

**University of California, Los Angeles**  
**Graduate School of Education and Information Studies**

**Ed 220A – Inquiry into American Schooling:  
Organization and Change  
Fall 2002  
Tuesday 9-1**

*Dr. Robert Cooper*  
*Moore Hall 3331*  
*(310) 267-2494*  
[cooper@gseis.ucla.edu](mailto:cooper@gseis.ucla.edu)

**Course Description**

For the last two decades the term “restructuring” has dominated educational discourse with regards to how to fundamentally change the schooling experience for students. Research suggests that restructuring initiatives emerged in several waves (Lusi, 1997). The first wave focused on raising standards. Schools were simply asked “to do more of the same, but just do it better” (Petrie, 1990, p. 14). Petrie argues that asking schools to do more of the same failed to recognize the systemic nature of the educational enterprise. This wave has been characterized as piecemeal and disconnected (Cohen & Spillance, 1992; Smith & O’Day, 1990). Though schools and educators were asked, and in many cases, were required to make significant changes, research suggests that this wave of reform left the fundamental nature of teaching and learning unchanged (Cohen, 1988; Cuban, 1990; Firestone et al., 1989).

The second wave shifted the focus of reform to the redistribution of power (Murphy, 1992). Reformers sought to decentralize control of curriculum, budgets, and staffing to principals, teachers, and parents (Clune & White, 1988). This wave called for school-by-school, locally adapted change that was respectful and sensitive to the local context (Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988). Reforms were designed to “capitalize on the energy and creativity of individuals at the school level” (Murphy, 1992, p. 6). While this wave produced a number of schools in which teaching and learning were qualitatively different, the number of schools that experienced and sustained fundamental change was not widespread (Lusi, 1997).

The third and current wave of reform represents a fundamental shift in how educators and policymakers view the purpose of education (Murphy, 1992). It seeks to alter the traditional conceptions of schools. The goal of education is no longer viewed as the maintenance of the organizational infrastructure, but rather the development of human resources (Mojkowski & Fleming, 1988). Embedded within the policies and practices of many of the current reform strategies is the belief that more students can be better served educationally when traditional notions of teaching and learning are reconceptualized. This reconceptualization often requires

restructuring four important dimensions of the schooling process: (1) structures; (2) curriculum and instruction; (3) professional development opportunities for teachers; and (4) norms that guide and direct policy and practice. Structural reforms refer to policies and strategies aimed at changing the social and/or physical organization of the school. They include various initiatives such as career academies, smaller learning communities, extended instructional periods, reduced class size, interdisciplinary teachers teams and block scheduling. Curriculum and instructional reform refer to attempts to improve the content and delivery of academic subjects. These include innovative ways of teaching math and English as well as infusing culturally relevant pedagogy and literature into academic courses. Professional development refers to any number of training activities for teachers and school leaders aimed at helping them to address changing dynamics. And finally, restructuring the norms that guide policy and practice refers to altering institutional ethos in a way that values and celebrates the unique contributions and learning style of each student. At the center of the current school restructuring movement is the notion that if we can alter the way in which schools are organized, we can change how teachers teach and how students learn (Elmore, 1996).

The focus of this course is on understanding the change process in schools. The course challenges the notion that fundamental change at the school or classroom level will occur simply by following centrally mandated initiatives. The readings in the course argue that to achieve fundamental change in schools, particularly urban schools, requires policymakers and other reformers to develop a solid appreciation for the complexities of school life, one rooted in a deep social, political, and cultural history. The issues confronting urban public schools are inextricably connected to the social, economic, and political conditions of the urban environments in which they are embedded. Too often, educational reform efforts overlook these connections and educational innovations fail because of a lack of attention to the macro level context. This course explore the ways in which schools are influenced by the political, social and cultural context of the urban environment and examine how educational policies can respond to the conditions and issues that exist there.

### ***COURSE OBJECTIVES***

There are four principle objectives that will guide or discussions and activities:

1. To familiarize students with the school change literature with a particular focus on policy analysis, policy implementation, and scale up;
2. To provide students with a theoretical understanding of the problems and issues confronting urban public schools;
3. To strengthen student's skills in analyzing educational polices (teasing out assumptions and assessing evidence) in order to determine the success or failure of such polices;
4. To develop the skills to write a research paper that makes links theory, research, and educational policy in order to deepen our understanding of the complexities of transforming urban education.

