CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SAN MARCOS

THESIS SIGNATURE PAGE

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

EDUCATION

THESIS TITLE: WHAT PRINCIPALS AND DISTRICTS CAN DO TO SUPPORT VETERAN TEACHERS DURING TIMES OF MANDATED CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

AUTHOR: AMY LYNNE COPELAND

DATE OF SUCCESSFUL DEFENSE: SUMMER 2004

THE THESIS HAS BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE THESIS COMMITTEE IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATION

Jennifer Jeffries, Ed.D.
THESIS COMMITTEE CHAIR

Signature 8-10-04

Elizabeth Campbell
THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

Signature 8-10-04
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With gratitude

to Mom and Bruce,

for encouraging me to finish.

to Shane and Dad,

for reminding me I could quit

and to the participants of this study

who shared with me their passion for the art of teaching.

******

Heartfelt thanks to Dr. Jennifer Jeffries

and Libby Campbell for their tremendous support through this process.
### TABLE OF CONTENTS

**THESIS ABSTRACT** ........................................................................................................ 3

**CHAPTER I — INTRODUCTION**
- Background to the Problem .................................................................................. 4
- Statement of the Problem .................................................................................. 6
- Importance of the Study .................................................................................... 6
- Limitations of the Study .................................................................................... 7
- Definition of Terms .......................................................................................... 8
- Organization of the Study .................................................................................. 9

**CHAPTER II — REVIEW OF LITERATURE**
- No Child Left Behind ........................................................................................ 11
- California’s Academic Performance Index .............................................. 25
- Teacher Job Satisfaction .................................................................................. 32

**CHAPTER III — METHODOLOGY**
- Participants ...................................................................................................... 37
- Procedures ........................................................................................................ 38
- Materials .......................................................................................................... 39

**CHAPTER IV — RESULTS AND FINDINGS**
- Findings ........................................................................................................... 41
- Responses to Interview Questions ............................................................... 43

**CHAPTER V — SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS**
- Summary .......................................................................................................... 81
- Recommendations ............................................................................................ 85
- Conclusion ......................................................................................................... 89

**APPENDICES**
- Appendix A — Select Questions from US Department of Education’s Public School Teacher Questionnaire .................................................................................................................. 92
- Appendix B — Questions for Teacher Interviews ........................................... 98
- Appendix C — Consent to Participate in Research Form ..................................... 99

**REFERENCES** ........................................................................................................ 100
Supporting Teachers During Mandated Curriculum 3

THESIS ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine what principals and district administrators can do to support veteran teachers during times of mandated curriculum implementation. The objective of this study was to research what impact mandated curriculum implementation has had on one elementary school in a large district in San Diego County and hear teacher’s perceptions during mandated curriculum implementation. Qualitative data was collected through multiple questionnaires as well as individual interviews with five veteran teachers. This study provides an overview of literature related to No Child Left Behind legislation, California’s Academic Performance Index, and teacher job satisfaction.

District administrators and principals need to clearly articulate reasoning behind mandates to be implemented by teachers. Autonomy and a sense of empowerment within their teaching help teachers to maintain high job satisfaction. Veteran teachers must perceive that their experience in the classroom is valued and respected by administrators.

Some of the related themes in the questionnaires and interviews included: teachers felt they had less influence on selecting instructional materials, content, topic, skills to be taught, and teaching techniques within their classrooms. Veteran teachers expressed frustration, humiliation, and surprise at the district’s insistence on the exclusive use of the mandated curriculum, and felt principals and districts could support teachers during times of transition by using them and their experience as resources with regard to new curricular programs.
CHAPTER I – INTRODUCTION

Background to the Problem

Legislation such as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 has propelled educators into the age of accountability. Using the tools of high stakes testing, disaggregated data based on significant subgroups, and intense public scrutiny, law makers have decisively influenced the manner in which each individual child, school, district, and state is going about the business of education. In order to address the “what” of teaching in a clear and concise way, states and districts have developed detailed curricular standards. Due to the educational research being viewed as unreliable and undisciplined as noted in Levin (1999), NCLB requires “scientifically based research” be used when deciding on programs and use of Federal funding. Because of high stakes testing, accountability, standards based teaching, and mandated curriculum to comply with scientifically based research requirements, pressure on teachers, school sites, districts, and states are at a critical level. This confluence of pressures can have psychological effects on all parties in the educational arena, particularly classroom teachers.

At the beginning of the 2003-2004 school year, a large district in San Diego County adopted a new language arts series containing state standards which is published by Houghton Mifflin. Since the beginning of the school year, the district has taken a firm stance on the use of the language arts adoption and has forbidden the use of any supplemental materials, including literature related to the content areas.
The progression of the language arts adoption through the 2003-2004 school year has been a remarkable one with regard to teacher job satisfaction. In spite of voicing frustration with the structure of the adoption and its perceived effectiveness, teachers continued working diligently and in good faith to use the curricula as directed by the district. As more district mandates arose regarding the forbidden use of any other materials, teachers have grown increasingly discontented as evidenced by informal conversations at the work place and within grade level meetings.

Minimal attention has been given to the impact of the combined factors of high stakes testing, accountability, standards based instruction, and mandated curriculum on veteran teachers. One result of this neglect is veteran teachers feel they aren’t valued for their professional opinions or experiences. The passage of NCLB and its mandate to utilize “scientifically based research” in developing, selecting and using instructional materials and pedagogies has put tremendous pressure on districts to demonstrate sustained improvement and meet target goals. The desire to show they are complying with mandates by using “scientifically based” adoptions is critical to district’s ability to receive federal funding. Unless a district is willing to turn down federal funding, the rule of the law must be adhered to.

Teacher perception regarding mandated curriculum is important for principals and districts to understand because, even though the program may be scientifically based in research, the materials may be so difficult for teachers to implement that they don’t effectively present them (Slavin, 2002) or so boring the
students will not be motivated to study them (Levin, 1999), thus squelching any hope of state test scores moving up. It should be noted that scientifically based or not, if materials are too difficult to implement or boring they are difficult to implement.

A qualitative investigation into veteran teachers’ job satisfaction during times of strictly mandated curriculum will give voice to veteran teachers who may feel their expertise is not valued nor appreciated. In addition, a qualitative inquiry will enable veteran teachers to state, in a secure setting, what principals and districts can do to support their unique needs in times of curricular transition.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the qualitative study is to inform principals what they can do to support veteran teachers during times of high stakes testing, accountability, standards, and mandated curriculum in a San Diego K-8 district. Teachers with high job satisfaction are more likely to approach their work with focus and enthusiasm. When job satisfaction is reduced, teacher effort and attitude can be negatively affected. This is a problem for teachers, principals and, ultimately, the students. The adoption and implementation of highly prescribed curricula that teachers perceive as negating their professional experience and expertise can negatively impact teacher job satisfaction. Educational reform and mandates are here to stay so it would be to everyone’s benefit to understand how principals can support veteran teachers during cycles of significant instructional change.

Importance of the Study
By better understanding veteran teachers’ perceptions of mandated curriculum including their concerns, frustrations, and realities, principals and administrators will learn what they can do to support veteran teachers during stressful curricular transitions. Due to this study, principals will have a knowledge of the signs and symptoms of a decrease in satisfaction and will respond to those signs and symptoms in a meaningful way. Districts will better understand the necessity of clearly communicating their curricular goals to their teachers and to clearly state the reasons and rationale behind mandates. By building a bridge of understanding, teachers and administrators can work together to achieve excellent student progress on state tests and maintain a healthy job satisfaction level for veteran teachers.

Limitations of the Study

Readers of this study must be aware of the following limitations of this research study:

1. Participants in this study represent one elementary school within a large school district in San Diego County. Any data collected from the participants should not be expected to represent all schools and districts with the same or different population demographics.

2. Only teachers with more than 12 years experience participated in this study. Responses of veteran teachers could differ greatly from that of beginning teachers.
3. Qualitative data will be collected from five independent interviews. The small sample size may not represent the larger population of veteran teachers.

4. Participants were asked in March 2004 to fill out a questionnaire regarding their views on the 2002-03 school year, which ended in June 2003. The passage of time may decrease the accuracy of their perceptions. In addition, the implementation of the new curriculum was already underway. Participants were vocal about their resistance to the new curriculum. This could have magnified their positive feelings about the previous year and magnified their discontent in the current year.

Definition of Terms

Academic Performance Index (API) – Statistics used by the state of California to show yearly growth of students. Standardized and other assessment data is disaggregated by district, school, and student sub-populations including, but not limited to: socioeconomics, English Language Learners, and special education. Schools are compared to schools with similar populations.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) – Yearly student progress required by No Child Left Behind until the year 2014, when all students will be proficient in reading and mathematics. Schools not meeting AYP targets in any student subgroup will face escalating consequences.

Current State of Mind – The state of mind the employee is feeling in the current school year with regard to his or her teaching career.
Mandated Curriculum – Curriculum adopted by a district. Curriculum refers to instructional materials as well as pedagogical models. Adopted curriculum is required and the use of alternative materials or pedagogical models is prohibited.

No Child Left Behind – Legislation passed by the Bush administration in 2002, requiring incremental growth for all children until the year 2014, as well as the use of scientifically based research in selecting teaching materials.

Professional Demeanor – A description of a teacher’s level of contribution to their profession, including involvement in committees, level of respect afforded by other teachers, sharing of ideas, and hours of work beyond the contract hours.

Scientifically Based Research – Research, usually quantitative, that has been replicated in large studies and is deemed to be highly rigorous.

Subgroups – Any of the five subgroups required to be reported through No Child Left Behind. These include: disability, low-income, race/ethnicity, gender, and English-language learners.

Veteran Teachers – For purposes of this study, teachers with more than 12 years experience, with a minimum of five years at the site of the study.

Organization of the Study

“What Principals Can Do to Support Veteran Teachers During Times of Mandated Curriculum Implementation” is presented in five chapters. The following is the content of each of the chapters:

Chapter I establishes the background for the study. A brief history is given regarding events that have led up to the situation being studied. The importance of
the topic is described and is followed by the purpose of the study and the statement of the problem. Following the research problem are the limitations of the study, the key vocabulary terms as defined by the researcher, and a brief description of the organization of the study.

Chapter II is a review of literature pertinent to the study. The review describes key research on several strands that directly affect mandated curriculum including: No Child Left Behind, scientifically based research, Academic Performance Index, and teacher job satisfaction.

Chapter III establishes the methodology of the study. A description of the participants and materials used by the researcher is included. In addition, the procedures used for survey taking and interviews are established.

Chapter IV presents results and findings of the study.

Chapter V includes the summary and conclusions of the study.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

No Child Left Behind

January, 2002 ushered in sweeping reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Entitled the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, the 600 page, 150,000 word document (Hayes, 2003, p.2) was passed by the Senate with a non-partisan 87-10 vote. Although results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress show that, “at the end of the century scores in reading and mathematics had leveled off at a 30 year high, dropouts were near all-time lows, and our nation’s economic supremacy was unquestioned” significant inequities were found to exist in our educational system. The difference between the United State’s highest scoring and lowest scoring students was greater than that of any nation (Mathis, 2003, p. 680).

In order to address the inequities, NCLB established a timeline and four areas within education on which to focus attention. By 2014, the law states all public school students must be performing at grade level in reading and math (Hardy, 2003, p.30). The four key pillars of NCLB are: accountability and testing, flexible use of federal resources, school choice, and quality teaching/quality teachers (Cicchinelli, Gaddy, Lefkowits, & Miller, 2003, pg. 1).

NCLB places great emphasis on accountability. Within the realm of accountability comes the mandate of annual testing in reading and mathematics for all students in grades 3-8, beginning in the 2005-2006 school year (Cicchinelli, et al., 2003). Additionally, states are required to show “adequate yearly progress”
(AYP) in all student subgroups. The six subgroups of students required by the Act are: disability, low-income, race/ethnicity, gender, English-language learners, and migrant students (Sanders, 2003, p. 26).

In establishing AYP, each state is responsible for setting up clearly defined “target” goals for ensuring all students meet state standards. Target goals are established by state plans in which benchmarks are set for the percentage of students in each school who are to reach proficiency. The percentage of students reaching proficiency must increase incrementally until 2014, at which time all students are expected to be proficient in both reading and math. Further, if any one of the subgroups doesn’t reach its AYP, the entire school does not reach its AYP (Education Trust, 2003, p.1).

