

Structural Change in Public Education

SPRING 2021 – For BIDDING ONLY

INTRODUCTION

The central task of the Seminar portion of the course is to provide a conceptual framework for achieving fundamental change and improvement in how public institutions serve their client populations. Our main focus is on fundamental change in how public school systems serve students, especially students of color, in poverty, or otherwise traditionally underserved. This framework focuses less on particular substantive policies—because different contexts (e.g., different schools, classrooms, and students) so often call for different substantive strategies—and more on two questions about the process for identifying objectives and deciding how to achieve them: (1) How do public school systems and other public organizations go about deciding what substantive policies to implement and how to implement those policies? (2) How and to what extent do such systems involve their field staff, client populations, and other stakeholders in making and carrying out substantive decisions? The first question focuses on what we call the “governance” model that public systems use in making and implementing decisions. This second question focuses on the forms of “democracy” or “politics” public systems use.

In developing this framework, we draw on perspectives from a variety of fields, including education, law, management, organizational design, policy, sociology, and political science. Likewise, we consider case studies from many public- and private-sector domains in and well beyond public education. We incorporate such a broad range of disciplines, domains, and perspectives given the complexity of—and the insufficiency of any single approach to solving—the problem of educational inequity at the level of each child, classroom, school, and the system as a whole.

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

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

In Part I of the Seminar, we consider the historical and current state of public education in the United States and elsewhere. We build this discussion around (1) different stances and responses to the racial segregation of schools in the US over the past 200 years, and (2) variations in student learning outcomes among different countries and US states and across different time periods over the past several decades. In addition to providing context, the goal of Part I is to show that crucial learning inputs and outcomes do respond to the intentional decisions that schools and school systems make—so that history, demography, and culture need not be destiny for kids—but that positive change in educational equity is difficult and requires far more than good intentions.

In addition to introducing you to the Governance and Democracy lenses that the Seminar uses to address questions of educational equity, Part I (especially in Session 5) introduces a third lens we’ll apply throughout the semester—the lens of equity itself. When we strive for equity in public education, how

do we imagine that end state at the interpersonal, organizational, and systemic/society-wide levels? Like so many others in the US, we are only beginning to understand how even to address that question, much less how to answer it and how to make a reality of that answer in our own work and in public education generally. Even more than the others, therefore, our use of this lens in class will require mutual patience, support, and courage to try out things that do not fully succeed.

Parts II and III explore the two hypotheses we note above and will raise again at the end of Part I: that different modes of governance (Part II) and different forms of democratic engagement (Part III) have a lot to do with whether school systems' intentional decisions do or do not systematically improve educational equity. We begin Part II by discussing the pros and cons of the most common form of governance of large public school systems over the past century: bureaucracy. Finding that bureaucracy has largely failed school children since at least the 1990s, we consider several important governance alternatives to bureaucracy, including "managerialism," "professionalism," "craft," and "evolutionary learning." Although the focus of Part II is on alternative forms of governance (i.e., on how organizations go about making and implementing decisions), we use a particular substantive policy (i.e., what an organization has decided to do) as an illustration of how each governance model works. This enables us, in the context of discussing governance (the "how"), to explore important policy debates about such strategies as teacher evaluation, charter schools, and mastery learning (the "what"). Part II concludes that evolutionary learning governance holds out the most promise as a pathway to educational equity but that evolutionary learning cannot succeed without substantial organizational flexibility, learning, and discipline.

Part III then considers tools evolutionary learning organizations can use to achieve the necessary flexibility, learning, and discipline. This Part focuses on four overlapping tools: qualitative review, "structured inquiry," deeply participatory and deliberative forms of "problem-solving democracy," and a commitment to apply an equity lens to all phases of activity. All four tools aim to break down hierarchy, status distinctions, and racial and cultural barriers to the free flow of knowledge between leaders at the district and school levels and teachers, and between educators and the students, families, and communities they serve. Put the other way around, all four tools aim to equalize and maximize influence over the process and its products across all of those actors. As in Part II, in Part III we use a variety of policy debates (i.e., debates over what to do in order to achieve goals in particular contexts) to help illustrate the different forms of democracy under discussion (i.e., to illustrate different answers to the question of how to decide what to do to achieve success).

Part IV of the Seminar address transition questions: (1) how organizations that *choose* to do so can transition from bureaucracy to evolutionary learning and from interest-group to problem-solving forms of democracy; (2) how, that failing, organizations can be *made* to change through litigation or other forms of public advocacy; and (3) how systems that develop effective organizational learning and democratic structures can expand or "scale" their impact.

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

Questions the Seminar raises include:

1. What is the current state of public education in the United States and the world, and what are the causes of differences in educational inputs and outcomes from one place and time to another?

2. In changing public school systems so that they achieve greater educational equity, what is the role of governance and democracy (i.e., *how* organizations go about deciding what to do to improve educational equity) and what is the role and importance of policy (i.e., *what* substantive steps are chosen and implemented)?
3. What are the comparative merits and demerits of bureaucracy and alternative governance models in achieving public education equity?
4. Do you agree that evolutionary learning is a promising alternative form of governance? What might it take for evolutionary learning to live up to its potential for enhancing educational equity?
5. What role can qualitative review, structured inquiry, and problem-solving democracy play in enabling evolutionary learning to live up to its potential?
6. How can school systems change, or be made to change, the way they govern themselves and how democratically they interact with their stakeholders?
7. How can effective school systems and nonprofit organizations expand their impact?
8. Where do you come out on a variety of educational policy debates, e.g., over teacher evaluation, charter and other independent schools, mastery learning, the role of teachers unions, etc.)?
9. What is the future of public education reform?