## ***ASSIGNMENTS:***

Students are expected to come to class having read the material and being prepared for discussion; this course is designed as a seminar, not a lecture class. Your preparation, in terms of careful and thoughtful reading of the material, writing down questions of your own for discussion, and reviewing your notes before class, will directly influence how much you can contribute to the discussion and how much you can expect to get out of it.

In addition, students will be asked to take turns moderating class discussion. During the course students will be asked to plan and lead small group discussions. The faculty will also be prepared with material, of course, but this structure is intended to reinforce the idea that this class is a community of inquiry, in which all participants have valuable and significant contributions to the learning process of us all.

Analytic Memo: Please prepare a 1 –2 page reflective memo responding the specific question asked regarding the readings for the week. In doing so, select and incorporate at least two of the following six questions as a way to help frame / structure your response.

1. What question (s) or problem(s), or issue(s) does the collective readings attempt to address or bring together? What is the main argument or organizing idea?
2. What type of evidence is used to support the author's position? What resources, methods, and/or data does the author(s) bring to bare in order to address the question (s) or problem (s)?
3. In your own words, describe the major findings that the readings conclude?
4. What questions does the reading raise regarding the nature and purpose of schooling? What practical implications, if any, does the readings have for urban school administrators?
5. What serious omissions are left out of the readings? How do these omissions distort or undermine the author's position?
6. In what ways does the readings reinforce, extend, challenge, or oppose your own views? Be specific.

Culminating Project and Presentation (7-10 pages): Identify an educational policy that has significant impact on schools in urban areas in which you have a strong interest. Examples of such policy areas are: School choice & Vouchers, Multicultural Education, Technology, Home schooling, School administration, At-risk youth, Career paths and transition, Values in education, School boards and Superintendents, Changing Demographic, Inclusion / heterogeneous grouping, Distance Learning. Using the readings from the course, as well as other sources, write an extensive review of the literature with regards to your selected policy area. Your review should include a detailed analysis of the policy, and a discussion of the potential issues of implementation and scale- up. In writing this paper describe what was the impetus for the policy, what are the policy assumptions and objectives , as well as what process was followed to identify the need for the policy and the design for it.

If possible provide a timeline of critical events during the life of the policy and resulting program/ reform/ innovation. Identify actual outcomes vs. intended outcomes. What unintended

outcomes do you find interesting? Additionally, highlight three to five questions which are meaningful to you. What do you think is important for educators to know about this policy.

Although the final copy of your paper is due on the last day of class, each student will be asked to make a 45 minute presentation of their policy area.

## **GUIDELINES FOR WRITING ASSIGNMENTS**

Evaluation of the writing assignments will be based on the writer's ability to:

- Be coherent
- Adhere to the topic
- Integrate theory and practice
- Reflect the readings

### ***GRADES:***

Grades in the course will consist of the following assignments / activities:

1. Class attendance / participation (10%)
2. Four analytic memos (20%)
3. 3 to 5 page midterm (30%)
4. Culminating policy paper and presentation (40%)

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>WEEK 0 - Tuesday September 24<sup>th</sup>, 2002</b> <b>Introduction: Educational Change as a Field of Study</b></p>
--

***Theme: Educational Change as a Field of Study***

***Readings for this session:***

Bush, G. W. (2000). No Child Left Behind.

Lieberman, A. 1998. "The growth of educational change as a field of study: understanding its roots and branches" in A. Hargreave's et al. (eds), International Handbook of Educational Change. Great Britain. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 13-20.

**WEEK 1 - Tuesday October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2002**  
**Developing a Conceptual Framework for Understanding  
the Change Process in Schools**

***Theme:*** What does it take to change American schools

***Analytic memo # 1 due:***

***Readings for this session:***

Calhoun, E. & Joyce, B.(1998). “‘Inside-Out’ and ‘Outside-In’: Learning from Past and Present School Improvement Paradigms” in A. Hargreave’s et al. (eds), International Handbook of Educational Change. Great Britain. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 1286-1298.

Fullan, M. (1998). “The Meaning of Educational Change: A Quarter of a Century of Learning” in A. Hargreave’s et al. (eds), International Handbook of Educational Change. Great Britain. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 214-228.

