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Executive Summary

This report presents the results of a ten-month long case study of two Georgia high schools that participated in the High School Redesign Initiative (HSRI), a transformational effort of the Professional Association of Georgia Educators (PAGE) that grew out of its work to promote the development of teacher leadership and schools as learning organizations. The results of this study confirm positive change at both high schools and demonstrate that substantial portions of this change can be linked directly to each school’s adoption of the HSRI framework.

Overview of the Study’s Design

In order to investigate the effect of HSRI on schools, we conducted a case study of HSRI, which included two high schools who joined the initiative when it was first launched. Case study method is the preferred research strategy when studying how and why change has occurred in complex organizations. These two schools were recommended for inclusion in the study by PAGE staff because they were thought to exemplify the benefits of HSRI. The two schools also had similarly robust levels of participation in HSRI professional learning opportunities, but existed in notably different policy contexts, especially in terms of the relative emphasis on standardized tests. This combination of very similar levels of participation with different policy contexts allowed us to more clearly differentiate the effects of HSRI from the effects of factors such as poverty level or how a school’s host district responds to state and federal mandates. This analysis, in turn, helps establish the degree to which a school or school district might expect its adoption of HSRI to yield similar outcomes.

The study focused on changes in school culture (e.g., what teachers and administrators believe and value) and school structure (e.g., how the school structures the roles of teachers and administrators), and was organized around four research questions. The first set of questions focused on documenting cultural and structural change at each school, while the second set of questions focused on documenting the cause of cultural and structural change. To answer these questions, we conducted a total of seven interviews, 11 focus groups and reviewed more than 400 documents. Focus groups and interviews were designed to elicit participants’ experience of cultural and structural change at each school, and included educators new to each school and those who had been at the school since the beginning of the school’s involvement with HSRI. We interviewed four PAGE staff members familiar with HSRI, and PAGE’s executive director, Dr. Allene Magill. All interviews and focus groups were audio recorded. Interviews, focus groups and documents were analyzed to determine the degree to which they provided evidence in support of or counter to 33 propositions — statements representing the outcomes predicted by HSRI. Propositions
were organized into cultural or structural themes; 12 propositions predicted that positive
cultural and structural change was caused by the school’s participation in HSRI. Results
were summarized in tables and graphical form. We compared the results for each school,
not to evaluate which school is “better,” but rather to discern the effect of HSRI relative to
that of its policy context.

Findings

To succinctly convey results, schools are distinguished by keywords that best
represented the way each school adapted HSRI to their context. Thus, we have dubbed
them Success School and Engagement School.

Question 1 focused on cultural characteristics of the school and how they have changed
since joining HSRI. It included three sub-themes: “beliefs and values,” “meaning and
commitments” and “lore and tradition.” These sub-themes included communication,
collaboration, school purpose, and views about students and teachers. The most robust
change at both schools documented by the study occurred in the “beliefs and values” sub-
theme. We found clear and extensive evidence at both schools indicating that consistent
communication about the school’s purpose exists, that teachers and administrators are
collaborative and focused on student engagement and/or success, and that students and
parents are respected and viewed as key agents in successful education. Slightly more
robust and consistent evidence of this change was evident at Engagement School in
comparison to Success School, a variance attributed to differences in policy context. Policy
context also affected conceptions of engagement at each school. Success School tended to
foster engagement using extrinsic motivators such as grades, while Engagement School
tended to foster engagement using intrinsic motivators, such as the inherent value students
found in the work being assigned.

Question 2 focused on structural change since joining HSRI, and examined the work of
teachers, students, administrators and parents. Three sub-themes comprised Question 2:
“roles,” “rules and norms” and “relationships.” The second most robust finding documented
by the case study was in the “relationships” theme. Key to the HSRI framework is the
importance of relationships. Strong relationships with students and their community
enabled teachers at each school to design meaningful lessons for students that engaged
them, fostering learning and commitment to schoolwork. A clear focus on relationship-
building developed at both schools, evidenced by how both schools see students and
families as their customers, with educators seeing themselves as responsible for designing
learning experiences that meet each customer’s needs. This finding was equally strong at
both schools. Trust was analyzed as especially important at both schools for establishing
the strong relationships between teachers and students, among teachers, and between
teachers and administrators. Thus, HSRI’s emphasis on teachers as leaders and principals
as leaders of leaders both requires and gives rise to trusting relationships that create the conditions for transformation and effective adaptation. These results suggest that trusting relationships are key for solving some of the problems identified by advocates of test-based accountability, such as fostering teaching excellence and deep learning.

Question 3 examined causes of identified cultural change at each school; sub-themes mirrored those used to organize Question 1. As was the case with the results reported for Question 1, HSRI had the largest effect on “beliefs and values” of each school. And while Success School had slightly less robust evidence in support of propositions for this theme, we found very similar levels of evidence at both schools that their relationship with PAGE through HSRI caused a substantial portion of the changes documented by the results for Question 1.

Question 4 examined causes of identified structural change at each school; sub-themes mirrored those used to organize Question 2. The most significant results were found with respect to the sub theme of “roles” for both schools. Both schools had similar levels of support for propositions in the “roles” theme, with Engagement School having slightly more manifest evidence than Success School; virtually no evidence contrary to this theme’s propositions was found. Again, the focus was on determining the degree to which structural factors — such as the formation of teams of teacher leaders to design engaging lessons — could be traced back to HSRI. While more evidence that parents and students notice and appreciate the focus on student engagement was found at Engagement School, Success School produced slightly more evidence that the emergence of teacher leaders or Design Teams can be traced to PAGE.

**School Transformation: The HSRI Effect**

There is no doubt that HSRI brought about qualitative change at both high schools. But what is more important is the relative importance of policy context in determining the extent and nature of transformation, and the ability of HSRI’s framework to have an effect in difficult contexts.

This study revealed that the difference in the amount of evidence demonstrating cultural and structural change at each school is greater than the difference in the amount of evidence demonstrating that HSRI caused these documented changes at each school. This is significant for at least two reasons. First, it suggests that the different effect sizes are a results of the different policy contexts in which each school operated. As each school participated in very similar ways in a single initiative (HSRI), we determined differences in outcomes were most likely related to difference between school contexts, and not some other school-level factor, such as student demographics or teacher characteristics. And while there was less evidence of change at Success School compared to evidence of change at Engagement School, a greater portion of documented change at Success School can be
attributed to HSRI than is the case with Engagement School. This difference indicates that while it may take “more HSRI” to achieve similar results in less hospitable policy contexts, transformation can occur across an array of contexts.

Other findings are noteworthy. While the evidence that documented change was a cause of HSRI tends to be more evenly distributed between the cultural and structural domains, evidence of change at both schools is weighted to the cultural domain. There was more change in terms of the “beliefs and values” than there was change in terms of “roles” for both schools. This suggests that beliefs and values may be easier to change than structural features such as the roles of teachers and that policy contexts may have a greater influence on structural elements such as roles than they do on belief systems.

A single word — trust — may signify why HSRI had the positive effects that it did. We believe that one of the key benefits of HSRI for schools is the development of trust as a key feature that enables the school to work on transformation in a challenging policy context, guarding against the damage to school culture and structure that can result from punitive and simple-minded policies. In this sense, trust is not about being “touchy-feely” but rather a distinctive feature of the organization. Trust, we observed, was required for collective problem solving and fostering the initiative and accountability of individuals and groups, including students, and thus the development of a true learning organization. Our research suggests that trust at both schools formed the kernel of positive organizational functioning in the form of relationships with students and their families, among teachers and between teachers and administrators. Trust is central to relationships. We observed the second largest change in the relationships category; these changes were fostered and reinforced by changes in beliefs and values regarding engagement and school purpose. Thus, we conclude that these trusting relationships are a necessary condition for teachers to collaboratively design meaningful and engaging work for students, and for students to be willing and able to demonstrate what they have been expected to learn in ways that are both meaningful and motivating to them, that in turn cause them to be truly prepared for their many adult roles.

Conclusion

We offer this report as initial but substantial and verifiable evidence that HSRI can lead to school transformation that ultimately leads to students being ready to assume their myriad responsibilities in the 21st century. Our findings provide support for expanding HSRI in some form, and suggest the effect of the framework may be greater if adopted district wide, from the beginning. The HSRI framework should be given serious consideration by educators and policy makers as an alternative to faltering efforts to improve public education in Georgia and across the United States through test-based accountability regimes.
Introduction

Whether one is an educator, school board member, parent or community leader, questions regarding the future of public education cannot be ignored. We collectively face the dilemmas of deciding the direction of public education and the methods by which we will determine if we are indeed headed on the right path. These two key dilemmas are deeply connected: the means we choose for determining if we are “making a difference” cannot be separated from the “differences” we seek to make. Each standard we set presumes a goal, and each goal demands a standard fit to its ends. If we continue on the path of school “reform” — tired, decades old models and silver-bullet programs — we risk choosing a vision of education rooted in the past.¹ In the words of a 2008 brochure advertising the High School Redesign Initiative (HSRI):

[S]chools have tried and discarded program after program as they have diligently sought to address the dropout problem, student achievement, and apathy toward learning. This [high school redesign] initiative is designed to help schools use their own school and community data to determine what changes need to take place and determine the core business of their schools. Using this as a foundation, the capacity of the faculty must be developed to create engaging work for students.

HSRI emerged out of a vision of teachers as leaders and designers of engaging work for students, and it has been continuously elaborated by PAGE as a framework for organizational transformation since it was introduced in 2006. As a five-year initiative, HSRI is conceptualized as having phases, but this does not mean PAGE staff conceive of HSRI in a rigid, lock-step manner.

As the quoted pamphlet text suggests, PAGE emphasizes that HSRI is not a program but instead a framework. PAGE’s Executive Director, Dr. Allene Magill, told us she repeatedly emphasized this point during the course of this work. As this difference is key to understanding HSRI, a brief outline of the two approaches is warranted. While a program is prescriptive and compliance based, a framework is conceptual and requires active engagement of participants; whereas programs insist on standardization and deny the significant role of context, frameworks call for customization and application of concepts on the basis of a deep understanding of those concepts and the practice setting; and while

¹ The history of public education is, in some ways, a history of reform and by almost all accounts, efforts past and present have failed to provide high quality education for all students. While it is not our purpose to review this voluminous literature, we do wish to mention the following: David B. Tyack and Larry Cuban, Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995); Diane Ravitch, Reign of Error: The Hoax of the Privatization Movement and the Danger to America’s Public Schools, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2013).
programs focus on individual staff training, frameworks identify the development and transformation of organizations as key.²

Based on our work since April 2014 to examine what affect the High School Redesign Initiative (HSRI) has had on two Georgia high schools, we report here solid evidence demonstrating that there is a viable alternative to our inherited ways of teaching and learning. That alternative is renewing public education on the basis of transforming schools into learning organizations. But by advancing a transformational vision and framework and a set of professional learning experiences and school supports designed to realize that vision, PAGE faced a new challenge. In the words of PAGE’s director of The Impact Project, David Reynolds, “how will we be found guilty of making a difference?” David Reynolds and PAGE staff understand that the typical means for demonstrating success — that is, standardized test scores — are rooted in old ways of thinking about teaching and learning (largely behaviorist in nature) and therefore unable to assess the kind of change HSRI seeks to bring about. Because standardized tests of academic achievement systematically confound effects of schools with those of the school’s context,³ these tools are unable to provide accurate feedback to PAGE about the affect HSRI is having on participating schools. This is even more of a problem given the drastic changes in curriculum and federal and state policy that have occurred since HSRI’s inception.⁴

What thus became increasingly apparent over the last year is that one key requirement of school transformation is the simultaneous transformation of the publicly accepted means for evaluating educational organizations and any initiatives these organizations take up to better serve the students who are entrusted to them. If test scores don’t tell us all we need to know about school transformation, then what will? Thus, because HSRI is comprised of professional learning experiences designed to lead to transformation, new methods must be developed and used to determine if schools are truly engaged in work that leads to transformation.

² While the two schools examined here officially began their redesign journey in 2008, the public announcement, justification and recruitment period for HSRI dates back to 2006 (see Doc.PAGE.02). See Doc.PAGE.03 for the 2008 HSRI brochure. Also see two publications on teachers as leaders, authored by Dr. Allene Magill, Executive Director, PAGE (Doc.PAGE.01a and 01b) (see Appendix A, Table 5 for document citation codes; the document database was provided to David Reynolds on completion of this study). A table describing the difference between a program and framework, and an outline of Initiative’s “phases,” can both be found in in Appendix C, entitled “HSRI At-A-Glance.”

³ David C. Berliner, “Effects of Inequality and Poverty vs. Teachers and Schooling on America’s Youth,” Teachers College Record, 116 (2014).

⁴ This tendency is especially apparent when significant social consequences are attached to the results of standardized tests; see Sharon L. Nichols and David C. Berliner, Collateral Damage: How High-Stakes Testing Corrupts America’s Schools (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Education Press, 2007).
Why a Case Study?

It has long been established that public schools are unique, situated amidst a dizzying array of sometimes-competing interests and demands from nearly every political, social, economic and cultural constituency. Schools, it has been established, cannot be truly understood without understanding the communities in which they reside, and the students and families they are charged to serve. Public schools have been shown to be especially subject to the influence of non-educators, which contributes to a long-standing tendency to inappropriately adopt practices used by commercial enterprises or other institutions, such as warehouses, hospitals or prisons. This unfitting mimicry has stalled the development of advanced methods uniquely tailored to meeting the social responsibilities associated with public education. It has also contributed to an inability to see when methods and practices from other fields can help improve schools.

These facts suggest that any effort to examine the effects of a school, school system or transformational initiative such as HSRI, must be able to (1) methodologically contend with a lack of clear boundaries between the school or initiative and its context(s), (2) objectively analyze social phenomena as they occur in practice (i.e., not in a laboratory or artificial setting), and (3) be able to systematically collect, organize, verify and analyze multiple sources of quantitative and qualitative data over time. Such a method must also have an array of designs suited to determining if and how change has occurred, and to what any documented changes can be attributed. Case study method and design equips researchers to handle these challenges.

---


6 For a useful discussion of the difference between public education and for-profit enterprises, See Larry Cuban, The Blackboard and the Bottom Line: Why Schools Can't Be Businesses (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004); for a classic study of the misapplication of efficiency schemes to education, see Raymond E. Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces that have Shaped the Administration of Public Schools (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962); for an understanding of what schools can learn from business and a customer-centered approach to education, see Phillip C. Schlechty, Shaking up the Schoolhouse: How to Support and Sustain Educational Innovation, 1st ed, The Jossey-Bass Education Series (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001).

7 Case study method and design is often confused with (1) the case study method of instruction, common in medical and business schools, and (2) misrepresented as necessarily qualitative in nature. Case study method allows for the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data, employing both qualitative and quantitative data analyses techniques, interpretive or statistical. The distinguishing feature of a case study is that it focuses on a "how" or "why" question, and seeks to understand or test theories in contexts that have the characteristics described above. See Robert K. Yin, Case Study Research: Design and Methods, 4th ed. (Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications, 2009).
Method and Design

The aim of this research project was to study, retrospectively, the affect of HSRI on two participating high schools. Key to the case study method is to clearly establish what the actual case being studied is — in this instance, the case is in fact the HSRI is a relationship with schools. In other words, the aim of the study is to examine the influence of HSRI, which can be understood as a partnership between each participating school and PAGE. It must be emphasized that the aim here is not to evaluate the participating schools, but to see what, if any, affect HSRI had on them, and to identify in particular what was responsible for identified changes. Thus, we chose a single-case design (a study of HSRI as the case) with two instances of this relationship, or two “embedded units of analysis.” Each high school in the study is thus an embedded unit of analysis in a single case study.

