_____

Distributed Leadership and Comprehensive School Reform:
Using the Distributed Perspective to Investigate the Distribution of Teacher Leadership

Camille Rutherford
Brock University, Canada

While school leadership is often cited as being paramount to the success of
individual schools, the distributed leadership perspective affirms that school
leadership is more than just the individual who resides in the principal's office.
Consequently, the distributed perspective can be considered an exceptional tool
for investigating school leadership as it focuses attention on how leadership
practice can be distributed across structures, roles, and routines. Guided by the
distributed perspective, this paper examines how the leading comprehensive
school reform models activate teacher leadership by distributing school
leadership across prescribed structures, roles, and routines.

Introduction

Comprehensive school reform (CSR) seeks to improve student achievement by aligning all of the
components of the education process. By aligning changes in organizational structure with changes in
curriculum and teaching practice, CSR has the potential to create a tightly linked environment where all
of the components of the educational process work in conjunction with each other to support academic
success (Murphy & Datnow, 2003). These changes represent a fundamental reconfiguration of human
interactions at every level of the educational enterprise (Murphy, 1991). This paper examines this
reconfiguration by investigating how specific CSR models activate teacher leadership by distributing
school leadership across prescribed structures, roles, and routines.

The distributed framework affirms that school leadership is more than just the individual who
resides in the principal's office. It purports that leadership practice is a product of the interaction of
leaders, followers, and the situation (Spillane, 2006). Consequently, to understand the impact of CSR on
teacher leadership, it is paramount to examine how these constituting elements of leadership practice are
altered by the changes prescribed by the leading CSR models.

Ten of the most widely implemented reform models, which benefit student achievement, will be
examined to denote the prescribed distribution of leadership across leadership structures, roles, and
routines. While previous studies have investigated these elements individually, obtaining a full picture of
restructured school leadership and its ramifications for teacher leadership is possible only when they are
examined together.

The reform models examined are the following: The Accelerated Schools, America's Choice,
Atlas Communities, Comer School Develop Program, Co-nect, Core Knowledge, Direct Instruction,
Edison Schools, Modern Red SchoolHouse, and Success For All. These CSR models are currently being
implemented in thousands of schools and have supporting evidence to indicate that they have had a
positive effect on student achievement (Borman, Hewes, Overman, & Brown, 2002; Center for
Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement, 2006). As a result, these ten models have the potential
to improve the academic success of millions of students.

While most CSR studies investigate the impact on student achievement, there is little research
that examines the impact on school leadership (Camburn, Rowan, & Tayor, 2003). The need for an
examination into the impact that CSR can have on the organization as a whole is greatly exasperated by
the proliferation of externally developed reform models that are being marketed as a way to prevent
schools from falling prey to the punitive effects of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation. CSR
participation has grown at an unprecedented rate (Borman et al., 2002) as many state, district, and school
administrators have turned to CSR as a means to facilitate improved student achievement.

_____

By cataloging the leadership structures, roles, and routines being prescribed by the leading CSR models and identifying commonalities, it is hoped that a clearer picture of the essential elements of successful school reform may come into focus. In addition to using the distributed perspective to unpack the organizational elements of CSR for the research community, it is hoped that this comparison will serve as a resource to schools and districts considering CSR so that they may better understand the organizational nuances of the various models before they engage in the reform process. Many CSR models require that teachers vote to support the reform process. Without fully understanding the impact the reform process can have on their professional responsibilities, teachers many be blindly entering a process that may or may not significantly alter their professional lives.

Theoretical Framework

Contrary to popular belief, distributed leadership was not conceived as a prescription for organizing school management more effectively (Gronn, 2002; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001b) but as a "perspective or lens for thinking about leadership" (Spillane, 2006, p. 9). More than simply acknowledging the importance of multiple leaders, it considers leadership practice, which is a product of the interaction of leaders, followers, and the situation, to be at the centre of the concept (Gronn, 2002; Spillane et al., 2001b). The notion that leadership is "stretched over" people and place (Spillane & Sherer, 2004) makes the distributed perspective somewhat unique in a leadership landscape that is littered with references to omnipotent leaders that are single-handedly responsible for the success of the organizations they lead. By refuting the myth of the heroic leader, the distributed perspective concedes that the authority to lead is not exclusively located in formal positions, but is dispersed throughout the organization (Muijs & Harris, 2003) across structures, roles, and routines.

Before one can embrace the belief that leadership can be stretched over structures, roles, and routine, one must cast aside a role-based notion of leadership. Common definitions of leadership include the following: the office or position of a leader; capacity to lead; and the act or instance of leading (Merrian-Webster, 2007). These role-dependent definitions are not only overly narrow and circular, they over-emphasize the work of the individual. Even though finding a definition of leadership that broadly addresses all of the facets of leadership practice that can be agreed upon by all interested parties can be considered the holy grail of the new millennium, forgoing a definition is not an option. Even a crudely constructed definition can be a source of illumination when traveling the dark road from the generalized meaning of a concept to the standard operational definition of a construct (Hoy & Miskel, 1982).

Within the area of educational administration numerous definitions of leadership abound and the literature reveals numerous overlapping and competing constructs (Hoy & Miskel, 1982; Muijs & Harris, 2003). Despite the lack of a coherent, unifying definition, a social influence construct of leadership has been readily applied to school leadership (Gronn, 2000; Harris, 2003; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999; Spillane et al., 2004). Social influence constructs consider leadership to be "the exercise of influence over beliefs, actions and values of others" (Leithwood et al., 1999, p. 116). To surmise that leadership is merely the exercise of influence and then to conclude that leadership has been exercised any time someone has been influenced would be simplistic and erroneous (Spillane, 2006). Consequently, Harris (2003) addresses the knowledge building function of leadership by suggesting that "the leadership process is one of facilitating the personal growth of individuals or groups" (Harris, 2003, p. 2). Inherent in this definition of leadership is the development of "new understandings" (Harris, 2003). This construct more accurately portrays leadership as an interaction that results in learning or knowledge development. This knowledge-building component is essential to our understanding of leadership as it is the fundamental element that distinguishes leadership from administrative or managerial tasks. Initiatives that attempt to simply distribute administrative tasks merely result in the division of managerial labor if these activities lack a transfer of knowledge (Little, 2003). While perfunctory tasks, such as completing paperwork or delegating resources may influence the realization of organizational goals, they in-and-of

_____

themselves do not directly influence individual or organizational capacity and thus cannot be considered leadership.

