

EAD 940: August 28th, 2004 Organizational Analysis of Education,

Course Objectives:

In this course, students will:

- gain knowledge about the structural, cultural, political, and individual elements of school organizations;
- gain knowledge ways think about organization, the theories that people keep in their heads when they are constructing organizations or trying to improve school organization
- Take a look at some school organizations and see how they differ, how they are alike
- Do a small study of some element of your organization and apply one of our theories to that element.
- Items: Some like to bring snacks; OK with me and not a bad idea
- Absences? You get one. Take when you want No more; we already loose Labor Day.
- Please: Today: I want a paper with your (a) name) (b) position, (c) school, (d) address of self, and (e) e-mail. Please: make it legible
- Requirements: attendance, reading weekly assignments, two book reviews, one paper. Paper to be discussed.

Note: I'm going to lay the course out – including the readings and topics -- as we go along. I never understand how instructors lay out courses prior to knowing who is in the class or how the class will go. The course does not exist independent of the students. Let us commence but first the books: here's two lists. On one are books about theory. On the second are books about practice. I have some of the books and you can take one of mine or go to the library. We don't want two people reading the same one. Read it. Write a review. How to write a review will be explained as we go along. And since we are not all reading the same things, each will present, in a verbal report, her or his books to the class. So we need two reports for the next class.

Theory books:

Barnard, C. (1937) The functions of an executive. First half.
Blau. P. (1967) Exchange and Power in social Life.pp 1-150, John Wiley*
Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1976) Schooling in capitalistic America. Basic
Downs, Economic Theory of Democracy
Drucker, P.(1946) The Concept of the corporation. John Day.*
Drucker, P. (1942) The future of industrial man. Manchester. Transaction Press*.
Gerth H. and Mills, C. W. (1946) From Max Weber. pp 196-244)*
Gouldner, A. (1954) Patterns of Industrial bureaucracy. *
Hielbroner, R. (1970) Between Capitalism and socialism. Random House
Homans, G. (1957) The Human Group. New York. Harcourt, pp 1-171
Katz and Kahn. (1966) The social Psychology of Organizations. John Wiley*
Kingdon, J.W. (1984) Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies. Little Brown
Likert, R. (1961) (pages 1-191) New Patterns of Management. McGraw Hill*
March, J. and Simon, H. (1967) Organizations. John Wiley and sons
Olson, M.Jr. (1965) The logic of collective action. Cambridge. Harvard U.
Parsons, T. (1949) The Structure of Social Action. Free Press. (pp 1-75)*
Prestus (R (1965) the Organizational society*
Simon: H. (1957) Administrative Behavior. Chapters 1-6, Free Press*
Stinchcombe, A. Constructing Social Theories
Thompson, J. (1967) Organizations in Action.*

Here's a second list. These are books about actual organizations – some are schools -- and people who run them.

Callahan, R. (1962) Education and the cult of efficiency. Chicago.
Chernow, R. Titan (the story of JD Rockefeller. Read the first half.
Coleman, J. and Jencks, C. . Inequality and educational reform
Cusick, P. (1992) The Educational System; it's nature and logic
Durkheim, E. (1900) Suicide
Goffman, E. Asylums
Hollingshead, SA.B. Elmtown's youth and Elmtown revisited. (1975)
Kanigel, R (1997) The One Best Way. NY. Viking
Muncie, D and McQuillan, P. (1996) Reform and Resistance in Schools and
Tarbell, I. (1963) The History of Standard Oil.
Sloan, A. (1924) My years with General Motors.
Vaughn, D, (1988) The challenger launch decision. Chicago.
Wilson, S. California Dreaming (about math reform in California schools)

PART I: The Educational Organization

We spend most of our lives in organizational settings. And organizations are not just the setting where we carry on our work. We don't just "teach"; we teach inside institutions and those institutions influence how we teach, who we teach, how we think about our teaching, and how we are judged as teachers. So it helps to think about organizations and how they operate. And also, you are on your way, I take it, to another degree – PhD or Spec -- in school administration, and school administration is about managing the organization. So it helps to have given some thought to how the organization works. For these reasons, the study of organizations has flourished, and organization theory is a fundamental component of graduate study. Note that in the No Child Left Behind legislation, the emphasis is on the school, it is the "school that succeeds or fails". So if your students are not doing well, not meeting AYP, you have to think about the school organization. Which is a revolutionary way to think about education because in the past we attributed success or failure to the student, independent of the school. And our current emphasis on the organization is all the more reason to think about that organizational entity.

The focus of this course is organizational theory for educational organizations. We will examine how the school organization operates and how it impacts administrators, teachers, students, parents, and even community members. We will take a close look at topics such as the history and creation our out educational system, formal and informal leadership, school culture, structural arrangements of schooling, school governance, the organization of instruction, criticisms of school organizations, and student achievement. The study of relevant organizational theories will provide you with knowledge about the historical and theoretical foundations of educational administration. The structure of organizations is debated endlessly and we're always trying to find that magic structure that will keep people both happy and productive.

Let's look at a school organization, According to the Standard and Poor's data on Michigan schools, this school district spend \$9236 on students (02 data). Of that \$5415 is for instruction. And \$1152 for administration, \$772 for operations and

maintenance, and \$354 for food services. That's a total non-instruction cost of \$2682. So half as much is spent on on the organization as is spent on instruction.

Further, There are 914 people working in this district's schools and 414 of them teachers. That means there are 500 people working in the district who are not teachers. Administrators, aids, secretaries, bus drivers, cooks, maintenance people of all types, program coordinators. Please note: The proportion of teachers to staff has been decreasing steadily – across education -- for at least 30 years. It was about 75% (teachers) to 25% (staff) when I started looking at it 25 years ago. Now its half and half. What do all these non-teaching people do.

The answer is lots of things: But the question is: how did we get to a situation where we keep hiring more people, or in organization terms, why do we continually divide and subdivide functions? The answer lies in the history of western rationalism, dating perhaps from the 17th French enlightenment and the discovery of math, measurement, scientific ways of knowing, and the effort to control our lives with "empirical" means. In a word, rationalization. That means looking at desired outcomes and planning – with empirical measures– to attain those outcomes. Note: Before Franklin and his connection of lightning with electricity, a popular solution to thunderstorms and the lightning that might start a fire was to ring the church bells and drive away the angry demons. Rationalization has no patience with such stuff. So Franklin, studying the matter empirically, proposed lightning rods.

More to the point of modern organizations, we try to control organizations through empirical means and so "reduce uncertainty". How do we do that? Well, one way when we run into something problematic, we tend to hire someone to attend to it. For example: In 1970, the Dean's office at MSU's college of education had a dean, three asso. deans, a few staff. Maybe 7 or 8 people and a student body of 12,000. Now the Dean's office has a staff of 37 and the college has a student body of 4000. (*hand-out)

Your assignment for next time: Go to your district directory: Count the number of people who work in the district. Divide them by function: Teachers, aids, maintenance, food service, administrators, project coordinators, transportation, security, etc. Draw a little chart showing how many people, and what –in general - they do – One page. No copies needed, but be prepared to stand up and explain your chart to the class.

The point of all this is to understand the process of differentiation and specialization by which educational organizations grow, become complex, and big and expensive. It's this inexorable press to further specialize and differentiate the organization by hiring more people to fulfill more functions. Admittedly, lots of the hiring is in response to compliance from the state, from the fed, but lots of it is internally generated.

Why do we do that? Because, again in the words of organizational theory, we want to "reduce uncertainty". How do you reduce uncertainty? By recognizing some "hole" in the organization and hiring someone and assigning that person to attend to that hole. So, federal programs increase; hire a federal programs coordinator. Technology? Hire a tech coordinator? Women's Hockey" Hire a woman's hockey coach. Security: Hire more guards. Special education? More aids.

Dropout prevention? Alternative schools, teachers, aids, etc. We're continually trying to reduce uncertainty and so when run into something problematic, we hire.

What's the principle at work here. Besides rationalization, it's the principal of specialization. As the organization grows, so the number of extra things to be done increases. So we hire more people. And pretty some we have more people doing the tangential jobs than are doing the basic jobs. So while there are 414 teachers in this district, there are upwards of 500 doing the other stuff. The good part is that things get attended to. The perhaps less-good part is that the organization gets more expensive, more complex, and worse, there doesn't seem to be any logical limit to the number of occurrences that might demand more people. In other words, the process of specializing and differentiating the organization is theoretically limit-less. And further specialization drives up costs. This is what drives conservatives – fiscal conservatives – crazy. "When are you going to stop hiring all these people?" or "Is there any logical limit to the number of people you hire? And the answer is, "no". There are of course fiscal limits -- no money to hire, no hire – and that is what conservative politicians try to do. Cut the taxes, cut the funding, and let the programs wither: in the words of Mr. Cheny, "Starve the beast."