Selecting the Units of Analysis

While there are more than 45 schools that are or have participated in HSRI since its inception, Sonoraville and Shaw high schools were identified by PAGE staff as good examples of ongoing school transformation resulting from each school’s participation in HSRI. Sonoraville and Shaw were two of four initial schools to join HSRI, according to both interviews with PAGE staff and a review of internal PAGE documents. Both schools participated in HSRI for the full five years originally envisioned by the initiative. In fact, both schools currently benefit from “continuation funds” established by HSRI staff when these schools neared their fifth year. Each school sent between 45-47 different staff members to professional learning events related to HSRI between 2008 and 2012, with a total of 70 registrants from each school over this period, when individuals who attended more than one event are included. Each school employed about 90 certified staff members during this period, indicating a 50% participation rate in off-site professional learning (PAGE staff suggest a much higher level of onsite participation, as these attendees worked to collaborate with staff at the school following their off-site professional learning). PAGE provided an estimated $92,500 per high school over the five-year period, not including continuation funds. Thus, Shaw High School and Sonoraville High School each represent a complete and very similar instance of partnering with PAGE on the redesign journey, and

---

8 See Doc.PAGE.04 for a recent example of how PAGE presents the HSRI partnership to prospective and participating schools. This document represents substantial change from the original application process. See Doc.PAGE.05

9 See Doc.PAGE.08.

10 See Doc.PAGE.04 and Doc.PAGE.05.

11 Continuation funds were relatively small sums made available to participating schools following the last official year of HSRI. The idea of continuation funds is recognition by PAGE staff that redesign efforts are ongoing, and benefit from continued support.
therefore each warrants inclusion in the study as a key and comparable instance of HSRI. Each school evidences consistent staff participation in HSRI-related professional learning activities, regular communication with HSRI staff, and identifies HSRI-related initiatives and ideas in its school improvement plans over the five-year period.12

Figure 1 depicts the design of the study. The graphic emphasizes that PAGE, HSRI and participating schools are situated in a dynamic policy context that influences schools in many ways. Policy context refers not only to the numerous and specific demands emanating from federal (e.g., the No Child Left Behind Act and the Race to the Top initiative) and state governments (e.g., new teacher evaluation policies, new curriculum mandates), but also to fiscal and economic contexts, such as decreases in state funds for public education and increases in the number of school-age children living in poverty.13 The case study design adopted here enables us to differentiate the affect of HSRI from the affect of the policy

---

12 Very similar levels of staff participation in HSRI related professional learning are evident in Doc.PAGE.06; also see Doc.PAGE.07. Archives of email communication between HSRI staff and each high school can be found in the following two document collections: Doc.Shaw.01 and Doc.Sonoraville.01. School improvement plans are found in these collections: Doc.Shaw.03 and Doc.Sonoraville.02.

13 According to analyses of U.S. Bureau of Statistics data by kidscount.org, Georgia has the fourth highest poverty rate among all 50 states. Gordon County (Sonoraville) had an increase in the child poverty rate from 18.5% in 2008 to 26.0% in 2012. Muscogee County (Shaw) had an increase in the child poverty rate from 26.2% in 2008 to 28.1% in 2012.
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context by comparing how two different schools in two different school systems serving two different communities responded to the same initiative. It should be pointed out that these schools primarily worked with the same PAGE representatives over the five-year period, experiencing equal financial support and professional learning opportunities. While we will discuss this point in more detail below, the design allows us to isolate commonalities across and differences between each school and to discern how these similarities and differences reflect unique features of each school, the influence of HSRI, and the policy context.

While we maintain that each school was similarly exposed to and participated at a similar level in HSRI professional learning and supports, important differences between the schools are evident. We present here basic demographic information about each school along with important differences in each school’s policy context. The racial/ethnic composition of Shaw High School was considerably different from that of Sonoraville between the 2007-2008 and 2011-2012 fiscal years (the five years spanning HSRI). For example, more than 50% of Shaw’s students were classified as Black over this time period, while Sonoraville had an average of only 1% of its students classified as Black. Over this time period, Sonoraville had an average of 91% of its students classified as White while Shaw had an average of 34% of its students classified as White. During this same time period, the number of students receiving free or reduced price meals (a typical proxy for the level of poverty affecting the community of students the school serves) was similar at each school, with each school showing an increase in this category of enrolled students. At Shaw, the percent of students receiving free and reduced price meals averaged 45%, with a low of 37% in 2008 and a high of 51% in 2012. Sonoraville had a slightly higher number of students in this category: the percent of students receiving free and reduced price meals averaged 49%, with a low of 40% in 2008 and a high of 53% in 2012. Per-pupil expenditures, however, differed between the schools. The average per-pupil expenditure for Shaw was about $5,500 while it was $6,800 for Sonoraville, between the years studied. While funding dipped but then reached 2008 levels for Shaw, Sonoraville had an overall decline of $1,200 in per-pupil revenue during the five years studied. Additionally, while we do not have data on the number of students classified as homeless at Sonoraville, Shaw reported 44 such students in 2011, an increase from 1 in 2009. We also suspect that Shaw has more student transiency than Sonoraville.

There are important differences to note between the policy contexts of each school as well. Muscogee County, Shaw High School’s district, joined President Obama’s signature

14 Unless otherwise noted, information and terminology for this section comes directly from Doc.Sonoraville.03 and Doc.Shaw.04.

15 See Doc.Shaw.02, p. 29.
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education reform initiative as a Race to the Top district. This brought controversial reform strategies to influence Shaw High School, including a heightened emphasis on standardized tests. This follows Shaw High School’s repeated designation as a school that did not meet "Adequate Yearly Progress" (AYP) under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), provisions of which were subsequently waived when Muscogee County won a Race to the Top grant. Sonoraville’s Gordon County did not choose to participate in this initiative, and it has always met AYP requirements under NCLB.

Another key feature affecting Shaw that is far less an issue for Sonoraville is the magnet system operating for all nine high schools in Muscogee County. This choice system creates competition between county high schools for students, and adds to the pressure emanating from federal and state policies to focus on test scores. This competitive system and its policy context encourages parents to use the results of standardized tests as a sole measure of school quality. While there is some rivalry between the two high schools in Gordon County, Sonoraville being one, the level of competitive pressure that Shaw experiences does not exist for Sonoraville. Further, the parents with the students who tend to score well on standardized tests tend to choose schools with similar test score profiles, and as all magnet programs are criterion based, a de facto academic tracking and ranking system exists in Muscogee. We believe this is a significant difference and we argue this policy context plays an important role in creating the differences in how HSRI affected each school. Additionally, Shaw High School has had two principals, led by at least three different superintendents since 2008, while Sonoraville High School has had the same principal since the beginning of HSRI and enjoyed a relatively stable superintendency.

Research Questions and Propositions

The overarching question guiding this study was: how and why has each high school’s connection to and work with and through PAGE contributed to changing each school’s culture and structure? On the basis of this question, we established four specific research questions with each question corresponding to a series of propositions (see Appendix A, Tables 1-4). These questions can be summarized into two themes, reflecting the study’s focus on how and why cultural and structural change occurred at each participating school. These are: (1) how have cultural and structural elements changed since the beginning of the High School Redesign Initiative? (questions 1 and 2) and (2) why did these changes

---

16 See Doc.Shaw.08.
17 The principal of Shaw High School highlighted this point at several times during our interview with him.
18 The importance of administrative turnover was confirmed by both teachers and the principal of Shaw High school. Further, interviews with PAGE staff and discussion with Sonoraville High School’s principal confirm the relative stability of leadership of Gordon County schools.
occur as they did? In particular, we aimed to identify the degree to which positive (desired) change can be attributed to HSRI (questions 3 and 4).

From April until July 2014, draft research questions were developed from examining the expectations embedded in an original HSRI application and discussion with David Reynolds, PAGE’s director of The Impact Project. These were piloted during a Sonoraville High School summer retreat in July, 2014, which included teacher leaders and the school’s administrative team. Along with David Reynolds, we observed the vast majority of this retreat, and subsequently revised our research questions as a result. Key revisions included a greater focus on teacher leaders, the themes of trust and collaboration, and the adoption of a more systematic framework for crafting propositions on the basis of cultural or structural characteristics.

Case study propositions direct the researcher’s attention to what should be examined within the scope of study. In order to concretize cultural and structural change, we established 33 propositions, each reflecting either a cultural theme — beliefs and values, meanings and commitments, and lore and tradition — or a structural theme — roles, norms and relationships. These propositions link the “theory of action” of HSRI to evidence in the form of interviews, focus groups and documents (e.g., discipline rates, school improvement plans, samples of student work). PAGE theorizes that a school will be transformed in specific ways by participating in its professional learning opportunities, and from its professional support and guidance. For example, as a result of HSRI, PAGE expects to see evidence that, “The school’s purpose is focused on engaging students in meaningful work, serving each student’s academic, social and psychological needs” (Question 1, Proposition 2). Thus, expected outcomes, derived from the theory of action assumed by HSRI, are stated here as propositions. Each proposition is a prediction of what should be evident in the school as it transforms into a learning organization. Further, the propositions for questions 3 and 4 (the “why” questions) are designed to capture the degree to which HSRI and PAGE caused any change documented in the evidence gathered for the first two questions (the “how” questions). Finally, we explicitly looked for examples of evidence contrary to each proposition in all three data sources (interviews, focus groups and documents), as a means to increase the validity of our findings.

---

19 See Doc.PAGE.05.

20 While we did gather and archive data from this retreat, it was not our intent to include it in the case study database for analysis.

21 These themes are derived from Phil Schlechty’s work.
Data Sources

For this case study, we collected three sources of data over ten months: seven interviews, 11 focus groups and more than 400 documents (see Appendix B for the list of requested documents and the focus groups and interviews scheduled for each school). We collected all three types of evidence from both Sonoraville High School and Shaw High School. We interviewed four PAGE staff members familiar with HSRI, PAGE’s executive director, and we obtained a variety of documents (25 in total) about PAGE and the history of HSRI from PAGE staff. Many of the documents obtained from PAGE (e.g., email correspondence) are with respect to Shaw High School or Sonoraville High School, and thus are included in each school’s section of the case study database (see Appendix A, Table 5 for a listing of all documents cited in this report). All interviews and focus groups were semi-structured in nature (see Appendix B for interview and focus group protocols). In all cases, David Reynolds served as a liaison between us, each school, and other PAGE staff.

Data Collection

While the gathering of documents and other relevant artifacts was ongoing between April 2014 and February 2015, focus groups and interviews with school personnel took place on October 23, 2014 (Shaw High School), and October 24, 2014 (Sonoraville High School). These visits were not our only visits to each school however. As is recommended practice, we began our work with PAGE by visiting both schools in April to better understand the nature of the relationship between PAGE and each school, to assess the viability of including the school in the study, to build rapport with PAGE and school staff, and to begin to assess what possibilities existed for the study's design. While these visits shaped our understanding of the schools, PAGE and HSRI, the information taken and notes gathered at that time were not intended to be included in the final case study database. We have, however, relied on that early visit in the case of Sonoraville High School, since we were unable to interview the principal during our October visit.

School-based interviews and focus groups lasted between 30 and 45 minutes. All participants were informed about the purpose of the interview or focus group, and assured that its contents would have no bearing on the evaluation of school personnel or students, and that all content would remain confidential; if quoted, content would be de-identified, except in the case of interviews with a school’s principal. Interviews with PAGE staff averaged about two hours in length; each was informed about the nature of the interview and confidentiality was assured. All participants were given the chance to request that they not be recorded. Recording of both interviews and focus groups was accomplished using a note-taking software program that enables the researcher to indicate key points during a

---

recording, which can be quickly accessed later. During focus groups or in school interviews, each of us took notes and made observations, as did David Reynolds, when he was present.

We crafted a request outlining what documents we wished to obtain from each school, along with a list of types of individuals (teachers, administrators, etc.) we would like to interview, or engage with in focus groups, along with the criteria for selecting participants and documents. These requests were sent to each school’s administrative team by David Reynolds, who negotiated document collection and details of the interview and focus group schedule at each school. While not all of our requests were met, both schools made good faith efforts to accommodate our needs.23

Analysis of Data

As we sought to investigate not only how Shaw and Sonoraville high schools have changed, we sought to demonstrate why they have changed. In particular, we sought to determine to what degree, if any, the predicted documented changes were caused by the school’s participation in HSRI. As such, this is a causal case study, as it seeks to explore a causal relationship between an independent variable, school participation in HSRI, and a range of dependent variables (the three cultural and three structural themes that organized the study’s research questions and propositions). As the propositions were derived from the theory of action guiding HSRI, they constitute the expected outcomes. Thus, data analysis was guided by the idea of “pattern matching”: the degree to which theoretically predicted outcomes match empirical outcomes.24 In particular, by having two embedded units of analysis, each being an instance of the “treatment” of HSRI, this design is experimental in principle. Unlike a true controlled experiment with a representative sample, however, the results of this study are not generalizable to any population of high schools, but rather constitute a means for analytic generalization (test of a theory’s efficacy). As each school received nearly the same “treatment” any differences in outcomes

23 See Appendix B for the requests sent to each school. Sonoraville High School did not organize teacher focus groups on the basis of “design teams” and “rank and file” teachers as we had requested, complicating our ability to clearly differentiate between these two groups of teachers during data analysis. Further, while Sonoraville High School students clearly represented a range of students in terms of academic, social and emotional characteristics, who obviously received no coaching (student comments indicated they were not aware of the nature of the focus group prior to the beginning of each session), Shaw High School students were informed “that this was part of a case study of Shaw’s involvement with the PAGE High School Redesign Initiative which includes how to better engage students” and the informing administrator “stressed that [students] had to talk and be honest.” This focus group was exceptionally deferential and responsive. One Shaw participant’s mother was a teacher at the school, and that student reflected a characteristically adult mindset when speaking about the school’s administration. It also appeared that many participants had experience in the school’s magnet program classes, a criterion admissions program representing only about a quarter of all students at Shaw). We realize that we should have provided a more explicit protocol for each school to use while inviting student and staff to participate.

24 See Yin, Case Study Research, pp. 136-141).
between the two schools can be examined as originating in one of the following: (1) unique features of the school prior to or during the course of HSRI (including the existence of other programs, change in administration, etc.) or (2) differences in the policy context in which the school exists. Similarities, when logic and evidence permit, can thus be attributed to the affect of HSRI.

One of the key challenges of the data analysis was to document actual change over time. While several focus group and interview questions probed respondents to evaluate this change (see Appendix B for the interview and focus group protocols), and while we did collect evidence in the form of documents across multiple years, the documentation of evidence in favor of a proposition was easier than demonstrating actual change from a previous state. Neither school provided us with all requested documents, further contributing to this challenge. In the case of Sonoraville High School, we are relatively confident about school characteristics emerging with the arrival of HSRI as Sonoraville opened in 2006, which was described by teachers who began working at the school when it opened as “cold” and “rigid.” The following year its new (and still current) principal Bruce Potts told us during our introductory meeting with him in April 2014 that he was “looking for something” to bring the school together, and decided to focus on HSRI (he attended PAGE sponsored events that morphed into HSRI beginning in 2006). As Shaw has been in existence for decades, some school characteristics that align with outcomes predicted by HSRI may have been a feature of the school prior to HSRI. Our main means of sorting this out was the “design team” teacher focus group at Shaw. Its participants all began teaching at the school in 2003, and spoke openly about its characteristics then and since HSRI.

All school-based focus groups and interviews were coded for manifest and latent evidence in support or in contradiction to the study’s propositions (see Appendix A, Tables 6-9). Coding took place in three passes, which consisted of the first author initially extracting key text elements from recordings and assigning initial codes; subsequently, extracted text was jointly recoded by both authors. In cases where codes differed, discussion and further exploration of theme was pursued by going back to the focus group or interview recording or review of related documents, or both. Data were then put into tables and initial trends were identified. These trends spurred an additional pass at coding, which led to minor coding changes and subsequent recalculation of table subtotals and totals. Finally, coding patterns were compared to patterns observed by David Reynolds, from his notes during the focus groups in which he was present. While his interpretations generally aligned with our final coding efforts, some differences were evident, mainly because he did not code for counter evidence.25

25 We asked that David Reynolds not be present during the interview with the school’s principal or design teams, as these groups were most likely to be influenced by his (PAGE’s) presence, being the beneficiaries of professional learning opportunities provided by PAGE.
Following the identification of manifest and latent evidence in support of and counter to the case study propositions, documents were reviewed for supporting or contrary evidence as well. As it was expected that the nature, scope and extent of documents varied greatly by school, documents were not coded, but instead used to support, challenge or better comprehend the nature of identified trends.

Finally, data visualizations were created to represent findings, based on the theme subtotals presented in Tables 6-9. These will be discussed in the findings section below. Quotes from interviews or focus groups, along with evidence obtained from documents, are used to provide nuance and examples of major findings as well as to point to difficulties in data analysis and interpretation.

Findings

In this section, we report the major findings from each research question, in the order they appear in Tables 1-4 (for the results section, it is now assumed readers know that all tables referenced are to be found in Appendix A). While we introduce some of our preliminary analysis of these findings here, we save the majority of the discussion of the significance of findings for the discussion section. But a key conclusion that is helpful to note here is this: there is no question that HSRI had a substantial affect on each school in the desired direction. We think a far more interesting question to keep in mind when exploring these findings is what they reveal about how HSRI interacted with key aspects of the policy context of each school and the relative amount of cultural to structural change that occurred and possible reasons for different outcomes by themes. Finally, all quotations that are referenced in the findings below are taken from either focus groups or interviews that occurred during the October visits, unless otherwise noted (see Tables 10 and 11).