Oakes, J., Welner, K., Yonezawa, S., & Allen, R., (1998). Norms and politics of equity mined reform: Research the “zone of mediation” in A. Hargreave’s et al. (eds), International Handbook of Educational Change. Great Britain. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 953-975.

Danielson, M. & Hochschild, J. (1998). “Changing urban education: Lessons, cautions, and prospects”, in C. Stone (eds), Changing Urban Education. Kansas: University Press of Kansas. Pp. 275-295.

**WEEK 2<sup>i</sup> - Tuesday October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2002**  
**Policy Analysis and Changing Schools<sup>ii</sup>**

***Theme:*** What is the role of policy analysis in transforming urban education?

***Analytic memo #2 due:***

***Readings for this session:***

Cibulka, J. (1994). Policy analysis and the study of the politics of education. Journal of Educational Policy, 9 (5&6),105-125.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). “Policy and Change: Getting Beyond Bureaucracy” in A. Hargreave’s et al. (eds), International Handbook of Educational Change. Great Britain. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 642-667.

Miles, M. (1998). "Finding Keys to School Change: A 40-Year Odyssey" in A. Hargreave's et al. (eds), International Handbook of Educational Change. Great Britain. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 37-69.

Weimer, D. & Vining, A., (1992). "What is policy analysis?" in D. Weimer and A. Vining (eds), Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Pp. 1-12.

<b>WEEK 3 - Tuesday October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2002</b> <b>Policy Implementation</b>
---

***Theme<sup>iii</sup>*: What is policy implementation and why should we care?**

***Analytical memo #3 is due:***

***Guest Speaker: TBA***

***Reading for this session:***

Cooper, R., Slavin, R., & Madden, N. (1998). Success for all: Improving the quality of implementation of whole-school change through the sue of a national reform network. Education and Urban Society, 33 (3).

Mazmanian, D. & Sabatier, P., (1989). "A Framework for Implementation Analysis", in D. Mazmanian, and P. Sabatier's (eds), Implementation and Public Policy. Maryland: University Press of America. Pp. 18-44 (Chapter 2).

McLaughlin, M. (1998). "Listening and Learning from the Field: Tales of Policy Implementation and Situated Practice" in A. Hargreave's et al. (eds), International Handbook of Educational Change. Great Britain. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 70-84.

Palumbo, D. & Calista, D. (1990). "Opening up the Black Box: Implementation and the Policy Process" in D. Palumbo and D. Calista's (eds.), Implementation and the policy process. New York: Greenwood Press. Pp. 1-17.

Schneider, A. (1982). Studying Policy implementation: A conceptual framework. Evaluation Review, 6 (6), 715-730.

**WEEK 4 - Tuesday October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2002**  
**Scale up and Diffusion of Education Innovations**

**MID-TERM DUE!**

***Theme:*** Exploring the Problem of Scale

***Reading for this session:***

Cooper, R. (1998). Socio-cultural and within-school factors that affect the quality of implementation of school-wide programs. Johns Hopkins University, Report #28.

Elmore, R.E. (1996). Getting to scale with good educational practice. Harvard Educational Review, 66 (1), 1-26.

Sergiovanni, T. (1998). "Organization, Market and Community as strategies for change: What works best for deep changes in schools" in A. Hargreave's et al. (eds), International Handbook of Educational Change. Great Britain. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 576-595.

Stringfield, S., Datnow, A., Ross, S., & Snively, F. (1998). Scaling up school restructuring in multicultural contexts. Education and Urban Society, 30 (3), 326-357.

**WEEK 5 - Tuesday October 29, 2002**  
**Supporting school change at different stages and with different purposes**

***Theme:*** Exploring the different points of entry to change schools: A policy perspective

For the next two weeks we examine different points of entry to change schools, including national systemic education reforms, reforms of curriculum and teacher education, and reforms school choice. We explore the extent to which the choice of point of entry influences the process and outcomes of the change process.

***Analytical memo #4 due:***

***Guest Speaker:*** TBA

***Reading for this session:***

Dalin, P. (1998). "Developing the twenty-first Century School: A Challenge to Reformers" in A. Hargreave's et al. (eds), International Handbook of Educational Change. Great Britain. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 1059-1073.