Other conservatives conclude that "public schools are primarily about maintaining the machine, not about the kids or teaching the kids or learning. They are about maintaining a large and ever growing organization and controlling society's education function. It was that kind of thinking that lead to the 1993 "choice and charter" effort in Michigan.

As an assignment for next time: Two weeks. Look up your school. Come to class next time and tell us, in a few minutes, some things about your school district. You can get them all on Standard and Poor's School Evaluation Services For instance. How much money is spent? How do the kids do on tests, relative to the state? Then go to your district directory? Count: How many staff are there? How many teachers? Aids? Maintenance people? Cooks, technicians, computer maintenance people? Drivers? Mechanics? Administrators, principals, vice principals? Let's get a picture of the organization of your school. The point being of course the organization is itself a complex entity. I did it too. (Handout) We have about 300 people in my college and 146 of them are instructors.

PART II

How does the Education system operate. There's the fed What do they do. Why: There is the State: what does the state do. And then the locals. What do they do. What kind of power do they have. In general, we have a federal system, that means power is not located in one place. And then there is the interaction between all three. Let's look at NCLB as an example, then some info from the state. 2; EAD 940, FALL 04: Sept 11

I. Review:

What does the fed do in education? Mainly concern itself with large scale initiatives that reflect particular concerns. The Northwest Territories Act, 1787, which gave away federal land and which allocated 1/16th of every township to education. In

1917, there was concern about training people for work and the Smith-Hughes Act put considerable federal aid into vocational education. In 1943, there was concern about what to do with the military which, if the war was won, would be out and on the streets soon. So the GI Bill was passed and money was provided for veterans to go to school. (that act ended in 55, and was reinstated in 67) In 1957, Russia beat the U.S. to space and the National Educational Defense Act was passed to encourage teaching of math and science. Lots of initiatives emerged from that money. In 1965, Lyndon Johnson wanted to end poverty, and reasoning that "if poor people had skills they could get jobs and if they could get jobs they would not be poor", he put a lot of money into putting educational resources into poor schools. And in 93, Pres. Bush (1) put in "Goals 2000" which put money into states so they could develop standards. (And we did) And you all know, as you told me, about NCLB, which is the updated ESEA and it is generally aimed toward the lower achieving? Why them? Because there is always the need for a democracy to have an educated citizen. And reflecting also the "social capital theory", that is an educated citizenry is an economic asset driving the country. It's a theory that emerged from Germany after WWII.

What does the state do. Lots and they do with their share of the federal money. 2-4-5% of every dollar going from the fed to the schools, is allocated for "administrative costs." Which is then spent by the state to maintain its organization. And then the state's governor, legislator, dept. of education and (often) the attorney general can pass rules and regulations that schools have to follow. I'll show you some examples. What else: John Pierce, Michigan's first state supt. (1837-1842) got the land, given to the locals under the North West Territories Act and allocated to maintaining schools, given to the state. From which he created a public school system and the U of Michigan in Ann Arbor. John Porter, state supt in the late 60s started the MEAPss. Phil Runkle in the 70s said to the supts "Too many snow days. The kids get 180 and you have to give it to them." Also started a "blueprint for curriculum" and rewarded schools with an extra (small) stipend for those who complied. Next supt: Don Bemis, extended the blueprint and initiated PA 90, which put in some reforms such teacher advisory committees, annual reports, etc. The next Supt, -----was in the middle of the choice and charter thing and did – as the insistence of the then-Governor -- what he could to calm the board down when it was all about "choice charter and market." (And he did it) But he also witnessed the 93 reform which put in choice, charter schools, and proposal A. which moved the school funds from a property to a (largely) sales tax dependence. The present supt., Tom Watkins is not a traditional school person and seems to be working hard to implement NCLB. Under the state supt. is the Dept of Education which is generally charged with enforcement of extant rules and regs. But as indicated in the above examples. the State Supt. can take initiative. We have also an elected state board of education which hires the supt, has authority over things that go on in the dept., and can serve as a sounding board for ideas. Such as choice and charter. But the real state power over schools is in the legislature.

2. What do the locals do? Run the schools? Teach the kids, keep everyone warm, dry, fed and relatively peaceful. Move them along, As you know and so every day. And they do all that within a host of rules and regulations coming from the fed, the state, the attorney general, the dept. of education. etc. At the local level, there is a lot of stuff to comply and the need to comply with all the rules is itself a source of endless specializing.

3.

WW

hat else: In a democracy policies and changes emerge from the bottom up and there are myriad associations and interests watching one or another facet of public ed. There are 81 listed educational organizations in the state directory and most have an interest which they pursue, or hire lobbyists to pursue, in the state. Ex: the move to use ACTs instead of MEAPs came from the secondary principals' asso. And it might work. And every districts has a many of these, the swim parents, soccer parents, strings or band parents, football supporters, etc. And they want something for their children, and they watch to see that they get it. It seems that lots of parents don't want a "public" education; they want a private education, but they want it at public expense and inside the public schools. What associations exist inside your school systems.

4. Few Terms:

a. Norms of rationality. Coming from, perhaps, the French enlightenment onward and meaning roughly that, one should have some empirical measures to demonstrate that she is doing what she is supposed to do.

b. Reduction of uncertainty: Meaning that the obligation of the organization is to look for ways to assure a reasonable relation between what it is and what it is intended to do. So we're always looking for ways to make the place run more smoothly, more "rationally".

c. The combination of (a) and (b) lead to more specialization which I showed you with reference to my college, and with reference to Standard and Poors'. We find holes in the organization and we hire people to fill them. So, we don't wait for the kids to show up, We bus them. And then we feed them.. And then we hire people to advise them, hall guards to monitor them, playground aids to make sure they don't get hurt, and so on. Pretty soon we have lots of people doing things other than transmitting knowledge.

d. Transaction costs: The cost of maintaining the organization so that productive work can go on. A "potential problem" is that transaction costs can get out of control and you can find organizations where maintenance is devouring too many resources. (that is the economic argument for the fall of the Soviet Union. They spent so much energy maintaining the Soviet political and economic machine that they could not get anything done.) It's a problem.. How much of your time is spent on organizational matters? (question for next class)

e. The conservative critique. That public schools are more interested in maintaining their system than they are in teaching the kids. I don't believe that, but judging from increased transaction costs, one can see the argument. The solution: The 1993 "choice, charter and market" initiative. Blow up the system, give every parent a voucher and let the "market" come up with educational offerings which one can buy as one chooses. Interesting idea. What happened to it?

In general traditional conservatives distrust the public schools because they are too bureaucratic". Definition? A system based on (1) functional specialization, (2) rules and regulations, (3) expertise and (4) authority, (5) impersonality--you take on your role and don't corrupt it with your personality. And Standards of work and output, records and files, rules and regulations, contractual agreements. All of

those are characteristics of a bureaucracy. Weber called it the most perfect system. The whole idea is to create a system that can handle complex tasks, that can make sense of large endeavors where people are not in face to face contact, that increases predictability and stability while decreasing the unpredictability caused by human variations and emotions. And of course that reduces uncertainty that keeps the organization surviving. All of which are combined to "reduce uncertainty". People in government always worry about the "ever expanding" but it's hard to posit a solution. Except

Anarchy? A system based on (1) self help, (2) mutual cooperation, (3) an absence of power and authority, (4) small organizations (face to face) g. Anarchy? A solution to bureaucracy based on (1) self help, (2) mutual cooperation, (3) an absence of power and authority. As an educational philosophy, this was expounded in the late 1960s and early 70s, and argued that schools should leave off telling kids what to do. Rather allow them freedom and they will, when inclined, gravitate toward learning. And since they gravitated toward it of their own volition, they will learn more. Taken very seriously in several experimental colleges and in Troy, Okemos, Grand Ledge, and several other Michigan districts. A lot of Schools within Schools carried this philosophy.

(h) Theory: The topic of the class, a systematic explanation of reality. Theory is based on (1) indicants, that is empirical facts; (2) concepts, the putting together of the facts, (3) propositions, the statements of relation between concepts, and (4) when the propositions are systematically arranged, we have a theory. Nice. Example:

(i): Verifiability: In order for a theory to be scientifically valid, it has to be capable of being falsified. And the problem, for a theory such as psychoanalysis, is that since it is based on the patient's subjective recollections, it cannot be falsified. There is evidence – empirical data -- outside those recollections. Are education theories capable of being falsified?

(j) System: Put the parts together – fed, state, local – interest groups -- and they make a system. Our educational system. Which leads to questions: Where is the power? How does change occur? What drives the system?