Research Question 1

The first research question asked: How have the following cultural elements (concretized as 13 propositions) changed since the beginning of the High School Redesign Initiative at Shaw and Sonoraville high schools? Figure 2\textsuperscript{26} summarizes our findings for Question 1.

\textsuperscript{26} Visualizations for questions 1-4 were developed on the same scale. This means that relative circle size across the four questions is a meaningful depiction of the relative amount of evidence for each theme. It is also important to note that visualizations are based on evidence obtained from focus groups and interviews only. Documents were used to verify observed patterns. There are important cases where focus group and interview data did not produce evidence of patterns that nonetheless appeared in documents and were observed by us during school visits. These findings are addressed in the narrative, but cannot be used in the creation of visualizations, as neither the observations nor the documents were comparable in nature.
Figure 2 indicates that, by far, most documented cultural change at both schools occurred in the “beliefs and values” category. There is clear evidence at both schools that consistent communication about the school’s purpose exists where teachers and administrators are focused on student engagement and success and that students and parents are respected and viewed as key agents in successful education. This was a consistent finding from all focus groups and interviews at both schools. These trends were supported (or at least not contradicted) by many of the documents we analyzed, such as samples of student work, course syllabi, and school-created professional learning activities and protocols.

During the focus groups at Shaw, teachers indicated the heart of the school was student success, which included the intellectual, social and personal development of students and not just test scores (Shaw’s principal referred to this as “full option graduation”). When asked what we would see if we shadowed teachers at Shaw, teachers indicated that we

---

27 Circle size for evidence in support of propositions is not calculated by subtracting contrary evidence. The logic here is similar to that of a court, where the jury is presented with and must weigh all evidence before making a decision. This method of visualization allows the reader to see summaries that include evidence in support and contrary to propositions, simultaneously.

28 See Doc.Shaw.05 - Doc.Shaw.07 and Doc.Sonoraville.04 - Doc.Sonoraville.06.
would see real world applications of student work. Counselors at Shaw also perceived an engagement focus. Parents indicated the value of hands-on learning for engaging their children at school, and appreciated the school’s commitment to student success. Students indicated that something interests them every day, although this admittedly varies by their interest in the particular subject (see Table 10, Ref. Nos.: 1, 6-7, 9, 12, 21, 24, 30).

Focus group evidenced very consistent patterns at Sonoraville. Engagement was a clear focus of the school, and consistently communicated by administration and teachers. This focus was noticed and appreciated by parents as well. Teachers repeatedly talked of “engagement” and “inquiry based” methods, “real world” connections, working to meet the needs of “diverse learners” and the need to build strong relationships with students and the community. During one focus group, teachers spontaneously chanted, with conviction, the school’s mission: “We are a learning community actively pursuing a higher standard of excellence.” The engagement focus of the school was clearly understood as a means to help students develop intellectually, socially and personally, and consistently communicated by teachers and administrators (see Table 11, Ref. No.: 10).

While the amount of evidence in each category is similar, it is also clear that the evidence for Sonoraville was stronger for two of the three themes, and more consistent, where almost no evidence contrary to the propositions was found. A greater proportion of the evidence from Sonoraville was also classified as manifest in nature. As “lore and tradition” are considered to be secondary effects of cultural change, it is not unexpected that the least amount of evidence appears in this category. While we find that both schools developed important “lore and traditions” that can be traced back, at least in part, to HSRI, that finding is not discussed here. We now focus our attention on analyzing nuances of the findings for the two dominant themes.

Beliefs and Values

While compelling evidence at both schools exists showing that teachers and administrators are focused on student engagement — a key goal of HSRI — the particular meaning given to engagement and the practices used to foster it did differ between the two schools. These differences correspond, we argue, to the slightly less robust evidence in support of propositions for the “beliefs and values” theme for Shaw High School. It is important to emphasize again that we focus on these differences, not to declare which school we think is better, but to more carefully understand how school context and HSRI interacted, a discussion we give emphasis to throughout the rest of this report.

29 While we were unable to interview the principal of Sonoraville during our October visit, our meetings and observations of him during our April and July visits presented clear evidence for propositions related to all three themes for Question 1.
The subtotals resulting from the addition of all instances of manifest and latent evidence for the “beliefs and values” theme were in a similar range for both schools (Shaw, n=88; Sonoraville, n=111, see Tables 6, 7). Approximately 16% of focus group and interview evidence was classified as contrary to the propositions in the “beliefs and values” theme for Shaw High School, where no contrary evidence was found at Sonoraville High School. Examples of evidence contrary to Question 1 propositions are found in Table 10 (Ref. Nos.: 6-7, 10).

To help clarify how each school understands the concept of student engagement, how it intended to foster engagement, and more generally, how the school framed its purpose, we have dubbed Shaw the “success” school and Sonoraville the “engagement” school. We found Shaw to be keenly focused on ensuring students were successful. When asked about the focus of the school, student success was the most frequently given answer by participants (see Table 10). By success, the school’s principal, teachers and students enlisted common indicators including graduation from high school, increased test scores, academic decathlon trophies, college admission and well-paying jobs. Unlike at Sonoraville, parents at Shaw expressed views suggesting that there may be an unhealthy pressure on students to perform, to get into the best college, to choose careers too early in life (see Table 10, Ref. No.: 25). During the student focus group, for example, one participant indicated his goal was to “get into a good college, like Harvard”. It was clear that Shaw as a whole had hitched student engagement to the district’s notion of “full-option graduation” and the principal’s vision of raising the prestige of the school in the eyes of the community. While success was broadly understood at the school, there was some tension arising from an increased focus on test scores, with for example, the introduction of “data teams” during teacher planning time. Teachers were very conscious of and spoke to this pressure, and their comments suggested they understood that this pressure originated in the larger policy context (see Table 10, Ref. Nos.: 3-4, 10-11).

This notion of success was, we believe, connected to a notion of engagement fostered more by extrinsic motivators like food and other rewards than intrinsic interest and the personal satisfaction derived from learning. While HSRI promotes the view that students should be provided challenging work, Shaw’s principal and some teachers emphasized engagement as a means to encourage students to take up the challenge of doing well on tasks that may not be inherently interesting, such as work sheets (see Table 10, Ref. No.: 28). And while students gave numerous examples of teacher assigned work that they found
interesting as such, we also documented patterns that suggested *ritual engagement*. This form of engagement might also reflect the influence of a military culture familiar to many students. For example, during the student focus group, one student rose from his seat and stood at attention before answering the first question. We should acknowledge, however, that some tension over the meaning of engagement was evident in interviews with both the past and present principal, teacher focus groups, as well as PAGE staff familiar with Shaw (see Table 10, Ref. No.: 16). Some teacher leaders expressed a yearning for the days when engaging lessons were more about drawing out a student’s native interest, but again, it is also important to note how these teachers linked this change directly to the school’s current policy context (see Table 10, Ref. No.: 10).

We thus believe that Shaw’s strategic focus on community reputation and success oriented engagement has its origin in the context in which Shaw exists, and that the school’s participation in HSRI equipped it to effectively contend with an increasingly challenging situation in terms of funding, central office turnover, competition with other high schools, and especially the district’s commitments under Race to the Top. Shaw thus applied engagement to help it adapt to its operational context, which in turn, brought about its “success” focus.

At Sonoraville, there existed a more universal agreement about what engagement meant and a pattern of consistent communication about engagement as a core purpose unto itself. Sonoraville evidenced an understanding of engagement that focused less on extrinsic rewards, less on formal measures of student success (such as test scores) and more on designing work students would find intrinsically meaningful, fulfilling and relevant. The schools administrative team often said that if the students are engaged in challenging, meaningful and carefully designed work, “the test scores would take care of themselves” (see Table 11, Ref. No.: 11).

**Meanings and Commitments**

Both schools evidenced nearly equal change in terms of the propositions established for the “meanings and commitments” theme. Tables 6 and 7 present data for Shaw and Sonoraville and reveal that most of this evidence was found with respect to two groupings

---

30 Ritual engagement refers to a form of student motivation focused on meeting the demands of respected authority figures and outcomes those figures emphasize, such as college admission; this form of engagement is not derived from the inherent qualities of the work designed for students. See Phillip C. Schlechty, *Shaking up the Schoolhouse*, p. 65. Schlechty’s later work uses the phrase *strategic compliance* to convey this type of student motivation. As both schools in this study were influenced by Schlechty’s *Schoolhouse* text, we have opted to keep the older language. See Phillip C. Schlechty, *Engaging Students: The Next Level of Working on the Work* (John Wiley & Sons, 2011).

31 Shaw High School is about 20 miles from Fort Benning, and the school’s administration reports that about 11% of students are from active military families.
of propositions, 1.6 and 1.7, which relate to teacher collaboration, and 1.9 and 1.10, which relate to multiple opportunities for students to be successful and the valuing of student feedback. Both Shaw and Sonoraville evidenced a relatively strong commitment and set of accompanying practices to ensure students are successful, with Shaw revealing an emphasis on academic success and graduation from high school (see Table 7, and Table 10, Ref. Nos.: 20-21, 27). While we found more evidence of collaboration at Shaw (proposition 1.6), Sonoraville revealed more evidence that planning time was devoted to designing engaging work for students (proposition 1.7; see Table 7).32

Based on our observation of Sonoraville’s planning retreat in July, 2014, we suspect that teacher focus group results tended to underestimate the amount of collaboration between teachers and the influence of teachers on administration. Teacher and administrator collaboration at this retreat — which about a fifth of Sonoraville teachers voluntary attended following the 4th of July weekend — was exceptionally high and consistently evident over the two days of work. Because focus groups at Sonoraville tended to be about 10-15 minutes shorter than at Shaw, collaboration may have been underrepresented. As a result of this limited time, we tended to move through the focus group protocol more quickly than planned, sometimes skipping prompts that may have yielded additional evidence of collaboration.

Lack of evidence for 1.7 for Shaw is likely related to recent efforts to use some teacher collaboration time to analyze test data, and the district’s new schedule, which apparently further reduced collaboration time. During the July visit to Sonoraville, we learned that schedule difficulties also limited teacher collaboration time. Additionally, we also found slightly more evidence at Sonoraville indicating that student and parent feedback was welcome. Finally, while there were very few mentions by participants of how resources at each school are spent, we expected this outcome: this knowledge is typically only available to a few key personnel (we discuss the role of PAGE in fostering themes related to this provision in presentation of the findings for questions 3 and 4).

Research Question 2

Question 2 follows the logic of Question 1, but focuses on what has been termed structural change. It asks: How have the following structural elements changed since the High School Redesign Initiatives at Shaw and Sonoraville high schools? Figure 3 presents a summary of the evidence for Question 2. It suggests there is similar but less evidence of

---

32 When coding focus groups, we reserved coding for 1.6 for when there was evidence of collaboration, but where the nature of that collaboration was unclear or not focused on designing engaging lessons (e.g., analyzing test data). Content coded as evidence for proposition 1.7 was reserved for instances of collaboration that was focused on engagement work; content coded as evidence of 1.7 was not also coded as evidence for 1.6.
change in terms of “rules and norms.” This is expected and, in part, an unintended outcome of there only being one proposition for this theme. We thus turn our attention to the other two themes, which reflect important similarities and differences between the two schools.

Figure 3 reveals the relative strength of the “relationships” theme, not only when compared to the two other themes, but also with respect to Question 1 themes. The “relationships” theme focuses on how teachers and administrators understand and relate to students and each other, with proposition 2.8 focusing specially on trust between teachers and administrators (see Table 2). While HSRI and PAGE are not the only actors to emphasize the importance of relationships for effective teaching and learning, it is important to note that the evidence from each school is particularly aligned with HSRI’s framework and its particular articulation of the significance and function of strong trusting relationships in transforming schools into learning organizations.

**Relationships**

Key to the HSRI framework and its understanding of relationships is an emphasis on the interaction between knowing your “Who” (a conception central to the “Working on the Work” or WOW professional learning opportunities PAGE provides through the Schlechty Center) and being able to design meaningful lessons for students that engage them, and as a result, yield deep learning. This relationship-building process is evidenced by how both
schools see students (and increasingly families) as their customers, with the school being responsible to design learning experiences that meet each customer’s needs.33

At both schools, we found strong evidence in support of propositions related to the “relationships” theme — that is, evidence coded as manifest in nature, and with little or no contrary evidence (see Table 10, Ref. Nos.: 12, 14; and Table 11, Ref. Nos.: 3-4). While Shaw yielded more evidence for proposition 2.8 (see Tables 6, 7), which focused on trust and collaboration between teachers and administrators, we predict Sonoraville would have shown similar levels of evidence had we been able to interview the principal during the October visit. This assertion is based on our discussions with and observations of him and his administrative team during our April and July visits.

Thus, an essential element of relationships at both schools that emerged as an important finding was trust. We first became sensitive to the importance of trust for both schools during the Sonoraville retreat in July 2014, during which we piloted our initial research questions (proposition 2.8 in particular emerged out of that pilot). At that retreat, we watched administrators and teachers work to solve two key problems confronted by the school: the addition of the eighth grade into the high school and the new Georgia teacher evaluation system. Instead of serving to instigate confrontation between teachers and administrators, we observed how these groups worked together to adjust to these challenges. The way in which the administrative team involved teachers in analyzing the new evaluation system — easily interpreted as a threat to teacher professionalism — could not have occurred if trust between teachers and administrators had not been established. Together, teachers and administrators examined how they could comply with the new mandates while advancing their school’s engagement focus.

During focus groups at both schools, teachers indicated in various ways that their respective administrative teams protected them, supported them, allowed them to try new things, and involved them in important decisions. Administrative support for teachers as professionals was also evident at each school, but particularly strong at Sonoraville (see Table 11, Ref. Nos.: 2, 8-9). Thus, HSRI’s emphasis on teachers as leaders and principals as leaders of leaders both requires and gives rise to trusting relationships which create the conditions for transformation and effective adaptation. While this will be discussed later, we believe trusting relationships are key for solving some of the problems identified by advocates of test-based accountability.

Additionally, both schools evidenced strong relationships among teachers, with focus group evidence suggesting not only collaboration, but strong feelings of trust and support.

33 Just as the call for engagement if often misunderstood as a call for teachers to be entertainers, the notion of student as customer can be confused with the idea that students and families are buying grades or that teachers and administrators should pander to students. A nuanced understanding of the customer concept as adopted by HSRI can be found in Schlechty, *Shaking up the Schoolhouse*, pp. 89-90.
from colleagues. This was evidenced in comments about there being few cliques (see Table 11, Ref. No.: 2) and extensive mentoring (see Table 10, Ref. No.: 5).

Roles

Figure 3 reveals more difference between the two schools in terms of the “roles” theme. This difference is evident in the amount of evidence at each school in support of the four propositions comprising the “roles” theme, in terms of the relative degree of manifest evidence, and in the degree of evidence counter to the theme’s propositions. While both schools revealed similar levels of emphasis regarding teachers as collaborative designers of engaging lessons (proposition 2.1), we did find more evidence in support of this proposition at Sonoraville, and more of it was manifest in nature (see Tables 6, 7). But Tables 6 and 7 show that the biggest difference between the schools is with respect to proposition 2.3, which predicts schools will understand the role of students as active learners who can display their learning in authentic ways.

This difference in evidence for proposition 2.3 accounts for most of the contrast between the two schools, for this theme. Because we know that both schools have equally strong levels of evidence for the “relationships” theme, we offer again that this particular difference is a reflection of the different policy contexts in which each school exists. Sonoraville appears to face less outside pressure to focus on student test scores than Shaw, for all the reasons described earlier. The emphasis on test scores, we believe, brings with it a passive view of students and works against teachers as collaborators in designing engaging work for students, directing them to instead spend more time analyzing test scores and tweaking lessons to boost those scores, effort that does not necessarily boost student interest or help them make real-world connections. This approach also limits the space for authentic (non-standardized) demonstrations of student learning.