When using the distributed perspective to examine leadership one must consider leadership to be "those activities that influence the motivation, knowledge, affect, and practice of other organizational members in the service of the organization's core work" (Spillane, 2006, p. 11). This definition readily highlights that the activities that many teachers engage in on a daily basis when interacting with the colleagues should be labeled as leadership. This realization acknowledges that schools are filled with many more leaders than the organizational chart may reveal. The moment an individual intentionally engages in an activity that has the potential to influence the motivation, knowledge, affect, and practice of other organizational members in the service of the organization's goal, they can be considered a leader in that instance, regardless of their formal role. This creates an environment where all participants have the potential to be an informal leader. Consequently, the distributed perspective invites teachers to re-cast their role as potential leaders and not just followers of the principal's leadership.

What often distinguishes formal leaders from informal leaders is the frequency of their influence. The duties and expectations of specific roles often lend themselves to greater opportunities to influence the knowledge, practice, and motivation of others (Hoy & Miskel, 1982), thus contributing to their formal leadership. When teachers are given release time to mentor novice teachers they have more opportunities to interact with and influence their colleagues. Influencing the knowledge, practice, and motivation of others is often a key part of the role that curriculum specialists play. Consequently, creating specialist or mentor roles serves to activate teacher leadership by increasing the distribution of influence in schools, as leadership is stretched across a greater number of formal roles.

Just like individuals, groups can also exert influence. These influential groups are formed as a result of the organizational structure that divides labor into sub-units that exhibit stable and patterned behavior (Meyer, 1977). Social structures create a network of interactions that affect the frequency and duration of contact between individuals. In large and/or complex organizations, the organizational structure is most clearly demonstrated in its organizational chart. The location of this group on an organizational chart should indicate its place in the school's hierarchy as well as its duties and responsibilities. As the organizational structure divides a school into sub-units and work groups, these groups can have the potential to collectively influence the knowledge, practice, and motivation of others. An example of an organizational structure in schools is the school leadership team. This highly influential group is often charged with the execution of a number of key leadership functions. While the leadership team may be the sole administrative unit, their decision-making process can be influenced by the work of sub-committees that are charged with gathering and disseminating information. Thus, even committee work should be seen as having the potential to activate teacher leadership, as it provides teachers with an opportunity influence the school's decision-making process. This distribution of influence highlights the manner in which leadership can be stretched over organizational structures.

Spillane (2006) notes the critical issue when examining leadership practice is not whether leadership is distributed, but how leadership is distributed. It is in this regard that the distributed framework can be of great benefit to an examination of leadership in schools implementing a CSR model. The majority of CSR models seek to create new organizational structures, roles or routines. Some even attempt to change all three. Consequently, the distributed perspective can be considered an exceptional tool to examine how the leading CSR models distribute leadership and activate teacher leadership.

Comprehensive School Reform
The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program began in 1998 with the goal of raising student achievement by employing proven methods and strategies to produce comprehensive school reform (United States Department of Education, 2006). It has since grown to a program with an annual expenditure of over $300 million that has provided funding to over 6,000 schools (Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2007). The focus of the CSR program is to foster coherent school wide improvements that cover virtually all aspects of a school's operations, rather than piecemeal,

_____

fragmented approaches to reform. The Comprehensive School Reform movement attempts to move beyond previous reform efforts by bringing together much of what has previously been learned about creating better schools. In the past, efforts to improve public education focused on fixing the parts of schools, the people in the schools, or the curriculum in the schools. After reflecting on these efforts, researchers and practitioners have come to understand that in order to improve student achievement, it is necessary to rethink and revamp the whole education system – from the classroom to the district office to the statehouse. This approach goes beyond the piecemeal improvement efforts of the past by not only combining them, but by integrating them as well (Cicchinelli & Barley, 1999). It is this emphasis on integration and alignment of reform elements that differentiates comprehensive school reform from previous reform efforts.

Whereas previous restructuring efforts were primarily attempts to decentralize educational management (Lawton, 1992), comprehensive school reform represents a deep change in education – not simply alterations in the forms and structures of schooling but fundamental reconfigurations of human interactions at every level of the educational enterprise (Murphy, 1991). As decreed by the CSRD, reform models must seek to tightly align school management with instruction, assessment, classroom management, professional development, and parental involvement (North Central Regional Educational Library, 2003). Murphy and Datnow (2003) note that one of the most powerful and enduring lessons from the research on previous reform efforts is that better schools are more tightly linked – structurally, symbolically, and culturally– than less effective ones. They operate more as an organic whole and less as a loose collection of disparate subsystems (Murphy & Datnow, 2003). One could argue that as a result of this alignment, schools that decide to undergo the reform process and successfully implement an externally developed CSR model will see an improvement in the academic achievement of their students (Borman et al., 2002; Stringfield et al., 1997). In fact, Borman et al.'s (2002) systematic meta-analysis of 232 studies that examined 29 CSR models concluded that "the average student who participated in a CSR programs out-performed 56% of similar children who did not attend a CSR school" (Borman et al., 2002, p. 47).

Fostering school wide change is of particular importance to Title I schools that are under pressure to significantly improve student achievement. Consequently, the CSR program, with its emphasis on scientifically based research and effective practices, has become an integral component of the No Child Left Behind Act (United States Department of Education, 2006). With the passage of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act in 2002, the CSRD cast aside its 'demonstration' title to become a fully authorized program (Tushnet, Flaherty, & Smith, 2004). Schools struggling to demonstrate adequate yearly progress can receive funding to seek out the assistance of a CSR model if the model adheres to the eleven components of the CSR program. To be eligible, the models must:

- Employ proven methods and strategies based on scientifically based research
- Integrate a comprehensive design with aligned components
- Provide ongoing, high-quality professional development for teachers and staff
- Include measurable goals and benchmarks for student achievement
- Be supported within the school by teachers, administrators, and staff
- Provide support for teachers, administrators, and staff
- Provide for meaningful parent and community involvement in planning, implementing, and evaluating school improvement activities
- Use high-quality external technical support and assistance from an external partner with experience and expertise in school wide reform and improvement
- Plan for the annual evaluation of strategies for the implementation of school reforms and for student results achieved. Identify resources to support and sustain the school's comprehensive reform effort
- Have been found to significantly improve the academic achievement of students or demonstrate strong evidence that it will improve the academic achievement of students

_____

While altering teacher leadership is not an intended goal of the CSR program, adhering to these eleven components often requires a fundamental reconfiguration of how school stakeholders interact with each other (Murphy, 1991). If comprehensive changes to how school operates are to take place, one must expect that these changes may significantly impact the role teachers play in these reform environments.