What is a theory. It is a systematic explanation of some phenomenon; it's a "body of logically interrelated general concepts" (Parsons 1949). Parsons, in one of this week's reading, uses Herbert Spencer – a 19th century philosopher – and his idea that "the pursuit of rational self interest would result in the greatest good for the greatest number of people" as an example of a theory. (Spencer was very popular with late 19th century industrialists. He gave them a rationale for all that money they made. He posited the argument that the rich were serving an important social function; that they really were the harbingers of the future, that society needed them, and moreover that they were the more farsighted and intelligent of the population. Spencer had a theory, working from Darwin he developed an explanation for the rapid economic progress that was occurring in the late 19th century. He had some beliefs, some assumptions, some facts, and he wove them into a coherent theory explaining social progress. He was also a believer in the Lamarckian notion that achieved qualities could be inherited. So if one were successful in business, his children might inherit whatever it was that made him successful. Not only did Spencer justify wealth; he justified continued privileges of an aristocratic class.

Here's another theory: Weber's theory on the rise of Capitalism. Roughly stated Weber was trying to explain why Capitalism took root in some countries and not others. He had some facts, such as the England and Scotland had moved further ahead in capitalism than countries like France and Spain and Italy. Weber was looking for an explanation of observed phenomena. So he suggested that that Capitalism depends on both the accumulation of and the reinvestment of capital. And Protestants – who stand before God as individuals – are encouraged by their religious beliefs to work hard, do the right thing, live modestly, and lead virtuous lives. (don't live in a big house, drive a big car, own a swimming pool, throw big parties, and don't be a show-off.) So in Protestant countries, Scotland, Switzerland, England, there were a great number of people keeping their heads down, working hard, making a lot of money, but still fearful of offending God. They were living modest and disciplined lives. (John D. Rockefeller once terminated a business relationship because the partner bought a boat) So these people made money – didn't spend it on pleasure or excessive consumption but reinvested it – and so turned into capitalists.

Contrast to Italy and Spain, both Catholic countries and Catholics have their church to guide them to salvation. One doesn't stand alone before God. One has the church as guide, protector, intervene-or; and one has less personal responsibility for her or his salvation. (The parable of the prodigal son is a favorite among Catholics, as is teaching that one can be forgiven "seven times seventy" (a mystical and infinite number) for one's sins. Not to go on, but Weber suggested that Capitalism – the accumulation and reinvestment of capital – found a better reception in Protestant countries than it did in Catholic countries. So Weber presents us with a theory explaining a social phenomenon.

What are the elements of a theory?

1. First Facts. The western tradition of knowing, from the enlightenment, has been empirically based. Everything begins with experience and experience can be described in behavioral terms. So we begin with the facts. Facts are -- we hope -- empirically based. They can be seen and or heard, felt, measured in some way, and so on. In this class we will not be interested in theories that explain things that are not empirically measured. Example: Psychic phenomena, religious experiences, alien abduction, etc. We're concerned about things that people pretty much agree are the case and things that, according to our western ideas of empiricism, can be demonstrated to be the case. 2. Concepts: You've taken some information – a lot of kids doing scoring low on the MEAPs and you've abstracted out the term "low achievement." And you've noted that this "low achievement" tends to occur among the children of poorer people. So you have two inferred concepts. Low achievement and its greater frequency among the poor. So you make an inference. "Children from poorer parents tend to demonstrate lower achievement than children from wealthier parents." Now you can explain low achievement. And more, you have some direction to follow if you want to improve achievement. Put more resources into schools with poor kids. That's why we have Title One. So we had some theory and the theory lead to action. Simple. Just note that if we did not have a theory, we would not – in the fact of so many choices -- know what to do. Theory guides action; it also limits action.

Not so simple. Because there are lot of theories competing to explain low achievement, and because not all poor kids do poorly in school and some richer students do worse, we need to modify the theory. And we have to remember that social theories are always influence by political considerations. And it is, in fact, not politically feasible to blame the poor – the victims – for being poor and their children for being low-achieving. So along with increased assistance for those poorer students, we have placed the responsibility on the school organization. That is, having looked and found that some poor students do fine and some schools with lots of poor students do fine, we decide that the "unit of analysis" is not the student's family situation. It is the school. So we decide that if the kids do poorer, it is not

entirely the kids. It is the school. So we went from "the child is failing" to "the school – even the district – is failing" So now if the kids do poorly, we don't just add in Title One funds; we say the school – qua school – has to reorganize, hire new people, get a new principal, get taken over etc. That's what No Child Left Behind is all about. It's built on a theory that the organization – not the child or the child's family situation -- is the party responsible for the child's achievement It's sort of an interesting logic. A combination of facts, that some kids do poorer in school and that those who do poorer in school tend to be poorer fiscally. Add in the political realities: that the poor include many who are minorities and it is not politically feasible to blame minorities for their situation. (they are the victims of racism, capitalism, sexism, etc.) So the unit of analysis shifts over from the individual student to the school organization, and to the people running the organization – the administrators.

But note: It was the schools themselves that sold the policy makers that they—the schools—could improvement achievement if they had the resources. So the schools have said for some years, "You give us the money and we can do the job." And the feds and states are saying, "we gave you the money; show us you are doing the job." The point of all this is the thinking that went into And the implemented legislation and policies follow the thinking. There, we have done a little organizational analysis of the latest reform. We have concepts, i.e. achievement, socio-economic-status, some political considerations. Then we have propositions; then we have a plan of action.

EAD 940: Class 3: Sept 18, 2004

Articles and assignments So Far:

Review of people employed in district

Chapter on F.W. Taylor

Thompson; Chapter 2

Self Report of time spent on transaction costs.

Perrow on Human relations

Rochelle on Cernow's book on JDR

Kellie on Thompson's Book

I. Review of terms:

- a. Transaction costs, (how much time do you spend on transaction matters)
- b. Theory: a systematic explanation complete with concepts and interacting propositions.*
- c. Proposition: A statement of relation between two concepts.
- d. Concept: An abstraction from reality.
- e. Empirical: something we can measure, see, touch, feel, etc
- f. reduction of uncertainty, ..what organizations try to do
- G. soft or uncertain technology,
- h. hard technology: when you can predict a result
- i. rationality. The effort to control processes through the application of logic. (a caveat: As Hayek noted about socialism, it's "fatal conceit was socialists thought that because they understood economics, they could also control economics. So we may think that because we think, via the application of theory and logic, that we understand education, we can control education. (If you're still looking for a good theory book, consider Hayek's "The Fatal Conceit".) Ask yourself: Does

understanding lead to control? And think about what Weber said: "As rationalization increases, irrationality increases in intensity". (Freund: p. 25)

j. *system – a network of collectivities, side by side and overlapping -- ,

k. anarchy – the political philosophy predicated on the assumption that power is always mis-used and life and work should take place in small, face-to-face units. (One is reminded on Wolcott's admonition, "education is not conducted by the organization, but by responsive and closely-knit sub-units). There is lots of room for anarchy in education. Here's a theory from Olson that I used in a book about the educational system. I did a lot looking at the actions of people, And it seemed to me that the essence of the system was in small groups where people worked out their own versions of the whatever it is they call education:

- a. The larger the group the smaller the benefit received by any individual.
- b. The smaller the benefit, the less likely the individual is to be willing to bear the cost of participation.
- c. The larger the organization, the greater the organizational costs.
- d. For these reasons, the larger the group, then farther it will fall short of providing an optimal supply of a collective good, and very large groups normally, will not in the absence of coercion, provide their members with minimal amounts of a collective good."

m.. Anarchy: Think Sommerville.

N: Loose coupling, trendy term in the late 80s, to denote the way schools were careful about counting kids and lining kids through the curriculum, but not too careful about what was actually taught and learned. One could take NCLB as a reaction against loose coupling.

o. Technical rationality: Thompson: "the essence of the instrumental question is whether the specified actions do, in fact, produce the desired outcomes and the instrumentally perfect technology is one which inevitably achieves such results

Note: People talk about the "system" as if it should be rational, logical, and closely coordinated, but what they are talking about is a more hierarchal bureaucracy run from the top. Our educational "system" with it's reflection of America's federal (where power is spread around) governance system has all sorts of players moving in and around, some in government, some in private associations. My example was the construction of the standards. We had the Legislature, the MDE, the U of Michigan, the Oakland ISD, school districts and teachers, the State Board of Ed.

Please recall DeToqueville's (1837) observation: "American's are constantly forming associations" and that "those in government are surrounded by a plethora of associations trying to advance their interests".

k. Verifiability: The idea that unless a theory can be dis-proved – not "is" disproved" but "can be" disproved with reference to empirical measures, it's not a good theory. So: what is middle school theory? And can it be "disproved"?

l. Specialization, differentiation. What we do to reduce uncertainty.

m. Vertical Integration: What we learned from Rochelle's account of JDR. Control of oil from the oil-well to the gas tank. Our public school system is vertically integrated. From pre-K to

graduation, we have a sure thing. A monopoly. * But here's a quote from a new RAND study of "The 21st Century At Work".

