Jody Cohen with Maria Mulero (Research for Action)

Walking the Talk: Teacher Work on the Road to Reform

DRAFT--VISION STATEMENT

We as Re-Learning Faculty will support each other as critical friends, facilitate the process of educational change involving the total school community, and develop a student-centered learning environment in order to foster life-long learners in accordance with the Coalition of Essential Schools Common Principles.

- Philadelphia workshops participants, summer 1994

In July 1994, twenty-eight Philadelphia high school teachers met five days a week in the basement of an urban comprehensive high school. They were engaged in an intensive professional development workshop, a "lab" where they taught mornings and used afternoons to reflect on practice. Co-sponsored by the in-house Philadelphia Schools Collaborative and the national Coalition of Essential Schools (CES), the workshop drew on seven facilitators--three Coalition National Faculty present for the duration and two whose arrivals marked particular emphases in the work, and two locally-based teachers staffing the Teaching and Learning Network. Two ethnographers were invited to document what was happening.

The teacher-participants, soon to be named Philadelphia Re-Learning Faculty, came from a broad range of the comprehensive high schools in a district in the midst of a major restructuring effort as well as a changeover of top management. Twelve of these teachers, referred to as Cohort I, were returning for a second summer of CES work, while the 16 teachers of Cohort II were entering their first round. Several from each cohort taught during the school year in schools or charters (schools within schools) that were exploring Coalition approaches. Some of the teachers had participated extensively in professional development through such networks as the Writing Project, while for others this represented an early effort. Across cohorts these teachers were diverse in a number of ways: most were African-American or Caucasian; about two-thirds were female; they taught across disciplines; and while many were experienced teachers, some were relatively new to the system.

Other players critical to this "lab school" genre of professional development were the 140 summer school students--heterogeneous by race, gender, and school achievement--who were organized into 7 classes of 20.

Participating teachers recognized these students as "like our kids," though the terms of the summer program would distinguish their experience.

Although this summer work emerged from the CES development sessions at Brown University, it also represented a different effort in that it was regionally based, allowed for greater diversity of participants' prior experience with the Coalition, demanded less than 24 hour-a-day rigor, and supported a local reform effort. The Re-Learning Professional Development workshop was constructed to promote both individual change for teachers and collective change for the system. This two-tiered agenda provides a framework for looking at the work.

Within their cohorts, teacher-participants divided into teaching teams of two which then paired to create observation and debriefing groups of "critical friends." During the morning one team taught while their counterparts observed, then they switched roles. With a facilitator the foursome debriefed, reflecting on what was happening in their respective classrooms. Pairs planned for the next day's teaching. Afternoons began with full group working lunches, which included talk about participants' "hot issues" as well as team-building and vision-sharing activities. Then the cohorts worked separately or together on such CES processes/forms as peer coaching, Socratic Seminar, and alternative assessment.

As ethnographers we spent time with teachers in each of these modes, and asked questions of teachers both informally throughout and more formally in interviews and focus groups weighted toward the end. Data for this paper came from fieldnotes, transcripts, and program documents. A data feedback session with facilitators in the third week helped to define our methods and questions for the final week. We saw our role as formative, involving documentation and analysis to feed a reflexive process during the month and then over the year.

In this paper we look at four weeks of the longer process of "becoming" in which these professionals are engaged. We look both at what unfolded as part of the explicit curriculum and at what several facilitators at the outset referred to as "hidden," or "undiscussable" layers of learning. While our analysis of data indicates themes characterizing professional development *over* the month, particular issues seemed to dominate early on while others emerged strongly in the middle and then the final weeks of the work. This paper is organized both to highlight themes or issues of professional development as part of school reform and to convey the rise and fall of particular concerns over time; the intent is to mirror something of the development process itself.

In the early days of the workshop, issues of **authority** arose frequently and often uncomfortably, taking somewhat different forms in the two cohorts. Issues of **relationship** among teachers and students emerged as critical during the middle weeks--the chronological heart of the workshop--and helped to shape the concerns about **reform** that marked the agenda of the final week of the workshop. Of course, these themes do not appear once and then disappear but rather are woven throughout, becoming more or less visible at various points and perhaps holding implications for the rhythm of professional development and school reform.