Methods

This research draws on the available publications created by model designers that describe and outline how their models are to be implemented. The models were selected from the listings of the Center for Comprehensive School Reform & Improvement (Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement, 2006), the Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center (CSRQC) (Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center, 2006), the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory Catalog of School Reform Models (NWREL, 2007) and the Department of Education's CSR award database (Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2007). While these organizations collectively acknowledge the existence of over thirty externally developed reform models, the Accelerated Schools, America's Choice, Atlas Communities, Comer School Develop Program, Co-Nect, Core Knowledge, Direct Instruction, Edison Schools, Modern Red SchoolHouse, and Success For All models were selected for this review because they have shown evidence of positive effects on student achievement as indicated by both the CSRQ Center report and Borman et al.'s (2002) meta analysis of CSR and student achievement.

Despite the millions of dollars that are consumed as a result of comprehensive school reform, the CSRQ Center's report and Borman et al.'s meta analysis are the only current, exhaustive, and objective reviews of the effects of CSR that examine more than a handful of reform models. While the Borman analysis included research studies of 29 reform models, the report from the CSRQ center examined 33 models (See Appendix A for a complete listing of the reform models included in both reviews).

The Department of Education's CSR Awards Database was also used to determine the number of schools that were currently or had previously implemented the reform model. Schools that did not solicit federal CSR funds are not included in this number. Thus, models that take the form of charter schools, such as Edison Schools, and do not require CSR funds are not listed in the database. Edison Schools was the only model that fell into this category. Thus, the number of schools currently implementing the models was generated from the Edison website. The significant organizational differences found in middle and high schools would make it difficult, if not impossible, to compare and contrast models created exclusively for upper level schools with models created for elementary schools. Thus, only models that are implemented at the K-8 level were included for consideration.

Results

What follows is a review of the publicly available information regarding the ten leading CSR models. This review was conducted in an attempt to gather information regarding the essential elements of each reform model. All of the leading reform models have web sites that provide a plethora of information and resources regarding the implementation of their model. The information available online ranged from model overviews designed to provide a cursory description for curious stakeholders, to detailed implementation guides that provide the reader with a thorough understanding of the purpose, history, and conceptual framework of the reform design. Most reform teams also provided links to internal and/or external research studies that examined the impact of the reform model. Proprietary information for the exclusive use schools or districts that have entered into a contract with the reform team was not included.

_____

Accelerated Schools
          What began as a two-school pilot program in 1986 has now grown into an extensive educational service provider that has served over 300 schools (Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2007). The goal of Accelerated Schools is to create powerful learning opportunities for all students. This is done by implementing a comprehensive approach that purports to address all aspects of a school including instructional delivery, academic rigor, school culture, governance, parent and community engagement, and student self regulation. They claim that these components support the core of improving student achievement, the quality of the teaching, and student experiences (Accelerated Schools, 2006).
          Central to the implementation of the Accelerated Schools model is the creation of a governance structure and decision-making process that invites the participation of all stakeholders, especially teachers. The new governance structure includes a three-tier committee system. Similar to a leadership team, the Steering Committee in Accelerated schools directs the School as a Whole (SAW) committee. The work of the SAW is then supported by a cadre of committees that focus their attention on a number of specific priorities.
          With this new structure comes a number of new routines. Accelerated Schools advocate the use of a specific decision-making process that begins with "Taking Stock" to ensure that the entire school community — teachers, staff, students, parents, and district personnel — are in agreement to work together to transform the school. This is followed by the use of specific problem solving and decision-making protocols created by the design team. These routines emphasize consensus building, collaboration, and using data and assessment strategies to improve student achievement.
          An external coach assigned to each Accelerated school supports the implementation process and is the only new role to be created.

America's Choice
          America's Choice considers themselves a solution provider that offers comprehensive solutions to the complex problems that educators face in an era of accountability (National Center on Education and the Economy, 2007) . The America's Choice model was the result of extensive research on the best educational practices in the U.S. and abroad. By combining these best practices, America's Choice strives to improve the global competitiveness of American students by ensuring that every student is successful on state and local assessments and is prepared for college. Since its creation in 1990, The America's choice model has been implemented in 284 schools (Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2007).
          Following years of research, the America's Choice reform team has determined that there are key tasks for schools to focus on that will ready students for success in today's economy. These tasks include creating an aligned instructional system with a focus on standards and assessment, implementation of a high-performance management and leadership structure, which include professional learning communities, and an emphasis on parent and community involvement (National Center on Education and the Economy, 2007).
          The new governance structure prescribed by the America's Choice design team involves a school leadership team, which includes but is not limited to the principal, the primary coach, the upper elementary coach, the math lead teacher, and the parent/community outreach coordinator. The intent of the team is to work in collaboration with parents and the school community to create school-wide targets for achievement and oversee the use of data to guide instruction and decision-making. In addition to changes to the governance structure, America's Choice also prescribes changes in the organizational structure as well. To foster the development of learning communities, larger schools are divided into houses that consist of fewer than four hundred students. As a consequence of the house structure, teachers in America's Choice schools must also engage in two essential routines. Within each house, teachers are required to teach the same group of students for at least two years and plan each student's program for more than one year. An additional routine revolves around weekly common planning times where teachers plan collaboratively by subject area as well as by grade level. In addition to lesson planning, an

_____

additional purpose of this routine is to analyze and discuss student performance. Additional routines, called "Study Groups" and "Teacher Meetings" focus on increasing teachers' understanding of the America's Choice approach to teaching and learning.

Implementation of the America's Choice model also requires the creation of a number of new roles for teacher leaders. The America's Choice design team claims that research clearly shows that instructional coaches can have a positive impact on teaching and learning in the classroom. Consequently, coaches are used extensively to support professional development and growth. While large schools, are provided with a Design Coach to help the principal coordinate the implementation process, all schools must employ on-site literacy and math coaches that model the America's Choice approach to teaching, deliver professional development sessions, and disseminate curricular information and resources. In addition to being excellent classroom teachers, these instructional coaches are provided with training that equips them with the knowledge and skills necessary to become effective models, mentors, and change agents within their schools and districts (National Center on Education and the Economy, 2007). Unique to the America's Choice model is the role of Parent Community Outreach Coordinator. The function of this position is to help parents understand how to better support higher student achievement.

Atlas Communities

Established in 1992, the Atlas Communities reform team believes that all students can and will achieve high educational standards when students, staff, and parents are made to feel important; when they are expected to do well; when they are engaged in challenging and meaningful work; and when they are supported by a unified PreK-12 community of teachers, parents, and other concerned and involved adults (Atlas Communities, 2006). According to federal records, 76 schools have used federal CSR funds to join the Atlas community.