COURSE FACULTY AND TEACHING ASSISTANTS

Course Faculty:

Jim Liebman: jl32@columbia.edu

Elizabeth Chu: emc2170@tc.columbia.edu

Class TAs:

Kayla Butler: kch2138@columbia.edu

Yunee Ryoung: hee.ryoung.yoon@vanderbilt.edu

CLASS PREPARATION/PRE-CLASS ASSIGNMENTS

Below, you will find a Syllabus for the Course. For most class sessions you will see reference to three categories of class preparation steps:

- “Assignment” Questions 1 and 2 (**answers to be submitted before class only if your Group—A or B—is on call for that session**)
- “Discussion” Question 3 and comments/replies to others’ answers to Question 3 (**answers and comments/replies to be submitted before class only if your Group is on call for that session; everyone should read the posted answers and comments/replies before class**)
- “Readings” (**required for everyone for every session**)

To explain further: We have divided up the students in the class into 2 groups, A and B:

Group A:

Audrey Altieri

Kira Jayne Burkhauser

Group B:

Aya Bukres

Carolyn Chen

Bruna Credidio Camara
Raven DeRamus-Byers
Joshua Friedman
Yasmina Haddad
Shefain Islam
Ana Jarquin
Armando Lizarraga
Katherin Martinez Gomez
Jalil Muhammad
Reid Pickett
Alexandra Treat
Thea Van Gorp
Shiyu Wang
Margo Wolters

Yvette Dean
Robert Francis
Nadia Greggs
Stephen Henriquez
Leah Jack
Clive Lee
Nathan Levin
Andrew Mange
Lauren Monz
Renata Penalva Vieira da Silva
Nora Riesenber
Alejandra Vazquez Baur
Wicy Wang

When the Syllabus below indicates that your Group is “on call” for a session (which occurs about 40% percent of the time), you will be expected to:

- Submit BRIEF answers to Assignment Questions 1 and 2. These questions explore your understanding of the reading.
 - **Please submit your answers to Questions 1 and 2 through the Assignment tab on Courseworks/Canvas, no later than 24 hours before class.** These answers will be read only by course faculty.
- Submit a BRIEF answer one Discussion Question 3 and at least one comment or reply to someone else’s answer to the same question. The discussion question will explore your judgment or opinion on a topic we will discuss in that class session, which often will be based on the readings for that class
 - **Please post your thoughts and responses on the Discussion tab on Courseworks/Canvas, no later than 24 hours before class.** These answers and comments/replies will be read by everyone in the class.

Important notes:

- Your answers to Assignment Questions 1 and 2 and to Discussion Question 3 (including your comments on/replies to others’ answer to Discussion Question 3) should be BRIEF. We do not expect or want an essay but only enough information, clearly stated, to answer the question or offer your comment or reply. If a word or phrase or a few short bullet points are enough for that purpose, then that is all you need to and that is all you should provide. In regard to Discussion Question 3, first impressions, half-formed thoughts and reactions, and even clarifying or critical questions are fine. The goal is to start or continue a conversation, not finish it.
- You are required to answer Assignment and Discussion Questions and provide comments on/replies to others’ answers to Discussion Questions only when your group (A or B) is on call for that session. Even if you are not on call, however, you should read the Assignment and

Discussion Questions before class in order to orient yourself to the class discussion to come. Also, students not on call are free before class to submit answers to and to comment on/reply to other students' answers to Discussion Questions.

- Sometimes you will see an **Item 4** listed after the Questions 1-3. This item usually applies to both Groups A and B and alerts you that you may be called upon in class or in a small group to provide a brief summary of a reading that only some of you were assigned or a reading on which views and understandings tend to differ. Please be prepared to offer a summary of the reading orally to the whole class or in a small group.
- Also, you sometimes will be asked during class preparation to make some notes about a reading or video to organize your thinking for full-group and small-groups discussions in class. We will not require you to submit or turn in those notes, but we do ask that you make them as requested in order to facilitate class discussion.

CLASS

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

- Full class:
 - Lecture: Most lectures of longer than a few minutes will be prerecorded and included in the “Readings” you will be expected to review before class. It is during these videos that you most often will be asked to write down notes to share in class or small-group discussion.
 - Structured discussion: When it is important for all students to have a common understanding of a reading (including sometimes readings that only part of the class were assigned), we often will work through the reading using questions and answers to draw out (i) the factual story the reading is telling; (ii) the conceptual points the reading is trying to make; and (iii) your reactions to both. Students whose Group (A or B) is on call for the session and who thus have answered Assignment and Discussion Questions before class will be especially prepared to help lead the class through these structured discussions, as those questions aim to get to the heart of the reading and to provoke critical responses. During these discussions, keep in mind that students in the class come from different disciplines and vary greatly in the kinds of materials and concepts with which they are—and are not—familiar. You may find during these discussions that the reading under discussion is “old hat” for people in your professional program or, on the other hand, that the material is unfamiliar and unintuitive. We urge those in the former category not to check out of the discussion (“*I already know all this stuff!*”) and instead to engage and help those in the latter category come to grips with the material, no matter how straightforward it all may seem. And we urge those in the latter category (“*This makes no sense at all!*”) to ask the questions you need to understand what’s going on. Often, too, you will have strong reactions to a reading and may feel that the effort to understand it implies an endorsement of it. Far from it, our readings are designed to provoke critical commentary, which we urge you to offer as well.
- Experience shows that student comments that run against the grain of a reading or that are critical of ideas faculty or others are offering generate the best conversations we will have. So, fire away!**

- Open-ended discussion: Sometimes by design and sometimes not, our structured discussions will evolve into open-ended discussions. The answers and the comments/replies to answers on the Discussion Board also are designed as a prelude to open-ended conversations. And the “chat” taking place online during class—more on that below—is another source of open-ended discussion. As noted just above, members of the class always have the opportunity to provoke open-ended discussion by disagreeing with a reading, a faculty’ member’s comment or train of thought, or something else said in class. **If you want more open-ended discussion, start it!**
- Small groups:
 - Clarifying and sharing discussions: Another technique we will use to assure students have a common understanding of key readings—especially when we assign different readings to different sets of students—is to break you up into small groups to share your understanding of one or more readings or to discuss your reactions to readings. Faculty will at times listen in to small-group discussions, to keep up with the ideas that are emerging. Just ignore us.
 - St. Paul exercise: In several sessions during the semester, we will ask you to work in small groups to apply ideas from the readings and class to an ongoing hypothetical example of a school district contemplating and designing structural change in service of improved equity. During these exercises, we will ask you to stay “in role” either as leaders of the district or as consultants to it during this part of the session. Typically, small groups will be asked to generate a product—usually, an outline of a design or plan. We often, but not always, will debrief these products in the full class, but we may not have time to get to every group. We will ask each group to post its product on the Discussion Board after class for other students to review. (These products will not be graded!) At least during semesters when class is entirely online, your St. Paul small group will remain the same throughout the semester to give you a second small cohort (in addition to your project team) that you have the chance to get to know well.