Hargreaves, A. (1998). "Pushing the Boundaries of Educational Change" in A. Hargreave's et al. (eds), International Handbook of Educational Change. Great Britain. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 281-294.

### **The Role of the Federal, State and Local polices**

Elmore, R. (2002). "Local school districts and instructional improvement" in Hawley, W. (eds), The Keys to Effective Schools: Educational reforms as a continuous improvement. California: Corwin Press. Pp 111-121.

Lusi, S.F. (1997). The role of state departments of education in complex school reform, Chapter 1 & 2, Pg. 1-23. New York: Teachers College Press.

Stoufe, G. (1994). Politics of education at the federal level, in Scribner J., and D. Layton's The Study of Educational Politics: The 1994 Commemorative Yearbook of the Politics of Education Association (1969-1994). Washington, DC: Falmer. Pp 75-88.

### **Targeted Populations: Title One - The Federal Government's Largest Investment in Education**

Jennings, J. (2001). "Title 1: Its legislative history and its promise" in G. Borman, S. Stringfield, & R. Slavin's Title 1 Compensatory Education at the Crossroads. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. Pp1-24.

Slavin, R. (2001). "How Title 1 can become the engine of reform in America's schools" in G. Borman, S. Stringfield, & R. Slavin's Title 1 Compensatory Education at the Crossroads. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. Pp 235-260.

Farkas, G. & Hall, L. (2000). Can Title 1 attain it's goals?" Brookings Papers on Educational Policy, 59-123. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute.

### **School Choice: (Charter Schools, Vouchers, home-schooling)**

Godwin, K., Kemerer, F., Martinez, V., and Ruderman, R. (1998). Liberal Equity in Education: A comparison of choice options. Social Science Quarterly, 79 (3), 502-521.

Sneider, M., Marschall, M., Teske, P., & Roch, C. (1998). School choice and culture wars in the classroom: What different parents seek from education? Social Science Quarterly, 79 (3), 489-501.

Wells, A., Grutzik, C., Carnochan, S., Slayton, J. & Vasudeva, A. (1999). Underlying policy assumptions of charter school reform: The multiple meanings of a movement. Teacher College Record, 100 (3), Pp. 513-535.

Weiss, J (1998). Policy theories of school choice. Social Science Quarterly, 79 (3), 523-531.

## **Organizational Conditions**

Lieberman A. (2001). "The professional lives of change agents: What they do and what they know", in Rust, F and H. Freidus' (eds) Guiding School Change: The role and work of change agents. New York: Teacher College Press. Pp. 155-162.

Leithwood, K (2002). "Organizational conditions to support teaching and learning" in W. Hawley (eds), The Keys to Effective Schools: Educational reforms as a continuous improvement. California, Corwin Press. Pp. 97-111.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>WEEK 6 - Tuesday November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2002</b> <b>Supporting school change at different stages and with different purposes: Part II</b></p>
---

*Theme:*

**Guest Speaker: TBA**

*Reading for this session:*

Tyack, D. & L. Cuban. (1995). Tinkering toward utopia. A century of public school reform. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press. Chapter 1& 2. Pp. 1-59.

Hopkins, D. (1998). Tensions in the prospects of school Improvement in Hargreave's, A. et al. (eds), International Handbook of Educational Change. Great Britain. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 1035-1055.

## **Teacher Development**

Cochran-Smith, M. (1998). "Teacher Development and Educational Reform" in Hargreaves, A. et al. (eds), International Handbook of Educational Change. Great Britain. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 916-951.

Smylie, M. & Perry, G. (1998). "Restructuring Schools for Improving Teaching" in Hargreaves', A. et al. (eds), International Handbook of Educational Change. Great Britain. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 976-1005.

Youngs, P. (2001). District and State Policy influences on professional development and school capacity. Educational Policy, 15 (2), 278-301.

## **Externally Developed Models**

Berends, M. (1999). Assessing the Progress of New American Schools: A Status Report. Pp. Xi-42. Santa Monica California, Rand Report.

Levin, H. (1998). "Accelerated Schools: A Decade of Evolution" in Hargreaves', A. et al. (eds), International Handbook of Educational Change. Great Britain. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 807-830.