The Atlas design advocates an inclusive managerial and decision-making process where the school leadership team, comprised of administrators, teachers, staff, parents, and community members, are charged with charting the course for school improvement, assessing school improvement progress, and making policy decisions to ensure student success (Atlas Communities, 2007). Other than the leadership team, implementation of the Atlas design does not require the creation of any new organizational structures or school-based roles. To support the implementation process, each school is assigned an external Atlas site developer who provides ongoing support to teachers, administrators, and staff in a number of schools.

While some CSR models emphasize the importance of creating new roles or structures to support student learning, a distinguishing element of the Atlas design is its emphasis on the implementation of new routines. A key feature of the Atlas design is the Whole-Faculty Study Groups (WFSGs). The WFSGs represent a prescribed three-phase routine for fostering professional development. In the first phase the whole faculty examines data and establishes student needs. Then the faculty collaboratively determines what the study groups will do and how the groups will be organized based on the identified student needs. Working in groups of no more than six, the study groups design, implement, and assess WFSG Action Plans. The study group process is guided by Atlas created protocols that facilitate structured conversations about how to examine data to ensure that the study group addresses the implications this data can have for student success.

Comer School Development Program

Considered the grandfather of CSR models, School Development Program began in 1968 as an extension of the Yale Child Study Center. More recently, 128 schools have applied for federal funds to become Comer schools (Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2007). The Comer Process provides a structure as well as a process for mobilizing adults to support students' learning and overall development. The Comer design team claims that the structure they prescribe replaces traditional school organization and management with an operating system that works for schools and the students they serve (Comer School Development Program, 2006).

_____

The Comer School Development Program emphasizes the need to distribute leadership amongst all stakeholders within the school through the creation of three leadership teams. The central team is the School Planning and Management Team (SPMT). Comprised of the school principal, teachers, parents, and support staff, the function of the SPMT is to develop and monitor a comprehensive school plan for the academic, social climate, and staff development goals of students and adults in the school. Supporting the work of the SPMT is the Student and Staff Support Team (SSST). The SSST is comprised of staff members focused on addressing school wide prevention issues and managing individual student cases. Composed of parents, the Parent Team (PT) attempts to involve parents in all aspects of school activity. A representative of this team also serves as a member of the SPMT (Ben-Avie, Joyner, & Comer, 2004). The guiding principles of no fault, consensus decision-making and collaboration support the work of all three teams.

While a reform facilitator serves as a liaison between the school and the Comer design team, a core group of administrators, teachers, staff, or parents who attended the SDP Leadership Academy facilitate the implementation process by providing on-going training and support.

The "Teachers Helping Teachers" process supports teacher professional development in all Comer schools. This routine provides teachers with an opportunity to meet frequently throughout the year with a partner so that they can help one another strengthen and/or develop teaching competencies and skills in the delivery of six basic instructional models.

Co-nect (Pearson Achievement Solutions)

Originally created in 1992, Pearson Achievement Solutions acquired the Co-nect reform model in 2005. In contrast to most CSR models that focus on the internal capacity to support improved student achievement, Co-nect operates more as an external consultant than a school-based reform model. Co-nect considers itself to be a leading provider of data-driven professional development solutions that help schools and districts manage and measure effective instructional improvement. This is accomplished by the analysis of instructional quality from multiple sources, the creation of data-driven action plans to address identified needs, and the application of research-based instructional strategies to drive results (Co-nect, 2007). Federal records indicate that 200 schools have used CSR funds to acquire the services of the Co-nect design team.

Similar to Atlas Communities, Co-nect uses study groups as a means to support its technology-based professional development. Central to the Co-nect design is its emphasis on the implementation of routines that use diagnostic tools to examine instructional quality and facilitate the use of data to inform instructional decisions. To support the capacity of teachers to use data effectively, Co-nect schools create a new literacy coach position that provides assistance to teachers regarding the use of about how to use data to effectively plan and differentiate instruction.

Core Knowledge

The "Core Knowledge" movement, which began in 1986, is an educational reform based on the premise that a grade-by-grade core of common learning is necessary to ensure a sound and fair elementary education (Core Knowledge, 2007). In contrast to the majority of CSR models mandate that a majority of teachers agree to participate in the reform prior to implementation, Core Knowledge does not need to be implemented school-wide. While the ultimate goal is involvement of all teachers, it is not necessary that all teachers initially use the Core Knowledge curriculum.

While one hundred schools have applied for federal CSR funds to become a Core Knowledge school (Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2007), the model cannot be considered comprehensive in nature as implementing the Core Knowledge model does not require any significant changes to structures, roles, or routines. However, Core Knowledge does require that a teacher act as the liaison between the school and the Core Knowledge foundation in addition to their teaching duties. The Core Knowledge coordinator receives additional training so that they can support the implementation

_____

process. They also recommend the creation of a regularly scheduled ninety-minute common planning time for each grade level team.

Direct Instruction

Direct Instruction (DI) is a model for teaching that emphasizes well-developed and carefully planned lessons designed around small learning increments and clearly defined and prescribed teaching tasks (National Institute for Direct Instruction, 2006). Since its creation in 1968, 162 schools have used federal funds to implement the DI curriculum (Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2007). In addition to an emphasis on pedagogy, implementing the DI model requires the creation of new structures, roles, and routines.

DI schools are led by the school management team that includes the building coordinator and grade-level peer coaches to work with the principal to support the implementation process and student and teacher progress.

To support the implementation process, schools must hire an internal onsite building coordinator. In addition to providing professional development and technical assistance, the building coordinator coordinates peer coaches, student grouping, and the scheduling of onsite trainings. DI schools must also appoint teachers to serve as peer coaches for each grade level. The coaches receive additional training so that they can model DI techniques, observe teaching practice, and provide feedback.

Edison Charter Schools

Similar to the America's Choice, the Edison Schools design can be considered one of the most comprehensive reform models. Edison Schools are a research-based design, that uniquely aligns school management, assessment systems, professional development, and the integrated use of technology, to raise student achievement and, ultimately, to help every child reach his or her full potential (Edison Schools, 2006). To become an Edison School, schools must be willing to first become a charter school and then undergo a number of changes in structure, roles, and routines. As autonomous and semi-autonomous charter schools, 76 schools have transformed themselves into Edison schools since the founder, Chris Whittle, first began marketing the Edison model in 1992.