Authority

Issues of authority arose frequently and took a range of forms in the early days of the workshop. Most evident initially was the question of who was going to exercise authority here. This question percolated around decision-making and communication: Who would formulate groundrules for participating students? for participating teachers? How would decisions be communicated, when would they be negotiable, and by whom? Over time questions about the relationship of authority to knowledge came to the fore, making authority a richly problematic category.

Laying out the issues

The structure of a "lab school" where daily practice provided a crucible for reflection and change offered a playing field for exploring authority. This became evident at the lunch session of the first full day:

From fieldnotes of July 5, 1994::

Four facilitators sit before the group and enact a planning process:

"The teachers need rules."

"Some of these teachers are wearing shorts. They have to realize they're role models!"

"I heard some teachers socializing at the beginning of the day."

"I think they need to sign in and out when they go to the bathroom."

Facilitators continue with rules for teachers-"no phone calls," "limited access to the copier"-until they break frame and call for responses.

Cohort II teachers begin: "The basis for school is not giving authority and responsibility to the student--that's what we're here for." "We don't believe (your performance), it's tongue in cheek, it's antithetical to what we're supposed to be doing. Cut to the chase."

A facilitator : "You cut to the chase."

A Cohort I teacher: "Cut to the chase means ,what is the structure we want to see for summer school--what rules do *__we__* *want and it's up to us to put them on the table."*

A Cohort II teacher, slowly: "I liked some of the rules. We need a balance between administrative authority and the freedom of teachers so that there's some kind of order."

A teacher in a radically reforming school notes, "We had no school-wide rules this year. Each charter has its own set of rules . . . we went crazy." When a teacher admits, "I wanted to walk out at the opening, but what you did was not different from what I hear my colleagues doing with kids," a facilitator responds, "We wondered whether you saw the connection with Friday (when teachers made rules for students)."

This introductory exercise confronted the group viscerally as well as intellectually with the construction of authority in schools--at the parallel levels of district to administrators, administrators to teachers, and teachers to students. Teachers' ambivalent reactions highlight the tension between conventional schooling and current efforts to reframe teaching and learning. On the heels of this enactment a summer building administrator confronted teachers with the "real" problem that their students' breaktime dispersal had cause disturbances throughout the building. Teachers' suggestions ranged from policing students in classrooms to developing common spaces, and revolved around different understandings of authority in school. A facilitator named as a critical issue teachers' expectations of students. At the nexus of expectation, coercion, and collaboration sat the question of how authority was to be constituted in school.

This opening scene also raises questions about the facilitators' decision to kick up issues of authority in this way. How would these facilitators as teachers reproduce and challenge traditional ways of exercising authority in schools? What happened when teachers/facilitators brought their own strong beliefs to bear on what and how they taught?

The issue of who was in charge here continued to weave through teacher-participants' experiences of the program. For Cohort II teachers this tended to take the form of confusion over what they were supposed to be doing and learning, peppered with moments of resistance as when a teacher yelled at facilitators about their control of group time. For Cohort I teachers it more often took the form of critique--of how time was structured and who made decisions. Several teachers commented:
"We had no idea what we were supposed to do. Half the time we spent planning what we were supposed to do rather than what we should do with the students. . . One time we were told, the student-centered--which means

all the rules in the class, the curriculum has to be negotiated. And then the other point, that's not so, you have to have some kind of structure before you start anything." (Cohort II)
"Somebody has to make a decision--this baby needs to be born. We've wasted my time." (Cohort I)

Issues of authority and hierarchy became salient in the first week, as teachers working on their outcomes with a facilitator worried that "these aren't our ideas anymore," and Cohort I struggled with "what will we become" and who would decide. As teachers sought to reconceive hierarchical notions of authority, their relationships not only with students but also with "authorities" such as the District, the Collaborative, and the Coalition came up for reexamination.