Our conclusion is supported by focus group evidence, where teachers at Shaw indicated that because of the new curricular demands attached to the new Common Core tests, there is less space for inquiry based learning, which simply requires more time (see Table 10, Ref. No.: 10). While some teachers at Sonoraville expressed similar concerns, the pressure on them appears to be less intense than at Shaw. Again, we believe this is a result Gordon County not being a Race to the Top district, nor facing intense competition from other high schools, a competition which results in an uneven distribution of high- and low-scoring students, leading to the concern regarding reputation. When we take into account the positive changes documented at Shaw, such as the trusting relationships and collaboration that exists between teachers and administration, the affect of the policy context is, we believe, more strikingly revealed.
Research Question 3

While questions 1 and 2 directed us to examine cultural and structural change at each high school since HSRI, questions 3 and 4 ask us to try and identify the cause of documented change. These questions are accompanied by propositions that link documented changes to the school’s participation in HSRI. We cannot emphasize enough the challenge this poses for researchers, and so that readers do not misinterpret the presentations of findings for these questions, a few notes are in order.

Each school exists in a context that influences it in myriad ways. Shaw High School, for example, lists in its school improvement plans many initiatives, programs and professional learning activities, of which HSRI-related work was only one. Sonoraville teachers spoke of attending other forms of professional learning as well. How are we to separate out the influence of HSRI? While our method enables us to do so, it should be understood that there is an inherent limit on our ability to document an HSRI effect. It is thus expected that we will find less evidence that HSRI caused demonstrated change than we will find evidence demonstrating that change occurred.

An additional difficulty in documenting that HSRI caused changed at each school is a result of an otherwise positive attribute of how PAGE staff operate. We observed a strong tendency of PAGE staff to downplay their role, to never insist on PAGE or HSRI being thanked or referenced by name (even though PAGE spent over $180,000 over the five years of HSRI participation for the two schools, and offered continuation funds after HSRI officially ended). And, participating teachers or administrators need not be members of PAGE to participate in HSRI-related activities; nor does PAGE ask participants about their professional affiliation. In fact, it was very uncommon for school staff to speak of HSRI by name. When PAGE staff are working in a particular school, it would be easy for them not to be noticed as PAGE staff; only the administrative team and a handful of teachers are readily aware of who PAGE staff are and what role they play. Finally, it is a goal of PAGE staff that HSRI participants make HSRI-related ideas and practices their own. While the tendency of teachers to talk about ideas and practices they may have learned through HSRI-related professional learning as their own may be seen as a success by PAGE staff, it complicates the ability of researchers to find evidence regarding the cause of documented change.

As can be seen in the focus group and interview protocols, we worked hard not to “lead the respondent.” We refrained from asking focus group members directly about PAGE, HSRI or other initiatives. We only asked them general questions that we believed would reveal HSRI effects if they truly existed. Taking this understanding into account, we find that there

34 See Doc.Shaw.03.
35 See Doc.PAGE.07.
is strong evidence showing that substantial portions of documented change were caused by HSRI. We now turn to that evidence.

The logic of questions 3 and 4 followed that of questions 1 and 2, focusing first on cultural change, followed up by an examination of structural change. In each case, propositions direct us to see if there is evidence that changes in beliefs and values, for example, can be traced back to HSRI-related professional learning or staff.

Figure 4 summarizes the evidence for Question 3. It reveals that just as most of the cultural change took place within the “beliefs and values” theme, so too here, the strongest evidence that HSRI caused change was with respect to this theme.\(^{36}\)

Figure 4 reveals that evidence of HSRI effect is more similar between schools for Question 3 across all three themes than it was for Question 1. We will turn to this point again in the discussion section — where we present a different visualization comparing evidence of change to evidence that HSRI caused documented change — but for now it is sufficient to highlight this observation as it points to a common effect in different contexts. Put differently, the relative similarity of HSRI effect relative to documented change as such can help us understand how HSRI interacted with its context at each school, and thus helps us demonstrate not only that HSRI had an effect, but where that effect was most robust and

\(^{36}\) Again, visualizations for all four questions are calibrated to the same scale, so that strength of evidence can be compared both across question theme and across questions.
least evident. This in turn can help PAGE identify what it might do differently in the future, and what should remain a vital aspect of any future initiative.

It is clear from the evidence that both teachers and counselors at both schools attributed many of the documented changes to the “Working on the Work” professional learning opportunities PAGE provided through the Schlechty Center as part of HSRI (see Tables 10, 11). Documents also support this finding, with each school having an array of protocols, tools and school-based, teacher-lead professional learning emanating from HSRI related work.37

Yet, while evidence in support of propositions in the “beliefs and values” theme were very similar, Tables 8 and 9 reveal that there was more evidence in support of proposition 3.3 at Sonoraville (rank and file teachers trace PAGE-inspired beliefs to leaders at the school), while at Shaw, there was more evidence in support of proposition 3.1 (teacher leader’s beliefs were fostered by PAGE-related professional learning). We think that this difference represents differences in how broadly each school has been transformed, and the relative influence of each school’s policy context.

For Sonoraville, we saw a broader and more consistent adoption of HSRI inspired beliefs and values among a larger number of teachers, including those quite new to the school (see Table 11, Ref. Nos.: 1-11). In fact, the claim of more robust transformation at Sonoraville is suggested by the almost complete absence of evidence contrary to propositions at Sonoraville across all four questions. Sonoraville also initiated a teacher-driven induction process for new teachers, explicitly premised on the HSRI framework. While Shaw did have a mentoring program for new teachers, the focus of that program was not made explicit to us. Finally, Sonoraville’s choice to not organize focus groups on the basis of “rank and file” teachers and “teacher leaders” might suggest a cultural shift that rejects such designations as ultimately unhelpful or counter to the development of a learning organization.

As noted, more evidence existed at Shaw for proposition 3.1. This might in fact be an artifact of Shaw’s Design Team’s heightened consciousness regarding the value of HSRI in a policy context that is not wholly hospitable to its vision and method of work. In fact, during the focus group, the Design Team members, all of whom had been at the school since 2003, spoke as if they no longer functioned in the manner they had in the past (indicating for example they had not seen each other in some time). As the initiative had technically ended, teachers, who had been at Shaw during HSRI, lamented that teachers new to the school were not benefiting from HSRI professional learning as they themselves had. While teachers at Shaw spoke more readily about HSRI professional learning, they sometimes did so in the past tense (see Table 10, Ref. No.: 8). This type of focus group evidence was

37 See Doc.Shaw.05 and Doc.Sonoraville.04.
actually coded by us as both in support of and counter to some propositions. While it suggested that some HSRI-related practices may not be occurring as they had in the past, it also suggested the influence of HSRI on teachers’ thinking and revealed their strong desire to continue on the HSRI’s transformational path. In some way, then, the evidence of change at Shaw is more compelling because features of the HSRI effect still “stuck” in the minds of these educators.

Figure 4 suggests a near absence of “lore and tradition” being attributed to HSRI in some way. Yet, we know from other sources of evidence — namely documents, observations and conversations outside of focus groups and interviews — that key traditions at each school were inspired at least in part by HSRI’s framework. The teacher induction work at Sonoraville already mentioned, dubbed “Rise Up” by teachers, is one such example. Another at this school is the “Phoenix 40” (the Phoenix being the school’s mascot), a time for teachers to collaborate on engaging lessons. We know the teachers valued this as the previous year’s schedule change and funding cuts virtually eliminated it from the schedule. During the July retreat, teachers worked on plans to reinvigorate these sessions. At Shaw, work to develop the communications academy during one professional learning session led to the “Reel to Real” publication promoting the school’s communications magnet program. Most important, however, was the Raiders to Graduate ceremony. Again given credence to being named the “success” school, Shaw developed this ring ceremony and related activities to help move students from freshmen to seniors, setting expectations and goals related to graduation and post-high school success from the moment each student enters the door.38

Figure 4 indicates a very similar level of evidence for the “meanings and commitments” theme at each school. Having noted that, we suggest that these propositions were somewhat flawed. Beyond the fact that knowledge of how funds are spent is limited to a few individuals, and can be readily shown via PAGE records, the next two propositions (3.5 and 3.6) proved difficult to code. We found them to be both too similar to each other, and too broad in nature. For these reasons, we will not spend time analyzing these results.

**Research Question 4**

Question 4 asked: Why have the following structural elements changed since the High School Redesign Initiatives at Shaw and Sonoraville high schools? Whereas Question 3 examined causes of cultural change, Question 4 thus focused on structural change. Again, as was the case with Question 3, propositions for Question 4 predicted that important structural factors could be traced back to HSRI and thus PAGE.

Figure 5 demonstrates that most evidence supports propositions in the “roles” theme. Both schools had similar levels of support for propositions in the “roles” theme, with

---

38 See Doc.Shaw.05.
Sonoraville having slightly more manifest evidence than Shaw (virtually no evidence contrary to this theme’s propositions was found at either school). These propositions focused on the degree to which structural factors — such as the formation of teams of teacher leaders to design engaging lessons — could be traced back to HSRI. While Sonoraville had more evidence in support of proposition 4.3 (parents and students notice and appreciate the school’s focus on student engagement), Shaw had slightly more evidence in support of proposition 4.1 (the emergence of teacher leaders or Design Teams can be traced to PAGE) (see Tables 8, 9).

In terms of proposition 4.4 regarding the “rules and norms” theme, reviewed documents suggest stronger support for this proposition than observed from evidence obtained via focus groups and interviews. Given the nature of protocols and related tools, this is not surprising. Further, we wish to highlight our observations of the July Sonoraville High School retreat, noted earlier. Throughout the retreat, we observed teachers and administrators collectively employing HSRI protocols or protocols adapted from HSRI professional learning. Protocols for coaching (e.g., how to ask clarifying questions), group norms (e.g., one person speaks at a time), and design qualities of student work (e.g., protecting students from adverse consequences) were distributed. We observed during both whole group and small group discussion an adherence to these norms and rules in a non-mechanical way. Administrators, for example, were adept at removing

---

39 Doc.Shaw.05 and Doc.Sonoraville.04.
adverse consequences for teachers as a means to encourage their full participation. We
found that discussion and debate were professional, focused, collegial and productive, and
so we conclude that HSRI affected the rules and norms at Sonoraville beyond the evidence
gained from focus groups and interviews. We noted how these rules and norms supported
structural change. We observed, for example, a wide range of leadership emanating from
teachers, in addition to the administrative team, as the group collectively focused on solving
definite challenges, such as the state’s new teacher evaluation policy. In addition to
providing additional evidence of the effect of HSRI on the rules and norms of this school,
these findings from the retreat highlight the importance of observation for gathering
evidence of this nature. Unless directly asked, teachers and administrators were not likely
to reference specific rules or norms governing how they conduct their work. This was
certainly our experience with teacher focus groups, where, when asked about what we
would observe if we shadowed them, none indicated directly that we would observe them
following specific protocols, although we know from this retreat and other sources of
evidence that they in fact do, for example, use the design qualities protocol to guide the
development of lessons at Sonoraville.

Very much unlike the findings for Question 2, what strikes one upon first viewing Figure
5 is the fact that virtually no evidence exists in terms of the “relationships” theme; this
appearance must also, however, be examined in light of several facts.

The first is the nature of the focus group and interview schedule. In both schools, key
teacher leaders became administrators who were neither interviewed and, except in the
case of one teacher at Shaw High School, were not part of teacher focus groups. Also note
that this teacher at Shaw did speak emphatically regarding her relationship with PAGE (see
Table 10, Ref. Nos.: 14K15).

Thus, the data collection methods adopted for this study under sampled from this
particular group because key teacher leaders most likely to have strong relationships with
HSRI staff moved into administrative positions over the course of HSRI. Note that, on
account of our limited time, we chose only to interview the school principal, and not his
administrative team. If we had interviewed these other administrators (who were
previously teacher leaders) they may have offered examples of the importance of their
relationship with HSRI staff. While understandable given our time limits, it is nonetheless a
shortcoming of our data collection methodology.

Compounding this difficulty was the inability to interview Sonoraville’s principal who
led the school since beginning HSRI. Somewhat similar is the fact that Shaw High School
had two principals over the course of its HSRI participation. While the principal that started
Shaw on the HSRI journey was interviewed, Dr. Jim Arnold, that interview focused on the
origins and early phase of HSRI, and not how the relationship between PAGE and HSRI
formed and developed.
Finally, email records of communication between HSRI staff and teacher leaders and administrators at both schools demonstrate regular, professional and friendly relations. Email correspondence revealed that PAGE’s HSRI staff were trusted and welcomed at each school; HSRI staff were regularly invited to observe and participate in school events and celebrations. Correspondences from both schools also revealed that teacher leaders and administrators regularly shared with HSRI staff how HSRI was being adopted in each school, sharing, for example, sample professional learning activities, professional learning schedules and results from surveys of professional learning participants.

School Transformation: The HSRI Effect

We found, presented and discussed compelling evidence of positive cultural and structure change at both Shaw and Sonoraville high schools, and discussed how observed differences between the schools are related to each school’s policy context. The direction of change we documented is consistent with the transformative goals of HSRI, and provides evidence that both schools have developed some of the key characteristics of learning organizations, especially with respect to the “beliefs and values” and “relationships” themes.

Yet, the results as reported in the earlier section are less clear regarding the degree to which this change was an effect of HSRI and the work of PAGE staff. In order to better understand the relationship between evidence of documented change and evidence that participation in HSRI caused documented change, we present Figure 6.

Unlike the visualizations for figures 2-5, Figure 6 was constructed without distinction between manifest and latent evidence. Further, instead of separately representing evidence contrary to propositions, any negative evidence was simply subtracted from the total of all evidence in support of a proposition, serving to reduce circle (effect) size. This allowed us to craft a visualization that compared summaries of evidence for questions 1 and 2 to summaries of evidence for questions 3 and 4. By doing so, we are better able to see not only the relatively large portion of change that can be directly attributed to HSRI, but also the degree to which that change occurred along cultural or structural lines. Finally, we only included evidence from the first four propositions for each question. We did this to control for possible variance related to the different numbers of propositions in a theme (which ranged from 1 to 7), and because we believe that these groupings of propositions are the most closely tied to each question’s focus on either cultural or structural change (for example it could be argued that the last three propositions for Question 2 are cultural in nature, see Table 2).

Figure 6 reveals that the difference in the amount of evidence demonstrating change at each school is greater than the difference in the amount of evidence demonstrating that HSRI caused the documented change at each school. This is significant for at least two
reasons. First, it further supports our earlier interpretations of findings that explain observed differences by reference to differences in the policy context of each school. If each school participated in very similar ways in a single initiative (HSRI), it is plausible that observed differences in outcomes may be related to difference between school contexts. While both schools had very similar levels of students receiving free and reduced price meals, substantial differences in the ethnic/racial composition of their respective student bodies could be a factor causing documented differences. Yet, we found no evidence of this when speaking with students, teachers, administrators or parents (and all of these groups except administrators were composed of individuals with a range of ethnic and racial identities). In fact, parents, students and educators at each school repeatedly spoke in support of their respective communities, showing respect for student diversity and a desire to help families who lived in poverty (see Tables 10 and 11). Figure 6 also suggests that while there was less evidence of change at Shaw High School compared to evidence of change at Sonoraville High School, a greater portion of documented change at Shaw can be attributed to HSRI than is the case with Sonoraville. This difference further reveals the

**FIGURE 6.** Visualization of relative strength of evidence by research question theme for Shaw and Sonoraville high schools. Circle size represents the strength of evidence. Circle location represents the relative distribution of cultural change to structural change, with the center dotted line indicating equal amounts of cultural and structural change.
relative influence of the policy context and indicates that while it may take “more HSRI” to achieve similar results in less hospitable policy contexts, transformation can occur across an array of contexts. Thus, Shaw in particular provides insight into the potential of HSRI by demonstrating that it can bring about change despite challenging policy contexts. Figure 6 thus suggests that similar implementations of HSRI will have varying effects depending on the characteristics of a school’s policy context. Tailoring HSRI to a policy context may yield greater effect.

Figure 6 reveals other important findings. While the amount of evidence that documented change was a cause of HSRI tends to be more evenly distributed between the cultural and structural domains, it is clear that documented evidence at both schools is weighted to the cultural domain, that is, there was more documented change in terms of the “beliefs and values” evident at each school than there was documented change in terms of “roles.” This suggests several possibilities: (1) beliefs and values are easier to change than are structural characteristics of schools, such as the roles of teachers, and (2) policy contexts have a greater influence on structural elements such as roles than they do on belief systems. Of course, a combination of these two possibilities is likely. As noted, both schools faced cuts in staffing, limiting collaboration time for teachers. Further, Shaw’s policy context probably had a more forceful influence on teacher roles, as pressure to analyze test data worked against time to focus on collaboratively planning engaging lessons. Yet, both teachers and administrators at Shaw evidenced a strong commitment to engagement in some form. While there is certainly a dynamic between cultural and structural change, each reinforcing the other, evidence from both schools suggested robust change in the cultural domain, and where once established, these beliefs are not easily altered in the context of say, cuts in staffing or state mandates increasingly focusing educators on test scores.