Edison Schools purports to create a leadership structure that empowers teachers to play a greater role in the administration of the school. This is accomplished through the creation of a school leadership team. Comprised of the principal, academy director, lead teachers, and the school business manager, the leadership team supervises all administrative, evaluation, assessment, curriculum design, and hiring functions and serves as the primary decision-making body for the school

Edison schools are divided into three academies. The Primary Academy serves the school's youngest students in junior kindergarten to grade one. The Elementary Academy houses students in grades two to four, and the Junior Academy caters to students in grades five and six. Within each academy, students are organized into houses of 120 to 150 children. The implementation of the academy and house structure has a number of structural and role implications.

A lead teacher supervises and supports the work of five to ten other teachers in each house. The title of Lead Teacher is given to teachers who have at least three years of experience and have obtained or are pursuing a master's degree. The lead teacher is a multi-faceted position that allows teachers to straddle the boundary between teaching and administration. These positions function as house leaders, while teaching and assisting the principal in administrative, evaluation, assessment, curriculum design, and hiring duties. As disseminators of the information covered during leadership team meetings, lead teachers act as a critical link in the school's communication chain.

The teaching ranks at Edison Schools are further divided to include the roles of resident teachers, lead teacher, and senior teachers. First year teachers are given the title of resident teacher. Similar to the medical profession, a teaching resident is someone who has recently graduated from a teacher preparation program and works under the close supervision of a lead teacher. Resident teachers retain this title until they have successfully completed two years of teaching. Not to be confused with the role of Lead

_____

Teacher, Senior Teachers are also veteran teachers that have demonstrated their mastery in a specific teaching area. As curriculum coordinators, they administer assessment, model instruction, and monitor curriculum implementation.

While the title may sound unique, the role of Academy Director is very similar to that of an assistant principal. As a full-time administrator, the academy director duties range from managing student discipline to supervising teachers and assisting the principal in the general administration of the school.

In addition to the creation of new structural elements and teacher-leadership roles, Edison Schools must also engage in a number of routines that support and foster collaboration. Scheduling allowances must be made so that teachers are provided with common planning times and times to formally meet as a house, academy, or entire school. Daily house meetings as well as weekly academy and school-wide professional development meetings provide teachers with frequent opportunities to interact with their colleagues to discuss students, curriculum, assessment, and professional development.

Modern Red Schoolhouse

Established in 1992, Modern Red SchoolHouse (MRSH) has assisted 133 schools (Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2007) in achieving challenging goals through an array of customized professional development services. To help improve student achievement, the design team help schools build coherent curricula that are clearly aligned with state and local standards, improve teacher capacity to choose and implement effective instructional practices, and create collegial environments where the focus is on serving the needs of all students (Modern Red SchoolHouse, 2007). Similar to Co-nect, the MRSH design team initially serves as an external consultant who performs diagnostic tests to determine the best course of action and then creates a professional development plan to achieve the realization of desired goals. Contrary to the train-the-trainer model embraced by many reform teams, schools work directly with the same external MRSH specialists who are recognized experts in improving schools, and who lead all MRSH professional development sessions.

To support participative management, MRSH prescribes structural changes that establish a school leadership and six action teams. Working with the principal, the leadership team guides the school's decision-making process, the use of data to make instructional decisions, develops effective communication, and helps to identify priorities for school improvement. The members of the leadership team then serve as the chairpersons of the action teams charged with working collaboratively to ensure that technology, curriculum and instruction, data analysis, parent and community partnerships, professional development, school organization and culture all support the school improvement plan (Kilgore, 2003).

Success for All

Established in 1993, Success For All (SFA) has quickly become the most widely implemented CSR model in the United States. With a stated goal to help all students achieve at the highest levels—not just children who come to school well fed, well rested, and ready to learn, but everyone, at all levels, whatever it takes SFA attempts to transform schools through the adoption of proven, research-based programs (Success For All Foundation, 2006). SFA considers their top priority to be the education of disadvantaged and at-risk elementary students. As a result, 487 schools have used federal CSR funds to receive support from the SFA foundation (Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2007). This number represents only the tip of the iceberg, as thousands of schools opt to use Title I or other funds to implement the SFA curriculum (Success For All Foundation, 2006).

SFA prescribes the creation of a school improvement team, comprised of the principal, the SFA facilitator, and representatives of teachers and parents. A full-time SFA facilitator who is charged with working with an external SFA Lead trainer to organize staff development, monitor data from each quarterly assessment, and provide support and coaching to all teachers, while supporting the implementation process.

_____

To further support student success, SFA schools are required to establish a Solutions team that coordinates community, family, and school resources to ensure motivated, healthy, well cared for students who enthusiastically focus all of their energy on learning. The team attempts to link students, families, educators, and community resources together to address issues related to attendance, school-based intervention, family involvement, and service integration (Success For All Foundation, 2006).

Discussion

Structure

Central to the distributed perspective is its focus on practice. The majority of the leading CSR models understand the importance of practice by clearly stipulating how leadership is to be practiced.

As indicated in Table 1, common to all but two of the leading reform models, is the creation of a School Leadership/Management Team or School Improvement Team. While America's Choice, Comer SDP, and Edison Schools stipulate the "who" and "what" of leadership practice by prescribing the composition of the leadership team and the specific functions they are to engage in, others like Accelerated Schools and Atlas Communities provide specific protocols that guide the decision-making process.

These leadership teams serve to distribute responsibility for the administration of schools across a variety of stakeholders. The opportunity to participate in the decision-making process can allow teachers, parents, students, non-teaching staff members, and even community members to directly influence the administrative operations of the school as well as the beliefs, actions and values that guide the educational process (Rutherford, 2006). Without the opportunity to be a member of the school leadership team or sub-committee, the scope of influence is often limited to direct face-to-face peer interactions (Katzenmeyer & Moeller, 2001; Smylie, 1997; Spillane & Seashore Louis, 2002). The creation of a school leadership, where teachers are often in the majority, greatly enhances the influence of teacher leadership as the direct participation of teachers in the budgetary, fiscal, curricular, and instructional processes provides them with an opportunity to influence operation of the entire school (Smylie, 1997).

The proliferation of leadership teams with supporting committees prescribed by the leading reform models clearly demonstrates the desire to distribute leadership by 'stretching' the function of leadership over the work of a number of individuals (Spillane et al., 2001b) and activate teacher leadership. This distribution serves to put an end to the myth of the "super-principal" who is solely responsible for the success of the school (Gronn, 2002). The popularity of these teams and committees may also suggest that leadership tasks are best accomplished through the interaction of multiple leaders, which includes teacher leaders.