"Bait and switch": Metaphors and authority

Early on Cohort I's exploration of outcomes envisioned for their work erupted into a collective questioning of facilitators about "what they were to become" after this second summer of CES work. The conversation made explicit concerns over who held authority here and how authority was constructed in their schools and the district. Specific concerns included what relation these teachers as locally trained faculty bore to Brown-trained National Faculty, how the configuration of their second summer had been decided and why they had not been included in decision-making, and what kinds of responses and supports they could expect as CES "change agents" in the Philadelphia school system. Teachers opened up knotty and often unanswerable questions about the sources and consequences of authority in accomplishing such "bottom-up" work.

My fieldnotes of July 8 are dotted with metaphors teachers used in their efforts to describe and penetrate the authority that many felt others were exercising over them:
"I began by buying into what the teachers here said and what I read but now I'm not so sure. . . I feel hoodwinked."
"We were set up one way and they someone pulled the old bait and switch in midstream--what was done to us, and why?"
"I didn't know we had to carry our sword and shield (to the Collaborative and the District).
"I thought we were 'Coalition Fellows' with decision-making input in our schools. Someone (from last year) was raising the issues but found herself bucking the system alone. We expected others from the outside to help with roadblocks in the school. . . Is CES a toothless tiger?"

"It's scary to go up the highway of Rome and see the crucified change agents. How many crosses does one want to see?"
"Change is slow, teacher by teacher, classroom by classroom. There are no paradigm shifts, it's a slide, an oozing over."

Although we searched our data from the last weeks of the workshop, we never again found this plethora of metaphors. Why were teachers driven early in the month to describe their struggles in metaphoric language? The many and rich metaphors of the first weeks perhaps signalled the complex affect with which teachers invested heavily in a context that offered no assurance of returns.

The issue of who the teachers of Cohorts I and II "were to become" in relation to each other and to reform efforts in the district played out in various ways over the month. When facilitators proposed ways for Cohort I teachers to take on authority in the context of the workshop, these teachers constructed their own authority in the situation, offering a range of responses from heads-on-desks to repeated requests for clarification and the more explicit "This is too fast!" and "No one consulted us!" At the same time, the two locally-based facilitators, last year members of Cohort I, sought to establish relationships across the cohorts as a basis for decentering and expanding the bases of knowledge and authority.

As the workshop progressed, teachers began to describe and sometimes enact authority less in terms of power held by a person or group *over* others and more in terms of the exercise of interest, energy, and connection. In a session that wandered, a teacher whispered, "*The facilitators don't seem to have definite plans this year--it's unnerving. Is this their way of getting us to take more ownership?*" After a group of Cohort I teachers invited Cohort II teachers to co-facilitate vision-sharing, lunch became a time for informal small group talk. A Cohort I teacher described his lunch table, ending with pleasure: "Cohort I *expects* us to teach them!" A teacher who had sat back suddenly came forward with process recommendations to guide the afternoon: "What would we get (from the conversation)?" "Do you agree because it gets you off the hook?"

From field notes of July 18: When in the third week a facilitator arrived to work on assessment, the group brainstormed questions. Teachers raised the difficulties of alternative assessment with students who were in and out of school, concerns about assessing creativity, and the question of who should assess charters. When a facilitator suggested groups "to hash out what we know and what we need to know and work on," a teacher argued that he wanted to hear from the newcomer "because

you're the expert in assessment." A teacher said under her breath, "Right, don't ask us to do the work, just present." Disagreeing with the term "expert," a local facilitator noted that "in this circle many have thought deeply about alternative or diverse assessments"; the "expert" concurred.

In this scene the relationship between authority and knowledge and the sources of knowledge are made problematic. Questions about where knowledge comes from and who can access it hold obvious implications for teachers with students. There are also contradictory definitions of learning afloat, as listening to the "expert" is characterized in an aside as a way of *not* working and so not learning. Woven through the month were teachers' references to hierarchies within their ranks: *"There is such a range of ability in the group." "People don't seem to understand what consensus is about." "There were things that were privy to other folks, things that people were doing, that I had absolutely no idea about."* Participants who were learning to loosen "ability" and "understanding" as fixed qualities for their students had to struggle with analogous assumptions about colleagues.