If schools do not make their AYP and they receive funds under the Title I program, a program which provides supplementary funding for low-income students, the following steps will be taken, according to the Education Trust:

- In Year One: A school is going about its business as usual
- In Year Two: School finds out it did not make its AYP for the previous school year. Under the law there are no consequences for not making AYP for one year.
- In Year Three: If a school fails to make AYP for two consecutive years, parents need to be notified and given the opportunity to transfer their children to a higher performing school in the district. Priority needs to be given to the lowest achieving low-income students in that school. Schools
must identify the specific areas that need improvement and work with parents, teachers, and outside experts to develop a plan to raise student achievement.

- In Year Four: If a school fails to make AYP for another consecutive year, then tutoring and other supplemental educational services must be made available to low-income students at that school.

- In Year Five: Corrective Action. If a school does not make AYP for four years, it is identified for "corrective action." Children can continue to transfer to other schools or receive tutoring and other services. In addition, the district and school are required to implement at least one corrective action.

- In Year Six: The school must continue the corrective action and develop an "alternate governance" plan.

- In Year Seven: Restructuring. If a school does not make AYP for six years, the "alternative governance" plan that was developed the previous year must be implemented (p. 4-5).

In addition to its focus on accountability and testing, NCLB also employs a flexible use of federal resources (Cicchinelli, et al., 2003). A provision in the law allows states to combine federal funds they receive and allocate those funds into programs that will best meet the needs of their students. The intention was to give local boards the ability to combine resources in order to support programs.
Parents of students in schools identified as “in need of improvement” are able to transfer their children into a better performing public or public run charter school. The law also provides that parents may move their children if their school is designated as “persistently dangerous” by the state. Districts are required to offer more than one choice of schools to which to transfer and must pay the cost to transport the student to the selected school (Cicchinelli, et al., 2003).

The final pillar of NCLB is “quality teachers and quality teaching.” By the end of the 2005-2006 school years, the law requires that all public school teachers who teach core academic subjects must be “highly qualified.” In order to be deemed “highly qualified,” teachers must have state certification or have passed the state teacher licensing examination. Further, teachers must either pass a state test in their subject matter or hold an academic major in the area they are teaching. Teachers can gain certification through other routes, however, they can not teach for more than three years before they are fully certified (Cicchinelli, et al., 2003).

“Quality teaching” refers to teaching that is based on “sound, scientifically based research.” According to Slavin, 2002, NCLB Act “mentions ‘scientifically based research’ 110 times in references to Reading First programs for grades K-3, Early Reading First for preK, Title I school improvement programs, and many more. In each case, schools, districts, and states must justify the programs that they expect to implement under federal funding.” (p. 1).

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 has been a catalyst for change in educational research. Because of the law’s requirement for scientifically based
research, leaders in education have been moved to confront the “awful reputation” of educational research (Kaestle, 1993).

Educational research has long had an unreliable character. According to Levin, (1999) “For the better part of the past 30 years, the enterprise known as educational research has been gravely ill.” (p. 177). Federal funding will be appropriated to state and local schools districts only if scientifically based research has been utilized to show the effectiveness of programs.

No Child Left Behind defines “scientifically based research” (SBR) as “rigorous, systematic and objective procedures to obtain valid knowledge,” and employs research that “is evaluated using experimental or quasi experimental designs.” Although there is no consensus regarding the intricacies of what SBR means to educational researchers, Beghetto (2003) reports that defining characteristics appear across several sources including the Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy 2002, Comprehensive School Reform Program Office 2002, No Child Left Behind Act 2002, and the National Research Council 2002. Careful analysis of the characteristics effectively defines SBR as “Persuasive research that empirically examines important questions using appropriate methods that ensure reproducible and applicable findings.” (p. 3).

In fields such as science, medicine, technology, and agriculture great advances have been made during the 20th century due to “scientifically based research”. Slavin (1989) suggests these advances are a result of other fields’ acceptance of evidence and the necessity to use evidence to change practice.
Alternatively, education has not embraced SBR and therefore is victim to fads. Inadequate identification and implementation of effective teaching methods within the field has resulted because of this reluctance (p 752).

One of the more significant aspects of valid SBR to be addressed by educational researchers is that of control groups used in studies. Often matched studies are used in educational research due to the ease with which control groups can be created. Researchers compare a given group of students in one program to a group with similar characteristics, including demographics, prior achievement level, and poverty level. The difficulty of "matched studies" is in establishing a control group that is closely paralleled to the experimental group (Slavin, 2003). This produces a significant weakness in one of the most predominate research methodologies used in education and leads to low confidence in the findings of these studies.

Alternately, the preferred research design for valid SBR is a randomized sample. Students, teachers, or classes are chosen at random to participate, and are randomly assigned to the control group or the experimental group. Randomized samples are, as Slavin (2003) states, the "gold standard of research," and are far more difficult to establish due to financial constraints and availability of subjects.

A true experiment requires both random selection and random assignment, it requires conditions that preclude contamination among experimental and control groups, and if the consequences of the treatment are to be explainable from the theory from which it was derived, the treatment needs
to be prescriptive—that is, its features cannot depend on the idiosyncratic judgments of individual teachers. These conditions confer upon the true experiment a high degree of internal validity, but these are precisely the conditions that are so difficult to replicate in other “natural” settings. (Eisner, 1999 as cited in Levin & O’Donnell, 1999, p. 184).

Due to the current emphasis on random sampling, the U.S. Department of Education’s Institute of Education Sciences has created the “What Works” Clearinghouse. The Clearinghouse will establish standards for research and will dictate which studies meet those standards (Lewis, 2003). Further, the “What Works” Clearinghouse will create a set of standards in order to effectively evaluate claims that a studies’ intervention works and then create a database of SBR for educators (What Works Clearinghouse, 2003). These interventions, in the form of instructional materials and pedagogical approaches, become those that are acceptable in the eyes of the State and Federal officials who are empowered to monitor student progress.

Mandated use of SBR seems to be the progression in the evolution and improvement of education. According to the Department of Education’s “What to Know and Where to Go: Parents’ Guide to No Child Left Behind” (2002):

Under the new law, federally funded education programs or practices must be based on evidence that validates their usefulness in achieving the stated outcome specified in the law. For example, there are five essential components of reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, oral
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reading fluency, vocabulary development and comprehension strategies. These have been validated through years of peer-reviewed and replicated scientific research... (p. 19).

Although noble in thought, the mandate brings to mind a myriad of challenges. Slavin (2003) articulates some of these difficulties in a straightforward manner:

We can easily imagine a reading program that would incorporate the five elements but whose training was so minimal that teachers did not implement these elements well, or whose materials were so boring that students were not motivated to study them (p. 16).

In addition, it is difficult, if not impossible, to define variables in educational research. Levin (1999) asks how we account for and define “comparably effective” teachers, teaching style, not to mention how students are “comparable” (p. 191). Finally, simply because a program is based upon SBR does not ensure its effectiveness. Materials can be so difficult to use that teachers ineffectively present them. Districts may provide little or poor staff development causing teachers not change their instructional practices (Slavin, 2002).

While challenges plague educational researchers, the movement to rigorous research is crucial (Levin, 1999). Sroufe (1997) suggests educational research can’t compete with the “glamour” of fields such as engineering and biomedical science. Education simply cannot take a picture of a newly developed automobile or scientists holding a life changing drug. He differentiates between what educational
research cannot do-compete with glamorous fields- and what educational research
does not do. "Educational research does not provide critical, trustworthy, policy-
relevant information about problems of compelling interest to the education public."
(Sroufe, 1997, p. 27).

Levin and O'Donnell (1999) state, "Just as other fields informed by
bonifide empirical inquiry, in education we must be vigilant in dismissing 'fantasy,
unfounded opinion, 'common sense,' commercial advertising claims, the advice of
'gurus,' testimonials, and wishful thinking in [our] search for truth" (Stanovich,

In the literature Lewis (2003) sees the benefit of SBR, but also suggests caution should be taken when utilizing and relying upon SBR. The Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk at Johns Hopkins University has reviewed 800 studies of the most commonly used school reform models. Of those studies, only 3% generated evidence from randomized samples. "That fact alone makes one wonder how much innovation and productive variation will be left in schools when we are pared down to consider only randomized studies."(p. 340).

Slavin (2002) suggests it would be difficult to require federal funds be allotted only to programs that have been evaluated rigorously because there are so few programs of that nature currently available. With state and federal government taking stronger control of local education, districts are feeling pressure for students to make adequate progress due to consequences on state assessments. Because of this:
it is essential that schools focus both on the evidence base for their programs and on the outcomes in their particular school...schools should be expected to use methods known to be effective in general then to make certain that in their particular school, implementation of those methods is of sufficient quality to ensure progress on the state assessments (Slavin, 2002, p. 19).

Implications of SBR for school leaders is not yet clear, however, those schools receiving federal funding are required to utilize programs and practices based on SBR. One thing that is clear, however, according to Beghetto (2003) is “what remains unchanged is that school leaders still must rely on their professional judgment and the best information available in making decisions about the selection, implementation, and management of programs and practices in their schools.” (para. 24).

While NCLB mandates improved achievement for all students, which is a reasonable goal for all educators, it has not come without controversy. With regard to accountability and testing, opponents express concern that all children are held to the same standard, regardless of disabilities and other factors (Hardy, 2003, p.31). If any of the subgroups, including special education, does not make AYP, the school can be deemed “in need of improvement.” (p.32). It is possible a school can improve in all its subgroups and still be “in need of improvement” because in spite of growth, the growth may not have been deemed adequate for the goals. In this event the schools, including teachers and students, will be demoralized because of not reaching their AYP. As the number of subgroups in a school increase the school
has more opportunities to fail to reach their AYP. As Mathis (2003) states, “...a
diverse school, which faces greater challenges, is penalized.” (p.683).

Standardized tests, which are used in California for NCLB mandates, have
benefits as well as limitations. Standardized tests offer a snapshot of a student’s
abilities, rather than an overall picture of a student’s academic skills. Use of one test
to assess students provides untimely information that is unlikely to guide instruction
and provide interventions (Cicchinelli, et al., 2003, p.2 Standardized tests are
economically available to us, and do provide a glimpse of a student’s basic abilities
in the subjects tested. )

Annual yearly progress is based upon measuring the growth in a static model
rather than a cohort model. Rather than show growth of one group from year to
year, growth is shown based on grade levels. According to Mathis, (2003)
“Differences in the student body from one year to the next, combined with the
statistical error in the tests themselves, make it impossible to know whether the tests
are measuring real gains (or losses) or whether the changes are merely random
noise.” (p.683).

As noted by Thomas and Bainbridge (2002) recent state-level standards-
referenced tests show similar patterns in their outcomes: schools in affluent areas
score higher than schools in poor locations. According to the authors, there is “no
need to have seven years of research to show that money is the condition that
separates us socially, economically, and educationally.” (p.11).
While NCLB offers flexible use of federal resources, the issue of cost of full implementation remains a point of contention for opponents. Although funding has increased by eight percent over 2002, funding falls $5.3 billion short of the authorized funding levels for the Act (Cicchinelli, et al. 2003, p.682). In addition, research on the cost of providing “Standards Based” NCLB education for all children was conducted in ten states. The research showed that massive financial increases would have to occur in order to increase all students’ academic skills. Seven out of ten of the states studied would require increases in funding of more than 24% and six were between 30% and 46% (p.682). Currently, appropriations for Title I is $11.3 billion and the administration’s budget request is $12.3 billion. If an increase of even 20% were to occur, the budget for education would have to increase approximately $84.5 billion (p.682). Schlicktman, as quoted in Hardy (2003) says of NCLB, “This is a system designed to ensure the failure of public education. Raise the bar: cut the funding” (p. 32). One of the reasons the federal government has a strong hold on districts is Title I funding. Without compliance to NCLB mandates, Title I funding could be jeopardized, cut, or even forfeited.

School choice offers an opportunity for parents to move their children from “failing” schools, however, it could also add additional challenges for schools and districts. According to Cicchinelli, et al. (2003):

\[
\text{Removing children from low-performing schools does little to address the underlying problems in the school system itself, and transfers funding that might have been used for school improvement to other public schools. In}
\]

...
addition, a large number of student transfers almost certainly will raise issues of capacity for the higher performing schools slated to receive those students...The overcrowding of currently effective schools is likely to do little to improve low-performing schools and in fact may erode the performance of effective schools (p. 8).