Four models, Accelerated Schools, America's Choice, Comer SDP, and MRSH take structural reorganization to the next level and implement other structural elements, such as sub-committees and houses to further support the distribution of leadership. As innocuous as they may appear on the surface, these committees that are often lead by and populated by teachers provide teachers with an opportunity to influence the practice of the school as a whole while giving teachers a chance to develop their formal leadership skills. Consequently, structural elements such as sub-committees and houses serve to dismantle steep leadership hierarchies by further distributing leadership, flattening the appearance of their organizational chart, and activating teacher leadership.

Models without any structural elements such as Co-nect and Core Knowledge may not be considered truly comprehensive as they fail to align the organizational structure with curriculum and instruction and simply replicate piecemeal reform attempts of the past.

_____

Table 1
CSR Structures, Roles and Routines

	STRUCTURE (Prescribed # of Members)	ROLES	ROUTINES
ACCELERATED SCHOOLS	Steering Committee School as a Whole Committee Cadres		Taking Stock Problem-solving Decision-making
AMERICA'S CHOICE	Leadership Team (5) Houses	Design Coach Literacy Coach (2) Math Coach Parent/Community Outreach Coordinator	Common Planning Time Study Groups Teacher Meetings
ATLAS COMMUNITIES	Leadership Team		Whole Faculty Study Groups Study Groups
COMER SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	School Planning & Management Team (12) Student & Staff Support Team Parent Team Curriculum, Instruction, & Assessment Committee Social Committee Public Relations Committee Staff Development/Parent Committee	Facilitator	Teachers Helping Teachers
CO-NECT			Data-based Decision-making
CORE KNOWLEDGE		Facilitator	Common Planning Time
DIRECT INSTRUCTION	Leadership Team (5+)	Building Coordinator Peer Coach (for each grade)	
EDISON SCHOOLS	Leadership Team (10) Three Academies Houses	Academy Director Lead Teachers Master Teachers	Common Planning Time Daily House Meetings Weekly Academy Meetings Weekly Faculty Meetings Weekly PD Sessions
MODERN RED SCHOOLHOUSE	Leadership Team (7) Technology Action Team Curriculum & Instruction Action Team Data Analysis Action Team Parent & Community Partnership Action Team Professional Development Action Team School Organization & Culture Action Team		
SUCCESS FOR ALL	School Improvement Team (6+) Solution Team	SFA Facilitator	

Roles

A review of the roles required by the leading reform models suggests that the creation of new roles may not be considered central to engaging in comprehensive school reform. Four models, Accelerated Schools, Atlas Communities, Co-nect and MRSH do not require the implementation of any new roles and three more, Comer SDP, Core Knowledge and SFA require only the creation of reform facilitators positions. Unfortunately, reform models that prescribe the creation of new teacher leadership roles are in the minority. America's Choice, Direct Instruction, and Edison Schools greatly enhance teacher leadership by stipulating the creation of Lead Teacher, Master Teacher, Subject Coach, or Peer Coach roles. In contrast to the traditional roles of the Department Head or Grade Chair, whose responsibilities include a number of perfunctory house-keeping tasks such as ordering supplies and disseminating information, Master /Lead Teachers and Subject/Peer Coaches frequently represent the interests of their department, house, or grade on school wide committees or teams and are often charged with the responsibility of supervising the development of their fellow teachers. This can be achieved by modeling innovative pedagogy, evaluating teaching practice, or by simply providing assistance and encouragement when dealing with classroom problems (Smylie, 1997; Togneri & Anderson, 2003a). In addition to these supervisory functions, these roles are often charged with the task of developing and supporting curricular and instructional programs.

These roles are also provided with greater opportunities for teacher leaders to influence the knowledge, practice, and motivation of others. In addition to increasing the frequency of influence, some of these roles can be considered boundary spanning. Boundary spanning roles serve to connect multiple professional or social networks. Lead teachers can operate as boundary spanners in two ways: first, by connecting individual houses to the school as a whole and, second, by connecting teaching practice to administrative practice. As well, Subject Specialist/Coaches may help to connect the span between different grade levels or different subjects.

With the growth of externally developed reform models, a number of new leadership roles have been created. Unlike traditional teacher leadership roles, the role of Reform Coordinator/Facilitator often demands a full-time commitment, requiring teachers to relinquish their classroom responsibilities (Datnow & Castellano, 2001). For America's Choice, Comer SDP, Core Knowledge, Direct Instruction, and SFA, these roles serve to guide the change process by clarifying purpose, setting goals, delegating functions, defining roles, modeling practice, establishing procedures, and determining indicators of success (Coach, 2004; Datnow & Castellano, 2001; Supovitz, Poglinco, Bach, Hovde,Rosenblum, & Sauders, 2003; Togneri & Anderson, 2003b). For the other five models that do not require the presence of an onsite reform facilitator to guide the reform process, one can only assume that the daily role of guiding the reform process would then fall to the principal.

In contrast to the roles of Lead/Master Teacher or Subject Specialist/Coach the role of Reform Facilitator or Coach is often limited in scope and temporary in nature. As the leadership influence of these positions is often limited to the domain of the reform model, Reform Coordinators/ Facilitators may have less potential for boundary spanning if they merely act as a liaison with the design team. As well, once the initial implementation phase is complete and the reform has been institutionalized these positions may be deemed no longer necessary and terminated.

The Parent/Community Outreach Coordinator as prescribed by America's Choice is a truly boundary spanning role as this role connects internal school networks to the external community. Positions such as this have the potential to influence the knowledge, practice, and motivation of a wide audience.

Routines

Spillane (2006) notes that situation gives form to leadership practice in concert with leaders and followers. Routines are an essential aspect of situation and consequently shape leadership practice (Spillane, 2006). By prescribing specific routines such as collaborative lesson planning, study groups, and cadres many CSR models support the distribution of leadership practice that may enhance teacher

leadership. These routines provide opportunities for teachers to work collectively and influence the knowledge, practice, and motivation of their colleagues. A review of the routines prescribed by the leading CSR models, highlights an emphasis on routines that facilitate collaboration and the development of learning communities. Each time teachers collaborate and help each other they have the potential to influence the knowledge, practice, and motivation of their colleagues (Rutherford, 2006). Reform models that prescribe an increase in the number and frequency of these routines serve to further distribute leadership influence and activate teacher leadership.

The effect of these routines can be reinforced by the inclusion of protocols that guide the routine and impact the situation by prescribing how leaders and followers or leaders and leaders are to interact. As essential elements of their designs, Accelerated Schools, Atlas Communities, and Comer SDP include highly specified protocols that focus attention on practice and give direction as to how these interactions are to take place. The protocols that guide the "Taking Stock," "Whole Faculty Study Group," or "Teachers Helping Teachers" routines are intended to influence the knowledge, practice, or motivation of those participating in the routine.