The vertically integrated corporation was the dominant organizational model for much of the twentieth century. The model provided the means to control and coordinate the various stages of production, especially in an era when markets were underdeveloped and supply networks were more uncertain, While this model has by no means disappeared . . . some sectors of the economy are moving toward more specialized, dis-integrated firms. (The 21st Century at Work, 2004, p. xxiv) Now think choice, charter, MVU, home schooling, internet education, etc. Is the public school going to loose its monopoly, Loosing its monopoly?

:

On Taylor: What did he do? He figured out how to arrange work for the modern age. When he went to work, in the 1880s, industrial work was done on a craft basis. People learned on the job and from one another, and lots of people hired to do simple tasks. So Taylor said, first we have to learn things about the work and he set about for 12 years learning how to cut metal. With knowledge of steel cutting on his side, and in the hands of administrators and not engineers, then the skills were broken down into steps, then the steps were taught, then the technology and the evaluation techniques, and further research could be applied. Lenin thought Taylor a great man, and "scientific management" was considered to be one of the better ideas of the late 29th century.

When schools were being planned in the early 20th century, Taylor's thinking was adopted. The "platoon system" by which batches of students visit the teacher for a certain number of minutes each day was inspired by scientific management. Callahan says that Taylor – ism – crept into schools and drove out the "inefficient" courses such as Latin and Greek, elevated administrators, brought in the "elective" system where kids choose what to take, figures in the 6 or 7 or 8 period day, etc.

Taylor was accused of exploiting workers and relentlessly driving people out of work but Taylor opened the door for the "white collar" side of industry, and according to him, also opened the door to work based on knowledge which meant that one could learn more and advance. So he opened the door to the hiring of a lot of people. And Taylor cut into what he called "soldiering", that is the imposing of lowered expectations by fellow workers.

Ead 940: Fall, 2004: 4th Class

Articles and assignments so far:

First 25 pages of NCLB
Review of people employed in district
Chapter on F.W. Taylor
Thompson; Chapter 2
Self Report of time spent on transaction costs.
Perrow on Human relations
Rochelle on Cernow's book on JDR
Kellie on Thompson's Book
Piece on Nucor Steel. two weeks of reading

1. As for the reviews. For each book read write a 1200 wd, or so, review. A review includes (1) an account of the argument, (2) a description of the way the author went at the argument, (3) and a critique, which is an assessment of the worth of the both the argument and the way the author went about it. Please turn in the reviews by the end of the class.

Assignment for this week. In no more than 200 words, describe the organization of America's educational system. Add a few words, and list the element of the system that you consider problematic. Bring and read to class. On Saturday, the 25th.

2. The whole issue that Taylor raises is about whether the process of production in any enterprise is a science based on knowledge of the productive process. If it is, then it can be abstracted, and mastered by people other than those who do it. It can be controlled by managers and engineers. An their management of the enterprise can be done, almost remotely. (watch an auto factory; the movement of the process along the line controls the workers behavior).

3. Taylor argued that production is a science, so management would amount to a knowledge-based control of the process. If the boss knew more than the employee, he or she could tell the employee what to do and how to do it. Or if not the boss, then at least the engineer. At any rate control of production would not reside with workers but with those with the abstract knowledge. If the process is not a science, but a craft, then the it is not transferable to other sites, it's job-specific and must be learned on the job, and the control of it resides with the worker and in the particular organization. It seems to me that teaching has long been regarded a craft occupation, but emerging "forces" are trying to turn it into a "science", knowledge based and controlled from without.

4. Taylor was entirely science-based, reasoning as he did that work behavior was a science, that it could be abstracted and taught – "A reasonable man a can learn a reasonable job in a reasonable amount of time" – and if it was an abstract science, then it would not be controlled by workers, trying to protect their jobs and often slowing down production, but by management. "Efficiency".

And in the beginning of the 20th century, schools were subjected to Taylor-ism, which is where we got the "platoon" system of high school, which is where we got class sizes of 25 or so– and rooms, holding 25 or so and – according to Callahan, where we got rid of classes that were small and inefficient. We were building schools for many more students – education was becoming universal -- and Taylor helped us think about it.

5. Are we attempting to make teaching a science and will control move toward engineers and administrators?

6. You need a theory. .

Data do not explain themselves. Why? Because policy is made from arguments that are, as Weber explains, based on values. Theory applied to data is a prelude to action. My administrator friends say – 'No theory, just action.' But theory always joins action. Or as Parson's says, . . .all empirically verifiable knowledge – even the common sense knowledge of everyday life – involves implicitly, if not explicitly, systemic theory . . ." (p. 10) And As

Lenin said: "There is no revolution without a theory of revolution." If one did not have a theory, one would not know what – in the face of unlimited choice – to do. We don't live in the Garden of Eden. All things are not possible. We have to decide what to do; we're not free to go after a problem from all possible points. Limited resources don't allow it. Any of those and a potentially infinite number more could be the starting point for an explanation of differential academic achievement. The "facts" that you go after are decided upon by the theory. The trick as Parsons shows us is to make the facts and the theory go with one another. He calls this, verification. And he encourages us to embark on a search for theories that fit facts, admitting of course that what one calls a fact depends on a theory. So: "let the facts speak for themselves" is, according to Parsons a ridiculous statement. The facts never "speak for themselves."

Example: "Girls don't do as well as boys in math." Is that a problem? If so, we need a solution, and we need a possible explanation to test. The fact, by itself, gives no explanation, nor any need for one. (There is nothing in things themselves to give them significance") But our egalitarian – and gender neutral -- values tell us "that should not be the case" so it's a problem. Now we need an explanation so we look at teachers, classroom discourse – how many times do girls get called on – school structure – let's make single gender schools – and we develop some explanation that will direct us toward a solution. The sum: (1) facts. (2) add explanatory values, (3) test to see if the resulting explanation explains, (4) if not proceed to other explanations and (5) more testing. So we approach knowledge by, as Popper says, progressive elimination of competing explanations.

7. Reform:

Since the early 1980s, the prevailing school reform strategy among states has been toward "systemic change". These efforts are often phrased in ways that reflect Smith and O'Day's (1990) suggestion that a reformed system would consist of "challenging and progressive curriculum frameworks, a supportive organizational environment and instructional content directed toward complex thinking and problem solving" (p. 235). So let's look at a systemic change in Flint, from about 94-99.

"The "Flint Theory" of school reform is predicated on the assumption that changes in schools should be simultaneous and complementary with changes in central office."

So the steps were:

1. One Million grant from Rockefeller
2. More money from Panasonic
3. Total system reform, 3500 staff, 22,000 students
4. Get everyone involved
5. Invite speakers, games, spirit-raising exercises.
6. Eliminate redundancy in central office. Push decision making down
7. Have a team to decide on what will be done, then a subteam
8. Team with lots of enthusiasm and energy decides to:
 - Reduce redundancy, Reduce Silos (exp.)
 - Identify 5 prototype schools, (there are 33 elems. in Flint)
 - Put more resources to those schools (released-teachers etc)
 - New central office arrangements
 - More teacher involvement at school level
 - Allow people responsibility for budgets, their own
 - Hire full time reform-coordinator

Supt attends all improvement meetings

Put a group of adults behind each child

9. This went on for four years

10. What happened?

Lots of initial energy and enthusiasm and good feeling

Lots and lots of meetings

Prototype – those reformed first -- schools got extra resources

11 central office functions united into one “prototype” function.

Communication processes streamlined

Breaking up of silos, sharing, teaching, talking, etc, parent advisory,

In the prototype elem. schools, the teachers were working on standards and benchmarks

11 How did it end. (my view)

Supt Ray left. For a number of reasons, some board, personal

New Supt had different agenda, just ignored the reform

Prototype schools did not do better on scores, despite money and personnel

Other reforms, like the state, and Genessee County rolled over and pre-empted the reform.

People involved in the reform moved up in the org.

Some board members were antagonistic, Two, former GM employees said, “ At GM, it doesn't work in two years, we dump it. This is four years and there are still no

results’

The districts scores, money and personnel problems worsened, lost 5000 kids

Hired reform leader left

Advisor teachers re-assigned to classes, because of money

Some resentment from non-prototype schools

Never generated the volunteers around each child.

Reform never entered secondary school

Evidence- was-lacking.

New way of doing things was resisted, people find informal ways to do things, even when the system is inefficient. Bring in a more efficient and their old and informal ways don't work.

And other reforms came in. It struck me that some administrators would go to a conference, get an idea, come back and implement it, i.e. Walk-through. So hard to maintain attention on reform. Competing reforms roll over each other. And an asst supt. went out and got a competing grant. He just did it.

Lessons?

Human relations: Please do a little self-examination related to our study of the human relations business. Please ask yourself and be prepared to come and give your answer: Why do you work? How well do you like working? What's your greatest satisfaction from work. What would make you give more of yourself to work? How do you resolve conflicts between work and non-work?

What does Perrow say Human relations is all about? What is the logic? What is the origin? The theory? The extended theory? What does admin/leadership have to do with it. What part(s) do personality, behavior, motivation, etc. play? How does it contrast to Scientific mgt.