NCLB does indeed set the bar high for public education, but possibly with some unintended consequences. Since standardized tests are only geared to measure learning that is easy to measure, it is possible a school will narrow the curriculum in order to perform well on state testing (Mathis, 2003, p. 684). The desire to avoid being a “failing school” will supercede the desire to teach the whole realm of curriculum prescribed by states and districts.

Another consequence of NCLB is the notion of “failing schools.” Although the administration has changed the verbiage from “failing schools” to “schools in need of improvement,” the stigma of such a term sticks in the minds of media and people (Mathis, 2003, p. 684). Concerns about the impact of AYP and its part in establishing “failing schools” leave many wondering about the number of schools that will be deemed “failing.” Citing the work of Fletcher (2003), Mathis (2003) states:

A plethora of estimates have been put forth regarding the number of schools across the U.S. that will turn out to be failing under NCLB. The Center for Assessment says 75%, North Carolina estimates 60%, Vermont calculated
80% over three years, and Louisiana reports 85%-even though two-thirds of their schools show improved scores (p. 684).

Melville Morgan, the assistant superintendent for accountability for the New Mexico Department of Education as quoted in Hardy (2003) “Nationally, I’ve heard anywhere from 80 to 95%” of all schools will be failing in two to three years (p. 31).

According to Mathis (2003) the schools labeled “failing” won’t receive their label because they’ve failed, but because they are in poor and diverse neighborhoods. Schools with high diversity and many subgroups will find it especially difficult to make AYP, and schools with a subgroup in special education will find it virtually impossible (p. 684). In talking about the goal of all students being proficient in reading and math by 2014 through the incremental use of AYP, Paul Schlichtman provided this analogy in Hardy, (2003) “Picture yourself in a room where you’ve got water rising, and you can’t get out and the room’s half full…you know by 2014 that room’s going to be full of water. …Eventually, the water’s going to hit the ceiling by definition.” (p. 30).

Matt Gandal, as quoted by Hardy (2003), states, “I don’t think we’ve ever dealt with such a high bar and as ambitious a set of goals for schools” (p. 31).

NCLB does indeed set the bar high in education. While the Act does establish admirable goals for all students and participants in the educational arena, it is not without controversy. As Thomas and Bainbridge (2002) state:
Intoning a slogan like “No child left behind” never taught a child to read. Neither did “All children can learn.” But the most preposterous of these empty rhetorical phrases is “No child left behind.” The simplicity and stupidity of this statement prevent us from doing what we ought to do: provide sufficient resources to educate all our children successfully. The complexity of providing for an adequate education (as nearly 15 state supreme courts have said) requires much more than slogans (p. 11).

According to Hayes, (2003) people respond to NCLB in one of three ways. First, some people consider the law to be malevolent. An example of this is a superintendent who presented the view when he said, “This is the most anti-public school legislation that’s ever been passed. Its intention is to destroy public education in this state.” (p. 4) The second response is to worry about compliance. State department of education staff and district personnel are trying to decipher exactly how to implement the law within both the laws timelines and their own budgetary constraints (p. 6). Finally, and more hopeful than the previous two responses is creativity. Rather than reacting to the law as a conspiracy or as a timeline to be tackled, educators “will seize the NCLB as an opportunity for creativity” (p. 9).

California’s Academic Performance Index

Acting as the primary pillar of California’s statewide accountability system, the Academic Performance Index (API) was initially the result of the Public School Accountability Act (PSAA) of 1999. The law required that the California Department of Education, “…annually calculate APIs for California public schools,
including charter schools, and publish school rankings based on these APIs.”
(California Department of Education, 2004).

No Child Left Behind created a need for statewide plans to determine state proficiency goals, as well as forming methods for schools and districts to demonstrate adequate yearly growth (Brown & Ing, 2003). In order to comply with the rules of NCLB, in 2003 the California State Board of Education identified California’s API as an indicator for measuring AYP (California Department of Education, 2004).


The API is a numerical index or scale that ranges from a low of 200 to a high of 1000. A school’s score or placement on the API is an indicator of a school’s performance level. The state has set 800 as the API score that schools should strive to meet. A school’s growth is measured by how well it is moving toward (or past) that goal. Schools that fall short of 800 will be required to meet annual growth targets until the statewide target of 800 is reached. Schools that already meet or exceed the statewide target of 800 should continue working to improve the academic performance of all of their students (p. 9).

API results are generally reported twice a year, according to the Academic Performance Index Program Description (California Department of Education,
2004). Base reports are usually given after the first of the calendar year and growth reports are provided each fall. Both reports contain the same information but use testing from two different years (2004). Information on the 2003 API Base reports includes the following as outlined in Parent’s Guide to the 2003 Similar Schools Ranks based on the Academic Performance Index:

- API Base score (scale of 200-1000)
- Statewide rank (scale of 1 to 10)
- Similar school rank (scale of 1 to 10)
- 2003-04 API growth target
- 2004 API target (Base plus target growth)
- Subgroup information
- Demographic information (p. 1).

The 2003 API (Base) summarizes the performance of a school district or school based on its scores on the California Achievement Test, 6th Edition Survey (CAT-6 Survey), the California Standards Tests (CSTs), California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE), or the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) tests (California Department of Education, 2004 p. 3(4.11). For the 2003-2004 reporting cycle in grades two through eight, performance on the CAT-6 was given 20% weight in API scores and CSTs received 80% of the weight (California Department of Education, 2004 (5.4). An element of the 2003 API Base is a Scale Calibration Factor (SCF). As established by the Policy and Evaluation Division of the California Department of Education (2004), the SCF is:
…a numerical constant that is calculated by grade span…and then added to the API of each school according to grade span…the purpose of the SCF is to enhance the stability and interpretability of the API by ensuring that the statewide average API does not fluctuate solely as the result of adding new API components (p. 2).

Once the calculations have been figured for school’s APIs, the schools are separated within school type: elementary, middle, and high schools (California Department of Education, 2004). Each school is then given a statewide rank, also known as a decile rank. In order to establish decile ranks, API scores are “sorted from lowest to highest and divided into ten equal groups ranked from lowest (one) to highest (ten)” (Parents Guide to the 2003 Similar Schools Ranks of based on the API, 2004).

In order to satisfy the PSAA, a further process of ranking is necessary, known as Similar School Ranks (A Parent’s Guide, 2004, p. 2). Similar School Ranks is an effort to compare “like schools with like schools.” The PSAA specifies that certain characteristics must be included in establishing Similar School Ranks. As established in the Explanatory Notes for the 2003 API Base Report (2004) the characteristics used to determine “like schools” are to include:

- Pupil mobility
- Pupil ethnicity
- Pupil socioeconomic status
- Percentage of teachers who are fully credentialed
• Percentage of teachers who hold emergency credentials
• Percentage of pupils who are English language learners
• Average class size per grade level
• Whether the schools operate multitrack year-round educational programs (p. 4).

To establish Similar School Ranks, schools are first divided into three categories: elementary, middle, and high schools. Using the School Characteristic Index, (SCI) a composite of a school’s demographic characteristics is calculated and the results are compared to a group of 100 similar schools based on SCI. The 100 school’s APIs are compared and placed into deciles, one being low and ten being high (Similar Schools Ranks Questions and Answers, 2004 p. 3).

Not only are API scores descriptors of schools, they are also used in establishing future goals. Known as Schoolwide Growth Targets, these goals are targets based on increased API scores. In Explanatory Notes for the 2003 API Base Report,(2004), a school’s growth target is:

…calculated by taking five percent of the distance between a school’s 2003 API Base and the statewide performance target of 800. For any school with a 2003 API Base of 781 to 799, the annual growth target is one point. Any school with an API of 800 or more must maintain an API of at least 800 (p. 5).

Each school is provided with a yearly school report which consists of the core elements as well as data on subgroups and school demographic characteristics.
Numerically significant ethnic or socioeconomically disadvantaged subgroups are defined by PSAA as a subgroup “that constitutes at least fifteen percent of a school’s total pupil population and consists of at least thirty pupils” (PSAA as quoted in Explanatory Notes for the 2003 API Base Report, 2004). In addition, if any subgroup defined by ethnicity or socioeconomic disadvantages constitutes at least 100 students, that group is also deemed numerically significant (p. 6). Schools are responsible for showing comparable improvement for subgroups in their school that are numerically significant. Ethnic/racial subgroups include:

- African American (not of Hispanic origin)
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Filipino
- Hispanic or Latino
- Pacific Islander
- White (not of Hispanic origin) (p. 6).

Socioeconomically disadvantaged subgroups consist of students who meet either one of two criteria:

1. Neither of the pupil’s parents has received a high school diploma
2. The pupil participates in the free-or-reduced price lunch program (p. 7).

While the API aims to improve education and provide accountability for all children, opponents suggest there are critical flaws in the current system. According
to Sharon, Tapia, & Campbell, 2002) there is a 20 point margin of error with API scores. This significant margin of error can mean the difference between attaining target goals and receiving state incentive funding and being left out of the some $67.3 million in rewards that were handed out in 2002. Sharon et al. (2002) goes on to explain:

A school needing to score 650 to win money, for instance, would miss out with a 649. But a 20-point margin of error means that the system can't reliably measure such fine changes in school performance, and a 649 indicates only that the true score is somewhere between 629 and 669 (p. 2).

Issues of socioeconomic status also impact the API. According to School Wise Press (1999) and Sharon, Tapia, and Campbell (2002) schools with less diversity are much more likely to meet their growth targets. Schools with diverse populations, and more subgroups, statistically have a more difficult time reaching their growth targets because each individual subgroup must meet its growth target in order to be considered successful. For example, if a school has three subgroups, all subgroups must meet growth targets in order to achieve API goals and be considered for reward money.

Sharon, Tapia, and Campbell (2002) state that, “58 percent of schools statewide with one major group won awards last year, compared with about 29 percent of schools with four or more groups” (p. 2). The authors go on to assert that California awarded an average of $21 per student to predominantly white schools, and an average of $9 per student went to the most diverse schools (p. 2). Neufeld
Supporting Teachers During Mandated Curriculum (2000) paraphrases Stanford education professor Linda Darling-Hammond as suggesting, “Stanford 9 scores correlate strongly with students’ socioeconomic status and language background.” Further, some groups resistant to the API have deemed it the “Affluence Performance Index.” (p. 2).

The Academic Performance Indicator is California’s answer to providing accountability in the field of education. It also satisfies No Child Left Behind’s mandate to show adequate growth for all children. Schrag (2002) makes an interesting simile for the API:

Like any other 3-year-old economy vehicle. The once-shiny new thing called the California Academic Performance Index is beginning to show some dents and scratches. It runs less smoothly than promised by the salesman at the showroom—occasionally it gasps and coughs—but most of the time it gets there. We’re not riding in style, but it beats walking (p.1).

Teacher Job Satisfaction


Because job satisfaction may be an indicator of whether individuals (a) will be affectively connected to an institution, (b) will merely comply with directives, or (c) will quit (Hirschman, 1970; Randall, Fedor, & Longenecker, 1990), principals ought to have some understanding of the
Teacher job satisfaction has been the focus of numerous studies. Five significant aspects of teaching which result in teacher satisfaction will be addressed in this section of the literature review: love of working with children, colleagues and collaboration, autonomy, and shared decision making/empowerment.

When asked in the Status of American Public School Teacher 2001-2002 what was the primary reason teachers decided to enter the profession, 73 percent of respondents stated it was their “desire to work with young people” (NEA Research, 2003, p. 3). The reason has been consistent since the survey question was asked in 1971 (p. 3). Elmore, as cited in Holloway (2003) asserts that “visible evidence of student learning is the most immediate motivator” to teachers (p. 88). Horizon Research International (2001) and Cockburn (1999) note the prime reason teachers appear to enjoy the job is “the opportunity to work with children and nurture their learning” (p. 233) and to “make a difference in the life of a child” (p. 4).

School cultures which express collegiality and collaboration are generally those that “promote satisfaction and feelings of professional involvement of teachers” (Ma and MacMillan, 1999 as cited in Noll, 2004). Darling-Hammond (1995) as cited in Ma and MacMillan (2001) further establishes this point by stating “…traditionally rigid, bureaucratically administered schools have not succeeded in implementing change in education reform, whereas schools using collective or
collaborative problem-solving strategies based on an underlying sense of commitment have succeeded” (p. 39).