Discussion and Recommendations

There is no doubt that HSRI brought about qualitative change at both high schools. But what is more important is the relative importance of policy context in determining the extent and nature of transformation, and the ability of HSRI’s framework to have an effect in even difficult contexts. We suggest then that HSRI not only constitutes a viable framework for school transformation that should be expanded and further studied, we also believe that it constitutes an effective antidote to or immunization against the negative consequences of the near perfect storm of cuts in funds allocated to public schools, dramatic increases in poverty rates among school-aged children, and the intensification of high stakes testing by both federal and state authorities.

A single word — trust — may signify why HSRI had the effect that it did, indicating why HSRI is a viable alternative to the school reforms that have failed to yield positive results
over more than four decades. We believe that one of the key benefits of HSRI for schools is the development of trust as a key feature that enables the school to work on transformation in a challenging policy context, guarding against the damage to school culture and structure that can result from punitive and simple-minded policies. In this sense, trust is not about being “touchy-feely” but rather a structural feature of the organization with cultural content. Trust, we observed, was required for collective problem solving and fostering the initiative and accountability of individuals and groups, including students, and thus the development of a true learning organization. This research suggests that trust formed the kernel of positive organizational functioning in the form of relationships with students and their families, among teachers and between teachers and administrators. Relationships, central to which is trust, was the second biggest documented change observed in this study. We believe that these trusting relationships are a necessary condition for teachers to collaboratively design meaningful and engaging work for students, and for students to be willing and able to demonstrate what they have been expected to learn in ways that are both meaningful and motivating to them.

What do these findings suggest for future practice? First, we believe that the existing level of trust might be a key feature of a school to analyze prior to beginning work there. Both schools in this study either had significant prior levels of trust (a family atmosphere at Shaw with team teaching, was reported prior to HSRI) or a conscious effort to create trusting, caring environment, as was the case at Sonoraville, from almost the beginning. Second, the manner in which we found each school to understand engagement suggests that future work might benefit from a heightened effort to sensitize professional learning participants to the differences between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation, and in particular, consider how school-based professional learning and design team meetings might be encouraged to examine this part of the engagement puzzle more thoroughly. Because extrinsic forms of motivation are so deeply rooted in our culture, and because current reform efforts are framed in terms of rewards and punishments, heightened attention to work on understanding different types of motivation may be important.\(^\text{40}\) This might prove to be especially critical in working in schools with high concentrations of students living in poverty, because of the documented tendency for schools who serve such students to focus more on extrinsic rewards and compliance.\(^\text{41}\) Thus, a culture shift to truly engaging work might need to be specifically tailored to examine this tendency for professionals working in


settings likely to emphasize compliance and frame motivation in terms of rewards and punishments.

But possibly the biggest outcome of this study is the role the policy context plays. This suggests that if future HSRI-like endeavors fully operated at the district level, some of the affects of the policy context — especially on structural domains such as teachers roles — might be mitigated. Districts might be in a position to protect teacher planning time better than individual schools, even in the face of reduced funding. Districts might be able to organize schools to comply with external mandates without directing teachers away from collaborating to design meaningful and engaging lessons. Certainly the two schools here provide examples of how HSRI might help districts do just that. Districts are also in a position to structure options to families without unleashing unhealthy forms of competition between schools that foster a de-facto academic sorting system.

The last consideration then is this: HSRI may not reach its full potential until it is applied system-wide. And while the notion of system-wide school improvement is not new, the HSRI framework as an alternative to test- and competition-based reform is under explored and under tested. The results presented here provide support for this alternative and thus we recommend it be tried on a larger scale, in multiple contexts. We further recommend that work be expanded to develop alternative means for assessing the outcomes of these efforts.

---

42 It should be noted that the beginning of this case study coincided with PAGE embarking on a pilot multi-district initiative, intentionally engaging cross-role groups in transformational strategic thinking, and, finding that first year to be successful, had already developed plans to expand those efforts prior to this report being made available to PAGE. We, the researchers, became aware of this intention in August of 2014, learning modest details about this initiative in February 2015.
Appendix A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 1</th>
<th>Propositions</th>
<th>Sources of Evidence *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How have the following cultural elements changed since the beginning of the High School Redesign Initiative at Shaw and Sonoraville high schools?</td>
<td>As a result of PAGE’s efforts to transform education through sustained professional learning opportunities and coaching, the following cultural characteristics will have emerged at each school, and be different from past practice</td>
<td>F6-9; D8-9, 11-14, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beliefs &amp; Values</strong></td>
<td>1. Communication at the school evidences a clear, shared purpose and a set of shared, educationally relevant beliefs and values</td>
<td>F1-5; D8-9; D15, 17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The school’s purpose is focused on engaging students in meaningful work, serving each student’s academic, social and psychological needs</td>
<td>F1-5; D1-9; D16-19; D23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Students are respected and viewed as collaborators by school staff in their learning of culturally relevant knowledge, skills and perspectives</td>
<td>F1-5; D1-9; D16-19; D21-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Parents and community members are respected and viewed by school staff as collaborators in students learning culturally relevant knowledge, skills and perspectives</td>
<td>F1-5; D21-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meanings &amp; Commitments</strong></td>
<td>5. Financial resources available to the school have been used to support the development of teacher leaders and administrative teams to lead teacher leaders</td>
<td>F3; D8-11, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Time for teachers to actively share, collaborate and plan with one another is built into the school’s schedule</td>
<td>F1; 3; D8-11; 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Teacher collaboration time is focused on designing engaging high-level academic work for all students that offers them meaningful choices, relationships, and means to demonstrate their acquired knowledge, skill and perspective</td>
<td>F1, 3; D6, 8-9, 11, 14-16, 18, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Teacher feedback on school practices is welcome, sought, and used to inform administrative decisions</td>
<td>F1, 3-4; D8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Students are offered multiple opportunities for academic success in each class and until graduation</td>
<td>F1-5; D1-10, 15-16, 18, 21-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Student feedback on their courses is welcome, sought, and used by teachers to inform their instructional decisions</td>
<td>F1-5; D8-9, 16-17, 19, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Parent and community feedback on school practices is welcome, sought, and used by teachers and administrators to inform decision making</td>
<td>F1-5; D8-9, 17-18, 19, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lore &amp; Traditions</strong></td>
<td>12. Stories, ceremonies, artifacts and assemblies reinforce, represent and are consistent with the school’s vision, beliefs and values</td>
<td>F1-5; D8-9, 17, 19, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Student work and performances are made public and acknowledged by school staff and the public</td>
<td>F1-5; D8-9, 17, 19, 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix B for the Evidence Code Keys for Documents, Focus Groups and Interviews
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 2</th>
<th>Propositions</th>
<th>Sources of Evidence *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How have the following structural elements changed since the High School Redesign Initiatives at Shaw and Sonoraville high schools?</td>
<td>As a result of PAGE’s efforts to transform education through sustained professional learning opportunities and coaching, the following structural elements will have emerged at each school, and be different from past practice</td>
<td>F6-9; D8-9, 11-14, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roles</strong></td>
<td>1. Teachers are responsible for collaboratively leading the design of engaging classroom instruction and use assessment to customize and improve their instruction</td>
<td>F1-3, 6; D6, 8-11, 14-16, 18-19, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Administrators are responsible for leading teacher leaders and creating the conditions for them to focus on engaging students in high level academic and socially valued work</td>
<td>F1-4; D8-11, 14, 17-19, 20, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Students have a responsibility to be active learners, who can demonstrate their learning through the creation of products, exhibitions and performances</td>
<td>F1-5; D1, 3, 5-6, 16-17, 19, 21, 23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Parents and other community members have a responsibility to learn about, support and share their views with teachers and administrators about the work of the school</td>
<td>F1-5; D9, 17, 19, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rules &amp; Norms</strong></td>
<td>5. Professional discussion, conduct and disciplined inquiry exist and are expected among teachers, administrators and in classrooms</td>
<td>F1-5; D6, 8-11, 14-15, 19, 22, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>6. Teachers and administrators know the students well and have meaningful relationships with them and the larger community of which they are a part</td>
<td>F1-6; D1, 8-9, 15, 17, 19, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Teachers have strong work-centered relationships with their fellow teachers</td>
<td>F1-5; D8-9, 11, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Teachers and administrators work together in a trusting and collaborative manner</td>
<td>F1, 4-5; D8-9, 15, 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix B for the Evidence Code Keys for Documents, Focus Groups and Interviews
Table 3
Propositions and Sources of Evidence for Research Question 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 3</th>
<th>Propositions</th>
<th>Sources of Evidence *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why have the following cultural elements changed since the beginning of the High School Redesign Initiative at Shaw and Sonoraville high schools?</td>
<td>PAGE’s framework for transforming public education through sustained professional learning opportunities, coaching and financial support will be identified, in spirit if not in name, as initiating and sustaining identified cultural change in each building</td>
<td>F6-9; D8-9, 11-14, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beliefs &amp; Values</strong></td>
<td>1. Teacher leaders and administrators beliefs and values about education were fostered by PAGE provided professional learning experiences</td>
<td>F1, 3, 7-8; D8-9, 11-12, 13-15, 18-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Teacher leaders and administrators put their beliefs into action on account of their relationship with HSRI staff</td>
<td>F1, 3, 7-8; D8-10, 14-15, 18-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Rank and file teachers trace PAGE inspired beliefs, values and action to teacher leaders and administrators at their building</td>
<td>F2, 3, 7-8; D8-10, 15, 18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meanings &amp; Commitments</strong></td>
<td>4. PAGE financial resources made available to the school have been used to support the development of teacher leaders and administrative teams to lead teacher leaders</td>
<td>F3, 6-9; D8-9, 13-14, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Focusing on the needs and interests of students gave rise to new energy and focus to the work of teachers</td>
<td>F1-5; D6, 8-9, 11, 16-18, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Focusing on the needs and interests of students helped professionalize and strengthen the relationships among and between teachers and administrators</td>
<td>F1-5; D8-9, 10-11, 18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lore &amp; Traditions</strong></td>
<td>7. Teacher leaders/Design Teams will have generated their own unique traditions, names and identities at their school</td>
<td>F1-4; D8-9; 15, 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix B for the Evidence Code Keys for Documents, Focus Groups and Interviews
Table 4

Propositions and Sources of Evidence for Research Question 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 4</th>
<th>Propositions</th>
<th>Sources of Evidence *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why have the following structural elements changed since the High School Redesign Initiatives at Shaw and Sonoraville high schools?</td>
<td>PAGE’s framework for transforming public education through sustained professional learning opportunities, coaching, and financial support will be identified, in spirit if not in name, as initiating and sustaining identified structural change in each building</td>
<td>F6-9; D8-9, 11-14, 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Roles**
1. The emergence of teacher leaders or Design Teams can be traced to PAGE professional learning and coaching support
2. The emergence of administrators as leaders of teacher leaders can be traced to PAGE professional learning and coaching support
3. Parents and students notice and appreciate the school's focus on student engagement and success, which in turn helps students and their families remain interested in school

**Rules & Norms**
4. Teacher leaders/Design Teams learned and adapted to their needs, rules and norms from PAGE professional learning opportunities and HSRI staff, that resulted in collaborative work that helped improve instruction and increased student engagement

**Relationships**
5. HSRI staff have strong relationships with teacher leaders and administrators, and identify, understand and work with each on the basis of their needs

* See Appendix B for the Evidence Code Keys for Documents, Focus Groups and Interviews
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document citation code</th>
<th>Document filename as it appears in the case study database</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doc.PAGE.01a and Doc.PAGE.01b</td>
<td>PAGE Face of Teacher Leadership 12-10-2013 v3 copy.pdf</td>
<td>Two publications: “PAGE Teachers As Leaders.pdf” (n.d) and “PAGE Face of Teacher Leadership 12-10-2013 v3 copy.pdf” (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.PAGE.02</td>
<td>Oglethorpe HS letter.pdf</td>
<td>Letter to Phillip Todd, Principal of Oglethorpe High School, from Edie Belden, Director of Professional Learning, PAGE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.PAGE.03</td>
<td>2008 HSRI Brochure 110308-1 copy.pdf</td>
<td>Brochure advertising for the HSRI initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.PAGE.04</td>
<td>GOOD--PAGE HSRI Commitments - Ithaca ES 04.15.14.docx</td>
<td>Outlines the respective commitments of PAGE and any school participating in HSRI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.PAGE.05</td>
<td>application text addendum.doc.pdf</td>
<td>Contains two applications from high schools (2009), and commentary by PAGE staff about the application process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.Shaw.01</td>
<td>Folder “08”</td>
<td>Contains email archive of PAGE/HSRI communication with Shaw High School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.Sonoraville.01</td>
<td>Folder “08”</td>
<td>Contains email archive of PAGE/HSRI communication with Sonoraville High School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.Shaw.02</td>
<td>Shaw SIP Part B Aug 14.pdf</td>
<td>Provides a variety of useful data about Shaw, including information regarding increase in students classified as homeless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.Shaw.03</td>
<td>Folder “19”</td>
<td>Contains school improvement plans and related documents, showing the various initiatives and programs adopted by the school over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.Sonoraville.02</td>
<td>Folder “18”</td>
<td>Contains school improvement plans and related documents, showing the various initiatives and programs adopted by the school over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.Sonoraville.03 and Doc.Shaw.04</td>
<td>Nicole Data for Mark and Agnes 101414.xlsx</td>
<td>This includes data for both schools, including percent of students receiving free and reduced lunch, 2006-2013. Data was gathered by PAGE staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.PAGE.06</td>
<td>Participation lists through Feb 2012.xlsx</td>
<td>Provides professional learning attendance data for Shaw and Sonoraville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.PAGE.07</td>
<td>PL Attendance.doc</td>
<td>Narrative description of HSRI funding, school participation, and visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.Shaw.05 and Doc.Sonoraville.04</td>
<td>Folder “15”</td>
<td>Contains school-designed protocols, PL events, etc., that focus on engagement and teacher leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.Shaw.06 and Doc.Sonoraville.05</td>
<td>Folder “16”</td>
<td>Sampling of course syllabi from each school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.Shaw.07 and Doc.Sonoraville.06</td>
<td>Folder “23”</td>
<td>Samples of student work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.Shaw.08</td>
<td>Muscogee County SOW_FINAL_CORRECTED.pdf</td>
<td>Muscogee County Race to the Top application Executive Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.PAGE.08</td>
<td>School Data for Mark and Agnes 031315.xlsx</td>
<td>Presents data on schools who have or are participating in HSRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.Sonoraville.09</td>
<td>Folder “July 2014 Retreat”</td>
<td>Contains photos and documents from the July retreat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only documents or document collections cited in the case study narrative appear in this table. See case study database for all documents collected for the case study.
TABLE 6
Instances of evidence of how cultural and structure have changed by proposition and evidence type, from Shaw High School focus groups and interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1 Theme</th>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
<th>Counter Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beliefs &amp; Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meanings &amp; Commitments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lore &amp; Tradition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2 Themes</th>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
<th>Counter Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS** 49 39 88 10 1 11

Note: Subtotals used in development of visualizations of findings.
TABLE 7
Instances of evidence of how cultural and structure have changed by proposition and evidence type, from Sonoraville High School focus groups and interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1 Themes</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
<th>Counter Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:3</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:4</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs &amp; Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:9</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meanings &amp; Commitments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:13</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lore &amp; Tradition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2 Themes</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Subtotals used in development of visualizations of findings.
TABLE 8

Instances of evidence of why cultural and structural change occurred by proposition and evidence type, from Shaw High School focus groups and interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3 Theme</th>
<th>Manifest (M) and Latent (L) evidence in support of and counter to propositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>Supporting Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs &amp; Values</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meanings &amp; Commitments</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lore &amp; Tradition</td>
<td>3:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4 Themes

Subtotals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
<th>Counter Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norms</td>
<td>4:4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Subtotals used in development of visualizations of findings.
TABLE 9
Instances of evidence of why cultural and structural change occurred by proposition and evidence type, from Sonoraville High School focus groups and interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3 Theme Subtotals</th>
<th>Propositions</th>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
<th>Counter Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs &amp; Values</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meanings &amp; Commitments</td>
<td>3:4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lore &amp; Tradition</td>
<td>3:7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4 Themes Subtotals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Subtotals used in development of visualizations of findings.
### TABLE 10