1. Your summaries of the “way the system operates” were a little more hierarchial than I would have said. You gave more credit to the top-down aspect of the system. But don’t mix up the bureaucracy with the system. The bureaucracy is the outward form, but the system contains all sorts of individuals and groups doing all kinds of things independent of the bureaucracy. The bureaucracy is the target of the system, in the sense that what the small private group wants is the formal recognition that the bureaucracy can confer. So the “parents of mentally retarded children” (that was the 70s name) got PL 94-142 in order to force the bureaucracy to accommodate their children. And the band parents want the school to give them a band-room, uniforms, instruments, a teacher and a secure place in the 7 hour day. In that sense, groups “target” the bureaucracy to get what they want; but don’t confuse the bureaucracy with all those groups targeting the bureaucracy to get something they want. The bureaucracy is the formal manifestation of the system; but the system contains both the bureaucracy and all those groups.

And the school level, there is a lot of personal decision making, private innovation, local initiative, local control, local options, etc. The fed is all about “equality, equality, equality”. But schools do lots of things other than work on equality. Think of the (almost and sometimes more than) \$100,000,000 high schools being built in Ann Arbor, Detroit, Belleville (east of Ann Arbor), Grand Blanc, Holt, Detroit) And lots of the things in those schools are personal and local initiatives. You might test that by taking a close look at the range of things you do in your school and see how many are done by local initiative, as opposed to top down and bureaucratic initiative.

Organizations want normative compliance, not just utilitarian compliance, and certainly not forced compliance. They want people who enter into the spirit of the thing, make it their own, who therefore need little supervision, and put out a good product. But how many people actually do that?

People, including you, may change over a 30 year career, get burned out, cynical, giving less and less, but the rules of the job are such that even when that happens, they can still perform basic functions; show up, meet classes, teach, abide by the rules and regulations, etc. They don’t have to love it; they just have to do it. That’s the genius of bureaucracy. It can handle varying degrees of compliance, which an anarchy or a total democracy or community cannot. And lots of modern organizations push for normative compliance only from a restricted leadership. Walmart calls its workers “associates”, but those “associates” turn over at about 30% a year. Walmart, like other big corporations, is run not by “associates” but by a committed, smart, merit-selected, (lucky?) hard working, relatively small, and well-rewarded, cadre.

Think of the Communist Party, 1906 or 1907. Lenin said, “a small totally committed group of revolutionaries. The “Essers” –Social revolutionary party wanted all the socialists to join into one movement. Lenin held out. No compromise: Bolshevik means literally “party of the minority” as opposed to Meneshevik, “party of the majority”. And in 1917, he won. Or think the Catholic Church; small group of men, historically younger sons of nobility or bright poor boys; totally committed, married – literally (the church is not going to give up celibacy) -- to the church, And it’s worked, for 2000 years. The church picks out its brightest, sends them to the North American College (Jesuit-run) in Rome, trains them to run the church; and in time, they do.

We’re less that way in Education. There is no “central educational establishment” except at local levels, and people at local levels can change rapidly. There are some people who think

they are the educational establishment, We have a "national Academy of Education" (you didn't know this) but as a group, they exert no practical or policy-influencing leverage. They just yammer to each other. There are some dominant central ideas and policies, most having to do with equality of opportunity (ayp, NCLB, allocation of funds), equality of staff (rules and regulations – 600 pages in Michigan) about busing, food, time, personnel, finance, personnel, discipline and attendance, insurance, curriculum, graduation, etc. but again, that is mostly about equality, making sure with that, in keeping with democracy and bureaucracy, the kids, independent of background, are treated equally. At base: and this is my view, the educational bureaucracy operates like big corporations, which, according to Chandler are (1) vertically integrated, (2) serve mass markets, (3) practice economies of scope and scale, (4) expand by creating new services, merging with competitors, (5) are run by mobile managers,

"These corporations create markets for their products; more to the point, they create demand for products that they then produce. They also remain internally flexible, allowing them to assign people and resources to emerging problems and to provide latitude to people at lower levels." (Chandler, 1990)

And that seems to me to be the way the school establishment operates. The larger question is: what controls organizational behavior. Is the control internal to the person? Is it a matter of "psychological type". Is a person, as Prestus likes to say governed by her personality type. Is she "upwardly mobile" or "alienated". And does he or she respond to the organization life in terms of "personality type"? If she is by nature, upwardly mobile, she will "play the corporate game", work overtime" internalize the ethic, and get promoted into positions of leadership. If she is by nature "ambivalent" wanting the rewards but not willing to do what it takes to get them – then she or he is not going to "play the game" give 110 percent, etc, and that person will be quite satisfied with a modest return for a modest amount of work. Such a person would likely get her personal fulfillment in other walks of life. Makes sense; we can't all be the organizational winners. Why bother? There's lots of things to do in life and work is only one of them, Native Americans – as reported by B. Franklin thought that work and chasing after money was a "mean way to spend one's life". Franklin, a self-made and wealthy man thought so too. At the age of 42, he gave up working and spent his time on science and statecraft and eventually, revolution

Here's a more sociological explanation; One of the best, from Simon, (1954) is that when one joins a corporation, company, group, school, whatever, there is a structure that encourages certain behavior. The structure is physical, emotional, psychological; it confronts one as he walks in the door. One does certain things here, one does not do other things. One doesn't make shoes in an auto factory. Nor autos in a dairy.

The deliberate control of the environment of decisions permits not only the integration of choice but its socialization as well. Social institutions may be viewed as regularizations of the behavior of individuals through subjection of their behavior to stimulus patterns socially imposed on them. It is in these patterns that an understanding of the meaning and function of organization is to be found (Simon: Administrative Behavior p. 109)

We're constantly ironing out the details, but the range of possible issues over which we have arbitrary control is small relative to the larger structure. People are always talking about "changing the structure" but how much real flexibility does anyone have relative to the total setup. The structure is a physical and psychological environment that encourages certain behaviors, discourages others, takes over and controls the behavior of participants.

The trick for administrators is to structure the place so that the desirable behaviors emerge and undesirable behaviors are suppressed.

Simon: whom we are going to hear about says that the real controller of behavior is the "psychological environment" set up by the organization. He uses the term "bounded rationality." That is decisions are "bounded" by the extant structure and one can exercise limited rationality inside that structure. And what administrators; do is they control the range of decisions. "Individual choice takes place in a range of givens" and the "givens" are the structure which is purposely set up to control that range." Administrators influence the givens, and the givens control the decisions. Sort of an interesting way of looking at the issue.

EAD 940: Sixth class, October 9, 2004

1. Readings so far:

First 25 pages of NCLB
Review of people employed in district
Chapter on F.W. Taylor
Thompson; Chapter 2
Self Report of time spent on transaction costs.
Perrow on Human relations
Rochelle on Cernow's book on JDRockefeller
Kellie on Thompson's Book
Piece on Nucor Steel.
Anthony of Suzanne'e book, California Dreaming
Dan on Goffman's Asylums.
Sizer's suggestions for an improved secondary school structure
Lightfoot's description of St. Paul's School.
Lesa on Homans
Ved Meha on Christ's Hospital School

I. Review of terms:

2. Review of terms:

Transaction costs, bureaucracy, theory, proposition, concept, empirical, reduction of uncertainty, soft or uncertain technology, hard technology, rationality, system, anarchy, loose coupling, technical rationality, psychological set, vertical integration, organizational rationality, Distributive justice, hermenutical reasoning, critical theory, Informal organization. Informal system

3. Informal Organization: "Every formal organizations attempts to mobilize human and technical recourses as means for the achievement of its ends. However the individuals within the system tend to resist being treated as means. They interact as wholes bringing to bear their own special problems and purposes...It follows that there will develop an informal structure within the organization which will reflect the spontaneous efforts of individuals and subgroups to control the conditions of their existence. The informal structure will be at once

indispensable to and consequential for the formal system of delegation and control itself.
(Downs: Economic theory of Democracy, P. 30)

3. Reviewing Simon's notion of the organization as that is the range of "givens" that you live with. And what are the "givens"; On a 100 pt. scale, how much freedom do you have in the org. and how much of your behavior is controlled by structural givens? Is the structure such that your willing compliance is encouraged. Think alternatively: throw the door open and invite in 5 teachers and 80-100 kids. And tell them to work it out. What would happen? (We did that in the 60s-70s and we didn't like what happened.)

4. Please remember: the organization doesn't have to make you happy although it cannot violate too much your sense of distributive justice. Rather the organization has to channel your efforts into (what it calls) productive ways. And it does that by according to Simon -- bounding your rationality and subsequent behavior so that you have limited choices. The physical, social, cultural atmosphere of the school offers you a limited range of behaviorally-acceptable options. So your rationality and your choices of how to behave are limited. Schools are professional organizations so you have more options, or a greater range of options, than you would have in an auto factory. But we see, according to what I'm hearing from some of you, that your options are becoming restricted. But what the schools want is not just restrictions for the sake of restrictions, they want your effectiveness. And they don't want your grudging compliance: they want your willing compliance.