Conclusion

School leadership is often cited as being paramount to the success of individual schools (Copland, 2001; Fullan, 1999; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Leithwood et al., 1999; Murphy, 1991; Murphy & Datnow, 2003; Short & Greer, 1997) Consequently the distributed perspective can be considered an exceptional tool for investigating school leadership as it focuses attention on the importance of leadership and zeros in on leadership practice. Guided by the distributed perspective, this paper examined how the leading CSR models distribute school leadership across structures, roles and routines. Investigating the leadership structures, and roles revealed the prescribed "who" and "what" of leadership practice, while reviewing the routines served to unpack "how" leadership practice takes place in schools implementing these reform models. This has enabled us to zero in on each model's ability to activate teacher leadership.

A comparison of the specific leadership elements employed by the leading CSR models revealed that the implementation of a leadership team and routines that foster collaboration are common to most of these reform models. Boundary spanning structures, such as a leadership team, create opportunities for members to influence the knowledge, practice, and motivation of their colleagues and other stakeholders that they may not normally interact with. Routines that facilitate collaboration such as common planning times and study groups can also serve as boundary spanners when they bring people together that would not normally be a part of the same professional or social network. All of these changes have the potential to activate teacher leadership by creating formal structures and routines that allow teachers to influence the knowledge, practice, and motivation of their colleagues and other stakeholders.

It is interesting to note that the opportunity to significantly affect teacher leadership through the creation of new roles was utilized by only a few of the reform models studied. The limited prescription of new roles may be a result of the difficulty of compensating teachers with leadership responsibilities and a desire not to tangle with the contractual obligations of the teachers' union. The under-utilization of formal roles, as well as the challenges to distributing leadership across structures, roles, and routines are important areas that require further research. The difficulty of fully implementing prescribed changes to structures, roles, and routines may be why only two models, America's Choice and Edison Schools, fully utilize all three of these elements to support the distribution of school leadership. The title of 'comprehensive' school reform aptly suits these two as they are the only models that attempt to tightly align school management and governance with instruction, assessment, and professional development (United States Department of Education, 2006). This finding leads one to surmise that the majority of the leading CSR models that do not prescribe any changes to role of teachers and how they interact with stakeholders may not be considered truly comprehensive. Consequently, it is imperative that teachers understand the impact (or lack thereof) these reform models may have on the role teachers play in these reform environments before voting for or supporting any reform model.

_____

Since this investigation examined the prescribed changes of the leading reform models and not the actual changes, further research into the pre- and post-state of teacher leadership is needed. An exploration of the success of specific structures, roles, and routines to activate teacher leadership will not only contribute to a rich understanding of school leadership, it will also provide needed direction of how to fully capitalize on the potential of teacher leadership.

_____

References

Accelerated Schools. (2006). Accelerated schools plus. Retrieved July 10, 2006, from
        http://www.acceleratedschools.net/

Atlas Communities. (2006). Atlas communities. Retrieved July 21, 2006, from
        http://www.atlascommunities.org/

Atlas Communities. (2007). Atlas communities.   Retrieved January 21, 2007, from
        http://www.atlascommunities.org/

Ben-Avie, M., Joyner, E., & Comer, J. (2004). Essential understandings of the Yale school development
        program. In E. T. Joyner, J. P. Comer, and M. Ben-Avie (Ed.), *Transforming school leadership
        and management to support student learning and development* (pp. 15-23). Thousand Oaks, CA:
        Corwin Press.

Borman, G. D., Hewes, G. M., Overman, L. T., & Brown, S. (2002). *Comprehensive school reform and
        student achievement: A meta-analysis*. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of
        Students Place at Risk.

Camburn, E., Rowan, B., & Tayor, J. E. (2003). Distributed leadership in schools: The case of elementary
        schools adopting comprehensive school reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,
        25*(4), 347-373.

Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. (2006). CSR models. Retrieved July 6,
        2006, from http://www.centerforcsri.org/

Cicchinelli, L., & Barley, Z. (1999). *Comprehensive school reform: An evaluation guide for districts and
        schools*. Aurora, Colorado: McREL.

Co-nect. (2007). Co-nect school improvement. Retrieved January 7, 2007, from http://www.co-
        nect.net/home.html

Coach. (2004). Our work done well is like the perfect pitch. *Journal of Staff Development, 25*(1), 16-25.

Comer School Development Program. (2006). Overview of the school development program.   Retrieved
        August 10, 2006, from http://www.med.yale.edu/comer/index.html

Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center. (2006). *CSRQ center report on elementary school CSR
        models*. Washington, DC: Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center.

Copland, M. A. (2001). The myth of the superprincipal. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(1), 528-533.

Core Knowledge. (2007). Core knowledge sequence K-8. Retrieved January 6, 2007, from
        http://www.coreknowledge.org/CK/index.htm

Datnow, A., & Castellano, M. E. (2001). Managing and guiding school reform: Leadership in Success for
        All schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*(2), 219-249.

_____

Edison Schools. (2006). Welcome to Edison charter schools. Retrieved June 7, 2006, from
        http://www.edisonschools.com/

Fullan, M. (1999). *Change forces: The sequel*. London: Farmer Press.

Fullan, M., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College
        Press.

Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Educational Management
        Administration & Leadership, 28*(3), 317-381.

Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership. In K. Leithwood & P. Hallinger (Eds.), *International handbook
        of educational leadership & administration* (pp. 653-696). Boston: Kluwer.

Harris, A. (2003). Teacher leadership as distributed leadership: Hersey, fantasy or possibility. *School
        Leadership & Management, 23*(3), 313-324.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1982). *Educational Administration: Theory, research and practice*. New
        York: Random House Inc.

Katzenmeyer, M., & Moeller, G. (2001). *Awakening the sleeping giant: Helping teachers develop as
        leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Kilgore, S. B. (2003). *Guiding principles of the modern Red SchoolHouse design: Research-based
        solutions for 21st century schools.* Nashville, TN: Modern Red SchoolHouse.

Lawton, S. B. (1992). Why restructure: An international survey of the roots of reform. *Journal of
        Education Policy, 7*(2), 139-154.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. Buckingham,
        UK: Open University Press.

Little, J. (2003). Construction of teacher leadership in three periods of policy and reform activism. *School
        Leadership & Management, 23*(4), 401-419.