Class participation. Participation in all aspects of class is strongly encouraged. Please think of it as a responsibility you owe each other and the community, one that is particularly important in an online environment in which what you say out loud is your best way to establish and maintain connections to each other and the broader community. Typically, we will proceed in full-class and small-group discussions with volunteered comments, with the goal of assuring that everyone gets to speak often. We also may call on students in full-class settings to keep the conversation moving and assure that everyone participates. Class participation is not graded. In a small number of cases, however, we will use it to raise (never lower) final grades when participation has been exemplary—meaning when someone has avidly exercised the responsibility described just above.

Chat. During online classes, we often will have the “chat” function on and the dial set so that comments you make are visible by everyone in class. We ask that you use the chat only for comments on matters relevant to the session in question. Beyond that, however, you are free to follow whatever lines of thought or tangents that your chatted conversations generate. Both faculty and the class TA will keep an eye on the chat to find opportunities to pull chatted comments and ideas into the full-class discussion. If, however, we find that the chat is keeping members of the class from paying attention to full-class or small-group discussions, or is keeping people from speaking out loud in those discussions, we will shut down the chat.

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

Video ON; audio MUTED unless you are orally sharing: In service of that same responsibility, we ask that during class, you keep your video on, so we can see you and have you as a full member and participant in our community. If you for some reason feel uncomfortable having the video on during class, please discuss the matter with a member of the faculty, the TA, or Reva Gorelick (our confidential ombuds person). You of course are free to use a "fake" Zoom background to preserve the privacy of your home or other location, and you may briefly switch off the video during class if the need arises. Please keep your audio on mute when you are not sharing with the class or your small group, to avoid background noise.

Eating: If you are comfortable eating on camera, you may do so during Seminar. The rule is different for Skills, when you are asked not eat on camera or audio.

ASSIGNMENTS

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

1. **Answers to Assignment and Discussion Questions Before Class (ANSWERS TO BE SUBMITTED 24 HOURS BEFORE THE CLASS SESSION IN QUESTION, WHEN YOUR GROUP IS ON CALL).** The first set of assignments is described above in discussing class preparation. This set of assignments consists of your answers—when your Group is on call—to Assignment Questions 1 and 2 and Discussion Question 3 (and comments/replies thereto).
2. **An Evolutionary Learning Framework in Three Stages (PART I DUE ON OCT. 1; PART II DUE ON NOV. 11; PART III DUE ON NOV. 25):** You will develop a framework that an existing K-12 organization you identify could use to determine whether it is meeting its goals for promoting student learning and development and, if not, could use to help it fill the performance gaps. This assignment is divided into three parts, each part due on a different date. Students will complete this assignment in pairs. **The assignment details and grading criteria will be discussed in Skills class and posted on Courseworks/Canvas.**
3. **A Final Team Presentation (DATES TBD):** In this 55-minute presentation, your project team will lead a discussion of an educational issue (ideally one relevant to your project work) using the Seminar content as an analytic lens. **The assignment details and grading criteria will be discussed in class toward the middle of the semester and posted on Courseworks/Canvas.**

GRADING

CPRL has a variety of arrangements with participating graduate schools as to the allocation of credits to particular courses. For some graduate schools, all of the credits are counted towards a single course; for other schools, the credits are divided among multiple courses or subject areas. Please be in touch with the registrar at your school to determine how the credits are allocated. Similarly, CPRL uses each partner school's grading system (e.g., A, B, C, or H, HP, P) and curve in awarding grades. For all students,

however, the course credits and grades are tied to one or a combination of three categories of work—the Seminar, Skills, and Project Work. We use these criteria when calculating Seminar grades:

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

Grading is described further in the Course Expectations document.

SESSION DESCRIPTION AND ASSIGNMENTS

INTRODUCTION TO THE SEMINAR

Sessions #1 (September 14, 9am-11am ET): Orientation and Expectations

GROUPS A & B

1&2. There are no Assignment Questions for this session

3. [Discussion Board]: Identify 1-6 words that describe your reasons for participating in CPRL this semester.

Readings:

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

PART I. HISTORICAL AND CURRENT STATE OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

Sessions #2 (September 17, 9am-11:30 am ET): The Current State of US Public Education – What, Who, and Why and How to Change It

GROUP A

1. [Assignment]: What is the difference between treating education as a “public good” and treating it as a “private good”?

2. [Assignment]: What is the difference between "policy" and "governance" as the focus of actions by schools systems that we might seek to modify in order to achieve better and more equitable learning outcomes for all students?.
3. [Discussion Board]: List 3-5 possible purposes of public education that a school system could strive to achieve; note the 1 purpose you think should be prioritized, and write a sentence explaining why you would prioritize that purpose.

Readings:

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

Session #3 (September 21, 9am-12:30pm ET): The History and Current Reality of Educational Inequity in the US

Introduction:

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

GROUP B

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

Readings:

1. Richard Rothstein, The Color of Law: The Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America (2017), Preface
2. Butler, Buksinski, Liebman, Mine the Gap (2020), Introduction and Part II.D pp. 2-5, 37-45 (text only, not footnotes)
3. *Nice White Parents*, a 5-part podcast about efforts over decades to bring racial integration to a single school in New York City and others like it. [Note: we will be assigning portions of this podcast throughout the semester. If you have time, it is well worth listening to the entire series]
 - a. Introducing: Nice White Parents, audio (there is no published transcript for this segment)
 - b. Episode Two: ‘I Still Believe in It,’ audio or transcript [Note: The podcast is more powerful; the transcript is quicker]

Session #4 (September 25, 9am-12:30pm ET): Difference and Diversity in our Lives and in our CPRL Cohort

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

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

Readings:

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

Session #5 (September 28, 9am-noon ET): Three Course Lenses – Governance, Democracy, Equity

1. [EVERYONE]: Before doing any of the reading or other preparation for this session, read through the “Governance Rubric” In each row, mark the cell that best captures your preferred decision-making and work style. Submit your marked up rubric through the Assignment tab on Courseworks/Canvas.
2. [GROUP A Assignment]: The reading and video identify different governance models: Which model focuses mostly on inputs to achieve success and accountability? Which model focuses mostly on outcomes to achieve success and accountability?
3. [GROUP A Assignment]: Some of the readings show that student learning outcomes vary from one nation to another, from one US state to another, and from one time period to another. Identify one condition or action generating stronger-than-average learning outcomes in some nations, states, or time periods that you think:
 - a) is very difficult to replicate or achieve in other places or time periods in order to improve weaker-than-average student learning outcomes;
 - b) can more easily be replicated or achieved in other places or time periods in order to improve weaker-than-average student learning outcomes.
4. [GROUP A Discussion Board]: Among the governance models discussed in the readings and video, which do you think would work best as a way for public schools and school systems to achieve racial equity? Write a phrase or sentence explaining why you think that.
5. EVERYONE: During the video, you will be asked to write down and come to class with one reason why you like, and one reason why you dislike, each of the four governance models described.