Is the organization structured to obtain your willing compliance. Is it structured to obtain 90% of the participants willing compliance?

5, Here's a piece from Ted Sizer Horace's Compromise. Horace was the semi-fictional teacher whose day was so broken up that he could not teach. So Ted suggested some steps to structure schools to Horace could teach. We have another private school from Sarah Lightfoot's St. Paul's school. A different kind of structure. So now we get into the next question: what kind of leadership encourages optimal – most desirable – kind of compliance? Remember, according to Simon, leaders also set up the structure inside which we operate.

Let's go back to Perrow: Talking about leadership. What kind of leadership encourage willing compliance?

EAD 940: Seventh Class: October 16, 2004

In Angel there is an article from an old New Yorker by Ved Mehta, a long-time contributor to that magazine, about his experience and the experience of his friend, Jasper, at a private school in England. For your mid-term, please read the article and write an essay around these questions:

- a. Describe the structure of Christ's Hospital.
 - b. What was the school trying to do and what did it assume about education, learning, students?
 - c. Contrast the structure of Christ's Hospital to the structure of your own school?
 - d. Where would you rather work? Get your own education? Send your child?
- Please write a few pages -- typed or on the computer -- and bring them to class

2. Please: I've been reading students papers and too many of our students think that their job, when looking at schools, is to tell the participants what they "should or must" do. Subjunctive imperatives are bad writing. Your job as analysts is to begin with the assumption that people in schools are reasonable, honest, and hard working and that they do what they do for their own reasons. On their own terms, their actions make sense. The goal is to understand the educational world as they understand it, their roles as they play them, and the system as their combined efforts create it. No "musts" as in "principals must....." or "Teachers must....." Bad writing. You are supposed to analyze, not prescribe. Here's an "analysis" that I used one time.

3. Speaking of structure and values, I went to a school-architect's conference on Thursday and this is what I heard. Schools are being sold as "community learning centers", as "wealth creating engines", as "adding value to the communities". "Ignorance is the enemy". Communities are portrayed as in competition with other communities for jobs and good schools draw the job generating industries. How do you bring people in? With the amenities: pools, community centers, family friendly, child care centers, high speed internet, theaters, athletic facilities, community wellness centers, recreation, cafes, technology, holistic visions of learning. (What is that) Schools should be open inviting, have a common campus, no "bucket thinking", schools offer a significant return on investment 50% of the information transmitted in schools is obsolete, embrace and involve the community, sell the school as community improvement. And some of the terms describing the new schools: unified feel, natural light, ambiance, integrated design, differentiated interiors, welcoming entrances, cutting edge tech, music recital hall, movable bulkheads, multi sports center, state of art weight rooms, raised-glass lobby, geo-thermal heating and cooling, mezzanine area?, soaring lobby, translucent lighting, energy efficient, blue accent, sail-graphics, acoustical panels, curved contemporary, neighbor friendly, masonry detailings, vehicular circulation, commercial kitchens, filtered light, modular learning centers, active and quiet zones, commons, work stations, subdued lighting, visual appeal, flexible space, community needs, adaptable, welcoming, and a "river of blue tile", learning communities, interactive learning environment, ...it's all friendly and warm and inviting. (Not like Elmira Catholic High 50 years ago. Dim, grim, and subdued.) I was most interested in

the vision of learning; interactive, group oriented, community directed, technology-based, job-directed.

4. The argument of Simon can be stated simply. It is impossible for the behavior of a single, isolated individual to reach any high degree of rationality. The number of alternatives he must explore is so great, the information he would need to evaluate them so vast that even an approximation to objective rationality is hard to conceive. Individual choice takes place in an environment of givens, premises that are accepted by the subject as bases for his choice, and behavior is adaptive only within the limits set by these givens (P. 79).

5. The organization's structure also contains values. So here is the range of "values contained in the schools that Ted Sizer would like to see. What are the values that show up in your organization?

8. How did Eleanor Roosevelt do it?

To wit: she began to turn her principles into practice. "She returned to work in the Henry Street Settlement, and was invited to join the board of the League of Women Voters, and assigned to study legislation of interest to the members, and write monthly reports. In that association she met two women, Elizabeth Read and Esther Lape, with whom she worked on League business and with whom she "spent many evenings at their little apartment" (p. 112, auto). Because of her interests in Democratic politics, women, and labor, she met Marion Dickerman and joined the Women's Trade Union League. She met also, Harriet Mills, who was prominent in New York's Democratic party. During New York's Gubernatorial election of 1924, and she met Nancy Cook who invited her to join the Women's Division of the Democratic State Committee. As a member of that committee, she chaired the first women's platform committee of the Democratic Party and presented the party with a "Progressive Woman's Agenda". The latter included an eight hour work day, the right of employees to bargain collectively, abolition of child labor, equal pay for women, universal health insurance, sex education, and an end to lynching. Other items the agenda were "public housing and transportation, improved sanitation, parks and playgrounds, school lunches, workers' compensation, occupational and mandatory education, pure food and milk legislation, and the right of women to serve on political committees." (Cook, p. 339-340). She worked with Jane Addams in the in the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and in 1926, she made headline news when she participated in a mass picket demonstration of three hundred women in striking paper-box makers. (Cook, vol 1, p. 363) Her involvements seemed to trip over one another, they were all related to progressive ideals,

Through my interest in the League of Women Voters, the Women's Trade Union League, and the Democratic State Committee, where now I had become finance chairman, I was beginning to find the political contacts . . . I drove a car on election day and brought people to the poles. I began to learn a good deal about party politics in small places. I worked with our county committee and our associate county chairwoman I saw how people took money or its equivalent on election day for the votes and how much of the party machinery was geared to crooked business. (My Life: p. 344)

In the process of supporting and working for an overlapping set of progressive associations, Eleanor was also learning leadership.

10. How does leadership work in your own school? What kind do you respond to?

October 19th: EAD 940: Few points

1. Why are employee relations important? Because 93% of Americans are employees and of the remaining, 7% are farmers. And we are –93% of us –living in a “wage” system. That is we work for a wage and that wage takes care of all our needs. Few of us do anything essential for ourselves. We don’t grow our food, build our houses, make or repair our cars, fix our plumbing or the electricity and so on. We call someone who – like us -- specializes in some part of the wage system. The wage system is only 200 years old and there are those, such as Frichtof Bergman, an anthropologist at the U of M., who argue that it cannot last. We’re going to have to learn to do more for ourselves. At one time Bergman was influential in VolksWagon’s effort to keep the total workforce but reduce hours so that all of it’s its workforce could stay.

2. On Saturday, the 23rd, we have a K-12 event: We do this twice a year; invite in grad students and also some national researcher to talk about, in this case her, work. Carolyn Reihl is quite well known and it promises to be a good morning. And of course her talk fits in with what we are trying to do in class. So attendance at the Sat Am session is attendance at class.

EAD 940: 9th class; Oct 30th, 2004

1. On your papers: Decent. But we can all write better. A few points that I noticed when reading your papers: . If you use a pronoun, “this”, make sure that what “this” refers to is clear.
 - a. Don’t be breezy. It’s OK in personal letters, not in formal prose.
 - b. If you call it X the first time you refer to it, call it X every time thereafter.
 - c. In any writing assignment, figure out the central concept. Address it directly. “Structure” has lots of components. Going through each can create the paper’s outline

- d. 5. An Italian prof (not an Italian American but one educated in Italy) once told me, "American students like to talk about the topic; But they don't want to address the text." I thought he was right. Read the piece. Address it. Don't drift into "In my school, we...." until the closing.
 - e. Don't string prepositional phrases together. "of the teachers in the classroom". Turn the prepositional phrase into an adjective. "The classroom teachers".
 - f. Scrub your sentences of unnecessary words. Few write well but we all hear well. Write it until it sounds the way you want it to sound.
 - g. Say everything about the topic in the same place. Lots of you picked up a topic, dropped it, then picked it up again.
 - h. A few free copies of Strunk and Whyte: If you take one you are morally obligated to read pages 66-84 twenty seven times.
 - i. Agreement: Please if the antecedent is singular, follows with a singular. They...Students; "the student...he or she"
2. Just on the structure: It's everything in Christ's. The routine, the curriculum, the assumptions about education and life and what one did in life, about learning, morality, about social equality – or inequality – about the connections between learning and life, about creating a normative school society, about motivation. And you all said the same thing, in general, about your schools. Let's juxtapose some of Christ's structure with your structure. And following Simon, who talked about the organization as a set of "givens" that we accept when we walk in the door. So include in structure what we do, the assumptions connecting what we do, how we justify what we do, how we think of ourselves relative to the doing. Christ's was a whole world; so is your school a whole world. Here's a suggestion about structure, in theory form:

Prop 1. The public schools are driven by a doctrine of equality

Prop. 2. The doctrine of equality pervades the school structure. ...:

..... and the expectations about the structure

Prop 3. So the schools are constantly assailed by events that pit the individual over and against any normative structure the school would like to create.