The authority of learners

Teachers talked about students taking on authority in the classroom as an indicator of a positive climate for learning. Examples ranged from students asking when they would be paid to taking responsibility for choosing group projects and deciding on class activities. A Cohort I team told of students negotiating interpersonal issues using classroom values: *When two young women who had had conflicts with each other wanted to play the roles of two characters in conflict, the teachers advised against it; students argued that they could make it work, and the role play came off beautifully.* On the other hand, a Cohort II teacher worried that "maybe you are imposing something on students" who question this approach; his concern acknowledges the contradictions of granting authority.

In the workshop-as-classroom, gendered authority seemed at times to contradict other lines of authority such as knowledge of the Principles and the structural authority of facilitators. Although women outnumbered men and so as a group talked more frequently, men tended to talk at greater length. Males' dismissals of females through such joking asides as "Now she's gonna cry" and "I can't follow that!" (in response to a labor and delivery metaphor) tended to relocate authority in the men. When a male teacher yelled at a female facilitator, she said in an aside, "that's how men dominate--they impose." Finally, references to students in the classroom as "bad girls" and "little girls" and an admonishment to "be a lady" seem to

betray unequal expectations about the authority of young men and young women in the classroom.

Relationship

Relationship issues are both embedded in issues of authority and move beyond these. When the usual authority relations are disrupted and the status quo pattern of compliance and resistance no longer maintained, relationships tend to become both rich and problematic in new ways.

Schools have been structured to maximize numbers of children and minimize numbers of adults in a given setting. This has had implications for relationships: First, adults have had little colleagial contact in a schoolday, and even this has tended to be hierarchically structured, e.g. teachers' contacts with department heads and administrators. Secondly, structure, numbers, and assumptions about learning have hindered not only teachers' relationships with students but also students' with each other. Further, relationships have been seen as a distraction from academic learning. The structure and content of the Re-Learning workshop challenged and changed relationships among teachers and students and the intersection of relationships and academics. Here we will look at the promise as well as the tensions arising from changing relationships.

A dominant theme of the middle weeks was participants' hopes and worries arising from new kinds of relationships with colleagues and students. For many the opportunity to try out new colleagial relationships was especially stimulating as well as problematic. Also important were teachers' relationships with students and their reflections on students' relationships with each other.

Relationships among participating teachers

The organization of the workshop reflected critical tenets about the profession of teaching: Teachers were paired to plan and teach together; teaching teams were paired as "critical friends" who would observe each other's classes, respond to the teaching team's questions, and raise questions for shared reflection. The intimate classroom experience usually privatized between an adult and a group of youngsters was shared, and provided material for reflection among adults. Teachers also worked together in and across cohorts on a range of activities. Talk about morning practice was embedded in afternoon work.

Team building, sometimes cross-cohort, was an explicit element of afternoon activities. Strategies included structured talk, non-verbal exercises to promote communication and collaboration, and participant-directed work toward a collective vision. Relationship issues that arose in these sessions were often processed as part of the work. After a non-verbal exercise a "team" talked about what happened, including how their relationships did and did not facilitate collective learning:
"It was fun but frustrating. Why didn't we buy into people who seemed to have an idea?"
"I didn't understand the math so I would've jumped on a bandwagon. I got angry when people left the group."
"I didn't want to be part of that struggle, so why stay?"
"I felt like a total sheep!"
"It's not dumb to follow if someone else knows the way. . ."
Team-building with groups of teachers is a clear priority in Philadelphia restructuring, where teachers are struggling to work together in cross-disciplinary charter schools. Such exercises with relatively random groups of teachers provided a "pedagogy of relationship" that teachers might draw on in the fall with other teachers and students in their charters.