Horizon Research International (2001) and NEA Research (2003) note teachers see their peers as one of the benefits of the job, with time spent “outside the job” being very helpful. Cockburn (2000) cites Argyle (1987):

Social support, from co-workers and supervisors, is a major source of both job satisfaction and positive mental health. It can buffer the effects of stress at work more effectively than other sources of social support. People in stressful jobs are in particular need of support from cohesive working groups or socially skilled supervisors (p. 233).

Another aspect which directly relates to teacher satisfaction is the notion of autonomy. Autonomy has been described as a “teacher’s belief that they control important aspects of their work life. Autonomy is often referred to as internal locus of control,” (Martin, Crossland, & Johnson, 2001, p.5). Advocates of professional autonomy believe that allowing professional autonomy “…will enhance the attractiveness of the [teaching] profession as a career choice and will improve the quality of classroom teaching and practice” (Boe & Gilford, 1992 as cited by National Center for Educational Statistics, 1997, p. 3). With autonomy come the expectations of teachers to have creative and individual flexibility in teaching style and content. In a study by Horizon Research International, (2001) researchers noted “most [teachers] acknowledged the awareness of having the responsibility to teach a
certain curriculum by the end of the school year, but believed the time from the first day through the last day to be their own schedule and format” (p. 6).

The final factor which has a significant impact on teacher job satisfaction is shared decision making and empowerment within the field of education. “...power involves the formal authority or control over organizational resources, and empowerment is the process of sharing that power. Among educators, the belief is widely held that the more teachers share in decision making the greater their job satisfaction (e.g., Blase and Blase 1994; Blase et al. 1995; Shreeve et al. 1987 as cited by Davis and Wilson 2000, p. 349). Davis and Wilson (2000) cite Maeroff (p.349) as defining power as “the power to exercise one’s craft with confidence and to help shape the way that the job is to be done (p.349). According to Thomas and Velthouse (1990) as cited by Davis and Wilson (2000):

Personal power...emerges from choices one gets to make and from events in the environment. Research by Thomas and Velthouse has shown this sort of empowerment to be correlated positively with job satisfaction and negatively with job stress. In this sense, a high level of intrinsic empowerment is associated in a positive way with the lives of employees in the workplace (p. 349).

Davis and Wilson (2000) go on to claim that the more frequently principals employ behaviors that are empowering to teachers, the more teachers thought they had choices to make in completing their work and the greater impact they perceived they were making due to their efforts (p. 352).
Martin, Crossland, and Johnson (2001) cite Short, Greer, & Melvin (1994) as believing that “empowerment suggest an overall school philosophy of teamwork, collegiality, participation in decision-making, and problem-solving without the constraints of a bureaucratic organization.” In addition, research supports the assumption that teacher empowerment is related to greater organizational effectiveness (p. 4). Tactics of control on the part of principals have a negative effect on “morale, involvement, communications, and relationships” (Martin, Crossland, & Johnson, 2001, p. 2). Holloway cites Bernshausen and Cunningham (2001) as finding, “most experienced teachers who leave the field do so because of such factors as lack of support from administrators or colleagues and insufficient involvement in decision making” (p. 87).
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

During the month of March, 2004, five teachers completed a portion of the Public School Teacher Questionnaire two times: the first reflecting their feelings about curriculum and job satisfaction during the 2002-2003 school year, and the second reflecting their feelings about curriculum and job satisfaction during the current 2003-2004 school year. These questionnaires were completed mid way through a school year in which the district had adopted a new language arts curriculum and established rigid policies for the program’s implementation. The researcher believed the convergence of high stakes testing, accountability models standards based education, which had been in effect since the late 1990’s, and the recently adopted rigidly mandated curriculum initiated in August, 2003, has had an effect on the overall job satisfaction of veteran teachers. This reflective activity, as well as the “current state of mind” activity described below were used to gain insight into any changes teachers have experienced after the initiation of the mandated curriculum.

Participants

This study is a qualitative study in which teachers were surveyed and interviewed. The five teachers involved in the study all work at the same K-5 school in a large district in North-Inland San Diego County and have a minimum of twelve years of teaching experience. At least five of those years of teaching have been completed at the elementary site where the study was conducted.
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The elementary school where the study took place is a school which had an Academic Performance Index score of 830 during the 2002 school year. A score of 800 is the statewide goal for all schools in California. The school has three significant subgroups, low socioeconomic status and English Language Learners, and white/non-hispanic, and has shown adequate growth in both subgroups, as defined by Academic Performance Index requirements.

Teachers involved in this study were chosen based upon observation of “professional demeanor.” In years previous, teachers in this study were involved in curriculum development at the district and/or site levels, been respected leaders within their peer groups, been on-going learners and sharers of ideas, and worked beyond their contract hours. Teachers involved in this study were chosen because of noted changes in their demeanor beginning in the fall of 2003 including quitting committees, becoming less visible in site and district leadership roles, and becoming more isolated within their classrooms. In addition, teachers were chosen based on their willingness to participate in this study.

Procedures

Participants in this study received questions from portions of the U.S. Department of Education’s Public School Teacher Questionnaire that pertain to this study. Questions were selected from the following subcategories: class organization, working conditions, and decision making. See Appendix A. Because the original questionnaire included questions on a wide range of educational issues, questions were selected based on their applicability to this study including: weekly time spent
on various subjects, perceived influence and control over their work environment, perceptions about administration, and current satisfaction in their profession.

Participants were asked to answer the questionnaire two times. In the initial questionnaire, administered in March, 2004, participants were asked to reflect back to the 2002-2003 school year when considering their answers. One week of time passed between the initial questionnaire and the second questionnaire. During the second, yet identical questionnaire administered in March, 2004, the participants were asked to reflect on the current 2003-2004 school year.

Following the completion and analysis of the questionnaires, the researcher developed a series of interview questions designed to gain more insight and elaboration to key questionnaire items. The questions are in Appendix B. Participants were given the questions in advance and asked to meet in a face-to-face interview. Interviews were conducted at the workplace of the interviewees, and took approximately 25 minutes.

Participants signed the informed consent document and were made aware that the confidentiality of their names would be protected. Also, participants gave permission for their interviews to be audio taped for later transcription and were informed that the transcription would be made available to them for revisions if they desired to make them. Participants were also informed they would receive the results of this study following its completion.

Materials
Each participant received a researcher created Consent to Participate in Research form.

Portions of the Public School Teacher Questionnaire relating to the topic of this thesis were utilized.

The researcher created interview questions after reviewing the participant responses to the modified Public School Teacher Questionnaire.
CHAPTER IV – FINDINGS AND RESULTS

To gain an understanding of veteran teachers' current state of mind regarding the mandated curriculum implementation, five veteran teachers from the school site completed questionnaires and were interviewed. A list of ten questions with sub-categories was selected from the U.S. Department of Education's Public School Teacher Questionnaire (see Appendix A). Teachers were asked to reflect on their "past state of mind" from the 2002-2003 school year, and then asked to reflect on their "current state of mind" from the 2003-2004 school year for the purposes of the questionnaire. Following the questionnaires, veteran teachers were individually interviewed using a list of twelve questions (see Appendix B).

Findings

Many commonalities can be found in the responses of the interviewed teachers. The majority of the participants focused on and made common observations about the following major themes in either the questionnaires or during the individual interviews.

Major Findings In Questionnaires:

- the number of hours per week spent on teaching language arts has increased from the 2002-2003 school year to the 2003-2004 school year;

- the number of hours per week spent on teaching social studies and science has significantly decreased from the 2002-2003 school year to the 2003-2004 school year;
• teachers felt they had less influence on setting performance standards for students and for establishing curriculum at the school;

• teachers felt they had less influence on selecting textbooks and other instructional materials, selecting content, topic, and skills to be taught, and selecting teaching techniques within their classrooms;

• teachers felt the school administration’s behavior toward the staff was less supportive and encouraging during that 2003-2004 school year than during the 2002-2003 school year.

**Major Themes Found in Interview Questions**

• concern was expressed regarding the rigid nature as to how students are to be grouped according to the mandated curriculum;

• grouping of students during language arts was perceived to be less effective than groupings used in previous years;

• veteran teachers felt they were spending more time grading worksheets and questioned the value of those worksheets

• veteran teachers felt the mandated curriculum taught skills in isolation, didn’t teach for depth or higher level thinking skills, and was “choppy” in its organization;

• there was no consensus or clear understanding of why the district was taking a strong stance on the mandated curriculum;

• veteran teachers expressed concern over the current focus on test scores;
• veteran teachers expressed frustration, humiliation, and surprise at the district’s insistence on the exclusive use of the mandated curriculum;

• veteran teachers felt principals could support teachers during times of transition by using them as a resource with regard to new curricular programs; asking them what works, getting their input, and respecting their experience as teachers;

• veteran teachers felt districts could support teachers during times of transition by using them as a resource with regard to new curricular programs; asking them what works, getting their input, respecting their experience as teachers, and differentiating between new teacher and veteran teacher’s abilities to deliver instruction.

Excerpts of responses from the individual participants follow for each of the interview questions asked.

Q1. How did Mandated Curriculum change the way you group students in class?

Participant A: I have a group of English language learners and there are a lot of specific expectations for them in terms of the amount of differentiating instruction they have to receive. It's meant that I pulled that specific group as a permanent group and I might have moved some of those kids in and out because they've spread themselves out. The mandated curriculum is interesting in a way in that it's just not 'teach these skills', it's just not 'teach these
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standards', but it has become something quite different. There was a major shift in a very short time to use this material in a relatively particular way. So, there's a real expectation in the way of a lot more small group instruction than would be typically done in a fifth grade class in language arts. And I think all kinds of upper grade teachers are struggling with that. It's not a natural way to do stuff. Lots of us have taught lower grades and know how to do that just fine. I've been encouraged to do it in various eras; various methodologies that we're in and it didn't stick because it's difficult to make work. It's not because we're lazy or stupid or ... you know, we're always trying to find stuff to make work. There comes with that, the Houghton-Mifflin, there comes with that certain expectations in terms of organization, certain expectations in terms of methodology, that go beyond just addressing the standards and making sure the kids do it. And that's something I really think I'm in transition on how far I want to comply with that and how I want to work that out.

Participant B: The overall thing I felt on just the idea of grouping is that the ELL students in particular, are more isolated. Because it seems like now, everything is so specific and so there isn't a tie-in with other things, it's like there's this standard, then there's this standard, and I just feel, especially this year, things are more
isolated. There isn’t a connection. I feel like the grouping is much more specific so you don’t get to settle in as much. I liked being able to stay with them and really be able to work with them in a quality way instead of this and that and then that.

Participant C: Well, it’s forced me to group students in certain groups depending on what their testing scores are, which I don’t always like that.

Participant D: Well, for me, I think it’s kind of disrupted how I would like to group the kids in the class because I feel like I have to have a high, middle, and a low group, rather than just flexibly moving kids around. Sometimes I’d rather do whole group things. So I feel like I’m slowing down the kids that I really would like to move ahead.

Participant E: It has not changed the way I’ve grouped students in class, because we’ve continued to do what we’ve always done. We still do our small groups and rotations in the morning and I do them according to ability.

Q2. Has it been more or less effective than the way you grouped students previously?

Participant A: Well, the truth is, in my really long career, I’ve grouped kids just about every way. In the upper grades I’ve found what worked best for me, and it varied a lot depending on what kind of a class,
was to teach classes first and then pull out groups that naturally sort of evolved. So if you’re teaching math, for example, you always have a group of kids who “totally get it” and need to fiddle around with something a little more complex and you always have a groups of kids that go “what??” and you need your “what?” group up there, but that changes and that’s always flowing and the kids join that “totally get it” group and it gets a little bigger. The same thing with language arts. I don’t think here is a clear outline in the materials, although there appears to be. This has pushed me towards some different small group work, and in fiddling around with that I’m not as happy with where I am right this moment as I was a year ago. But that doesn’t mean that I’m not going to change how I do stuff. I’m always looking for a new way to approach tings, and if I get a different class next year, it’ll be different. The different expectations definitely slowed me down with my top kids, and all this skill stuff is definitely in the way, but it might be good if I had a different group of kids.

Participant B: I think it’s less effective, there are too many interruptions. Just way more interruptions.