Merrian-Webster. (2007). Online dictionary & thesaurus. Retrieved August 10, 2007, from
        http://www.merriam-webster.com/

Meyer, M. W. (1977). *Theory of organizational structure*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Modern Red SchoolHouse. (2007). Modern Red SchoolHouse: The art of teaching. The science of
        learning.   Retrieved November 28, 2006, from http://www.mrsh.org/

Muijs, D., & Harris, A. (2003). Teacher Leadership: Improvement through empowerment? *Educational
        Management Administration & Leadership, 31*(4), 437-448.

Murphy, J. (1991). *Restructuring schools: Capturing and assessing the phenomena*. New York: Teachers
        College Press.

_____

Murphy, J., & Datnow, A. (2003). *Leadership for school reform: Lessons from comprehensive school reform designs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J., & Datnow, A. (Eds.). (2003). *Leadership for school reform: Lessons from comprehensive school reform designs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

National Center on Education and the Economy. (2007). America's Choice: Program overview. Retrieved June 22, 2006, from http://www.ncee.org/acsd/program/index.jsp

National Institute for Direct Instruction. (2006). What is direct instruction? Retrieved November 6, 2006, from http://www.nifdi.org/

North Central Regional Educational Library. (2003). Comprehensive school reform. Retrieved May 31, 2003, from http://www.ncrel.org/csri/what/index.html

NWREL. (2007). The catalog of school reform models. 2007, from http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/catalog/index.shtml

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2007). Comprehensive school reform awards database. Retrieved February 10, 2007, from http://csrprogram.ed.gov/cgi-bin/mysql/csrawards.cgi

Rutherford, C. (2006). Teacher leadership and organizational structure: The implication of restructured leadership in an Edison school. *Journal of Educational Change, 7*, 59-76.

Short, P., & Greer, J. (1997). *Leadership in empowered schools: Themes from innovative efforts*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Smylie, M. A. (1997). Research on teacher leadership: Assessing the state of the art. In B. Biddle, G. Thomas & I. Goodson (Eds.), *International handbook of teachers and teaching* (pp. 521-591). Dordreht, Netherland: Kluwer.

Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2001b). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher, 30*(3), 23-28.

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). Distributed leadership: Toward a theory of school leadership practice *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 36*(1), 3-34.

Spillane, J. P., & Seashore Louis, K. (2002). School improvement processes and practices: Professional learning for building instructional capacity. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (Vol. 101, pp. 83-104). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Spillane, J. P., & Sherer, J. Z. (2004). *A Distributed perspective on school leadership: Leadership practice as stretched over people and place*. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association Annual Meeting and Conference, San Diego, California.

_____

Stringfield, S., Millsap, M., Herman, R., Yoder, N., Brigham, N., & Nesselrodt, P. (1997). *Urban and suburban/rural, special strategies for educating disadvantaged children: Final report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Success For All Foundation. (2006). Success For All. Retrieved July 28, 2006, from http://www.successforall.net/

Supovitz, J. A., Poglinco, S. M., Bach, A. J., Hovde, K., Rosenblum, S., & Sauders, M. (2003). *The Heart of the matter: The coaching model in America's choice schools*. Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Togneri, W., & Anderson, S. E. (2003b). *Beyond islands of excellence*. Washington, D.C: Learning First Alliance.

Tushnet, N. C., Flaherty, J., & Smith, A. (2004). *Longitudinal assessment of comprehensive school reform: Implementation and outcomes*. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.

United States Department of Education. (2006). Comprehensive school reform program. Retrieved February 2, 2007, from http://www.ed.gov/programs/compreform/index.html

_____

Appendix A

MODEL NAME	# of Schools	CSRQ (2006)	Borman (2002)
Accelerated School	**306**	**Moderate**	**Promising Evidence**
America's Choice	**284**	**Moderate**	**Promising Evidence**
Atlas Communities	**76**	**Limited**	**Promising Evidence**
Audrey Cohen College	9	Not included	Greatest Need for Additional Research
Breakthrough to Literacy	46	Zero	Not included
Center for Effective Schools	N/A	Not included	Promising early data NAR
Child Development Project	7	Not included	Greatest Need for Additional Research
Coalition of Essential School	187	Zero	Greatest Need for Additional Research
Comer SDP	**128**	**Moderate**	**Strongest Evidence**
Community for Learning	54	Zero	Promising early data NAR
Community Learning Centers;	N/A	Not included	Greatest Need for Additional Research
Comprehensive Early Literacy Learning	2	Zero	Not included
Co-Nect	**200**	**Limited**	**Promising early data NAR**
Core Knowledge	**100**	**Moderate**	**Promising early data NAR**
Different ways of knowing	73	Limited	Greatest Need for Additional Research
Different Ways of Knowing	73	Limited	Greatest Need for Additional Research
Direct Instruction	**162**	**Moderately Strong**	**Strongest Evidence**
Edison School	**79***	**Moderate**	**Promising early data NAR**
Expeditionary Learning	97	Zero	Highly Promising
First Steps	30	Zero	Not included
First Things First	5	Moderate	Not included
High Schools That Work	205	Zero	Greatest Need for Additional Research
High/Scope Primary Grades Approach to I	N/A	Not included	Greatest Need for Additional Research
Integrated Thematic Instruction	51	Limited	Greatest Need for Additional Research
Knowledge is Power Program	N/A	Limited	Not included
Learning Network	40	Not included	Promising Evidence
Literacy Collaborative	118	Moderate	Greatest Need for Additional Research
Making Middle Grades Work	21	Zero	Not included
MicroSociety	44	Not included	Promising early data NAR
Middle Start	71	Limited	Not included
Modern Red SchoolHouse	**133**	**Limited**	**Highly Promising**
Montessori	7	Not included	Promising Evidence
More Effective Schools	N/A	Limited	Not included
National Heritage Academies	N/A	Zero	Not included
National Writing Project	41	Moderate	Not included
Onward to Excellence	83	Zero	Promising early data NAR
Paideia	17	Not included	Promising Evidence
Project Grad	6	Limited	Not included
Roots and Wings (SFA)	66	Not included	Highly Promising
School Renaissance	3	Moderate	Not included
Success For All	**487**	**Moderately Strong**	**Strongest Evidence**
Talent Development High Schools	46	Moderate	Promising early data NAR
The Leona Group	N/A	Zero	Not included
Turning Points	80	Zero	Not included
Urban Learning Centers	34	Not included	Greatest Need for Additional Research
Ventures Initiative and Focus System	5	Limited	Not included
White Hat Management (HOPE Academies		Zero	Not included