Readings

1. Governance Rubric (**PLEASE FILL THIS OUT AND SEND IT IN THROUGH THE ASSIGNMENTS TAB BEFORE DOING THE READINGS**)
2. Review Jal Mehta, From Bureaucracy to Profession: Remaking the Educational Sector for the Twenty-First Century, 83 Harv. Ed. Rev. 453 (2013) (excerpts) (Session 4)
3. Liebman, Cruikshank & Ma, Governance of Steel and Kryptonite Politics in Contemporary Public Education Reform, 69 Florida Law Review 365 (2017) (Governance Model Excerpts)
4. Video Introduction to Governance and Democracy
5. OECD, PISA 2018 COMBINED EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES (Links to an external site.), p. 17-18 (review from Session 2)
6. Variation in Educational Outcomes Slides (review from Session 2)
7. Excerpts from Ludger Woesmann, The Importance of School Systems: Evidence from International Differences in Student Achievement, 30 J. of Econ. Perspectives 3, 24, 27 (2016) and from Brian J. Caldwell, School Autonomy and Student Achievement: Case Studies in Australia, Educational Transformations v-vii, 73, 76-77 (June 11, 2015)
8. Review So You Want to Talk About Race (Session 4)
9. RE-Center Race & Equity in Education (2018). 5 Shifts to Co-Create Equity

PART II. ORGANIZATIONAL GOVERNANCE

Session #6 (October 2, 9am-11am ET): Bureaucracy (Illustrative Policy Context: Grade Levels and Grades vs. Mastery-Based Learning)

1. [GROUP B Assignment]: Why do bureaucracies have trouble getting field-level employees to do what the organization wants them to do? (Or, if you prefer: Why do field-level employees have trouble serving bureaucracies well?)
- 2a. [GROUP B, Last names A-K only, Assignment:] How do Chubb & Mo claim that bureaucracy hampers school leaders' ability to serve students? Who or what do they blame for that problem?
- 3a. [GROUP B, Last names A-K only, Discussion Board:] In what ways is the organization of schools into grade levels (e.g., K, 1st grade, 2nd grade, etc.) bureaucratic? What would be gained by replacing grade-levels with competency- or mastery-based learning? (Or, if you prefer, what would be lost by replacing grade-levels with competency- or mastery-based learning?)
- 2b. [GROUP B, Last names L-Z only, Assignment:] How does Sizer claim that bureaucracy hampers high school teachers' ability to serve students? Who or what does he blame for that problem?
- 3b. [GROUP B, Last names L-Z only, Discussion Board:] In what ways are grades (e.g., A-F) bureaucratic? What would be gained by replacing grades with determinations of whether students have obtained mastery? (Or, if you prefer, what would be lost by replacing grades with determinations of whether students have obtained mastery?)
6. EVERYONE: Come to class prepared to describe the thesis of Chubb & Mo, or Sizer, or Youngblood, whichever you read.

Readings:

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

- a) [Last names A-K only:] John E. Chubb & Terry M. Moe, Politics Markets and America's Schools (1990), at 3-6, 38-45, 47-51 (through the end of the first full ¶ on p.51), 56-64 (through the end of the first full ¶ on p.64)
- b) [Last names L-Z only:]
 - i) Theodore R. Sizer, Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School (2004), 205-13.
 - ii) Johnny Ray Youngblood, Draining the School Swamp, N.Y. Daily News (1992)
- 3. Grade levels/grading vs. master/competency-based learning
 - a) Chris Berdik, What's School Without Grade Levels?, Heckinger Report, July 30, 2018
 - b) Kyle Spencer, A New Kind of Classroom: No Grades, No Failing, No Hurry, N.Y. Times, Aug. 11, 2017

Session #7 (October 5, 9am-11am ET): Managerialism (Illustrative Policy Context: High-Stakes School and Teacher Evaluation)

GROUP A

1. [Assignment]: Coglianese & Lazer identify three styles of government regulation: technology-based; performance-based; and plan-based. Describe a requirement that government regulatory agencies using each of the three styles of regulation might impose in order to protect consumers from salmonella contamination of peaches sold in super markets.
2. [Assignment]: In the midst of doing a lot of bad things, the Atlanta school district achieved one good outcome. What is it, and how do you think the district achieved it?
3. [Discussion Board]: Why is it a good idea or a bad idea to identify desirable public educational outcomes (e.g., student proficiency in reading and math) and reward educators who do, and demote those who don't, achieve those outcomes?

Readings:

1. Cary Coglianese & David Lazer, Management-Based Regulation: Prescribing Private Management to Achieve Public Goals, 37 L. & Soc. Rev. 691 (2003), at 691-706 (read through the preamble to Part III only)
2. Rachel Aviv, Wrong Answer (Links to an external site.), The New Yorker, July 21, 2014
3. Eric Hanushek, Teacher Deselection, in Creating a New Teaching Profession 165-78 (D. Goldhaber & J. Hannaway eds. 2010)
4. Thomas Dee & James Wyckoff, Incentives, Selection, and Teacher Performance, NBER Working Paper No. 19529, Oct. 2013, at 1-4, 26-29

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

GROUP B

1. [Assignment]: Are K-12 teachers better described as practitioners of a craft or as professionals? Why?
2. [Assignment]: Liebman & Sabel (starting with the reference to "second interlocking development" on p.4) describe a subtle shift in NYC District 2 away from a focus on "craft" and to something else. How would you (briefly!) describe the shift and why Alvarado made it?
3. [Discussion Board]: Diane Ravitch describes master educator Ms. Ratliff. Dana Goldstein describes master educators Mike Miles and Lenore Furman among others. Tim Clifford describes his understanding of master teaching in general. What is one reason to think that charter or other

public schools led by highly autonomous master practitioners can succeed in effectively educating traditionally underserved children? What is one reason to think that we cannot rely on such schools effectively to educate traditionally underserved children?