Representative quotes from focus groups and interviews at Shaw High School, by participant type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>Part. Type</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Teachers</td>
<td>Phrase that describes the school: “For me, it's project based, authentic,” and another teacher, “it's project based for me as well, it is also about the student ... everyone must succeed.” Another teacher: “School is about student success. At Shaw, possibly more than other schools, success has a broader definition, many teachers who care about both academic and personal and worldly success, students as individuals, as opposed to [just] test scores.” Another teacher: “Focus is on students.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Teacher</td>
<td>“I enjoy working here because of the collaboration in the department. Very willing to collaborate and share.” Tells story of former teacher who created and shared [names subject] curriculum. “We collaborate daily.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Teachers</td>
<td>“We all have to take a [names test] test, and everyone must succeed. Everyone has to pass this test. So that's what we start with, that's the phrase we use.” Another teacher: “With [names subject], we have the end of course [EOC] test. And of course, everyone knows your EOC test scores, across the district, the parents, everybody. Success for students, this is a sign; so everyone will pass.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Teachers</td>
<td>“And now with this competitiveness [new teacher evaluation system], from classroom to classroom, you’re almost competing with those scores, I feel like that is going to hinder our collaboration, but maybe not here at Shaw, if you look at our clusters of scores, at least for [names subject area], the teachers are clustered [in terms of scores] about the same place, that speaks to our school culture, there is nobody up here and down there.” Another teacher: “We as [names subject] teachers, we’re in there together, the kids are getting the same thing [as a result of team teaching and collaboration]”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Teacher</td>
<td>“[Collaboration at school] is what I owe my career as a teacher to...always wanted to be teacher..., came into situation that was team taught...as a team we were able to create curriculum and I had a mentor, and I also had those working on the work sessions that we attended the first year and a half...other teachers I met had no support ... we are one of the premier programs because of the collaborative process that exists here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Teacher</td>
<td>“If you were with me for a month, you would see kids working on something hard that had real life authenticity that would serve some purpose to them personally.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Teachers</td>
<td>“There's the focus on engagement, the WOW, how we set that up seven or so years ago. This keeps them, number one, out of trouble, and they want to come to your class.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Teachers</td>
<td>“I do wish we worked with teachers from other departments; tend to stick in our own department. I want to see what the [names department] department is doing ... we could collaborate more.” Another: “I wasn’t in the WOW years, I was after the WOW years. Even though I incorporate some of the training I've had here through [names teacher], I wish the teachers would collaborate more.” Another: “It [planning] doesn’t happen as much as it used to because of the new schedule, and time constraints.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Teachers</td>
<td>“Focus of the school is on the community image; it is achievement, student success.” “Real world application of student work; student engagement; the WOW term is authentic.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10 Teachers
There is now “a lot of focus on scores and evaluations. Lots of pressure. Expectations are high across the board, and the focus of where the school is going up in the air, questionable...I’m a really small piece of a really big puzzle.” When asked about stress further: “How stress affected my work? What is required for kids to know has increased, stuff we never did before, and all the testing, but it’s a different set of standards, not just tests, but specific skills or content, and sometimes it sucks out the fun factor, the creativity we were allowed to do big things, because this is what they need to know; this is my stress, it boxed me in.” “With the Student Learning Objectives from the state, there is limited time to cover material; limited time for creative stuff. There are more worksheets because it takes less time ... we can’t do all the engaging things we want.”

11 Teachers
“For courses with EOC test, we have data teams. With the common unit assessments, we review the data, to see where needed intervention is, and strategies for response to intervention. This was very helpful in [names subject] this year. The process [of data analysis] was simplified based on feedback [from teachers]. Teachers talk about the data.”

12 Teachers
“Building relationships is key, as students are more willing to work when we value them. Goes back to knowing your Who; get a feel from them, what they like, their ability, willingness, makes things a lot smoother ... you have to figure out who they are.”

13 Teachers
What has not changed? “Family atmosphere. That has stayed the same.” “Team teaching was going on before we got here [in 2003].”

14 Teachers
“We have had 3 superintendents in 4 years, but there’s one constant [names person] who helps us ... and keeps [administrators] grounded; [this person] is the one person who is fair, rational, even when ... [this person] is the one when you get around ..., you know you are loved.”

15 Teacher
When this individual was asked, how did this come to be: “By nature, I am very giving; want to help; to point to where I am, professionally, I wouldn’t’ be here with out the opportunity PAGE afforded me. It changed my teaching style and my dynamic. And it wouldn’t have happened without the support of all of them [teachers in the room] and the family atmosphere.

16 Principal
Speaking about his role: “When I first got here, the school needed transformational change, worked on changing the culture from being adult centered to a student centered environment, where decisions were going to be made based on what is best for kids first, adults second. And getting kids to understand they need to take ownership of their own learning, own behavior... Also we needed to raise the level of expectation, because good is the enemy of great.”
Focus of school: “prepared for full option graduation ... opportunity to do what he or she wants to do; tech college, military, going into workforce, business, skills, full option graduation ... a lot of teachers weren’t thinking about that, just their class... but they need to understand the bigger picture. And let’s take emotion out of this, and at the end of the day, it doesn’t matter what our opinions are, what matters is how much a student has grown. And like it or not, under the new system in Georgia, RTTT, we are evaluated on CCR index. We got to make sure we are winning back our community and show them we are preparing students to their potential. With adults I use a formula: A + B = C. Can’t just go to C. C = success; A is adults, the educators, B is students. Before B, we look at us. Are we providing opportunities, creating, designing, for B, our students, to get to C, success. We often blame students, but you have to look in the mirror, it makes people uncomfortable ... and they left; some left because I wasn’t going to give them planning period when they wanted; wasn’t about them anymore.”

“Biggest changes ... Majority of discussion is student focused on success. All the indicators of success: how are classrooms designed? Are they standards based? Are we building those relationships? Are we designing for rigor? Are we monitoring for engagement? Are we providing opportunities for mastery? Looking at retention. SAT/ACT. What can we do different? Our teachers are rallying around fact to get students across that stage, even the hard to reach ones. Before, pretty much their [student’s] fault. But what else would you want me to do? Whether you agree, get as many kids as we can, and not give up on anyone.”

Role of teacher: "Life changer. What I mean by life changer...you create, design, opportunities around your content, for kids to be successful. They don’t have to like your subject. But if you design it, and its rigorous, and they’re learning the standards, they’ll respect you. You’re going to change their life. Got to tie it to the real world, and show them they can do it.... Rigor leads to engagement.”

“In Muscogee county, every eighth grader gets chance to go to one of eight high schools, and we have a full magnet school. [One school] like a public, private school. They hand pick every kid that comes in. When kid doesn’t perform, shift them back to the home school. That’s why they are number one in Georgia.”

What interests your children? “Hands on, he can’t just sit and just listen. Classes are so long, that is needed to keep his interest...hands on.” Another parent: “I’d say how the activities are related to what they are experiencing ... they can grasp it a little more.” Another: “Anytime they can show how it applies to real life, they are more likely to grasp it and run with it ... need to see purpose for it. Where they might use it.” Another: “With [names course]...he has to go out and research something going on... and write about it, and he loves that, and this is a kid who hates to write.” Yet another parent: “This teacher, he had for [names course], some said how strict and awful he was ... but he just had high expectations. My son respected that. It was hard. He actually learned sentence construction. He showed respect and that allowed my son to achieve more in that class.”
25 Parents
Comparing to past: “There is a certain amount of stress now that is not always healthy, about college, about what you have to do, seems way over the top from when I was in school, the competitiveness.” Another parent: “Getting into college not at all like it was, I didn’t have to do all this. Now they grade you on all the outside activities, community service; kids can’t be kids. I got to be a kid.” Another: “I didn’t worry about if I had this or that, service hours, if she has enough so they want her over someone else.” And another: “And career paths here are fanatic, but can’t really know what you want to do when you’re seventeen and haven’t even been to college.”

26 Parents
What we need to know? “Shaw perception is misjudged in the community — it is getting better.” Another: “I call it the hidden gem. The open house gives you a different perception of Shaw. People who have gone to another school, I tell them I love it; nothing bad to say. The perception is turning around — I contribute that to principal. There are no saggy pants ... Student here dress with pride. This has helped clean up the image of school a lot. He has a lot of pride for this. Five years ago did not have that, [what] we have now.” Another: “Should ask, what is the public perception of the school. I don’t know where people are getting this stuff. Makes me angry...my kid looked at the test scores, and saw that the test scores are on the rise.”

27 Students
Talk about relationship with teachers: “In [names course], he helps us out, I want to get to college. he does offer us a lot...gets fundraisers.” Another: “they know what we feel like and want us to succeed ... and we relate to them because of this.” Another: “on a quiz, you get a second chance if not doing well.” Another: “With science, you can ask questions and stay after school.” Another: “this, especially with new schedule ... four classes a day, next day is different. This makes it hard to focus; they want you to have time to come to them and get things straight, and be able to do extra things like church or sports, and if there are multiple projects with due dates on the same day, teachers might adjust [asked, how teachers know?] oh, they are very open, I share, or teachers talk with each other ... they might not be able but might postpone an assignment.”

28 Students
In responding to question about an assignment that they liked: “In our [names course] class, she gave us a worksheet, and said, when you finish, I have some bacon for you all.” Another: “teachers have our backs and we get hungry, and they know how to encourage us.”

29 Students
When asked what makes them persist: “It’s all about that final grade, I want to go to college. Count on GPA, better college. Grades push a lot of people and you got to get into a good college. And for short-term goals, parents don’t let students go out if grades are not good.”

30 Counselors
Focus of school: “Student achievement, student success [asked, has it changed?] Not too long after I transferred we started working with PAGE and [principal], and student oriented, he wanted to make sure students were successful in the classroom, that was his whole reason for doing the WOW framework, so always been ... it just continues ... the focus [now] is to get the community to know, share with community [the success], get the word out about Shaw.” “Because of the choice of other schools, important to get the word out.”
Counselors What would you take from Shaw? “I like the curriculum council — we bounce ideas around, and let everyone know they have a voice, you have a voice within your group. I like that. The school I was at before was very authoritarian, very scary; here it is not like that, and you can say how you feel here.” Another: “We have a very approachable administration, and this makes it very easy to work here; we are very collaborative; grade levels, our students come to any of us, who they feel comfortable; we do everything as a team, and make decisions together.” “Decisions are improved because of collaboration.”

Counselors Favorite activity: “R2G [Raider to Graduation] ceremony...parents present their child with the ring ... I love the ice cream party, about honor role, admin scoops out ice cream and they have sense of humor and play’in it up.” Another: “end of year, the senior activities — they are excited because they made it and more than survived, they excelled! Letters of recommendation ... it is stressful, but fun to say great things about students and have them get accepted. Celebratory things help counter heavy things.”

Counselors What else should we know? “Shaw is a very caring atmosphere. Not going to be a student who slips through the cracks. Transfers from other schools say this...it is harder here, but it is good, not allowed to just be...admins always in the hall, talking with them; they know different students names.” Asked about the other colleague not at focus group: “he moved for a year, and wanted to come back; like the way things are done here.”
**TABLE 11**

*Representative quotes from focus groups and interviews at Sonoraville High School, by participant type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>Part. Type</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Word or phrase that describes approach to teaching and learning? “Engagement, that’s the word that’s often thrown out there, to get the kids engaged into the lesson, in the skill we’re trying to approach.” Another: “I like inquiry based, in science, very much inquiry based.” Another: “As diverse as we can, students learn in so many ways, we try to hit them all.” Other ideas: “Real world.” “Relevant.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>When asked about their first impression of the school their first week: “I loved the atmosphere here [all agree], and its not like the other schools [I’ve worked at], its different atmosphere than schools I have been at. Everybody knows everybody, there’s not a lot of cliques.” Another: “It’s a family and I know people outside of the science department, not just stuck with same group [others agree].” Another: “I transferred here from another school first two years, first faculty meeting, didn’t worry about who to sit by, didn’t have to sit by anyone. Like he said, a family.” Another: “At a faculty meeting, everyone is just cutting up.” Another: “really a community school … connected to the community.” Another: “I think it is parent involvement, it is big here, and now that we’re connected to high school, even more so.” And another: “I also think it’s the style of leadership. I’m brand new here, and I’m supported by atmosphere they establish, we don’t walk in fear; they encourage us to try to do new things. There’s more freedom there. First impression was that students are more engaged; they care more, even with the non-honors or gifted. Where I came from before, not like this ... because of what is going on here, kids expect engagement, looking for and want to be engaged. When I went on the last PAGE conference ... the pieces began to fall into place, I realized, oh, they have been working this way, and this is why the atmosphere is the way that it is, and among the kids.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Schools focus: “Relationships, and I can relate it socially, academically.” Another: “We’ve always been told students come first.” Another: “Kinda knowing your Who.” [Many agree with this point] Another: “[Tells a story of a student telling teacher they need a band aid, as asks: “Your students tell you when they need things”? [Reacting to this teacher’s story] “On a whole, that’s what the students expect from us, expect us to be part of the community, feel at ease and they approach you.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Teachers

Where did this focus come from? “They are our customers, and to better serve them, we need to know their needs ... [learned] a lot from attending PAGE conferences ... and knowing our WHO.” [Any part of this that sticks out as key?]

Another: “Freedom to experiment, and to fail ... they want us to try something to help our students learn ... relief that it didn’t work and I didn’t get in trouble, and I can improve.” Another: “Engagement, some think of it as professional freedom, here, this is a professional expectations ... teachers set that expectation, and set by department chair.” Another: “Just speaking for [names subject], I have [subject] coach for last six years, and always trying new things.” Another: “Today, at Rise Up event [teacher induction program], this is how they want us to think, innovation, I don’t have to stick with something if it doesn’t work, she [department chair] expects me to change if not working, and then the new idea, she might copy; they want everyone’s ideas to help the school as a whole.” “A’ha moment, at last PAGE conference, learned that not about being an entertainer ... no, not that; not putting on show everyday; about being getting to get them engaged, and that may not be super fun activities, but make them think?” “And what are our goals, not 100 percent engaged all the time, not possible. What are, what do we really want with our goals? It’s not 100 percent engagement all the time, try to keep the majority at this level majority of time, a’ha moments clarified by conference for me.” Another: “I continually probe them [students] for responses, to get continual assessments, and for this, engagement is needed. Some might have trouble with the noise.”

5 Teachers

What else should we know? “Not like this everywhere ... if you go to PAGE conferences, and you talk with other teachers, you learn that. We’re doing the principal and leadership network through PAGE; we do have it awesome here, you hear other teachers say we are so lucky; one group had to sneak there, because the superintendent was opposed.”

6 Teachers

First impression of school: “I was, like, I died and gone to heaven ... Came as long term sub, very different environment at that time [when the school first opened], very structured the first year; very structured, and it has changed a lot.” Another: “I felt very welcome, like family. It was my first year teaching here, but 15 years of teaching; I was constantly asking, when is the ball going to drop, but everyone said it is not going to, is something lurking around the corner, but no!”

7 Teachers

“We communicate a lot, you’d see lots of collaboration, sharing of what we are doing; but the kids first, change things, flip schedules, the activities based around the children, we are always thinking about them; other teacher — I am recognized as an expert, and to develop the lessons, and engage the kids, and create those relationships with the students (references engagement as a key word); that was my first week, the last year at middle third principal in five years, very stressful, a lot of time crying, up here, much more freedom to do what I need to do; going to see a loving and nurturing environment; teachers level with each other no matter what they are going through [started crying about how it means a lot] going to be taken care of in a professional manner.

8 Teachers

Relationship with administration? “Principal has my back, cares for me, APs that care for my well-being, and trust; I’m from business world, where I wondered, ‘are you protected, does boss have your back?’; with our admin, I know I do. Any time I needed to ask for help, they have gotten for me. Being my first year, it wasn’t even a question. Totally feel supported by all of them, 100 percent.”
9 Teachers

First impression of the school: “Last year was my first year, stood out, openness among faculty, and relationship with students; community based high school, not been around before.” Another: “4th year; first week, same ideas, open with faculty, jump in, two in science new to Sonoraville that year, other teacher was first year. We helped him out a bit. Could always ask admin whatever we needed, anytime; that was helpful. This 14th year, questions answered more quickly here.” Another: “Admin trusts you to do your job, allow you do your job, not going to lash out, figure out a way to make what needed happen.” Another: “First year for me my husband and I came to football game first year, it was a scrimmage game, but yet lots of school spirit. Husband, ‘are you sure this is a scrimmage game’? Way different.” Another: “Admin trusts us to do our job; my first two weeks during [names event], I thought I needed permission for every move, at one point [administrator] just said, just do it, don’t need to tell me everything…. he wants to know, but he doesn’t hover over you … he trusts us as a faculty.” [Other schools? Is this common?] “Pretty unique here. Nine years here, first job for me. When I came, I knew [names subject], but nothing about working with kids. Admin helped me out without being condescending; never had a gotcha moment; other admin at another schools, that is there.”