Participant C: I started trying it the first month of school, but it was just way too chaotic and very unrealistic with that many kids.
Participant D: Far less effective and far less fun, far less motivating for the kids, and I don’t think they like the learning as much. That kind of bugs me. So I would like to do more things with the kids than I feel I can get in because I’m locked into bits and pieces of curriculum and I feel like that slows down the learning process for every kid, whether at the lower end or the upper end. So, I think it’s had a really negative impact...for me, and my love for teaching too. I don’t like it as much. I don’t feel like I get as much done, or as much joy. I don’t feel like the kids are having as much fun learning. And to me, that’s part of the whole thing. If they get excited about math, then it gives them more reason to learn the new bits and pieces that I want to teach them or in whatever other area. If I give them good reasons to write, then they’re going to want to write, and they’re going to want to find more effective ways to communicate in writing, rather than just kind of isolating it with skills...

Participant E: No, it’s the same.

Q3. How has mandated curriculum changed the way you work within your grade level?

Participant A: It has the potential to have us work much more closely together...almost more than...not potentially; it almost begs us to... I mean, now we have not only a common set of goals and a
common curriculum in terms of skill and content areas that we want to cover, but we have a common set of materials that we are supposed to be using. All those pieces sort of take over and you can easily forget the kids in there and what we’re actually trying to teach just to get through that all. And so, to do that, I mean, there’s a tremendous invitation to group by skill and there’s a tremendous invitation to become experts in small areas and to departmentalize...I think there’s a huge invitation to do that. I think the deeper thing is...the deeper question is, “Do we really want to departmentalize?” Is that what we really want to do as elementary school teachers? I’m willing to learn, but I’m sort of thinking not. I’m thinking that what I really work to do is to integrate my curriculum and integrate my working with individual personalities and individual families. I would have a lot more fun teaching high school or middle school, in terms of curriculum, but I don’t want to see 180 kids a day, or 120 kids a day, I want to work with those individuals, I want to become part of their families. I’m a parent. I know how much I’m there, I know how much I move in with those families and so if I’m departmentalizing, then I’m losing them. I want to put that all together. I want to put the content together, I want to put the skills together and integrate them into a whole story and I want to
have that notion of story and important parts. I can’t do that if I’m shipping my class off. I don’t feel the same way about the kids and I don’t teach them the same way. And when I only teach them, the middle math group, for an hour, five days a week... and I’ve done that before, and those kids who came into my class who weren’t mine, I never felt they got quite as good instruction as the kids that were mine because it all fit together. I wasn’t meeting their parents in the parking lot having a chat, all that stuff.

Participant B: Well, once again, there’s too much focus on isolated skills. When we do our grade level meetings, it seems to be just really choppy and a lot of times, the agenda’s already there. We don’t get to derive our own agenda and talk about what’s really happening. It’s just pretty much standards driven. Teaching is more rigid. It doesn’t flow naturally like I think it should.

Participant C: Well, it did change the way I worked within my grade level, because at the beginning of the year I realized it’s just not working and I just had to change it back because it’s just not even feasible. It’s just kind of crazy.

Participant D: I think we’re all frustrated because we feel like there are certain things that we’re locked into doing from the curriculum rather than what we know we’d like to do as a grade level for our kids. I
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think we’ve had lots of discussions about the fact that we don’t like bits and pieces of the curriculum; how can we make it effective? How can we make it more interesting? I’m not sure, I think we’ve also had to all kind of decide, Ok, we’re going to have a 2 ½ hour language arts block, we’re going to use this practice book, these workbook materials, and we can’t have the flexibility to do the things we want to do.

Participant E: A lot. It has caused a lot of turmoil because we’ve had to accommodate the ELL students so we had to make lots of changes. We had children who have to move about. We are teaching, instead of 20 kids, we’re teaching 24 kids. Morning groups stays the same and we keep our classroom, but the structure required another hour and 15 minutes devoted to Houghton-Mifflin and that’s where we are required to do the workbook pages and that type of thing, so it has made a lot of changes within there because we’ve had to re-group based on that small group of ELL students…they’re locked in. We’re very upset about that because we feel some of those children could come back into our classroom and be more successful because we feel the Houghton-Mifflin Plus program is not providing their needs. And there are so many different levels. I mean, there’s really, really low where they have very little English, to some
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that are very high, that would be working much better in a regular classroom.

Q4 If you’ve spent a different amount of tie at school outside contract hours this year, compared to last year, to what do you attribute that change?

Participant A: I don’t think I’m spending more or less time. I think at this point, regardless of what you give me to teach, I find that there is much more time that is needed to teach it well than I have the energy and time to do. And so I go home when I give up. I go home when I’ve done all that can be done to be ready for the next day, and sometimes it’s a little earlier, and sometimes it’s really late, but I never go, “Oh dang, I’m ready!” It doesn’t happen.

Participant B: We’re buried in paper. We’re teaching more the almighty worksheet, which I think is funny. Ten years ago it was, “Boy, you better not have any more than one or two worksheets a week…” That was considered not very good teaching. And now the pendulum has swung. Now it’s the other extreme. We’re doing way too many worksheets, I feel, and not as much discussion, and sort of that “teachable moment” and some concepts that get connected and the “aha!” I don’t get to enjoy that near as much. We’re just kind of buried in paper, it’s Xeromania.
Participant C: Well, I had two big things. One, the new program, Houghton Mifflin, and the other thing is that I’m used to having 20 kids. It takes a lot more time having 12 more kids. My grading has been a huge amount of time, especially on writing, and then just trying to be one page ahead of the kids. And with the new program, I’m trying to figure out what I can do to tweak it to make it work for me. On a daily basis, I’m probably spending 2-3 hours more than last year, which is huge. I mean, it’s just a huge amount of what I do is grading things. I had a lot more time last year to conference and work with small groups so I could be looking at the writing with the kids, and right now I’m taking it home because it’s so much to look at and it’s impossible to look at it and then pull kids and work with them.

Participant D: I feel like I have a whole lot more to do, so in that sense, I feel like I’m staying longer. I have more correcting of things to do. And a lot of the things I’m correcting for the kids is busy work and it’s busy work for me. And then I found myself taking the curriculum pieces that are given in this mandated curriculum, and trying to do things to try to make it something that it’s not in and of itself, and that takes extra time also.

Participant E: Well, learning the new program. That’s taken a lot of time, and then providing the materials, coming up with where you are
going to go with a particular theme, but it is pretty structured. We are supposed to be creating all these materials. It’s just not happening across the board... just don’t think it’s of value.

Q5. Why do you think teachers might be unhappy with the recently adopted language arts series?

Participant A: I think a lot are. I think the unhappiness is probably more with veteran teachers and there are small things and there are fundamental things. I think that the fundamental thing is that the message that has been delivered by district administrators, whether they would be very happy with it or not, is that regardless of what think s best, regardless of what you think is best for your kids, we want you to do this, even if it’s worse. And the notion of pursuing the best...pursuing the truth, is put aside for what I think of as bureaucratic reasons. For them to say, “Well, everybody is doing this” and there’s real power for them to say that in terms of being about to respond to their bosses. I think that fundamentally, regardless of what you know, regardless of what you see in your kids, you have to do this, even if it’s not as good. I think that’s a fundamental thing and I think that’s sort of shocking. I’ve never quite heard that before. I’ve heard a lot of “We want you to try this because we think it’s better,” “We want you to integrate this because we think this
would be a nice piece,” “We definitely want you to teach these skills because we want better test scores,” all that’s different than, “We want you to do this whether it’s better or not.” And I’m sure that that’s the message. It’s been my discovery, after having led a couple, and living through many educational reforms, that there aren’t exactly revolutions, there aren’t’ sing right ways to do stuff. You add to your bag of tricks. What worked with one group one year, or what worked with one kid one year, doesn’t exactly work with the same kids the next year, and the more you do it, the more you learn and you’re assembling on your side of the teaching game in the same way you want kids to assemble meaning on their side.

What people won’t really like is the organizationally spiraling practice which really becomes spiraling instruction. So they don’t really dig in to teach a lesson until you think that class has it and then spiral back to it. It amounts to isolated pieces. I think that’s a weakness. The stories are boring. You can say all these stories are on a theme, but you develop theme from deep stuff. And there isn’t any. There may be two stories in the whole reader that are stuff that we could really dig in and kids would really have to think about to get to the deep thematic stuff. In terms of how it’s grouped, it’s very directed towards teacher talk. In the balance,
there’s way too much teacher talk, as opposed to kid talk. There’s way too much teacher reading as opposed to kid reading, and so that’s a weakness. Every series has its weakness. You need to work on that, but you can’t if you’re told “you have to do this” talk.

At the largest level, I think, it’s the whole notion that you’re to toss out all that you’ve learned. Not just to try something else, but to only do something else, whether it’s better or not and it’s fundamentally flawed.

Participant B: It’s kind of a lot of what I’ve already been saying. It’s just too rigid, it’s choppy. The skills are being focused on separately; they’re not really being tied together so much, other than what I attempt to do to tie them together. I think sometimes the understanding is lost in the shuffle. So, I guess mainly that, it’s just very rigid and skill driven.

Participant C: Think?! I just see there’s really no higher level thinking. Every work book page you look at you can see it’s just addressing a standard, but it’s not addressing it in a meaningful way. I see it as more of a check-off list. Here’s the standard, here’s what we have to do, so let’s make a workbook page for this, this, this, and this, and check…no matter if it’s a thing that they need to master. I just feel like those workbook sheets don’t show any form of
mastery, and it seems like a waste of time to me. It’s a check off list that it’s been covered. I think that teachers that want to teach for meaning and understanding, depth and higher level, have a really hard time with it for that reason.

Participant D: Because it takes away their heart and their creativity and their love for teaching. Their whole instinct for how to teach kids is taken and moved to a prescribed single program and that’s not the way we want to do it. That’s not the way the whole kid works, I don’t think. Plus, for us in fourth grade, we had our language arts and our literature and our social studies all integrated and we were able to have motivating, fun things, but also very meaningful things and they connected with each other so we were able to accomplish a whole lot, reading a book like Island of the Blue Dolphins and doing writing projects and maybe some art projects and extending it into science because it talks about the coastal system and climates and phases of the moon, what plants were appropriate to eat, how cultures survived in the hard times with drought and so on. So we got to talk about a lot of different things across the curriculum that hooked into good things that were part of our motivating kids.

Participant E: It’s inconsistent. There is no clear structure that starts at a good point and ends at a good point. It just bounces all over. Yesterday
I had to teach prefixes and adding ‘ies’, you know, dropping the y and adding ies. That’s ridiculous in first grade. It jumps all over. There is not consistency, it doesn’t build… and this is from experienced teachers. Between Nancy and I, we look at this, and we know we start our kids out and we build and we build and we build, and we just don’t feel that this program does it. The stories do not have enough to them to do a lot of comprehension. At the very beginning the workbook pages, I mean, you just have to go step by step. They’re just too hard for the kids. They just jump right into it. What they consider sight words are the words that they have come up with and have a different concept of what we consider the sights words we think they should be learning. It’s a very frustrating program. I will work on it next year.

Q6. Why do you think the district has taken such a strong stance on the exclusive usage of this language arts adoption?

Participant A: I don’t think it’s our district. If you talk to some other districts, you pretty much hear the same thing. Certainly you hear the same thing from any district that has a rich socio-economic mix, that has a large number of language learners or kids who are at risk. We have our backs up against the wall in terms of the really high expectations they put on them and I really think that’s the case all over the place. What we’re doing is we’re sort of taking the worst
stuff that happened in San Diego and we’re going, “Let’s do it here.” All of a sudden, we’re going, “Wait a minute! Everybody hated that in San Diego that was a disaster in San Diego. Why would you do that here?” I think it has a lot to do with No Child Left Behind and a lot to do with state expectations. It also has to do with upper level administrators coming into the district and deciding that “I am a data driven administrator.” And therefore they have a vision and it does tend to get pushed down. A lot of times, it doesn’t reach us. This time, I think it is.

Participant B: I think it’s mainly for universal control of what happens in the classroom. I think that maybe they have a point where there are some teachers and/or schools or whatever that they’re not happy with. But I strongly feel that those should be dealt with separately and it shouldn’t affect the rest of us for a few that maybe aren’t working out. Because I really feel it’s a way of controlling us and it doesn’t work. It’s not going to work. I think they’re going to find it’s going to get worse and especially if they say for everybody to be on this theme this month, and now everybody needs to be on page 243. When that happens, I’m gone.