Readings:

1. Craft/Professionalism in Education
 - a) Diane Ravitch, The Death and Life of the Great American School System (2010), at Ch. 9 through p. 178, 2d paragraph
 - b) Dana Goldstein, The Teacher Wars 231-47 (2015)
 - c) Tim Clifford, Raising the Bar on Teachers? I'll Pass, WNYC/SchoolBook, March 21, 2013
 - d) Review Jal Mehta, From Bureaucracy to Profession: Remaking the Educational Sector for the Twenty-First Century, 83 Harv. Ed. Rev. 453 (2013) (excerpts) (Session 4)
 - e) Liebman & Sabel, A Laboratory Dewey Barely Imagined: The Emerging Model of School Governance and Legal Reform, 28 NYU L. & Soc. Change 1-6 (2003)
2. Teacher-Led Charter and Other Schools (read one of the following)
 - a) David Osborne, To Improve Schools, Let Teachers Run them, Wash. Post, Jan. 15, 2015
 - b) Emily Langhorne, The Teacher-Powered School Movement, Forbes, July 11, 2018,
3. Charter Schools in General: Elaine Liu, Solving the Puzzle of Charter Schools, 1 Colum. Bus. Rev. 279 (2015) (excerpts)

Session #9 (October 16, 9am-noon ET): Evolutionary Learning (EL) (Illustrative Policy Contexts: School Reform in New York City and New Zealand)

GROUP A

1. [Assignment]: Write one clarifying question you have about what Evolutionary Learning governance is or about how it works?
2. [Assignment]: Answer one of these three questions:
 - a) In what ways is plan-based (aka management-based) regulation as described in Coglianese & Lazer an example of Evolutionary Learning governance as you currently understand it?
 - b) In what ways is the NYC education reform as described in Butler et al. an example of Evolutionary Learning governance as you currently understand it?
 - c) In what ways is the New Zealand education review system as described in Ladd an example of Evolutionary Learning governance as you currently understand it?
3. [Discussion Board]: Based on your current understanding, what is one thing that excites you about Evolutionary Learning? What is one thing that worries you about Evolutionary Learning?
4. EVERYONE: During the video, you will be asked to write down and come to class with a sentence or two answer to these questions:
 - a) Ansell claims that EL does a better job than bureaucracy and other governance models of avoiding the problem of "bounded rationality." Does it?
 - b) Ansell claims that EL has a practical solution to the problem of how to determine causation when problems arise or when solutions are tested and appear to succeed. Does it?
 - c) Ansell claims that EL avoids the need to have agreement on objectives before people can work together effectively to solve problems. Does it?
5. EVERYONE: In preparation for a small-group exercise, think of a public agency that strikes you as frequently unsuccessful in carrying out its mission. Before class jot down some notes on:
 - a. Aspects of the operation or outcomes of that agency that strike you as unsatisfactory;

- b. Steps you might take to transform the agency through the application of bureaucracy, managerialism, craft/professionalism or evolutionary learning.

Readings:

1. Evolutionary Learning in General
 - a) James Surowiecki, Better All the Time (Links to an external site.), The New Yorker, November 10, 2014
 - b) Christopher K. Ansell, Pragmatist Democracy: Evolutionary Learning as Public Philosophy (2011), at pp. 3-19, 84-101
 - c) Review Coglianese & Lazer (Session 8), pp. 3-9 (first 6 lines) on plan- (aka management-) based regulation
2. Evolutionary Learning in School Systems
 - a) Butler, Buksinski & Liebman, *supra*, at 24-26 (first 3 paragraphs of section C; text only, not footnotes)
 - b) Helen F. Ladd, Education Inspectorate System in New Zealand: A Policy Note, 5 Ed. Fin. & Pol'y 378 (2010), at 378-83
 - c) Martha Minow, School Reform Outside Laboratory Conditions: A Response, 28 N.Y.U. Rev. L. & Soc. Change 333 (2003) (excerpts)
3. Video #1: Introduction to Evolutionary Learning (view this video only after doing all of the above reading and after identifying a public agency that strikes you as frequently unsuccessful in carrying out its mission)
4. Video #2: Evolutionary Learning Responses to Three Organizational Difficulties (view this video only after: doing the above reading; viewing Video #1, and identifying a public agency that strikes you as frequently unsuccessful in carrying out its mission)

Session #10 (October 23, 9am-12:30pm ET): Classic Examples of Evolutionary Learning in Action

GROUP B

1. [Assignment]: The two excerpts from the Spear book present 4 case studies in all: Alcoa, Nuclear Navy, Pratt& Whitney, and Toyota. Pick two of those case studies and, for each of the two, identify at least one of the following:
 - a) how the organization uses decentralization to respond to the problem of “bounded rationality,” i.e., the problem that limitations on humans’ inability to see and understand everything that is going on leads organizational leaders to make non-optimal decisions;
 - b) how the organization assesses the causes of problems as they arise;
 - c) the location within the organization or within its production process where experimentation takes place;
 - d) how the organization spreads knowledge from one person or place to another.
2. [Assignment]: Rank the four case studies from the most to the least useful as a model for how leaders of a struggling urban school district might change the way the district is managed. Write a sentence explaining why you think the case study you ranked the highest is the best of the four models for this purpose.
3. [Discussion Board]: Spear presents all of his case studies as examples of systematized individual and organizational learning from the close observation of the results of everyday experience. Describe one way that you think an urban school system with large resource and outcome disparities between white children middle-class students and students of color and in poverty—or one way individual schools or educators in that school system—could use similar forms of adult and organizational learning to overcome those inequities?

4. EVERYONE: Pick one of the four Spear case studies and come to class prepared to describe that case study to your classmates.