Team-teaching and cross-visitation demanded a plunge into colleagial relationships of even greater risk and intimacy. Pairs of teachers devised learning outcomes for their students and planned together daily. For many this teaming relationship seemed to provide an anchor from the start and remained a critical if sometimes problematic feature of the work. As one teacher expressed it, *"It was very positive to work with other teachers. They have very different things in mind."*

While early on teachers talked about the pleasure of working closely with another teacher, by the third week many began to articulate tensions that arose as part of this learning experience:
"I've certainly been exposed now to working with a team of teachers as critical friends. That is something new and in that context I've been learning how to question better, and the last couple of days we've been focussing on team-building and managing conflicts within teams, and I think that is extremely helpful." Another teacher reflected on this new colleagial footing: *"I've never worked with another teacher before, and the benefits were to fill in the gaps for each other and reinforce what the other was saying. . . you could reflect off of each other and get feedback and grow. . . We had moments when it wasn't perfect, we're both very strong women and we're both used to teaching in our own classes, and you had to sort of listen differently and plan differently."* Learning to "question

better" and "listen differently" may well be among the consequences of inventing relationships in the absence of predictable authority structures.

After a particularly difficult session, a teacher grappled with how to address tensions that she saw as inevitable: *"It's something that's constantly negotiated. . .it's like a marriage. . . Communication is extremely important. Speaking to each other about the differences you have. If this work is to continue I think people need to be trained in not just conflict resolution for students but working with each other and how to speak about things that are uncomfortable between the two of you. . . You know how to say nice things but you don't know how to say things that aren't so nice without hurting."*

In some instances "critical friend" relationships were problematic from the start. A number of teachers articulated their issues with colleagues in terms of differing levels of commitment or expertise/authority: One teacher took issue with being paired by the facilitators, and described a relationship that began at odds:
"So now I was partnered with someone very different from myself who had no interest in what I wanted to do, never even asked me what I wanted to do, and I knew that I could do it but it wasn't an area where I thought I needed the work. . . So there were some real problems going on."

Several described phases or changes over time in these relationships: In an early interview, a teacher said, *"I don't know that I trust this critical friend business. . . I mean I don't know that I trust it with the specific people we're doing it with because I don't think the open commitment for them is there."* Later she reflected, *"Now I'm very comfortable with them as critical friends, because the questions stretch my thinking and stretch me so that it's not just a matter of this was good and that was bad or my blackboards look good. . ."* Unlike in traditional schools where teachers often teach side by side for years without knowing what's going on next door, these teachers moved rapidly through exposure and into exchange.

Being and seeing onself as a "strong teacher," a professional touchstone, could itself become problematic in a situation where learning with and from colleagues was critical to performance. Teachers explored how their assumptions of authority could hinder reflective relationships:
"He wanted to shut down because I was too overbearing and pedantic and that was something I needed to learn, needed to hear."
"We went through the first two stages (of teaming)--the first is testing the water, the second is struggling--and we're hoping we're in the third stage, getting it together. . . The kids know I interrupt (my partner), and (the

partner) pointed that out to me. So that made me more aware of what I had in my mind, of the right way and wrong way to do something."

For some, reflection on teaming entailed recognizing self in other: *"We have a lot of differences in philosophy. . . I think (my partner's) approach is a real choice for myself that I negotiate all the time, and so negotiating with him is like talking to myself in some ways. You know, because he asks questions like, 'This can't work.' And I say, 'You know it doesn't look like it's working now, but you know we're going for the long run'. . . And I don't always believe it either."* This kind of questioning--of colleagues, students, and self--was named by facilitators and participants as a skill critical to accomplishing change.

Interestingly, the "critical friend" relationships that teachers most often described as problematic in terms of commitment and pedagogy were also relationships in which the members were dealing with differences of race and/or gender. Race was named often in our interviews with teachers, usually as a self-descriptor ("I am White/Jewish/African-American") and sometimes in relation to how one felt perceived by someone or some group that was "other." This "I am" approach might be understood as way of acknowledging and even welcoming difference in relationships; on the other hand, it might signal a desire to stave off the necessity to deal more deeply with difference as it shapes teaching and learning.

<u>Relationships between teachers & students, students & students</u>

Given the opportunity to work with and question each other, teachers learned from colleagues' relationships with students. This was strikingly evident in a team of Cohort I teachers' response to a classroom crisis:

From fieldnotes of July25: A group of kids has been dealing with the fallout from an invasion of privacy, as one girl read another's journal entry and passed along hurtful gossip. Cohort I helped the teachers strategize, and the four teachers of these kids co-facilitated a session with the students and, as it turned out, one young woman's grandmother. Teachers described the kinds of cues they took from each other:
"(One of the teachers) brought up that you could use this technique in family situations to diffuse problems. I looked at (my teammate) and I said, 'Everybody's gonna talk in this one.'"
"I don't think I would've risked doing that (session) alone. I thought it was great, I think this was a much more positive way to express what you feel rather than getting angry at the 'bad girls' and flying off the handle."