Participant C: Politics. I mean basically, the state came down and only allowed us to look at certain programs because they were standards-based. Research based. Therefore, to continue to have money from the
state they need to do that. I just feel like it’s kind of scary for me, that something like this is controlling everything we do as teachers and a lot of people who are probably involved in this research based thing, I don’t know if they’re even teachers. It’s just kind of scary that they have taken such a strong stance on it. But I don’t know if that’s true anymore because you hear so many different things. Are they really taking that strong of a stance or do they have to pretend they are?

Participant D: I know from what I’ve heard that it’s supposed to be something backed by research. It says that if this program is taken and used the right way that the kids will hit the standards that they’re supposed to hit and that our district won’t be penalized for not reaching all those different levels that they’re supposed to hit. What it’s doing is it’s pulling us down to a lower level and I don’t think it’s pulling the other schools up from what I understand. But I think they did it because that was an easy way to justify that they’re addressing underperforming schools and addressing certain standards to the satisfaction of whatever that number happens to be as a district. That’s what the research said and so they just put us all in it. Unfortunately, I know sometimes I make decisions for the whole class; we’re all going to do this. And sometimes that doesn’t allow for the individuality of the kids
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or their learning styles and things like that. But this was pretty strong, pretty widespread. Do that for every teacher and every school. I don’t think that allows for the difference of teaching, the difference of kids.

Participant E: The way I feel about this is that we have adopted the Houghton-Mifflin program to accommodate the second language learners and then they invented the Houghton-Mifflin Plus, which is a very poor program and did not accommodate the second language learners. I have heard they’re even going to adopt other reading programs because they don’t think Houghton-Mifflin is going to work and either is Houghton-Mifflin Plus.

Q7. Should a school’s API score effect the curriculum it teaches? Why or why not?

Participant A: You have to teach them to read...do math...think...write. You have to teach them content area stuff so they have this foundation to study it more seriously later on and to be citizens later on. The test scores that API is mostly based upon test those things. It’s just a piece. And so, the more kids struggle with that, the more you have to work on making sure that you’re teaching those things. There are inherent troubles with standards basted, test driven instruction though. One of the difficulties with standards based instruction is that it assumes every child at 10 years old is in the fourth grade and is going to necessarily know that same
content, and that you have to be covering that regardless of what they already know. So if they don’t, what you have to do is give them all this extra stuff on top of that. It’s not that you go back and you work on where they are. You have to do both. It’s the ‘do both’ stuff that’s quite crazy. So we have after school programs and pull-out programs and we’re inflicting them on the kids who have the least patience for another hour of reading that day. A whole lot of kids who are able to learn to read at nine perfectly well who struggled at 7, but we have to make sure we go back and we cover what they need.

The second thing on teaching too narrowly to the API is that we miss big pieces of what reading and what math is. We tend to teach little pieces, but then they don’t put them together and we wonder why they don’t get the next piece. Well, we taught in isolation, all these nice little pieces in isolation and the standards don’t really go together quite to tell that story. I mean, API makes it sound like they’re just marbles in a jar and I’m going to give you 23 marbles and the next teacher is going to give you 42 marbles, and the next teacher is going to give you 15 marbles. If you add those all up, you’re going to be an educated person. It doesn’t exactly work that way.
Participant B: It kind of evolved like that, but I think everything that we do shouldn’t be governed by test scores. I mean, that’s the crux of that question. The API score shouldn’t necessarily effect the curriculum we teach, but everything shouldn’t be so driven by this ultimate test which is like a one shot deal on a certain day and it doesn’t take into consideration a lot of other things besides what this child knows.

Participant C: In some ways I think it’s a measure and a guide line. You can look as far as...the score, if you break it down and look at the testing and what’s happening, you might be able to see trends or patterns or things like that, but it shouldn’t be the be all, end all. It was hard for me, because I know when they were comparing even scores of third graders; they were looking at last year’s third graders and looking at this year’s third graders. It should be more of a trend where it’s following a group of kids. I don’t feel like we do that enough. In fourth grade they were low last year, so this is what we need to do this year to bring them up. Well, maybe those kids don’t struggle with that. I don’t think it should be the sole measure of what you teach, and how you teach, and why you teach.

Participant D: I don’t think any single test score should ever determine what goes on instructionally. I think it’s one mark. And I think if you
have a whole bunch of different things to use to evaluate what
you’re doing, then that serves everybody better. To use one
particular score I think is really not a good use of data and I don’t
think that’s the way that people who study statistics and numbers
would want.

Participant E: No...well, it depends on what you’re talking about. I mean,
we’ve got North Broadway. No, we know what we’re doing, we
know what kids need. We know what to give them and how to
use the curriculum and different materials that are available to us
to benefit them. I can’t go down to Lincoln School and say what
those kids need.

Q8. What has been the most significant positive change in teaching over the past
five years?

Participant A: I really believe class size reduction in the elementary grades. It
didn’t help me particularly, but I think that was a fabulous thing.
It has to do not so much with what test scores they use but the
humane treatment of kids. The teachers have the time to work
with them as individuals and the kids who need a little room,
have a little room.

I also think that an emphasis on looking at our kids who are
struggling and our commitment to teaching them something. To
not just letting them be “Well, there’s that percentage that fails.”
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That commitment to that, and that’s society wide. I mean, I think No Child Left Behind says exactly that in it’s name. I think it’s a tremendously powerful thing. I think it’s been interpreted in a bureaucratic way, that’s had a lot of negatives to it, but I think the commitment to our most struggling kids has been a powerful one.

I also think that all the scrutiny we’ve been put under comes with professional expectations that we ought to live up to. I oughtn’t to spend all of December having my kids cutting paper chains and hanging them around the room. I know some teachers did 25 years ago when I started. Things need to be a little looser than they are, but not that loose. It needs to be professional… an increase in professionalism.

Participant B: I was trying to think of something and I finally did think of something overall…getting back to some of the fine arts. For the longest time we had nothing. I’m a product of this school district and when I was in school, we had an art teacher, and we had a chorale music teacher. We had the art teacher once a week and we had the chorale teacher I think twice a week. We always had art and music. There was always a balance of that. Since probably the 60’s, it’s been off again, on again. And then the back-to-basics started in the 80’s. It seemed like that was a real death now to anything other than the 3 r’s. So for a while there
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was nothing. Then they realized, hey, that’s not a well rounded child. So some of that’s come back, but nothing real strong. At least they’re trying to.

Participant C: I don’t think there’ve been any positive changes. I don’t know, that’s a tough one. I think there’s a lot of negative towards schools and teaching in general and not performing. I think it’s all been focused on how are we going to fix what’s wrong. I don’t think there’s as much wrong as people think. If I’m looking over from the beginning to now, I don’t think there’s been anything positive in the last five years. It seems like it’s kind of going backwards almost to me.

Participant D: In our district, I like the fact that we’ve gone off of year-round back to traditional. I don’t know that there’s been a really significant positive change in teaching in the past 5 years.

Participant E: I would say low class size. That makes teaching more pleasant and makes it easier for me to teach. I really feel that I can spend so much more time with those kids. They need help on different skills and I think that’s made a difference. I was trying to think positive...there’s just so much negative...that’s just terrible!

That is a saving grace, it really is.

Q9. What would you say has been the most significant negative change in teaching in the last five years?
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Participant A: I think trying to run schools as a bottom line business.

Participant B: The No Child Left Behind law. I think it’s poorly written and I think it’s being driven by a lot of people who aren’t in education. They don’t understand that you can’t pigeon hole everybody. We’ve got kids who have IQ’s below 80 and I don’t care what anybody does. A CEO from some big corporate place can come in-some big-wig, and they’re not going to be able to do any better as far as getting certain kids to be able to do something they’re not going to be able to. I think that has to be dealt with. Besides that, at this level, I don’t know so much in high school, maybe it should be more driven toward there, it’s developmental education right now. In a grade, there’s a span there. Some kids aren’t ready to do some things that others are and they do just fine if you give them another year. They do just fine but they’re not going to be able to do it at the same pace.

Participant C: Teachers are losing control of what they do in their classroom. I think that’s the hugest thing. Being scripted to any kind of a program is really scary. That’s definitely the biggest negative change, I’d say for sure. We’re just losing control.

Participant D: More and more of it has become more test driven, and more and more of it has become a way to find higher test scores. Less and less trust of teachers in the classroom. I know student teachers are
very frustrated with the way they're being prepared and the
things they're being told they're going to have to do in the
classroom and really second guessing whether they made a good
decision. I think a lot of teachers are feeling more burned out and
more frustrated because we're working harder to do things and
accomplishing less. We're doing our best to keep kids motivated
and remind them that they're nine or ten years old and we want to
Teach them that learning can be fun and we want to have for and
for it to be exciting and a journey and all those kinds of things. I
feel like we're having to work harder and harder to get that.
We're not supposed to do so many things that were good because
we have a built-in, mandated curriculum that we have to cover
and if we don't we're going to get scolded or the principal's
going to get scolded and I just think that's the wrong way to do it.

Participant E:  Curriculum. Not knowing where they want to go, what they want
us to do with it. And going to meetings and what do you want
from this and what do you want from that and no one can give
you answers. That's just about it. I've never been so frustrated in
teaching in my whole life. You know we're kind of down in our
little first grade section and we do a lot of talking and sharing and
the negative, it's just so bad; being so frustrated. And it basically
comes to say that they don't trust us with our kids and what we
think is good for them. It’s a horrible feeling. And maybe it has
to occur at other schools and maybe there’s a lot of new teachers,
but for us who have out here so long in teaching it’s degrading, it
really is.

Q10. If you had to give an analogy for your teaching career right now, what would
it be?

Participant A: I had an analogy that I really liked, up to about two years ago.
This is where I was headed and I think it’s been interrupted. It
sort of was like this: I have this mechanic, a great guy who works
on foreign cars. I’ve have a series of old wrecks that he sort of
kept on the road and I completely trust him. So I looked at Mark
and I though what is it about his business that I like? Well, first,
he has some knowledge. Over the years he’s learned a lot of stuff
and he has technical skill. And it’s come from his experience and
his work and his intellect. He knows stuff. He’s also planted
himself in a community. He’s part of that community. He has
people that know him and trust him, his customers are customers
that have worked with him before and trust him the same way
that I trust him. He’s built that, you know. I go back because I
know what I’m going to get. And even if he makes a mistake, I
forgive him because I know who he is. He works hard, so there’s
physical work. He has the knowledge of stuff and he has
community connection. He’s built this place; he’s earned this place, by how he’s interacted with people. And I was thinking that’s really how I had been seeing myself. I’ve been at the school actually a fairly long time. And I’ve taught a long time and I know my craft. I know my craft as well as anybody I know knows it. I mean, I’m trying to learn new stuff...Mark’s going to learn new stuff too, but I know my craft. I aim to work hard. Sometimes I fail, but I aim to physically work hard, when I’m teaching and I suck that energy and climb up on the furniture and run around the room and make individual contact with kids who might come to my class. To come in here on a Saturday, to try to do that work, which I’d rather not do at this point, the physical effort it takes to do this. I try to work for the long term. I’m just not interested in cranking some test scores at that last minute that doesn’t stick and then I’m done. I want my kids to come back to me and say in middle school that these things are really easy for me, I’m really glad you taught me like this. I want parents to think that I understood their kid. That we shared responsibility for their kid this year and that I can learn from them about their kids. I work for them and if their neighbor’s kid comes over or their next kids comes, that they know what’s coming, and that they can trust me and that they will forgive me my mistakes. And
so the other stuff is all outside. District administrators and the state politician’s office...all that stuff is stuff I have to deal with. But that isn’t the heart of what I do. It’s about my relationship with kids, and their families and my position in this community. That’s what it’s about and it’s not about this giant bureaucratic machine. I think that’s the threat of the stuff that’s going on in the last two years; it’s an attempt to steal that from me. “I’m sorry, this is the way you teach social studies.” Even though I’ve got 15 years of kids coming back saying, “I still remember the social studies you taught and it’s made me want to go to college and study this...” “I’m sorry, we don’t have time for that now, we have this.” I’ve spent 30 years in this industry. People have spent a year or two don’t know my job as well as I and who I don’t think are probably as smart as me, fiddling with that, getting in the way of that.

Participant B: I’m a robot.