Readings: **WARNING: THIS IS THE SEMESTER'S HEAVIEST READING ASSIGNMENT**

1. Steven J. Spear, The High Velocity Edge: How Market Leaders Leverage Operational Excellence to Beat the Competition (2010)
 - a) Excerpt 1: Pp. xx-xxi, 1-2, 14-27
 - b) Excerpt 2: Pp.1-11 (Alcoa); 13-28 (Nuclear Navy); 29-32 (Pratt & Whitney), 36-71, 83-91 (Toyota)
2. This American Life Podcast on Toyota and GM

[Note: Spear explains more fully than the podcast how actions like the jidoka framework and quality circles enabled what the podcast calls the "team concept" to work. The podcast is better at illustrating how difficult it is to change the governance model of an existing organization (as Alcoa, Pratt & Whitney, and eventually GM did) than it is to create a new organization with a preferable governance model from the start (as the Nuclear Navy and Toyota did). In Session 16, we will address this "transition" issue in more detail. As you listen to the podcast, especially Act 2, take notes for use in Session 16 on what the Nummi experience suggests about how a large bureaucratic organization might transform itself into a learning organization more effectively and rapidly than GM did.]

Session #11 (October 30, 9am-noon ET): Evolutionary Learning in Action in Three School Systems; St. Paul Exercise #1 [change St. Paul exercise number from 2 to 1 -- all of the other St. Paul exercise numbers below also have to be changed.]

GROUP A

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

Readings:

1. Introduction to St. Paul Public Schools Exercise (please read this first; note that each of the remaining readings is assigned only to members of two of our six exercise groups. The members of the exercise groups are listed at the end of this document as a reminder)
2. New York City Reforms, 2003-2013- Exercise Groups 1 and 2 only:
 - a) Maureen Kelleher, New York City's Children First: Lessons in School Reform (Jan. 2014) (excerpts)
 - b) NYC Strategy Snapshot (PPT slide)
 - c) Butler, Baksinski & Liebman, *supra*

- i) Review pp.t 24-26 (first 3 paragraphs of section C; text only, not footnotes) (from Session 9)

- ii) Additionally, take a look at the tables and graphs on pp.26-36, keeping in mind that the NYC reform ended In 2013.
- 3. Finland - Exercise Groups 3 and 4 only: Charles Sabel, AnnaLee Saxenian, Reijo Miettinen, Peer Hull Kristensen & Jarkko Hautamäki, Individualized Service Provision as the Key to the New Welfare State: Lessons from Special Education in Finland (Sitra Studies 62 Dec. 2011), at pp. 4-15, 30 ('The next national core curriculum')-53, 57-64
- 4. Long Beach, CA - Exercise Groups 5 and 6 only
 - a) Michael Fullan, Long Beach Unified School District (2016), pp.2-11
 - a) Desiree Carver-Thomas & Anne Podolsky, Long Beach Unified School District, Positive Outliers Case Study (2019), pp. 1-19
- 5. [OMIT THE VIDEO ITEM; THERE IS NO VIDEO FOR THIS SESSION]

PART III. ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING—ASSESSMENT & IMPROVEMENT; PROBLEM-SOLVING POLITICS; EQUITY LENS

Session #12 (November 6, 9am-1:00pm ET): Assessment and Improvement Tools (Illustrative Policy Contexts: Assisted Living, Child Welfare Services, Teaching Writing and Long Division)

GROUP B

- 1a. [Assignment, Last names A-K only]: The Braithwaites refer to two “paradoxes”—the paradox of reliability and the paradox of discretion.” Describe one of those paradoxes.
- 1b. [Assignment, Last names L-Z only]: Answer one of these two questions:
 - i. Noonan et al. describe the “practice model” or “problem-solving model” of child-welfare services case work on behalf of children (introduced p.538). Briefly describe that model, and identify one way in which it exemplifies Evolutionary Learning).
 - ii. Are QSRs in child welfare services mainly a form of public accountability or of professional and organizational learning? Why do you say so?
- 2. [Assignment]: Why were students at New Drop High School having trouble writing essays, and how did teachers figure out what the problem was?
- 3. [Discussion Board]: Assume that you are designing a framework for determining and improving how well schools (or, if you prefer, teachers) in your district are accelerating the learning of traditionally underserved students.
 - a) What (if any) use could such a framework make of qualitative review of schools (or teachers)?
 - b) What (if any) use could such a framework make of structured inquiry?
- 4. EVERYONE: Be prepared to describe either the Braithwaite & Braithwaite, or the Noonan et al. article to your classmates—whichever one you read.

Readings:

1. Qualitative review:
 - a) Last names A-K only: John Braithwaite and Valerie Braithwaite, The Politics of Legalism: Rules versus Standards in Nursing-Home Regulation, 4 Soc. & Leg. Stud. 307 (1995)
 - b) Last names L-Z only: Kathleen Noonan, et al., Legal Accountability in the Service-Based Welfare System: Lessons from Child Welfare Reform, 34 L. & Soc. Inq. 523 (2009) (excerpts)
 - c) Charlotte Danielson, Evaluations that Help Teachers Learn, 68 The Effective Educator 35 (Dec. 2010/Jan. 2011), at 35-39
 - d) Review Ladd, Education Inspectorate System in New Zealand (Session 9)

2. Low Inference Observation Slide
3. Structured inquiry/making meaning of what's known:
 - a) NYC Dep't of Education, Inquiry Team Handbook (July 2008)
 - b) Peg Tyre, The Writing Revolution, Atlantic Monthly, Oct. 2012
 - c) Jim Fredrickson, Are We Learning the Right Lessons From New Dorp High School?, Atlantic Blog (2012)

Session #13 (November 11, 11am-12pm ET): Interest-group (Bureaucratic) Democracy (“Normal” School Politics as an Illustrative Example)

GROUPS A and B:

- 1 & 2. [There are no Assignment Questions for this session.]
3. [Discussion Board]: Imagine you are an advocate for low-income parents of color in a school district with 100,000 students and persistent and substantial racial and economic segregation of schools as well as deep disparities in learning outcomes between Black and White students and between those who are and are not economically disadvantaged. The district interacts with families and the public in the way that Farkas & Duffett describe as normal. Although there are strong unions for teachers, principals, bus drivers, and custodians, there is no strong parent-led or student-led interest group. Based on the readings and (very opinionated) video for this session and your own experience and studies, write 1-4 sentences saying how you would propose to use, or to alter, the political process to speed up change and improve educational equity in the district.
4. EVERYONE: The video provides one faculty member’s controversial view about why (i) traditional interest-group politics, (ii) Alinsky-style community organizing, and (iii) traditional constitutional reform litigation are ineffective means of redressing educational inequity. Write down and come to class with a few sentences in which you defend one or more of those forms of advocating for greater educational equity.