Example: The Americans with Disabilities Act, busing, Title One, NCLB/ESEA, AYP, Choice, Charter, Home Schooling, In Re(the affair of) Gault, Title IX, -- all worthwhile, but the normative organization is always in retreat against the accusation that some individual or group is being treated unequally. (We are trying to understand the school organization, not make judgments about individual events.)

Prop. 4. In the absence of a normative society, which would be by nature excluding and discriminating, we fall back to saying....(as you did).... we emphasize the individual...." "At Christ's there doesn't seem to be any regard for how the students feel about the school...we do not want to upset anyone or make anyone work too hard...they had little understanding of the text(unlike at Christ's) (we) accommodate the individual needs of each learner"....researchers have studied how the brain effectively learns and how we as educators should teach to (each student)...(if we followed Christ's model) parents would complain the school administration was evoking too much control and thus limiting the student's opportunity to make choices for themselves....Christ's did not leave room for authenticity....(our) country was built on freedom of choice....etc.

Prop 5. So our public schools have created a system that accommodates our exigencies.

(So what I was trying to do is trace our practices to our structure to our constraints. What's lost in all this is the motivating power of a normative society, which we all understand intuitively. And educational reform literature is full of suggestions that schools become more

like “normative societies”. But every time we try to create a “normative society” we run into “you’re not being fair to some individual or group.”) So we have Prop 6:
Prop 6: In the absence of a “normative” structure, we rely on bureaucratic rules and procedures.

So when I ask you about the “structure” of your school, I mean that interconnected set of characteristics that create the place; the physical, social, the curriculum, teaching, discipline, sanctions and rewards. It sort of all has to make sense in an interconnected way; because if one or another piece doesn’t fit; the others combine to eliminate it. My experience on various “restructuring efforts” over the years have shown me that it’s awfully hard to change the structure without starting completely over. And people in schools don’t have that luxury.

Let’s take one more. John Cook, former supt., did a dissertation on alternative schools in Michigan. He described their structure as: And among what he found was a “willingness by teachers and administrators to “reduce institutional requirements to their most basic terms to get students to stay and get a diploma’. “keep them and get them through and bend the curriculum any way you had to”. “No pretense to nurture intellectual development” (Cook: p. 142-143)). And the alternative schools he studied were “given a free reign” to do as they wished. ...it is enough for the students to just get through. “Little outside scrutiny of scores”; scores were a matter of indifference. And these schools tend to be “small and personal”. The curriculum is tailored to what the kids will do. :lots of affect. “Customized procedures to meet the needs of individuals.” What is stressed is the “close and positive relations between staff and students”. Because what we want is attendance and close relations encourage attendance. The teachers “care about the kids” and in turn, “the kids cared about the teachers”. And the graduation rate was everything: 60% was regarded as a huge success with kids who might have had 100% dropout rate in regular school. The question is “what do we see as the goal and how shall we organize ourselves to attain it?” And the way we set up the arrangements is the structure. The structure is the way we distribute power and energy.

Here’s a Gates Foundation innovation: it’s sort of an anti-school perspective. “One student at a time”; The schools have “advisors, not teachers”, one advisor to 16 students, a new and individualized learning plan each quarter, half an hour each morning for Quantative skills” to help the kids pass the college entrance tests; But “critical thinking and problem solving” is the goal; not” :now we have math class”. No backsliding toward traditional education” with periods times, routines, etc. which the One Student...people regard as intellectually lacking. One student targets inner city students, for motivation and inter-personal skills and enough academic knowledge to help kids get to college. Project work, independent study, inter-disciplinary study, exhibitions of learning, teachers as coach: What it is not: Subjects we all take. Standard exams, routine, set curriculum, tests, numerical grades, etc, get the students to take charge of their own education, and the advisors to pay attention to a few students. Contrast one student to Cook’s alternative’s.
Leadership:

Let’s talk about leadership: Iverson. Perrow, Taylor, St. Pauls, Barnard, Simon, Welsh, Eleanor Roosevelt. Your own school leadership, charisma, bureaucratic.

1. Some terms: bureaucracy, psychological set, buffering, reducing uncertainty, human relations, values leadership, bureaucratic leadership, human relations leadership, theory, concept, proposition, induction, roles, exchange, re-production (neo-Marxist) theories, organization, system, zone of indifference, collective perspective, Charisma, empirical reality, levels of measure – nominal, ordinal, interval, ratio -- theory, unit of analysis, meritocracy, equality, federated political system, transaction costs, libertarianism, the Marxist critique, sunk costs, soft technology, reducing uncertainty, reproduction theories, egalitarianism, loosely coupled systems.

2. First 25 pages of NCLB

Review of people employed in district

Chapter on F.W. Taylor

Thompson; Chapter 2

Self Report of time spent on transaction costs.

Perrow on Human relations

Piece on Nucor Steel.

Sizer's suggestions for an improved secondary school structure

Lightfoot's description of St. Paul's School.

Ved Meha on Christ's Hospital School

Barnard on Leadership,

Weber On Leadership

Self Report on Leadership

Hollingshead: Elmtown's Youth: The High School in Action

3. Today we're talking about leadership. Some Different ideas: Taylor: Expertise, guide the work with superior knowledge. Weber on charisma, bureaucracy with the expertise, authority, direction, skills, push responsibility up, hierarchy, uniformity, standards. Weber presents Bureaucracy as the answer to autocracy and to patriarchal forms of government that were too undependable, personality driven, and unpredictable. Weber was writing after the First World War (1914-1918) when they threw the Kaiser out of Germany. Bureaucracy is the way the people limit the arbitrary exercise of power; it is the way that people took over government from chiefs and kings. So bureaucratic leadership took over from kingly leadership, which had lead Germany into WWI... So we have developed rational organizations based on specialization, exchange, division of labor, and equality.

4. Human relations: push responsibility down using the assumption that people respond and join in the spirit of the endeavor; they work harder and give and get more if they are treated more respectfully and responsibly. Create and capitalize on communal spirit and the desire of employees to engage in community. Take energy that might go into non-productive informal organization and channel it into productive ways. Provide psychological rewards. Homans who presents leaders as the most obligated to the groups, as those who must most closely observe small group norms, quite able to carry out group goals. And Barnard who says it's about morality, and overlapping sets of morality(s) Simon: Leaders set the psychological set or collective perspective within which we work. Their power is not in giving orders, but in developing the boundaries around which the work is to be set. Barnard: Interesting ideas on values or codes of conduct and how leaders have to work within several perhaps-conflicting value sets. Social Darwinism: popular in the late 19th century which said that leaders were superior people and their success was evidence of their superiority. After all they had risen to the top so that's the proof.

5. For instance as a teacher, you're free to advocate for certain things, more resources, more money, smaller class size, etc. and you are very likely right about those things. But if you're the principal, you have to balance what the teachers want with what the superintendent will allocate, with what the parent groups want. So you get caught between what the competing sets want and what the superintendent, and parents want, You have to cope with there separate moralities – systems of "shoulds" -- inside the same system. If you can't balance the three, you get fired. Simple. So a leader has to be able to "conform to a complex codes of morals" (p. 279). Interesting idea. Barnard also talked about the need to creating morals for others. Which is akin to what H. Simon said about the leader defining the psychological set of the organization, the set of constraints inside which decisions are made. Barnard says such people are simply more competent. You have to be; otherwise you won't be able to handle the stresses. He says also that young people thrust into positions of leadership often make mistakes. He says they suffer from "moral bewilderment" or "loss of ability" which can lead to "ill health" and a "collapse of character."

4. Other views of leadership: Taylor, Eleanor Roosevelt, B. Franklin who was .

..... never given over to disputing, even when he knew more than the other, aware that "disputing, contradicting, and confuting people are generally unfortunate in their affairs. They get victory sometimes but they never get good will, which would be of more use to them". Stated in some advice that Franklin later passed on to Thomas Jefferson, "Never contradict anyone." (Cusick, 2005)

5. Jack Welch, CEO of GE, about whom lots has been written, positive earlier, negative later, but this is how he says he did it: a combination of brains; (Ph.D in Chem.) high energy; (work 7 days; 12 hours a day), commitment; (live and breathe the company), respect for structure; (big organizations need a structure but don't be intimidated by the structure), ruthlessness; (fire the bottom 10%, every year), elitism; (form a smaller group of highly committed execs and make use of their energy and brains, reward them highly) human relations; motivate the top with money, trips, flattery, bonuses, remembers their names and birthdays; and luck, and move people around so they get experience in different facets of the company; And wise decisions: The 80s and 90s were a good time to be in money lending and Welch took GE Capital – then a minor part of the company which lent money to dealers who needed inventory (like GMAC which lends money to dealers to finance their inventory) -- and made it 47% of the GE's profits on it. Check your mail; you may have a notice about the favorable lending rates on second mortgages from GE capital. Now they lend money on everything. So a manufacturing company became, to a considerable degree, a finance company. And male aggressiveness; hang out with the boys, play golf and go to Red Sox games; cheer winners. Be networked into the set of people who count in the profession and who can be relied upon for support and advice.