As two of these teachers talked about how "instructional time" was pitted against learning from and about relationships, they considered relationship *as* instruction. One described how she would have approached such a conflict in school:
". . . *(W)hat right do these two students have to stop everybody else from learning? I never would have thought of instructional time. I would have taken them outside and given them classwork, or try to talk to the student one on one. . . See them at lunch or during your free period. Or pull them out of a class, but I would never handle it in class.*" The second responded,"*I can understand how you feel, but in the end one hour from instruction, it's going to make those kids know that a student's journal is private property. And they could probably learn far more valuable lessons than all the science that I would ever teach them. It's a lifelong lesson.*"

At issue here are essential questions about what is worth teaching and learning, in terms of both what adults model and how student experiences shape curriculum. If relationships among teachers are changing, what are the implications for how relationships between teachers and students and among students might also change? Asked what she felt excited about, a facilitator described a Cohort II debriefing:
"*As part of observations, I had asked things like, 'What do you think the role is of groundrules in group work?' So today at one of the debriefings one of the teachers said, 'I never realized how much difference it makes in the ability to do group work more effectively if you have groundrules.' And she said, 'We did those. We took an hour out because the kids were so disrespectful I couldn't take it anymore. So I don't care, we're gonna take an hour and talk about what the way is to show respect to human beings.'*"

Another Cohort II teacher described the changes she saw in her students' relationships with each other as workers:
"*Okay, so they did work together in groups. . . And at times it was social, but as we got toward the end it became more of who needed what done and they would help them do that. I saw an awful lot of love. There was one girl who was pregnant who didn't feel like moving around too much, and there was a guy in her group who came over and helped her do what she needed to do to work in the group.*" Interestingly, this teacher and others continued to feel that "academics fell off," attesting to the tenacious hold of the distinction between affective/relational domains and the "academic."

Several teachers talked about differences of gender and/or race as influencing relationships between teachers and students. A teacher talked about desired outcomes with a female student: ". . . '*(I hope) I'm not*

seeing any eyes, you better be the lady that I know you know how to be,' and she was like, 'Yeah.'" Another focused on classroom management: ". . . *(A)s a man you can do certain things that women can't get away with as easily, I think--being really rigid about stuff. . . I might be fantasizing about this, but I think Black women can get away a lot easier than I can. Because most of my students were Black. And when they said 'jump' it was like their mothers. When I say 'jump' it's like somebody you don't want to listen to."* While simply naming such issues represents a critical step in a district where race in particular has seldom been openly discussed, assumptions about how differences of race, culture, and gender shape relationships need to be addressed explicitly, reflectively, and over time to engage difference at the heart of reform.

At various points during the four weeks, participants noted that "this is not reality" and "paper holds anything." While most teachers agreed that the students were "pretty much like the kids at my school," a Cohort I teacher explained that the summer workshop setting enabled different kinds of relationships with kids: "*We're really enjoying our kids now. You're gonna take these kids and bring them back to the same school in the fall, and they're not gonna be the same kids. Because the system, the school, it does something to those kids as soon as they walk through that door.*"

Over the month, facilitators sought to invite teachers to shape their own learning, as teachers sought to learn with and from each other and their students in ways seldom expected or supported in schools. Older models of relationship--often hierarchical--coexisted with these newer models, creating moments of contradiction: While "every teacher can grow, and every teacher can learn, and every teacher can become more aware," participants continued to perceive leadership roles in terms of the scarcity model that there's never enough to go around; the perception that "things were privy to other folks, things that people were doing that I had absolutely no idea about" implied that facilitators like administrators were positioned to grant favors to the privileged few. Meanwhile, teachers hunted new models. A Cohort II teacher explained,
"*In the traditional high schools, it's the administrator who comes around to observe teachers. . . Wouldn't it be great if the school could use critical friends to observe teachers instead of the administrator who comes in to check off what he needs to check off. . .It's the critical friend who's in the classroom with you that's an ongoing teacher. A lot of administrators haven't been in a classroom in years. What can they tell me? I need my colleagues to tell me. . . I'm going to try to see if I can get it introduced.*"