Readings:

1. Review the Youngblood op-ed (Session 6)
2. Steve Farkas & Ann Duffett, Maze of Mistrust: How District Efforts and Cross Talk are Stalling Efforts to Improve Public Education (FDR Group 2014), at 6-18 (end of first column), 22 ('A Genuine Attempt at Dialogue')
3. Jeffrey Henig et al., Parent and Community Engagement in NYC and the Sustainability Challenge for Urban Education Reform, in O'Day et al., *supra*, at 33-38, 43-45 (ending with first paragraph of “The Three Groups” section), 46, 48-54
4. Dale Russakoff, Schooled (Links to an external site.), The New Yorker, May 19, 2014
5. Liebman, Cruikshank, Ma, Governance of Steel (Failed Democracy excerpts)
6. Video with (opinionated) introduction to representative, interest-group, and Alinsky-style politics and bureaucratic “public-law” litigation when all else fails

Session #14 (November 13, 9am-noon ET): Public Problem-Solving Democracy (Illustrative Policy Contexts: Habitat Conservation/Endangered Species, Community Policing, Racial Integration of Individual Schools and a School District); St. Paul Exercise #2

GROUP A

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

- a) Ansell describes the Clark County NV Habitat Conservation Plan process. What was it about that process that enabled diverse and hostile interests to agree on and commit to steps both to develop and to preserve the land in question?
 - b) Fung describes two phases of public deliberation and decision-making in the Traxton community policing context? What changed in the second phase, with what effects?
 - c) Together, the two assigned *Nice White Parents* episodes describe three instances of racial integration of schools in which the **usual political power imbalance between white families is** and families of color is radically tempered: Success Academy, the Boerum Hill School, and the District 15 Middle School enrollment plan. How do the three examples differ in terms of how the power of white families and families of color were equalized?
3. [Discussion Board]: The readings present a number of examples of “new democracy or politics” in the environmental, policing, and school contexts, although with doubts raised about their sustainability and scalability. What are one or two design principles you draw from the examples that might support a sustainable, equitable version of participatory democracy for a large urban school district?

Readings:

1. Christopher K. Ansell, Pragmatist Democracy, at 134-40, 166-83
2. Chicago Policing Politics: Archon Fung, Deliberation and Social Conflict, in Empowered Participation: Reinventing Urban Democracy (2004), at pp. 173-79
3. *Nice White Parents*:
 - a) Episode Four: “Here’s Another Fun Thing You Can Do’ (“Is it possible to limit the power of white parents”), [Audio](#) or [Transcript](#)
 - b) Episode Five: “We Know It When We See It,” [Audio](#) or [Transcript](#)
4. **DELETE VIDEO**
5. Slides introducing the St. Paul exercise for this Session

Session #15 (November 20, 9am-12:30pm ET): Evolutionary Learning and Participatory Democracy with an Equity Lens (Policy Context: Baltimore School District Reform)

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

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

1. In what ways does Evolutionary Learning help school systems and other organizations and their stakeholders address complex equity issues in education?
2. What are the challenges and potential limitations of this approach?
3. How might you build in equity considerations to enhance the Evolutionary Learning process?
4. How might you build an equity lens for yourself and help your client and others with whom you work build such a lens?
5. What personal and mental hurdles do you anticipate might affect how you engage in this equity work?
6. How will you prepare for what are often difficult conversations around race and equity?

Readings

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

PART IV: ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

Session #16 (November 25, 9am-noon) Achieving Transition from Within (Policy Contexts: School Reform in Aldine TX and New York City); St. Paul Exercise #3

GROUP B

1. [Assignment]: In answering this question, keep in mind that this Session will discuss two different kinds of strategies: One kind of strategy (the “transition strategy”) determines how the district will move its staff and stakeholders from the district’s old way of operating to a new way. The second kind of strategy (the “end-state strategy”) refers to how the district will operate differently after the transition occurs. Questions a. and c. below focus on the first kind of (transition) strategy. Question b. focuses on the second kind of (end-state) strategy.
 - a. [Last names A-G only:] Ansell describes ways organizations tend to change under normal circumstances and ways of change that occur as a result of what might be called “managed disruptions” that eventually transform the organization’s “meta-norms” and thus the organization as a whole. Identify an example from the reading of the latter type of change process. In that example, who did the disrupting?
 - b. [Last names H-MA only:] What governance style(s) best describe the way Superintendent Kujawa intended for schools and classrooms to operate on a daily basis and meet students’ needs after she completed her re-make of the district?
 - c. [Last names MO-Z only:] What governance style(s) best describe the transition strategy that Chancellor Klein used to get actors in the district to change from how they had done things in the past to how he hoped they would do things in the future?
2. [There is no Assignment Question 2]
3. [Discussion Board]: If you were putting a large urban district through a major change in governance styles and/or policy, what are two or three principles you would try to follow in order to make that transition work well?
4. EVERYONE: Be prepared in class to summarize your reading to students who read something else.

Readings:

1. [\[Last names A-G only:\] Ansell, supra, ch. 3, pp. 43-55, 61-62](#)

2. [Last names H-MA only:] Heather Zavadsky, Bringing School Reform to Scale (2009), Chapter 2
3. [Last names MO-Z only:] Eric Nadelstern, The Evolution of School Support Networks in New York City (Center on Reinventing Public Education 4-20 (2012)
4. [Everyone:] Review [This American Life Podcast \(Session 10\)](#) and your notes from it

Session #17 (December 4, 9am-10:30am ET): Mandating Transition from Outside Through Litigation when Politics Fail (Policy Context: The Right to Literacy in Detroit); St. Paul Exercise #4

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

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

Then in *Rodriguez v. San Antonio School District* in 1973, the Supreme Court refused to allow federal courts to hear lawsuits challenging school funding schemes that allocated many fewer dollars per student to schools with mainly poor, black, and brown students than to schools with mainly middle class white students. In doing so, the Court refused to declare that underserved students have a right to an education that is "equal" to that received by other children or that is "adequate" according to some legal standard. Explaining that conclusion, Justice Powell wrote that

the judiciary is well advised to refrain from imposing on the States inflexible constitutional restraints the could circumscribe or handicap the continued research and experimentation so vital to finding even partial solutions to educational problems and to keeping abreast of ever-changing conditions.