10 Teachers

Focus of the school? “Learning community actively pursuing higher standard of excellence — go Phoenix [all say slogan of school]; its true, we want the kids to be active.” Another: “A lot of work on front end to do engaging work, while rules and expectations are flexible, if something not working, you change that up, but there at same time. Students very flexible.” Another: “There is not one single quiet classroom … a lot of groups, out in the hall, on the floor … [how did you come to do this as a school?] “They allowed us to have the reigns, we started pretending you are a student, go; we redesign our curriculum every year … we never teach same thing twice.” Another: “The WOW [all jumping in to talk about it] look at the kid first, other school never knew what that was, Phoenix 40s [had more before lost days], [names administrators] would present and the frameworks, something to go by, and we went with that, that helped that, I never heard about that [WOW, etc.].” Another: “Saw the culture shift when I came, the idea that student is volunteer and customer, that was different, and wanting to engage them, now it is the expectation, and we collaborate even cross curricular; someone new comes in, this is way different … new teacher induction, Rise Up, where design qualities are explained.” Another: “When through it [Rise Up] last year, it was eye opening last year, here it was kids need to be engaged, freedom to design things around that.” Another: “Time to collaborate on creating engaging tasks … when someone new comes in, say it is way different.”
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11 Teachers</strong></td>
<td>Relationship with each other, and students. “We keep each other sane.” Another: “It’s a collaborative environment.” Another: “Great friends and family; get engaged on personal level. [Administrator] encourages us to support out of school … games, a play … show we genuinely care.” Another: “Even after graduate, we stay in touch.” Another: “If you followed us, sure, everyday not perfect, but overall I don’t hate to come to work and many teachers elsewhere do, because of all the stress from the state level. Fact is, I could not work in a school that didn’t have this atmosphere [to help deal with all state demands].” Another: “In my department, we cut up and laugh, and enjoy and collaboration.” Another: “Most departments sit together and whole departments, you’ll see at a wedding.” Another: “We’re told by admin, engage kids, don’t worry about test results, they will come, sure enough we got great test scores; we trust in that, so we keep the kids engaged. With EOCT, still get test prep, but majority of time not that. This is a drastic shift from other admins I have worked with.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Parents</strong></td>
<td>Work or phrase to describe the school: “Spirit, community, opportunity…[always been like that?] Pretty much consistent from what I’ve seen, but stronger now… everywhere, high school is influencing lower grades … everyone is getting into helping children in need.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13 Parents</strong></td>
<td>In talking about teachers: “I never heard my child talk about bad experience … they really care about performance … sports, coaches really care about future, they are coaching for future, what class to take, they guided her through classes she needs for health career.” Another: “They are very responsive … teachers don’t come to her, but if I ask a question, they respond, they are easy to reach.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14 Parents</strong></td>
<td>In talking about relationship with administrators: “They truly care, and there is a family feel. They are going out into the community, establishing our reputation; name of school is going out with graduates … [what is the reputation of the school?] “Very good, positive, get into downtown, its competitive … going back to admin question, the administration worked tirelessly when there was a storm, taking kids home. They had emergency plan … all students involved to help out, center of community helping out community.” Another: “We had some stuff disappear, and the administration very professional, made sure everyone was ok.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15 Parents</strong></td>
<td>In response to what kind of work is assigned? “The dual enrollment class, it’s more involved than when I was in college; they’re producing high quality amounts of work, they are challenging the children.” Another: “Work challenges my daughter, she gets bored easily; they moved her up when needed.” Another: “Teachers make themselves available with homework … he is available to help at night … teachers give students cell; texting and keep in touch on twitter; if there is bad weather, they assign work, kids know it.” Another: “They have open channel with teachers, planning and communication. I can drop off my daughter early, and she can go to tutor, and catch up and a teacher is always there.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16 Counselors</strong></td>
<td>In discussing how the school has changed: “It has grown in terms of numbers…more family like. It started out so new, it was almost cold, and nothing on the walls, so became community family oriented; started out with good stuff; become community, and now added elementary, bigger community.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20 Counselors</strong></td>
<td>In talking about relationship with teachers: “It’s very good! They are very open in talking about students; most of them come to me with a question or issue with a student, and we work together to help solve problems that get in the way of learning. [Used to have more counselors, but there was a cut].”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Counselors

Focus of school: “Focused on student improvement, engagement is a focus for sure. I’m not in the classroom, but I’ve heard that a lot, teachers are working on that. What they teach now is so different; very different from 15 yrs ago. They use different strategies, considering learning styles of students. And the content has changed. The [names subject], it is so much more rigorous and expectation now that all students are going to further their education. Before that wasn’t what school was geared toward.”

### Students

**22 Students**  
Word or phrase about school: “Pride! [Said very quickly] Work! Phoenix nation! [Several give these answers] [What does that mean?] It means learning community [is pep rally part of it?] It’s everybody, community too.

**23 Students**  
About teachers: “They help a lot, stay after, if needed.” Another: “Teachers care about everyone who comes in the door, they understand disabilities, what you excel at ... most teachers want you to succeed.”

**24 Students**  
Talking about kinds of activities in school: “There is this lab ... parachute lab where we take a piece of plastic ... we threw it off a higher area, if wind would catch, we saw how gravity and force work.” Another: “Hands on examples ... like chewing gum for physics.” Another: “It is common for teachers to do projects and classes together ... majority time they come together, like if guest speaker, for science — guest speakers, police officers, GBI [state FBI].”

**25 Students**  
Given examples of something they enjoyed: “I’m taking the [honors] program and we acted as congress and senate and made bills and it was cool to see the political things play out.” Another: “We made a raft, and had to see if it really works [environmental program]; had to learn about different water buoyancy.” Another: “We had to do the research to make a bill and it was neat to see people’s different political views.” Another example: “We have a club that helps out folks who are in need. [What do you learn from that?] “It makes you realize some people are far more lucky than others ... after you help, you just want to help people, they [the school] instill in you how to help others, that’s important in real life.”

**26 Students**  
What makes assignments interesting? “Hands on ... going out and seeing what happens in the real world, how you are going to use it.” Another: “We do Socratic seminars ... skills can we use to talk ... everyone is in a circle. The teacher gives us a topic and asks questions ... we have conversations ... the teacher tries to prevent himself from saying a word, to learn from each other... but some students are shy.” Another: “Sometimes we have debates, good to see opinions out there.”

**27 Students**  
Regarding relationships with teachers: “Some teachers are different from others ... they have more patience than I would have ... I think it is tough job.” Another: “Some teachers are harder than others ... but the work is challenging.” Another: “The grade is important for future, college, career [what would you do if no grades?] “It is also personal pride in knowing you finished something ... I feel like our government is focused on grades and test scores, but teachers are focused on us and want us to genuinely succeed.”

**28 Students**  
What will you remember most? “The people; homecoming, prom ... sports, clubs [many offer ideas].” Another: “Everyone can remember the love and pride, Phoenix nation.” [Are most students proud?] I’d say so, we are relatively new, and have tons of support, and the band, art.”
Appendix B
A CASE STUDY of the HIGH SCHOOL REDESIGN INITIATIVE

EVIDENCE CODE KEY *

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: FOCUS GROUPS, INTERVIEWS AND OBSERVATIONS

1. Design team/teacher leader observation or focus group
   1a. Focus group with “rank and file” teachers **
2. Focus group with parents
3. Interview with building principal
4. Interview with counselor(s)
5. Focus group with students
6. Interview with PAGE’s Executive Director, Dr. Allene Magill;
7. Interview with Dr. Bill McCown, former Superintendent (Sonoraville)
8. Interview with Dr. Jim Arnold, former Principal (Shaw)
9. Interviews with Marta Walker; Dr. Judy Henry; Ricky Clemmons (PAGE/HSRI)

* Coding used in the Research Questions document: e.g., the focus group with parents would be: F2.
** As one high school did not separate teacher leaders from rank and file teachers during the focus groups, these two originally separate sources of evidence have been combined into a single code.

EVIDENCE CODE KEY *

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: DOCUMENTS

1. Attendance: overall; percent missing more than 20 days of school (for non-medical reasons), since 2006-2007
2. College-credit bearing courses: list, description, and enrollment by year (2006-2007 to present)
3. College-going rates first year following graduation (2006-2007 to present)
4. Credit recovery programs: list, description, and enrollment by year (2006-2007 to present)
5. EOCT scores since 2006-2007
6. Four (4) samples of student work from CTAE/Academy/Magnet courses with rubrics, from the past school year (2013-2014). Equal emphasis on strong and weak examples (de-identified)
7. Graduation rates (within expected time frame, or as defined by State of Georgia), since 2006-2007
8. HSRI Email communication archives for both schools
9. Impact evidence documents (i.e., Impact Design and Development spreadsheets)
10. Master schedules (2006-2007 to present)
11. PAGE PL event attendance by school since 2006
12. PAGE videos, podcasts, etc.
13. PAGE’s HSRI budgets for each school
14. Records of HSRI-related visits to the each school
15. Related school-created tools and processes (e.g., modified protocols, PL presentations, reference guides, etc.)
16. Sampling of course syllabi from school year 2013-2014 or from the upcoming school year (2014-2015): 25% sample of all courses required for graduation, PLUS CTAE/academy courses, chosen by principal, with half of the selected syllabi being identified as exemplary, and half being identified as less than exemplary (de-identified)
17. School artifacts, t-shirts, public displays of student work, etc.
18. School improvement plans (2006-2007 to present)
19. School website/Facebook/youtube
20. School’s initial HSRI application (and PAGE’s HSRI application process overview/history)
22. Teacher referrals to principal/office, 2006-2007
23. Ten (10) samples of student work from courses required for graduation, along with scoring rubrics, from the past school year (2013-2014). Equal emphasis on strong and weak examples (de-identified)
24. Yearbooks

* Coding used in the Research Questions document: e.g., attendance would be D1
Case Study Document Needs/Requests

**TIMELINE/DEADLINE/TARGET** – all items needed on/before September 30. Earlier is the most advantageous. Items can be shared as they are obtained or they can all be submitted at one time.

1. **David/PAGE will provide**
   a. PAGE PL event attendance by school (Shaw, Sonoraville) since 2006
   b. Records of David’s HSRI-related visits to the two schools
   c. PAGE’s HSRI budgets for two schools (e.g., conference/retreat attendance, etc.)
   d. Email communication archives for both schools
   e. Impact evidence documents (i.e., David’s spreadsheets)
   f. Related school-created tools and processes (e.g., modified protocols, PL presentations, reference guides, etc.)
   g. School’s initial HSRI application (and PAGE’s HSRI application process overview/history)

2. **Evidence requested of Shaw HS and Sonoraville HS**
   All items are being requested BY SCHOOL YEAR, SINCE SCHOOL YEAR 2006-2007, or whatever exists (in the event multiple years of historical data are not available), unless otherwise noted (as in e., f., and g., below, which specify only one school year). It is understood that some of these data are simply not available for the number of years being sought. Share that with David when initially reviewing this list and each school’s unique information will be noted. This level of detail will help streamline the follow up that is needed to ensure that a comprehensive picture of the school’s data is in place.

   **NOTE:** eCopies preferred but if hardcopies are more readily accessible, that format is perfectly fine. The school is not expected to spend large amounts of time locating this data. The rule of thumb is for the school to provide the documentation that is quickly located and easily shared.

   a. Master schedules (2006-2007 to present)
   b. School improvement plans (2006-2007 to present)
      
      **NOTE:** Sonoraville HS has already provided an SIP for FY13
      **NOTE:** Shaw HS has already provided SIPs for FY11, FY12, and FY13
   c. College-credit bearing courses: list, description*, and enrollment by year (2006-2007 to present)
   d. Credit recovery programs: list, description*, and enrollment by year (2006-2007 to present)
   e. Sampling of course syllabi from School Year 2013-2014 or from the upcoming school year (2014-2015): only a 25% sample of all courses required for graduation, PLUS CTAE/academy courses, chosen by principal, with half of the selected syllabi being identified as exemplary, and half being identified as less than exemplary. Can be de-identified (anonymous/redacted).
   f. Ten (10) samples of student work from courses required for graduation, along with scoring rubrics, from the past school year (2013-2014). If no work is on hand from last year, samples can be selected as the 2014-2015 school year gets under way, if it is feasible to do so. Equal emphasis on strong and weak examples. Can be de-identified (anonymous/redacted).
   g. Four (4) samples of student work from CTAE/Academy/Magnet courses with rubrics, from the past school year (2013-2014). If no work is on hand from last year, samples can be selected as the 2014-2015 school year gets under way, if it is feasible to do so. Equal emphasis on strong and weak examples. Can be de-identified (anonymous/redacted).
   h. Academic Performance, Persistence and Discipline statistics**, by year, since 2006-2007:
      i. Graduation rates (within expected time frame, or as defined by State of Georgia), since 2006-2007
ii. EOCT scores since 2006-2007 (aggregated and/or disaggregated – what is on hand – do not create new reports)
iii. College-going rates first year following graduation (if possible) as far back as possible (2006-2007)
iv. Attendance: overall; percent missing more than 20 days of school (for non-medical reasons), since 2006-2007
vi. Teacher referrals to principal/office, 2006-2007

* description – (see d. and e. above) descriptions can be very brief and generic – if, however, the school has reasons to add specificity to a description – e.g., why one credit recovery program was chosen, or changed – the school should feel free to include that information

** Academic Performance, Persistence and Discipline statistics – if you know that your SIP (or some other document you can supply or have supplied) contains items in this section (h., i.-vi.), simply note that on the appropriate line and reference the core document – do not recreate data or duplicate efforts submitting it twice.
School Visit Schedule – interviews and focus groups

We are assuming a school day beginning at approximately 8:00 a.m. and ending at approximately 3:00 p.m. We can begin earlier, or stay later, so please let David know your preferred meeting start time. Your guidance will assist with our planning and will help us minimize the time you prep for the visit. We don’t want to disturb/distract anyone during arrival or dismissal, although we will likely want to observe those periods of time during our fall visit. In addition to the starting time for the first session (details below), please let us know the best time for us to arrive at the school so that we can observe students and staff as they start their day.

The order of the interviews/focus groups is flexible, and will be determined entirely by you, with a single exception where we do have a preference (the interview with principal - see below – which is best conducted at/near day’s end).

Each interview/focus group should be about 45 minutes in length, and we would like each to be audio recorded. The recording will be made available to David/PAGE, but otherwise will remain completely confidential. This time frame (45 minutes) gives us time to ask for further information, documentation, debrief between sessions (about 15 minutes between each), use the restroom, etc. This schedule also allows us some time to eat lunch, which could be included in one of the sessions with adults (e.g., parents). We are very willing to stay after school if that would assist you in planning for these interviews/focus groups.

Here are the six requested interviews/focus groups for your school.

- **Design team/teacher leader** observation or focus group/interview

  Note: The idea here is that if we can observe these teachers at work, as a design team or its equivalent meeting, that would be great, but we realize that the schedule will probably make this unlikely. The next best option is a focus group with teachers designated as leaders. The other/final option is an interview with a teacher who plays a leading role in HSRI related work. We are assuming the appropriate number here is between 3-5 teachers, but since a typical focus group size for this project is 6-9 individuals, the number can exceed five.

  *Only Mark and Agnes (not David) will be present for this observation, focus group, or interview.*

- **Focus group with “rank and file” teachers**

  Note: “Rank and file” descriptor used simply to indicate teachers who are not necessarily part of a formal, structured team/group that “officially” lead engagement-centered work. We would like for these teachers to consist of a range of faculty in terms of experience, “buy-in,” length of time employed at the school, content area representation, grade levels, etc. (Sonoraville HS, please include 8th grade.) We suggest that the principal and/or design team (or teacher leaders) can best make suggestions as to who should be in this focus group. Including teachers with little buy-in can be very useful in identifying culture change (positive qualities of efforts at the school), as these teachers, in expressing lack of buy-in to HSRI principles for example, provide evidence of the existence of these principles in operation at the school. If we could recruit 6-9 teachers, that would be great.