Participant C: A hamster running on a wheel. It’s just crazy and what’s good today is not good tomorrow, and what you’re told, even from the administration seems like is what I want to see and now you’re not...I don’t want to see that, and why are you doing that now? And I just feel like I’m on this wheel, just spinning and I can’t...I don’t know, it’s just...it’s crazy right now I think...to try to do a
good job and do what everybody expects, so it just seems like we’re just spinning in circles and nothing is really happening. Or nobody knows what should be happening.

Participant D: I don’t know…trying harder and accomplishing less. I don’t know if there is a metaphor for that.

Participant E: You know, I didn’t think about that one. Something with a lot of frustration, it could be that one—that’ll do.

Q11. What do you think principals can do to support veteran teachers during times of transition?

Participant A: If I were a principal, in my fantasy world, there are sets of people I would take care of. First, I would take care of the kids. They would come first. Whatever was in the best interest of the kids, that pretty much won. And so, if this new stuff was clearly better, and clearly needed to be taught for the education of the kids, then I’m going to help that be implemented whether the teachers particularly like that or not. The second group I’m looking out for, though, are my employees. I’m watching out for them and they need to feel that they’re on my protected list too because the principal’s job is partly to screen out the shit…so I need to watch that. The third group is the parents. They’re part of our family, they’re our customers too, and so I watch out for their needs. And I don’t see them as my workers, but I see them as the people who
have the greatest insight into their children, the greatest commitment to their children. After that comes district office and politicians, George Bush, Arnold Schwarzenegger, Jack O’Connell and all those guys. Those guys are just politicians, it isn’t that they don’t have important things to say, it isn’t that part of our job is dealing with them. So as a principal I want to set up those layers of protections. Sometimes you have to do some stuff to express that value too. Once I’ve done that, I have to look at what we have to do as an institution to survive, and I want folks to trust us. I’m not interested in working for an administrator that says, “Well, we can’t do that.” I want to get back to what we can do. What’s good in here, because everything has something good in it. Houghton-Mifflin has some really nice stuff about work study in there...how can we take this apart and make this work? What a better sequence to do that? How much leeway do my teachers need to make that work? And my veteran teachers are the guys who know that.

Participant B: Well, I think what our principal’s doing is good. She’s trying to be as fair as possible and I realize she’s under pressure. I mean, a lot of this is not coming from the campus; it’s coming originally from Sacramento and a lot from the district office. They get the pressure and they in turn send in on down, so everybody’s
pressuring the next level. And then we’re left holding the bag.

But I feel principals should let us teach the way we know, what we know works for us, and a good principal will be aware of that because everybody’s personality is a little bit different and obviously if something doesn’t work, we can see that. I think if you let people teach in the style that works for them, the kids are going to learn more than telling everybody to do it in a certain way. Because education is more of an art than it is a science. By far more an art.

Participant C: Respect them as a resource. That they do have knowledge and work with kids over those cycles. I mean, a lot of this is cycling around already and being able to choose which way the pendulum swings...that middle ground. Pulling from what you know, and value that. I think you need to be able to rely on them, to be able to help and lead other people and also to really be able to evaluate a program and its worthiness or unworthiness.

Whether it’s research based or not.

Participant D: Well, I think the principals almost have their power removed too, but I think it’s good when a principal says, “Hey, I know that you’re a good teacher, I know what you’ve been doing has been effective with kids.” I guess for me, when someone comes and tells me that this is research based, I kind of go, “Well, yeah, but
what about the research I’ve done for the past 20 years, teaching
fourth graders in the laboratory?” I think I’ve probably had more
experience with fourth graders, especially at my school site, than
any researcher from any institution. And I think that when a
principal understands that, their teachers work hard, love their
kids, are professional, want to forward their profession. They
communicate that to their teachers and say, “This is what we’ve
got to do, how can we make this work? How can we be flexible
with our population in your classroom and still make this material
relevant and useful since that’s what the district asks us to do?” I
think that goes a long way. I think if the principal allows time for
the teachers to get together and talk about how we can make this
work. I think, maybe, just some understanding. I think some of
the principals wouldn’t like to go back in the classroom under the
current climate. I don’t know if some principals like being
principals under the current climate.

Participant E: To agree with what we have to say and support us. I do think (our
principal) has tried to do that, I just think the district has come
down on her. The first grade teachers have expressed themselves
a lot and I think she is supporting us. Talking about what we’ll do
next year and what we’ll be able to use from the series and what
we can do to make things better by using other stuff outside the
series, so I think she’s supportive that way and I think she’s hung
in there with us and said do what you think you need to do.

Q12. What can districts do to support veteran teachers during times of transition?

Participant A: The biggest thing for the district to do it to not make it harder,
and not to fool themselves into believing that teachers support
stuff that they really don’t support. In my positions as a union
leader and as a curricular leader I was on both sides and I worked
with cabinet members, sometimes a lot. What often is the
question is “What do the teachers think?” “How will we get the
teachers to do stuff?” It’s always sort of ‘the teachers’. And I
understand that because that’s a great big old group and they’re
pretty busy and they have this momentum and they don’t turn
very easily. They don’t turn nearly as easy as you could turn that
committee that put out that memo. You could (send out the
memo) but the teachers, they just keep going. So it’s easy to start
always thinking of them as that way; ‘the teachers’ as if they are
an obstacle to the things that you need to accomplish and you
have to accomplish. So administrators always have to take a
healthy dose of looking back and say, “Wait a minute, those guys
are the only guys who have access to the kids. How can we
support them to do that better?” I’m 100% sure that on some
enormous average teachers want to give their kids the best
education they can give. They fail just like everybody else, but they want to give their kids the best education they can give. So administrators need to respect that and go from that angle. What works, what doesn’t work, how can we help you, all that stuff that gets mouthed needs to be said in some way that is clear.

Participant B: Well, focus on the teachers who need help, or who ask for help. For those who aren’t doing their job adequately, counsel them, find out if teaching is for them. I mean, teaching isn’t for everybody. I don’t know where they ever came up with that saying that anybody can be a teacher. No, anybody can’t be.

Participant C: I don’t know at the district level what they can do too much, other than I think that when they mandate something like this, it’s kind of like a slap in the face to veteran teachers, so maybe being supported during that transition time by honoring veteran teachers. I know when a lot of people go to Houghton-Mifflin in-services, basically presenters are just reading things off to teachers and will be supporting what Houghton-Mifflin says and not listening to what veteran teachers are saying. So maybe they might be able to say, “this is our program, and this is kind of how we’re going to implement it” and maybe getting some input from veteran teachers where they can show some of the things they’ve done to make parts of it work. I would think it would be hard for
them to support veteran teachers during transition because they kind of have to say, since they adopted it and supported it, they kind of have to say this is what you’re going to have to do to justify all the money that they spent. Just looking at veteran teachers and knowing that for the most part, they know what they’re doing and actually giving support to newer teachers during times of implementation of the program and leave veteran teachers alone. I think it’s more important how the principals handle it at their site, because really, at the district level, most people don’t know anything about my teaching. But your principal should know that, and so your principal should be the one to make a decision during transition and know that if I say that everybody has to do this, these people are really going to be upset.

Participant D: Well, instead of telling them they have to throw out all the stuff that they know works and that they’ve found uses, asking them to blend in pieces of this new curriculum, bits and pieces, maybe a chunk here and a chunk there, and seeing how they can integrate it with all the stuff that they know. I would think it would be better even for the district to say, “OK, veteran teachers, here’s a new curriculum, do it.” Then to ask the veteran teachers which parts of this new curriculum are going to make you more
effective as a teachers and make kids more effective learner, rather than mandate that you have to change everything and just use this, even if it's not as good a what you've spent years...I don't know, for me, I've spent 10 years working on certain things.

Participant E: Leave us alone! Just leave us alone, we know what we’re doing!

I've never seen it this bad before. I've never, and Nancy and I have both said that, that never in our whole career have we ever been told that “you will do this.” I've just never heard of that.

You pick out the good things, the bad things; you bring in things that you think will reinforce it if the program doesn’t cover it. Then you go to other materials. And this is the first time that we’ve been told and we feel like we’re in jail.

Q13. Is there anything else you’d like to tell me?

Participant A: No.

Participant B: OK, with our district situation, because that’s the only thing that effects us directly, I say go back and decentralize the district the way it used to be. We’ve just been going gradually more centralized, more centralized. When we were decentralized, each principal really felt like they were empowered and could make a difference at their school. Schools are going to be different no matter what you do, so I say, decentralize them and let each
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campus be the way it would work for that campus. Then I think
there would be more progress because principals need more
control of their schools.

Participant C: I just think it’s a really frustrating time in teaching right now
because we are becoming so scripted and because we have so
much to cover. I think that those of us who have been into
teaching for a while, we really want to work to teach for mastery
and meaning and for the kids to take it and make it their own.
That’s not worksheet and something they regurgitate and it’s
something they can understand. It’s something they can
manipulate and move on from that point and add to. It becomes
part of their repertoire. I think I’d like to see them teach a little
bit less but with more depth. We scratch the surface on too many
things. It’s not really meaningful; it’s regurgitating information
for the test, instead of learning for true knowledge. That’s what
scares me.

Participant D: Just that I don’t think it’s good in teaching to be as reactionary as
we are. I think that we put too much power in test scores. I don’t
really think that helps kids learn. I think we’re asking kids to do a
lot of individual pieces to go and perform better on a test rather
than really asking them to learn and understand. I think some of
that needs to be rethought through and I would like there to be
more of a philosophy that we're not just trying to produce a
number but we're trying to get kids excited about learning and
about writing and about thinking and about going into areas
where they can apply math or science or a skill we want them to
learn rather than just being able to perform a certain skill and be
able to demonstrate that they know how to do a certain skill. We
want kids to be excited about knowing things because it makes
sense and it connects and it extends out into life, not just so they
can get a good score on a test so that their school looks better, or
district looks better.

Participant E: I've pretty much covered it. It's been a terribly, terribly
frustrating year and I'm hoping it'll be better next year. I don't
think so many of us have talked about retirement in our whole
life. Even people who are not anywhere near it. I thought I'd be
teaching a lot longer. I don't know if I will. I don't know what
the future's going to bring.
CHAPTER V – SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSION

Summary

The passing of the federal law entitled No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2001 ushered in a new era of accountability for public education. With its four pillars of focus: accountability and testing, flexible use of federal resources, school choice, and quality teaching/quality teachers (Cicchinelli, Gaddy, Lefkowits, & Miller, 2003, pg. 1) the law sought to establish high standards for all students throughout the United States.

One of the paramount premises behind NCLB is the use of scientifically based research in selecting programs and curriculum for use in classrooms. No Child Left Behind defines “scientifically based research” (SBR) as “rigorous, systematic and objective procedures to obtain valid knowledge,” and employs research that “is evaluated using experimental or quasi experimental designs.” If districts choose to use materials that aren’t deemed sufficient to satisfy the SBR requirement, state or federal funding could be withheld or may have to be forfeited.

Facing the NCLB federal law, California structured its Public School Accountability Act (PSAA) of 1999 to adhere to the mandates of NCLB. The result was the Academic Performance Index. States were required by law to establish plans which determined proficiency goals, as well as forming methods for schools and districts to demonstrate adequate yearly growth (Brown and Ing, 2003).

No Child Left Behind and California’s Academic Performance Index established rigorous goals for students and educators to move toward. Sustained
academic growth in all populations is required by law, or schools and districts will face escalating consequences. Districts have felt the pressure to comply with laws due to possible monetary ramifications of not complying. As a result, districts have moved towards purchasing textbooks and adoptions that are approved by the state as soundly forged in scientifically based research and standards based because their funding demands it and the pressure to perform necessitates it.

While administrators at the federal, state, and district levels work feverishly to implement the intricacies of the new laws, teachers implement new curriculums and adoptions which do comply with the letter of the law. Slavin (2003) however, expressed some difficulties with relying exclusively on scientifically based research programs as a means for gauging improving student achievement:

We can easily imagine a reading program that would incorporate the five elements (of reading instruction) but whose training was so minimal that teachers did not implement these elements well, or whose materials were so boring that students were not motivated to study them (p. 16).