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

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

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

The *Gary B* case then was heard by a three-judge panel of an appellate court: the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit Court. One of the readings for this session is the April 2020 opinion of that

panel of judges, two of whom found that the plaintiff school children had demonstrated a violation of the US Constitution. A third of the three judges wrote a dissenting opinion, arguing that, as bad as conditions in the Detroit schools were, they did not provide the basis for finding a federal constitutional violation of the students' rights.

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

GROUPS A and B:

1-3 THERE ARE NO ASSIGNMENTS OR DISCUSSION BOARD FOR THIS SESSION.

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

Readings:

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

Session #18 (December 9, 9am-11am ET): Scaling Success (Policy Context: The Role of NGOs from an International Perspective)

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

Purpose: Students will learn about the main issues in the scaling-up of education NGOs, including mechanisms of scaling-up and organizational challenges.

Topics:

- Three scaling-up mechanisms: dissemination, affiliation and branching

- Key elements in the design of a scaling-up strategy: replicability, resources, returns, risks and receptivity
- The myths of scaling-up quality education programs
- Adding value to networks by enabling organizational learning and innovation.
- Teaching case: “Paths to Scale in Education Organizations. The Case of *Escuela Nueva* in Colombia.”

Main ideas discussed in this session:

1. Scaling-up: First we will define the term “scaling-up” and explore various meanings in the field (direct and indirect scaling-up, political-scaling up, replication etc.) (Schnell, 2010). We will also discuss three main scaling-up mechanisms, including dissemination, branching and affiliation (Dees, et. al 2004). We will also discuss the links between scaling-up mechanisms and organizational designs. Students are asked to identify and familiarize themselves with one example of an education organization that has scaled-up (in the US and/or internationally). Through the examples students will see the diversity of scaling-up forms existing in the field. Then we will briefly discuss some of the myths of scaling-up quality education programs and the dangers of reproducing education innovations and programs elsewhere, where local education practitioners are treated as delivery agents (Burns, 2018).
2. The management of scaling-up: Scaling-up is a dynamic and creative process, and organizations need to experiment, learn and refine their approaches continuously. We will learn about the Five Rs, as a framework education managers can use to test and refine their approaches to scale: readiness (is the innovation ready to be scaled?), resources (resources required to scale vary depending on the scaling path chosen), receptivity (the readiness of other communities –or key institutions—to embrace a particular education program/organization/innovation), risks, (how likely is it that an innovation will be implemented incorrectly?), returns (does the scaling-up path chosen offer greater possibilities for improving efficiency and effectiveness beyond the numbers reached?).
3. Case: Then, we will discuss a teaching case about Escuela Nueva, one of the few education NGOs in Latin America that scaled-up its program to various Latin American countries, and a few countries in Asia and Africa (Mair and Hehenberger, 2010). Through this case study, students will examine how scaling-up happens (is it organic or planned?) and some of the challenges an NGO such as Escuela Nueva had to solve as it scaled-up to other countries. Some of these issues and challenges include: property rights of Escuela Nueva, the role of donors in scaling-up, deciding on the right mechanisms to scale-up (i.e. dissemination, branching etc.), concerns about the quality of the innovation/program being scaled, how the nature of “customers” change for scaled-up organizations. Because scaled-up organizations transition from serving direct beneficiaries to serving other organizations, we will also discuss how scaled organizations add value to their affiliates by enabling organizational learning and innovation. “International Expansion of Escuela Nueva: A Transformative Pedagogy on a Global Scale” is a teaching case: Students will work with other students to suggest what decisions they would take to improve the scaling-up approach of the organization.

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

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

General:

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

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

Interventions ("What"):

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

Mechanisms ("How"):

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

Scaling-up and organizational structure:

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

Designing a scaling-up strategy:

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

Escuela Nueva Case:

1. Come ready to discuss Escuela Nueva's mission, programs, partners, business model, impact and organizational trajectory.
2. How did Escuela Nueva scale-up nationally in Colombia?
3. How did Escuela Nueva scale-up to other Latin American countries?
4. What are some of the strengths and weaknesses of Escuela Nueva's scaling-up experience.
5. If you were a member of Vicky Colbert's strategy team, what recommendations would you make to Vicky Colbert regarding Escuela Nueva's scaling-up strategy? You may apply any of the readings to make your recommendations (i.e. Dees et. al, 2004; Schnell and Brinkerhoff, 2010; Burns, 2018).
6. Would you recommend that Escuela Nueva continue to scale-up? Why? (or why not?)
7. What recommendations would you make to improve Escuela Nueva's scaling-up strategy?
8. What regions and countries should Escuela Nueva prioritize? Why?
9. What mechanisms should Escuela Nueva follow to scale up its model? (you may apply Dees. et al, 2004, or suggest alternative mechanisms that are not included in Dees et. al's article)
10. If you think Escuela Nueva should continue to scale-up, how could the organization makes sure its model is working for all affiliates or partners?
11. What recommendations would you make so that Escuela Nueva maximizes opportunities for organizational learning at a network level?

12. Escuela Nueva was successful partly because its education program was innovative in Colombia. As an organization with programs in multiple countries, what should Escuela Nueva do to continue being innovative?

Readings:

1. Dees, G., Anderson, B. and Wei-Skillern J. (2004). Scaling Up Social Impact. Strategies for Spreading Social Innovations. Stanford Social Innovation Review: Spring 2004: 24-32
2. Mair, J., Hehenberger L. and Moral, N. (2010). "International Expansion of Escuela Nueva: A Transformative Pedagogy on a Global Scale". Center for Business and Society. IESE Business School.
3. Schnell, S. and Brinkerhoff, J. (2010). "Replicability and Scaling Up". In Anheier, H., Toepler, S. and List, R. (Eds) (2010). International Encyclopedia of Civil Society (Pp. 1312-1317). New York: Springer
4. Burns, M. (2018). The Myths of Scaling Up. How Misconceptions about Scaling Up can Hurt High-Quality Implementation (Links to an external site.). Global Partnership for Education (2018). (p. 1-2)

PART V: TEAM PRESENTATIONS

(December 2: 11:30-12:30; December 4: 11-1; December 7: 9-12; December 9: 11:30-12:30): Team Presentations

PART VI: SUMMING UP; LOOKING FORWARD

Session #19 (December 11, 9am-noon ET): Summing Up; Looking Forward