  *Mark, Agnes and David will likely be present for this focus group.*

- **Focus group with students**

  Note: as with the “rank and file” teachers, we’d like to speak with a range of students, in terms of grade level, interests, academic performance, etc. School personnel should decide who should make this decision, but we do ask that in addition to the above criteria, that the group be composed to avoid including students with strong
friendships or rivalries. Put differently, students selected to participate should not be too familiar with each other. We would like 6-9 students for this group. 
*Mark, Agnes and David will likely be present for this focus group.*

- Focus group with **parents**

Note: Optimally, this would include 6-9 parents, but we realize this may be hard to pull together; we are hoping for a minimum of three parents. A range of parents, in terms of their involvement in and experience with the school, would be great, if possible.
*Mark, Agnes and David will likely be present for this focus group.*

- Interview with **counselor(s)**

Note: Optimally, this would include more than one counselor (three would be great), but we realize this may be hard to pull together, or there may only be one or two. 
*Mark, Agnes and David will likely be present for this interview.*

- Interview with building **principal**

Note: If this can take place toward the end of the day, it would be best, as we can follow up with questions that have emerged from the observations and conversations throughout the day. We are leaving it up to the principal if the assistant principal should be included. 
*Only Mark and Agnes (not David) will be present for this interview.*
Focus Group Questions: Counselors

Introduction: Thank you for sharing your time with us today! We are interested in learning more about this school; we are not evaluators, and this focus group is unrelated to and will not affect your formal evaluations. We are here to learn from the work you do!

Ground rules: before we begin with the first question, we want everyone to feel comfortable and share their views; there are no wrong or right answers. Everyone should have a chance to speak, but everyone does not need to answer every question.

Opening Question:
   Could you please introduce yourselves, providing your name and responsibilities, and how long you have been working at this school?

Introductory Question:
   What words or phrases best describe or symbolize your work here at the school?

Transition Question:
   Briefly talk about your impression of this school the first week you started working here.

Key Questions:
   How would you describe the focus and identity of Shaw/Sonoraville High School? —> How did this focus emerge? —> Do you see key points in the development of this focus? — Can you describe them?

   If we shadowed you every day for an entire month, what would stand out about how you conduct your work here? —> What influenced you to work the way you do?

   How would you describe your relationship with teachers, administrators, parents, and students? —> Describe the role of each group —> Have these roles changed since you started working here? If yes, how did they change? What influenced the change?

Closing Questions:
   What’s your favorite event at this school? Why?

   If you were to start a school from scratch, what would you take from your experience here to inform that work? —> What supports would you need, and from who would you seek them?

   Is there anything in addition to what you have told us that we should know to understand Shaw/Sonoraville High School?
Focus Group Questions: Parents

Introduction: thank you for taking the time to meet with us today. We are interested in learning more about this school, and about its relationship with parents and the community; we are not evaluators, and this focus group is unrelated to and will not affect how your child or children or this school, will be evaluated.

Ground rules: before we begin with the first question, we want everyone to feel comfortable and share their views; there are no wrong or right answers. Everyone should have a chance to speak, but everyone does not need to answer every question.

Opening Question:
Briefly introduce yourselves, and tell us how long your child or children have been at this school.

Introductory Question:
What word or phrase best describes the high school you attended?

Transition Question:
What is the first word or phrase that comes to mind when you think about this high school?

Key Questions:
Describe your relationship with this school —> how do you learn about what is going on at the school? —> tell us about your relationships with teachers, the school principal, assistant principal, and school counselors?

If I were your child’s teacher, what would I have to do to make an assignment interesting to them? —> since your child started school here, tell us about something they really enjoyed and learned from —> why do you think they enjoyed it, and learned from it? —> how do you know they learned?

Describe the work you typically see this schooling assigning your child? —> does it look challenging to you? —> what characteristics of school work do you value the most? —> what is your favorite school event?

Closing Questions:
How is this school different from when you went to school?

Is there a question that we did not ask you, that we should have, or is there anything you would like to add?
**Focus Group Questions: Students**

**Introduction:** Thank you for meeting with us today. We are interested in learning more about how teaching and learning takes place at your school. We are not evaluators, and this focus group will not affect how you or this school will be evaluated. We are interested in your experiences at this school, so questions are focused only on your experiences since enrolling here. We are here to learn from you!

**Ground rules:** before we begin with the first question, we want everyone to feel comfortable and share their views; there are no wrong or right answers. You don’t need to mention any names, when talking about your experiences at this school; and we won’t share any names if they are mentioned. Everyone should have a chance to speak, but everyone does not need to answer every question.

**Opening Question:**
Briefly introduce yourselves, and what year of high school this is for you, how many years have you been here, and tell us if any siblings have attended this school.

**Introductory Question:**
What do you think you’ll remember most about this school?

**Transition Question:**
Think of a word or phrase that best describes your relationship with teachers at this school.

**Key Questions:**
Tell us about your relationships with teachers, the school principal, assistant principal(s), and school counselors? —> how does this school view and treat students?

Tell us about a school experience (project, assignment, activity) that you really enjoyed and learned from —> what made the experience enjoyable? —> how do you know you have learned from it? —> beyond grades —> what makes some learning last, and usable in other subjects or even out of school?

How often does school work interest you? —> What about your friends or other students you know? —> what do you consider “busywork”?

What does challenging work look like to you? —> what causes you to persist in work (a math problem, a science experiment, a research paper) that is difficult?

**Closing Questions:**
What is your favorite school event?

If you were to start your own school, what aspects of this school would you keep? What aspects would you change?

Is there a question that we did not ask you, that we should have, or is there anything you would like to add?
Focus Group Questions: Teachers

Introduction: Thank you for taking the time to talk with us today! We are interested in learning more about how teaching and learning takes place at the school. We are not evaluators, and this focus group is unrelated to and will not affect your evaluations. We are here to learn from the work you do!

Ground rules: before we begin with the first question, we want everyone to feel comfortable and share their views; there are no wrong or right answers. Everyone should have a chance to speak, but everyone does not need to answer every question.

Opening Question:
Could you please introduce yourselves, providing your name and teaching responsibilities, and how long you have been working at this high school?

Introductory Question:
What words or phrases best describe or symbolize your approach to teaching and learning?

Transition Question:
Briefly talk about your impression of this school the first week you started working here.

Key Questions:
How would you describe the focus and identity of Shaw/Sonoraville High School? —> How did this focus emerge? —> Do you see key points in the development of this focus? —> Can you describe them?

If we shadowed you every day for an entire month, what would stand out about how you conduct your work here? —> What influenced you to work the way you do?

How would you describe your relationship with teachers, administrators, parents, and students? —> Describe the role of each group —> Have these roles changed since you started working here? If yes, how did they change? What influenced the change?

Closing Questions:
What’s your favorite event at this school? Why?

If you were to start a school from scratch, what would you take from your experience here to inform that work? —> What supports would you need, and from who would you seek them?

Is there anything in addition to what you have told us that we should know to understand your work at this school?
Interview Questions: Principals

Introduction: Thank you for sharing your time with us today! Since this school has been identified as exemplary, we are interested in learning more about how teaching and learning takes place at the school. We are not evaluators, and the interview will not affect the school’s evaluation. We are here to learn from the work you do. There are no right or wrong answers.

Opening Question:
Could you please introduce yourselves, providing your name and responsibilities, and how long you have been working as principal at this school?

Introductory Question:
What words or phrases best describe or symbolize your work here at the school?

Transition Question:
Briefly talk about your impression of this school the first week you started working here.

Key Questions:
How would you describe the focus and identity of this school —> how did this focus emerge? —> do you see key points in the development of this focus? —> can you describe them?

If we shadowed you every day for an entire month, what would stand out about how you conduct your work here? —> what influenced you to work the way you do?

How would you describe your relationship with teachers, other administrators, parents, and students? —> describe the role of each group —> have these roles changed since you started working here? If yes, how did they change? What influenced the change?

Closing Questions:
What’s your favorite event at this school? Why?

If you were to start a school from scratch, what would you take from your experience here to inform that work? —> What supports would you need, and from who would you seek them?

Is there anything in addition to what you have told us that we should know to understand Shaw/Sonoraville High School?
Semi-Structured Interview: PAGE staff

Notes:

There are no “right” or “wrong” answers, and the information provided is not part of an evaluation; the purpose is to help us document the effect of the relationship PAGE has had with two HSRI schools. The object of our research is this relationship, and so, we need to learn about PAGE and HSRI staff as much as we need to learn about the two schools in this case study, since it is their interaction and its impact that is the object of study.

The “—>” indicates a possible follow-up question, or direction for the conversation.

It is understood that some questions may be answered by the interviewee prior to their being formally asked by the interviewer, and as such, the question would be skipped, or elaboration will be sought.

1. Opening Question
   a) Briefly introduce yourself
   b) Briefly tell me how you came to work for PAGE, and how long you have been working with HSRI

2. Introductory Question
   a) What is your role in HSRI? Briefly talk about your main responsibilities

3. Transition Question
   a) Where did the idea for HSRI come from?

4. Key Questions
   a) How would you describe HSRI to someone who has little knowledge about PAGE or HSRI? —> Are there key components of HSRI? —> Are their distinct phases? —> How does a school join HSRI?
   b) What is HSRI ultimately designed to achieve? —> Why is HSRI believed to be the way to achieve this aim? —> “Theory of action”: If we do X, Y will occur.
   c) In your experience, what is the most common affect of HSRI on participating schools? —> How do you know?
   d) How would you describe the relationship of HSRI staff with participating schools? —> Describe their role, the nature of their work? —> How do HSRI staff work with each other?
   e) Tell me about an outcome with a participating HSRI school that you did not expect?
   f) In your view, are there any school characteristics that contribute to some HSRI schools benefiting more from the initiative than other HSRI schools?
   g) In your view, what is the biggest benefit a school receives from PAGE through HSRI?

5. Ending Questions
   a) It looks like there are well over 40 schools participating in HSRI? Can you talk about the range of experiences these schools represent?
   b) How has HSRI changed since its inception, what remains the same?
   c) Given the purpose of the study, is there anything you have not told me that I would need to know to understand HSRI and PAGE?
Appendix C
### High School Redesign Initiative - HSRI At-A-Glance

**Phase I (Years 1-2)**
- Urgency of Change Presentation**
- 1-day Leadership Retreat**
- WOW Conference - Engagement 2.0**
- 2-day Working on the Work Retreat**
- Principal's Academy Conference**
- Teacher Leader Academy Conference**
- Incentive Grant (at the end of Year 2)

- Design Team continuity process
- SIP/Data/Professional Learning update
- Begin Measuring Engagement
- Strategic abandonment
- Initiative alignment
- Update Executive Assessment and/or Schoolhouse Transformation
- Status/Update/Sharing*, Incentive Grant

### Phase II (Years 2-4)
- WOW Conference (Design 2.0)**
- WOW Conference (School Transformation 2.0)**
- 2-day Design Team Retreat**
- Principal's Leadership Conference (possibility)**
- Incentive Grant
- School(s) "parent group" presentation**

- SIP/Data/Professional Learning update
- Redo Images of School activity
- Embed concepts/language in processes/document
- Status/Update/Sharing*, Incentive Grant

### Phase III (Years 3-5)
- 1-day Leadership Retreat (additional staff)**
- 2-day Working on the Work Retreat (additional staff)**
- Teacher Leader Academy Conference (additional staff)**
- WOW Conference Engagement 2.0 (additional staff)**
- Design Team Conference**
- Coaching for Design II (by request)**
- Central Office Conference (if applicable)**
- Transition support training**
- Incentive Grant

- SIP/Data/Professional Learning update
- Revise beliefs/core business
- Optional possible design academy (intra-district)
- SIP/Data/Professional Learning update
- Update Executive Assessment and/or Schoolhouse Transformation

### Fluid, mutual, two-way inquiry, initiation, sharing

Ongoing/Yearly HSRI Support
- HSRI Staff Site Visit
- 24/7 email/phone support
- Professional Reading Material/Videos/Resources/Docs & Forms
- ProfLearn support (incl. assistance facilitating initial experiences)
- Subs/release time (for all formal, structured events)
- Networking connections
- PAGE Summer Conference

Superintendents are always welcome to attend all PAGE-supported events. The size of the school (student and staff population) is a factor determining the number of participants invited to PAGE-supported events.

### Phase IV (Years 6-10)

- Annual mini-grant opportunity, Status/Update/Sharing*
- SIP (evidence of HSRI focus)/next steps and/or Schoolhouse Transformation
- HSRI site-created tools, PLU info, etc.
- Any pertinent data
  - Staff actively engaged in HSRI
  - Executive Assessment
  - Student achievement
  - Student attendance
  - Disciplinary referrals
  - Parent commendations/complaints
  - Student/staff/parent/community perception data (e.g., surveys, focus groups, etc.)

**Status/Update/Sharing, Incentive Grant**

- Calendar or specific HSRI-focused work
- Resources developed
- HSRI site-written goals, HSRI site-generated tools, HSRI site-developed training, etc.

### A CASE STUDY of the HIGH SCHOOL REDESIGN INITIATIVE

**PAGE Principles** - Network (Ongoing/Active) and PAGE Principles’ Academy (Participant . . . Critical Friend)

**PAGE Principals’ Network (Ongoing/Active) and PAGE Principals**

- PAGE Summer Conference
- PAGE Principals’ Network (Ongoing/Active) and PAGE Principals

Superintendents are always welcome to attend all PAGE-supported events.

The size of the school (student and staff population) is a factor determining the number of participants invited to PAGE-supported events.

### HSRI Staff Site Visit

- HSRI Staff Site Visit
- 24/7 email/phone support
- Professional Reading Material/Videos/Resources/Docs & Forms
- ProfLearn support (incl. assistance facilitating initial experiences)
- Subs/release time (for all formal, structured events)
- Networking connections
- PAGE Summer Conference

Superintendents are always welcome to attend all PAGE-supported events. The size of the school (student and staff population) is a factor determining the number of participants invited to PAGE-supported events.

### Annual mini-grant opportunity, Status/Update/Sharing*

- SIP (evidence of HSRI focus)/next steps and/or Schoolhouse Transformation
- HSRI site-created tools, PLU info, etc.
- Any pertinent data
  - Staff actively engaged in HSRI
  - Executive Assessment
  - Student achievement
  - Student attendance
  - Disciplinary referrals
  - Parent commendations/complaints
  - Student/staff/parent/community perception data (e.g., surveys, focus groups, etc.)

**Status/Update/Sharing, Incentive Grant**

- Calendar or specific HSRI-focused work
- Resources developed
- HSRI site-written goals, HSRI site-generated tools, HSRI site-developed training, etc.

### PAGE Principles** - Network (Ongoing/Active) and PAGE Principles’ Academy (Participant . . . Critical Friend)

**PAGE Principals’ Network (Ongoing/Active) and PAGE Principals**

- PAGE Summer Conference
- PAGE Principals’ Network (Ongoing/Active) and PAGE Principals

Superintendents are always welcome to attend all PAGE-supported events.

The size of the school (student and staff population) is a factor determining the number of participants invited to PAGE-supported events.

### HSRI Staff Site Visit

- HSRI Staff Site Visit
- 24/7 email/phone support
- Professional Reading Material/Videos/Resources/Docs & Forms
- ProfLearn support (incl. assistance facilitating initial experiences)
- Subs/release time (for all formal, structured events)
- Networking connections
- PAGE Summer Conference

Superintendents are always welcome to attend all PAGE-supported events. The size of the school (student and staff population) is a factor determining the number of participants invited to PAGE-supported events.

### Annual mini-grant opportunity, Status/Update/Sharing*

- SIP (evidence of HSRI focus)/next steps and/or Schoolhouse Transformation
- HSRI site-created tools, PLU info, etc.
- Any pertinent data
  - Staff actively engaged in HSRI
  - Executive Assessment
  - Student achievement
  - Student attendance
  - Disciplinary referrals
  - Parent commendations/complaints
  - Student/staff/parent/community perception data (e.g., surveys, focus groups, etc.)

**Status/Update/Sharing, Incentive Grant**

- Calendar or specific HSRI-focused work
- Resources developed
- HSRI site-written goals, HSRI site-generated tools, HSRI site-developed training, etc.
# Program/Framework Contrast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requires learning prescribed activities, steps.</td>
<td>Requires learning concepts and interrelationship among and between concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumes a set of standardized activities will achieve some predetermined results.</td>
<td>Assumes users must develop or customize activities based on a deep understanding of concepts and of specific contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on accurately following prescribed sets of activities.</td>
<td>Focuses on determining desired results to be achieved through customized activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasizes conformance to prescription by means of staff training; organizational development is unnecessary or incidental.</td>
<td>Emphasizes understanding by means of organizational development and, subsequently, by means of staff development and training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>