three scaling-up mechanisms: dissemination, affiliation and branching
- Key elements in the design of a scaling-up strategy: replicability, resources, returns, risks and receptivity
- The myths of scaling-up quality education programs
- Adding value to networks by enabling organizational learning and innovation.

- Teaching case: "Paths to Scale in Education Organizations. The Case of *Escuela Nueva* in Colombia."

Main ideas discussed in this session:

1. Scaling-up: First we will define the term "scaling-up" and explore various meanings in the field (direct and indirect scaling-up, political-scaling up, replication etc.) (Schnell, 2010). We will also discuss three main scaling-up mechanisms, including dissemination, branching and affiliation (Dees, et. al 2004). We will also discuss the links between scaling-up mechanisms and organizational designs. Students are asked to identify and familiarize themselves with one example of an education organization that has scaled-up (in the US and/or internationally). Through the examples students will see the diversity of scaling-up forms existing in the field. Then we will briefly discuss some of the myths of scaling-up quality education programs and the dangers of reproducing education innovations and programs elsewhere, where local education practitioners are treated as delivery agents (Burns, 2018).

1. The management of scaling-up: Scaling-up is a dynamic and creative process, and organizations need to experiment, learn and refine their approaches continuously. We will learn about the Five Rs, as a framework education managers can use to test and refine their approaches to scale: readiness (is the innovation ready to be scaled?), resources (resources required to scale vary depending on the scaling path chosen), receptivity (the readiness of other communities –or key institutions—to embrace a particular education program/organization/innovation), risks, (how likely is it that an innovation will be implemented incorrectly?), returns (does the scaling-up path chosen offer greater possibilities for improving efficiency and effectiveness beyond the numbers reached?).

1. Case: Then, we will discuss a teaching case about Escuela Nueva, one of the few education NGOs in Latin America that scaled-up its program to various Latin American countries, and a few countries in Asia and Africa (Mair and Hehenberger, 2010). Through this case study, students will examine how scaling-up happens (is it organic or planned?) and some of the challenges an NGO such as Escuela Nueva had to solve as it scaled-up to other countries. Some of these issues and challenges include: property rights of Escuela Nueva, the role of donors in scaling-up, deciding on the right mechanisms to scale-up (i.e. dissemination, branching etc.), concerns about the quality of the innovation/program being scaled, how the nature of "customers" change for scaled-up organizations. Because scaled-up organizations transition from serving direct beneficiaries to serving other organizations, we will also discuss how scaled organizations add value to their affiliates by enabling organizational learning and innovation. "International Expansion of Escuela Nueva: A Transformative Pedagogy on a Global Scale" is a teaching case: Students will work with other students to suggest what decisions they would take to improve the scaling-up approach of the organization.

THERE ARE NO WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS OR DISCUSSION BOARD FOR THIS CLASS.

THIS SESSION WILL ADDRESS THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS. EVERYONE SHOULD REVIEW THEM BEFORE CLASS:

General:

1. What are some of the main elements of the definitions of scaling-up? (Schnell and Brinkerhoff, 2010; Dees et. al, 2004)
2. What are some of the concerns in the literature regarding scale and quality?
3. What are some of the tensions in the scaling-up literature regarding standardization versus local adaptations of interventions?

Dees et. al (2004) discuss two dimensions of scaling-up:

Interventions ("What"):
1. Based on the readings, think of some examples of "what" could be scaled?
2. Why are testing, refining and evaluation central to scaling-up processes? (Schnell and Brinkerhoff, 2010 and Dees et. al 2004).

Mechanisms ("How"):

1. Provide examples of what mechanisms NPOs/NGOs may follow to scale-up their interventions (i.e. dissemination, affiliation, branching, etc.).
2. What are some of the organizational implications of each of these mechanisms? (i.e. advantages, challenges).

Scaling-up and organizational structure:

1. Are scaling-up and organizational growth the same thing? Why? Why not?
2. How can organizations that scale-up their programs avoid the disadvantages of large organizations?

Designing a scaling-up strategy:

1. Dees et. al (2004) developed the 5 "R's" to guide organizations in the process of finding the best scaling-up strategy. What do Dees et. al (2004) say about readiness, receptivity, resources, risks and returns?

Escuela Nueva Case:

1. Come ready to discuss Escuela Nueva's mission, programs, partners, business model, impact and organizational trajectory.
2. How did Escuela Nueva scale-up nationally in Colombia?
3. How did Escuela Nueva scale-up to other Latin American countries?
4. What are some of the strengths and weaknesses of Escuela Nueva's scaling-up experience.

5. If you were a member of Vicky Colbert's strategy team, what recommendations would you make to Vicky Colbert regarding Escuela Nueva's scaling-up strategy? You may apply any of the readings to make your recommendations (i.e. Dees et. al, 2004; Schnell and Brinkerhoff, 2010; Burns, 2018).
6. Would you recommend that Escuela Nueva continue to scale-up? Why? (or why not?)
7. What recommendations would you make to improve Escuela Nueva's scaling-up strategy?
8. What regions and countries should Escuela Nueva prioritize? Why?
9. What mechanisms should Escuela Nueva follow to scale up its model? (you may apply Dees. et al, 2004, or suggest alternative mechanisms that are not included in Dees et. al's article)
10. If you think Escuela Nueva should continue to scale-up, how could the organization makes sure its model is working for all affiliates or partners?
11. What recommendations would you make so that Escuela Nueva maximizes opportunities for organizational learning at a network level?
12. Escuela Nueva was successful partly because its education program was innovative in Colombia. As an organization with programs in multiple countries, what should Escuela Nueva do to continue being innovative?

Readings:

1. Dees, G., Anderson, B. and Wei-Skillern J. (2004). Scaling Up Social Impact. Strategies for Spreading Social Innovations. Stanford Social Innovation Review: Spring 2004: 24-32
2. Mair, J., Hehenberger L. and Moral, N. (2010). "International Expansion of Escuela Nueva: A Transformative Pedagogy on a Global Scale". Center for Business and Society. IESE Business School.
3. Schnell, S. and Brinkerhoff, J. (2010). "Replicability and Scaling Up". In Anheier, H., Toepler, S. and List, R. (Eds) (2010). International Encyclopedia of Civil Society (Pp. 1312-1317). New York: Springer

PART V: STUDENT TEAM PRESENTATIONS

Student Team Presentations (April 15, 9am-12pm; April 22, 9am-12pm)

PART VI: SUMMING UP; LOOKING FORWARD

Session #18 (April 27, 9:30am-12:30pm): Summing Up; Looking Forward (Guest Speaker TBA)