Teachers and students in the summer workshop began to explore kinds of relationships critical to creating new structures and engendering a richer, subtler, and more fluid understanding of knowledge in schools. But as teachers suggest, the interplay of changing relationships and changing structures is dialectical: While changing relationships enable school reform, changes in the structure of schooling are critical to enable and nurture new kinds of relationships. As a teacher stated, "I don't have a critical friend in my school. When I go back, how do I not just shut the door?"

Reform

"*The underlying philosophy (of CES) is that all children can learn, and children should be empowered so that the learning becomes their own. . .and unless you believe the whole package together, unless you believe that there are other ways of looking at assessments and those kinds of things, then you get back to that picking and choosing, and it becomes like every other innovation that comes into education, which is down the tubes after a year or two.*" (facilitator)

"*Some of the things here seem deceptively simple, less is more, or student as worker. But there are different layers that you have to start unraveling and I feel this is not these four weeks and not even at the end of four weeks next year. It won't be the end but it'll be like an onion, and if you think of an onion and all those peels of skin, a rose, the petals, all the different petals to get to the core.*" (teacher)

While participants talked about their work in terms of reform throughout the month, explicit collective work on how the summer's efforts might inform and infuse the ongoing reform movement became the focus during the final week. The notion articulated in the facilitator's "whole package" and the teacher's onion and rose metaphors--that is, the relationship of the whole to the parts of change or reform--offers a way of looking at the processes of individual and systemic change at work here.

Teachers described their own efforts--sometimes painful struggles--to make meaningful changes in their own classrooms:
"*I think I'm learning more how to question students. To have them think more deeply. I'm learning some new strategies to help me get my students and also myself to think more deeply.*"
"*Sometimes it's very hard to nail down the content. . .I still think this was a new kind of method, and I learned that it can be a beautiful learning experience for everybody but this process, the transition is just a lot of pain, a lot of questions.*"

A number of teachers mentioned particular approaches or "parts" that they would take back into their classrooms:
"I know that I am going to work with students in the beginning of the course to establish tone and decency that they have input into, that we work on together. And I'm going to do Socratic Seminars. I'm going to train them in that process and do that all year."
While a facilitator expressed a concern about "teachers being able to talk the talk but not being able to walk the walk," a concern shared by some teacher-participants, it is also evident that teachers were engaged in a process of change in which the month was a metaphorical moment. A facilitator reflected, *"I think a lot of people in Cohort I went through that same process (of saying, 'I got it'), and then they went into their classrooms and started messing with it, and then they came back this year with some real specific questions and some gaps that they disco9vered on their own that they want filled in. And I think they've really been able to hone in and crystallize and now they really have it."*

Facilitators and teachers agreed that the summer work had to be incorporated not only into individuals' work in classrooms but also into and across charters and schools--that is, systemically. A facilitator argued for *"the need to provide (teachers) with the necessary support structures, which to me means that administrators have got to get training on reform so they understand why some of these things are important. It may change within a classrooms or within three classrooms, but unless you give them support where the decision is about money and the decision is about resources, then teachers won't continue with it and that's what bothers me."*

Cohort I teachers tended to describe changes they planned for their classrooms as consonant and even blended with changes in their charters and schools, minimizing the gap between individual and systemic change:
"We're going to work a lot on team building in the classroom, and I'm going to work on that in the school."
"I'm not worried because I'm in a Coalition school, a charter, so my school is already teaching this way, and I'm just going to implement assessment at a much deeper level."
One teacher talked about the challenge of engendering systemic reform:*"The thing I'm most worried about is the role I'm going to play as a change agent in spreading this information or in coaching other teams. I think that's something that has to be practiced. So I'm looking forward to that experience. . . That's what I see as a challenge and what I'm looking forward to."*