6. And again in The Economist: 10 principles of leadership: ethical compass, ability to make unpleasant decisions, clarity and focus, ambition, communication skills, ability to judge people, knack for developing talent, emotional self-confidence, adaptability, and charm. Which "The Economist" reports, is similar to the problems of heads of big corporations, asked to be responsible for more things outside of their purview and burdened with additional responsibilities. Note that the idea of sacking the chief for not meeting company goals is something we have imported into schools from corporations. And the Economist (Oct 25th, 03),

Speaking of leadership, theoretically at least. It's a very popular concept; we're always looking for "leaders." But it's hard to prove or demonstrate or find the connection between leadership variables and organizational success. "the literature on the topic is large; the findings are few"

7. Note what Tony Alvarado, supt. of /Dist 4 in NYC, did to raise test scores.

- (1) Focus on instruction, totally
- (2) Admit that reform has to start with people of energy and enthusiasm but the structure has to be in place when the energy and enthusiasm runs out. An important point: what do we need? Get rid of the guys who don't do anything. But in our system, it's not easy to get rid of people. We have to put a structure in place that insures a normative level of effort.
- (3) Replaced 20 of 30 principals in four years.
- (4) Gave continued evidence of a consuming interest in teaching and learning.
- (5) Expected the same of principals and teachers. (we don't talk about broken windows; we talk about scores)
- (6) Continued in-service and evaluation
- (7) broke down isolation of teachers working in groups, teams, etc.
- (8) Principals and teachers constantly interacting across the school, across the dist. Constant in-service and constant focus on instruction

Two book Reviews: 1200 wds. or so. Follow the outline:

- a. What is the book about. What is the argument.
- b. B. How did the author tell the story? (Stories don't tell themselves. The author had to get the message across. How did she do it? For instance in my last book, "A Passion for Learning", the argument is that education is a private and personal more than it is a public and institutional undertaking". Then to make that point, I narrate (what I call) the education(s) of seven eminent Americans. So tell the story and explain how the story was transmitted.
- c. Now you can express your opinion, of the argument, and of the way the argument was made. Was it readable, exciting, informative, dull. Might it have been better argued?

EAD 940: Week 11: November 13, 04

1. I need your papers by next Tuesday, November 16. I said you could wait until the end of the fall term, but the rules changed, even for courses like ours that are scheduled as "fall". And if you want or need to take longer, then don't worry. I'll put in a DF (remember my DF story) until you turn in the work. Then I'll change the DF to a grade. Sorry about that.

2. On leadership: Here's a view of leadership that fits what I was trying to say in my book, that leadership was not so much an individual quality as much as it is an expression of broad-based support" ..."A person in the Confucian sense is always a center of relationships rather than an individual complete in herself and separable from others, the structure and movement by which she expresses herself in the context of human relatedness becomes a defining characteristic of her humanity."

And please remember what Lesa told us from her report on George Homan's book, The Human Group. That leaders are obligated to most closely adhere to group norms. And group status allocated downward to those who adhere less to least.

2. What some of you said about leadership in your district/school..... safety, standards and policies evoke the most bureaucracy... Administrative – Unions issues, Dual hierarchies and conflicting sets of expectations with unions, hierarchy, dept. heads, IDP (Teachers' individual development plans) interest groups, Child Assistance Program, school boards and their oversight committees, principals who are allowed to serve as a puppet in regard to important decisions..... different kinds of leadership styles..... bureaucratic procedures are not followed and a lack of leadership as when "the principal "has not relayed information properly..... confusion – on your part about crossing of the formal with the informal... some dismay about your invisibility-"I'm only seen when "money is involved and trouble come... leaders anxious about compliance still a lot of freedom to do what you want inside the classroom ... " leadership as a complex system of formal and informal" and "students sometimes exerting control over teachers.

3. Here's the way I put what you said together into a theory-form: (A proposition is a statement of relationship between two concepts. A set of interrelated propositions is a formal theory.)

Proposition 1: School leadership is diffuse.

Proposition 2: Diffusion is alleviated by bureaucratic procedures.

Proposition 3: Bureaucratic procedures conflict with democratic ideals.

Proposition 4: Democratic ideals force adoption of human relations techniques

Proposition 5: But Human techniques are not allowed to override bureaucratic procedures.

Conclusion: School admin is highly bureaucratic but with a human-relations -facade.

3. And I was thinking about the organization. Where, in schools, is administrative energy exercised? At the school level? The dept level? The district level? More specifically, where do decisions about hiring get made? About tenure-ing? About assigning duties? About evaluating? About moving around, perhaps to administrative positions? Where do decisions about finance get made? At MSU, we a lot of that at the dept. level. That's why a say, the basic administrative of the university is the department? Where is your basic administrative unit? And what are the advantages and disadvantages of your system.

4. The next topic is change:

a. Change comes from ideas: There was a prof. at the U of Chicago in the 40-80's, Lewis Strauss, and many of his former students are today influential and/or able to influence our current administration. Among the things Strauss advocated were: anti-communism, individual rights – not affirmative action or feminism – market competition, not excessive regulation, educational and artistic excellence. (NYR: Nov. 4, 04. P. 55). Strauss did not think it the place of the government to intervene in affairs which people would work out themselves.that) genuine education is a necessarily elite enterprise, one difficult to maintain in a leveling, democratic society".....(Strauss taught that the greatest danger is within, from our "decay of moral standards and the atrophy of America's political religion of constitutionalism". (P. 59) Some of those influential people were also influenced by a U of Chicago economist Milton Friedman, a statistician by trade, who argued – again with statistics, that many government programs were ineffective and inefficient. When Pres. Bush talks about "privatizing social security", he and his staff are reflecting some of Mr. Friedman's thinking.

b. The biggest change comes, from I think: the 14th Amendment which opens the door to the accusation that one, that's one, individual is not being treated fairly by some public institution:

All persons born or naturalized into the United States . . . are citizens of the United States and of the states wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall bridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.

(Scaturro: p. 9)

So, affirmative action, the Americans With Disabilities Act, school busing, Title 9, In Re Gault, due process, NCLB -- "No child"—note that's singular, all of those elements were supported by the assertion that someone or some number of people were not being treated equality, or that their rights were being abridged. So? Well, the educational organization has to constantly adapt to assure that its sights are set upon the moving target of equality. And that means the school organization has to change, adapt, get more bureaucratic, etc. But what we wind up with is, what conservatives like to call, "the calcified" bureaucracy.

- d. Change comes from bureaucratization. For instance ESEA, 1965, put lots and lots of federal money into education, in the hope of reducing poverty. With the federal money went enlarged and empowered state departments of education; with such state departments came – in Michigan – MEAP tests, with MEAP with the notion that the "school was the unit of analysis". With that notion came PA 90 in 1990 which mandated school improvement teams, annual reports, school accreditation – which the state is still trying to figure out – mandated core curriculum, and (here's a big one) financial sanctions for schools that did not comply. In 1993, with "choice, charter, and market" and a change in the financing of schools, from property and 38% state to sales and 90+ percent state financing, the locals had to pay more attention to what the state, in PA 90, said. So there is this interplay of forces, equality, bureaucracy, the assumption that the school – not the individual – is the unit of analysis. And it seems that the changes we're witnessing revolve around that set of assumptions.

Elmtown's youth: presents us with some interesting problem we see a school where the rich run the school for their benefit. Remember this is 1939; little state aid, no federal aid, few state regulations, probably some curricular guidelines set by colleges or national accreditation groups, but constraints on the part of the locals. And what did the locals do? They ran the schools in ways that favored their own children. The school reflected the social structure of the town. What Elmtown Tells us is why we are constantly working on equality, why is is the central concern of the states and the federal govt. If they did not work on it, if they did not intervene in local affairs. The people at the local level would run the school – as they ran Elmtown – to benefit their own children. School actions would reflect the class system. The difference is between "particularistic" and universalistic" goals. And since equality is a universalistic goal, the school is under constant pressure to avoid doing anything that appears particularistic. So we're trying to show you why with the goal of equality, we have federal and local controls. It gives you an idea of what we are trying to accomplish with a universal and equal system; and the difficulties of creating one.

Final exam: Please write a three page – 1000 or so word essay – in which you take an issue: change, leadership, bureaucracy, human relations thinking, Scientific management.

A. How does the issue manifest itself in schools? b. what are the problems that present themselves around the issue? C. How are those problems resolved?