Ross, S et al. (2000). Using whole-school restructuring designs to improve educational outcomes: The Memphis story at year 3. Teaching and Change, 7 (2), 111-126.

## Curriculum - TBA

<p><b>WEEK 7 - Tuesday November 12<sup>th</sup> , 2002</b> <b>Race, Class and Equality of Opportunity</b></p>
---

### Student Presentations

**Theme: The Persistent Significance of Race and Class in Education**

**Reading for this session:**

Cooper, R (2000). Urban School Reform from a Student of Color perspective. Urban Education, 34 (5), 597-622.

House, E. (1999). Race and Policy. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 7 (6).  
<http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v7n6.html>.

Nieto, S. (1998). "Cultural difference and educational change in a sociopolitical context" in Hargreaves', A. et al. (eds), International Handbook of Educational Change. Great Britain. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 418-439.

Reimers, F. 2000. (Ed.) "Can our knowledge change what low-income children learn?" in Unequal Schools, Unequal Chances. The challenges to equal opportunity in the Americas. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press. Pp. 431-451.

<p><b>WEEK 8 - Tuesday November 19<sup>th</sup> , 2002</b> <b>The Politics of School Change</b></p>
---

### Student Presentations

**Theme:**

Guest Speaker: TBA

**Readings for this session:**

Blase, J. (1998). "The micropolitics of educational change" in Hargreaves', A. et al. (eds), International Handbook of Educational Change. Great Britain. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 544-557.

Cibulka, J (1998). Accountability policy adoption to policy sustainability: Reforms and systemic initiatives in Colorado and Maryland. Education and Urban Society, 30 (4), 502-515.

Tyack D. and Cuban, L. (1995). "Policy cycles and institutional trends", in D. Tyack and L. Cuban, (eds). Tinkering towards utopia. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>WEEK 9 - Tuesday November 26<sup>th</sup> , 2002</b> <b>No Class</b></p>
--

**Individual Meetings**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>WEEK 10 - Tuesday December 3rd , 2002</b> <b>From Theory to Practice</b></p>
--

**FINAL PAPER DUE**

***Theme:***

Guest Speaker: TBA

***Reading for this session:***

Farrell, J. (2000). "Why is Educational Reform so Difficult?" Curriculum Inquiry, 30 (1). Pp. 83-103.

Fink, D. and L. Stoll. "1998". "Educational Change: Easier Said than Done" in Hargreaves', A. et al. (eds), International Handbook of Educational Change. Great Britain. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Pp. 297-321.

---

<sup>i</sup> Small group exercise: Create a political and institutional framework for understanding policy?

<sup>ii</sup> What is public policy and what makes it "public"? What is the purpose of public policy, who makes it , why, and how? What can policy do? How is policy analysis different from policy research?

How the context of policy making has changed over the last three decades and what those changes mean. In this session we will discuss the institutional and political context in which policy development play out. Who does policy analysis and for what purpose? What do policy analyst do? What is it that policy can do? What is "public" about public policy?

---

<sup>iii</sup> Break into small groups and select an educational policy problem that you will develop over the course of the class. Today's group activity focuses on defining the problem. What is the problem? Why does the problem exist? What are its causes? What do we know about the magnitude of the problem? Is the problem on an upward or downward trend—becoming more or less important? What are possible causes of the problem? Is it long- or short-term? Who cares about the problem? What individuals or groups are affected by the problem? Why is it a problem? What is the cost of doing nothing?

If the problem that we are considering is teacher shortage, we need to understand the problem in its various manifestations. Is it a shortage of teachers in all subject areas, in all geographic areas, at all levels? Here we discuss the importance of developing a more nuanced and disaggregated understanding of the problem. In the teachers shortage example, shortage of teachers could be attributed to a variety of causes both on the supply and the demand side. They could be low pay, poor working conditions, labor market competition. We also want to examine the short and long-term manifestation of the problem.

This session needs to discuss the need for data collection to support the analysis. What kind of data do you need in order to understand the nature and magnitude of the problem? How much data is necessary to have confidence in it? The cost of data and balancing the need for perfect, good and adequate data. We will discuss the desirability of using available data versus conducting field research and why field research is a useful tool for policy analysis. What kinds of information can one get from field research and what are the limitations of its use. How do you design a data collection strategy and collect data.