Another was less sanguine, both about the work and about its place in systemic reform:"*I believe (the program) works. My question is with whom? . . . This could work in small pockets in my program.*"

Cohort I teachers, on the other hand, had experienced a year in which their expectations from the previous summer had run up against the difficulty of implementation in a system still functioning in a top-down, bureaucratic manner and itself on the brink of organizational change. Several mentioned a teacher who had "put her neck out" to implement change in her school and had been severed by administration. Many noted constraints that time, rostering, and the authority structure put on their ability to act as "change agents":
"*Aside from the changes we institute in our classrooms, what else does this (workshop) mean? Structurally, our statuses within the schools and within the school district, what does it mean?*"
"*(My school) does have meetings (but) the old fashioned ideas are still prevalent. Some people aren't willing, don't have any intentions of change. You could beat them with a bat and I don't think they would change.*"

A Cohort I teacher articulated the dialectical relationship between change at the individual and the systemic levels:
"*But we are the structure of school. . . And I realized it's not the kids. Why are they running from the oasis that we're supposed to have for them? And what are we, we are the keepers of the oasis. So it's something we're doing wrong, from a professional standpoint and from an individual standpoint. And I think we're turning off a lot of kids right in this damn classroom.*"

In a group where teachers debated who should decide on criteria for assessing students, a Cohort I teacher stated emphatically,"*When you say stakeholders, not everybody has the same vested interest. Greater weight ought to be given to people who haven't had voice! It shouldn't be one person, one voice, it depends on who's saying it and with what stake.*" Noticing my field notes, this teacher added, "*You can say it, but don't use my name.*" Her reluctance to be quoted by name perhaps states as loudly as her words the continuing risk to teachers of taking on--in a facilitator's words--"the whole ball of wax."

In the final days of the workshop, participating teachers created a work plan for implementing a reform agenda in the upcoming schoolyear. Groups named strategies/actions, who was responsible, who would participate, necessary resources, a time frame, and how the implementation would be assessed. Critical strategies in one area ranged from setting up

computer communications and developing a master directory to developing networks for critical friendship cross-visitation across charters as well as within charters. The locally based facilitators and available teacher participants committed to upcoming sessions for fleshing out plans.

Walking the Talk

"*When I was a little girl back in the stone ages my mother had a stretcher that she put my dad's work pants on, and they would stretch the trousers into shape so that you wouldn't have to press them as hard--the day before wash and wear. But more stretched, going this way and that way. I'm exhausted when I go home. Intellectually. It's stimulating. The exhaustion is stimulating.*" (teacher)

As July drew to a close, participating teachers described themselves as "stretched," "challenged," and "uncomfortable." While there was no consensus about what would happen when they returned to the "real world" of their schools, teachers felt that they had learned and grown during the workshop. One teacher described the sensation of undergoing change: ". . . *I had a personal commitment to (this approach), but in fact I haven't done it this long. I mean, I've done it with a project but it's been an attempt to do something. I'm walking around in the dark. That's what I've been doing. This has put a lot of light on things.*"

As teachers began to struggle with how their summer work might help shape their classrooms, charters, and schools, they also reflected on how they might change or refine the workshop to achieve its outcomes. Teachers' recommendations for the workshop included the following:
• begin with the work on assessment, so that teachers could share with students early on how their work in the course would be assessed;
• clarify decision-making processes about afternoon activities, particularly across the two cohorts, so that activities are more connected and focused and less time is spent negotiating decisions;
• integrate the work of the cohorts so that there is "more collaboration between the veterans and the virgins";
• separate the work of the two cohorts so that each can work at an appropriate level;
• make conflict management between teaming teachers an explicit part of the curriculum;
• give teachers more time to digest and reflect on old and new practices;
• offer administrators this kind of workshop, so that they can learn how better to support teachers and charters in this work.

Finally, a Cohort II teacher continued to remind us of the larger issues in the community embodied by students who were not there, and to insist that the work somehow address these young people: "*If the bodies are there they learn, but our students are here Monday then not again till Friday.*" This teacher's words keep before us the "real world" and the youngsters that provide context and impetus for educational reform; how do schools have to change in order to remember those who are absent?