Frymier (1987) as cited by Martin, Crossland, & Johnson (2001) state, “in any attempt to improve education, teachers are central” (p. 4). Five significant aspects of teaching which result in teacher job satisfaction are: love of working with children, colleagues and collaboration, autonomy, and shared decision making/empowerment. During the implementation of new curriculum, critical components of teacher job satisfaction can be overlooked in the effort to comply with the law.
One such component teachers may feel is overlooked is the idea of autonomy. Autonomy has been described as a "teacher's belief that they control important aspects of their work like. Autonomy is often referred to as internal locus of control," (Martin, Crossland, & Johnson, 2001, p.5). With autonomy comes the expectation of teachers to have creative and individual flexibility in teaching style and content. According to a study by Horizon Research International, (2001) "most [teachers] acknowledged the awareness of having the responsibility to teach a certain curriculum by the end of the school year, but believed the time from the first day through the last day to be their own schedule and format" (p. 6).

Another component teachers may believe is not valued is shared decision making/empowerment. According to Blase and Blase 1994; Blase et al. 1995; Shreeve et al. 1987 as cited by Davis and Wilson, 2000, (p. 349) "...power involves the formal authority or control over organizational resources, and empowerment is the process of sharing that power. Among educators, the belief is widely held that the more teachers share in decision making the greater their job satisfaction. Davis and Wilson (2000) cite Maeroff as defining power as "the power to exercise one's craft with confidence and to help shape the way that the job is to be done." (p. 349).

The research in the Review of Literature describes the laws created by federal and state officials to ensure that all students are held to a high level of academic rigor and will make continuous progress in academic achievement. No Child Left Behind and California's Academic Performance Index have created the need for districts to be accountable, which has forced them to adopt curriculum
which rigidly conforms to the mandate of utilizing scientifically based research. Explained in greater detail in the Review of Literature are the nuances of each law including the sub-groups of students, what adequate growth is, and ramifications for not achieving adequate growth.

This qualitative study examined the impact of one district’s newly adopted, mandated language arts curriculum on veteran teachers. Interviews were held and questionnaires were given to five employees of the school. Each teacher had at least 12 years of experience, with five of those years being at the school site where the study occurred. The main purpose of this study was to research what administrators can do to support veteran teachers during times of transition, such as the implementation of mandated curriculum.

The participants’ responses to the questionnaires revealed many similarities. The results of the questionnaires showed that while teachers were spending more time on the new language arts adoption in class, less time was afforded to the subjects of science and social studies. Teachers felt they had less influence on setting performance standards for students, for establishing curriculum at the school, on selecting textbooks and other instructional materials, selecting content, topic, and skills to be taught, and selecting teaching techniques within their classrooms. In addition, teachers felt the school administration’s behavior toward the staff was less supportive and encouraging during that 2003-2004 school year than during the 2002-2003 school year.
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The participants’ responses to the interviews also revealed many similarities. Among them, most significantly was that concern was expressed regarding the rigid nature as to how students are to be grouped according to the mandated curriculum. Grouping of students during language arts was perceived to be less effective than groupings used in previous years. Teachers felt the mandated curriculum taught skills in isolation, didn’t teach for depth or higher level thinking skills, and was “choppy” in its organization. There was no consensus or clear understanding of why the district was taking a strong stance on the mandated curriculum. Veteran teachers expressed frustration, humiliation, and surprise at the district’s insistence on the exclusive use of the mandated curriculum and suggested the district and principal’s respect their experience and judgment and genuinely ask them for input as to the effectiveness of the new program.

Recommendations

This study addressed the impact of mandated curriculum on veteran teachers’ job satisfaction and what principals can do to support veteran teachers during times of transition. In order for any organizational change to occur, teachers must believe in the movement or at the very least support the movement. The research clearly states that teacher job satisfaction is directly related to teacher’s perceived shared decision making, empowerment, and autonomy.

In terms of setting the climate for a smooth transition to a mandated curriculum the findings of this research indicate support for the following
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recommendations for district personnel which will help teachers during times of transition:

1. District personnel should clearly articulate to the teachers implementing the program their reasons for mandating a curriculum, whether it be to comply with federal or state law, or otherwise.

2. District staff development workshops should include time for discussion of what is working and what is not working with the new program amongst teachers.

3. Teachers should not be expected to or mandated to stop using teaching strategies that have proven themselves successful when used in a classroom setting over a period of time.

4. There should be clear and honest articulation between district office personnel and veteran teachers regarding the strengths and weaknesses of instructional programs. Teachers need to feel heard with regard to their concerns and observations.

5. Allow principals the freedom to work individually with their teachers in establishing best possible teaching practices within their classrooms. Principals should be seen as instructional leaders by their staffs, not solely as enforcers of district mandates.

6. Recognize that just as students have different needs and learning styles which need to be respected and appreciated, so do individual teachers. Teachers should not be expected to all fit into the same curricular mold with
the exact teaching styles. Seek out effective teachers at each site and allow them the freedom to share what works for them.

7. Honor the experience veteran teachers have acquired over their careers by listening honestly and objectively to their voices and experiences.

8. Recognize that teacher autonomy and perceived shared decision making, empowerment, and autonomy are critical to their job satisfaction.

Satisfaction of teachers directly impacts the learning of students.

These recommendations will help to foster a positive climate between district personnel and classroom teachers. Rather than seeing one another as “the teachers” and “the district office” or “us” and “them” a climate of collegiality could grow and a sense of teamwork would develop. Teachers will feel their voices are heard and will be more apt to embrace district policy in the future.

As school leaders and instructional leaders, principals have the responsibility to guide the teachers at their schools in the same individualized way teachers are expected to interact with their students. Research findings indicate support for the following recommendations for principals to ensure they are supporting teachers during times of transition:

1. Listen to teacher’s input about what is effective and what is ineffective about new curriculum.

2. Encourage on-going dialog between teachers at grade levels. Allow time during grade level meetings for discussions and planning regarding effective implementation of new materials.
3. Communicate teacher’s concerns to district personnel.

4. The experiences of veteran teachers should be honored. The experience they have in the laboratory of the classroom should be given merit and voice.

5. Be accessible to the concerns and needs of teachers. Teachers must feel their principal supports them in their classroom. Veteran teachers must not feel that their prior experiences have been for naught and need to be discarded.

6. Provide staff development opportunities that allow teacher’s voices to be heard. Leave ample time for teachers to discuss what has worked for them in the past. Empower teachers to have a level of autonomy in their teaching.

As the leader of the school, the principal must disseminate information from the district office and take back input from the site to the district office protecting the interests of students and staff at their individual site.

While mandates occur at higher levels, implementation occurs within school sites, but more specifically and realistically, within individual classrooms. Teachers are the group who has the most direct access to and impact on, student achievement. Because of this, the findings of this research indicate support for the following recommendations for teachers in order to maintain a high level of job satisfaction:

1. Teachers should clearly communicate their successes and concerns with their principals especially when they’re feeling unheard.
2. Teachers should collaborate with grade level colleagues about strengths and weaknesses with the new curriculum.

3. Teachers should seek to find areas in their professional life where they do feel they have autonomy, and articulate the importance of that autonomy to principals and district staff.

4. Teachers should seek to learn and understand the motives of district mandates and should actively ask questions to clarify understanding.

5. Teachers should diligently articulate their concerns at staff development workshops. Although at times it may seem as though concerns are unheard, articulation is important as is continued feedback to school leaders.

6. Teachers should physically and emotionally take care of themselves in order to lead and guide their classrooms most effectively.

7. Teachers should see themselves as on-going learners of their craft and open their minds to new teaching methods.

Teachers must not resign themselves to closing their doors and simply complying to mandates as they can best tolerate them. They must continue to voice their concerns and empower themselves to act as professional scientists in the laboratory of the classroom.

**Conclusion**

Because of recently passed legislation including No Child Left Behind and California’s Academic Performance Index, districts around the country are rallying to improve student achievement. The benefits of these laws are increased awareness
of and focus on students who previously may have slipped between the cracks. High standards and high accountability should be what we all aspire to be as educators.

With the increasing pressure on all in the educational arena, from district personnel to classroom teachers, it is no wonder that tension has increased to an all time high and control is seen as a prerequisite to success. It is important to realize, however, that a successful workforce relies upon feeling valued, heard, and empowered.

Both district personnel and teachers need to realize the importance of not seeing each other as “those guys” but rather of seeing each other as being on the same team. District personnel should clearly articulate the rationale behind their decisions. In addition, they should sincerely seek opportunities to hear from their vast resource of effective veteran teachers. Teachers and principals should feel free to speak their concerns without fear of reprisal or sanction from district personnel, whether that fear is truly founded or simply perceived.

As one participant in this study stated:

…it’s easy to start always thinking of them as that way; ‘the teachers’ as if they are an obstacle to the things that you need to accomplish and you have to accomplish. So administrators always have to take a healthy dose of looking back and say, “Wait a minute, those guys are the only guys who have access to the kids. How can we support them to do that better?” I’m 100% sure that on some enormous average teachers want to give their kids the best education they can give. They fail just like everybody else, but they
want to give their kids the best education they can give. So administrators need to respect that and go from that angle. What works, what doesn’t work, how can we help you. All that stuff that gets mouthed needs to be said in some way that is clear.
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APPENDIX A

Select questions from the U.S. Department of Education’s Public School Teacher Questionnaire

Class Organization

1. Which category best describes the way YOUR classes at this school are organized?
   Mark (X) only one box.
   - Departmentalized Instruction - You teach subject matter courses (e.g., biology, history, keyboarding) to several classes of different students all or most of the day.
   - Elementary Enrichment Class - You teach only one subject (e.g., art, music, physical education, computer skills) in an elementary school.
   - Self-Contained Class - You teach multiple subjects to the same class of students all or most of the day.
   - Team Teaching - You collaborate with one or more teachers in teaching multiple subjects to the same class of students.
   - “Pull-Out” Class - You provide instruction (e.g., special education, reading) to certain students who are released from their regular classes.

2. During your most recent FULL WEEK of teaching, approximately how many hours did you spend teaching each of these subjects at THIS school?

   a. English/Reading/Language Arts
      ______ Hours per week
      ______ None

   b. Arithmetic/Mathematics
      ______ Hours per week
      ______ None

   c. Social studies/History
      ______ Hours per week
      ______ None
d. Science

_____ Hours per week
_____ None

YOUR COMMENTS:

Working Conditions

3. How many hours were you required to be at THIS school during your MOST RECENT FULL WEEK of teaching?

_____ Hours

4. During your MOST RECENT FULL WEEK of teaching, how many hours did you spend AFTER school, BEFORE school, and ON THE WEEKEND on each of the following activities?

a. School-related activities involving student interaction, such as coaching, field trips, tutoring, transporting students

_____ Hours

b. Other school-related activities, such as preparation, grading papers, parent conferences, attending meetings

_____ Hours

YOUR COMMENTS:
Decision Making

5. Using the scale of 1-5, where 1 means "No Influence" and 5 means "A great deal of influence," how much actual influence do you think teachers have over school policy AT THIS SCHOOL in each of the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No Influence</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Setting performance standards for Students at this school</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Establishing curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Determining the content of in-service Professional development programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Evaluating teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Hiring new full-time teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Setting discipline policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Deciding how the school budget will be Spent</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Using the scale of 1-5, where 1 means "No control" and 5 means "Complete control," how much control do you think you have IN YOUR
CLASSROOM at this school over each of the following areas of your planning and teaching?

a. Selecting textbooks and other instructional Materials 
   1  2  3  4  5

b. Selecting content, topics, and skills to be taught 
   1  2  3  4  5

c. Selecting teaching techniques 
   1  2  3  4  5

d. Evaluating and grading students 
   1  2  3  4  5

e. Disciplining students 
   1  2  3  4  5

f. Determining the amount of homework 
   To be assigned 
   1  2  3  4  5

7. Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? 
   Mark (X) one box on each line. 
   Strongly Somewhat Somewhat Strongly 
   agree agree disagree 

   a. The principal lets the staff members know what is expected of them. 
      ____  ____  ____  ____ 

   b. The school administration’s behavior toward the staff is supportive and encouraging. 
      ____  ____  ____  ____ 

   c. I am satisfied with my teaching salary 
      ____  ____  ____  ____ 

   d. Necessary materials such as textbooks, supplies, and copy machines are available as needed by staff 
      ____  ____  ____  ____ 

   f. The principal talks with me frequently about my instructional practices 
      ____  ____  ____  ____
g. Most of my colleagues share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be.

h. The principal knows what kind of school he/she wants and has communicated it to the staff.

i. There is a great deal of cooperative effort among the staff members

j. I worry about the security of my job because of the performance of my students on state and local tests.

k. I sometimes feel it is a waste of time to try to do my best as a teacher.

l. I am generally satisfied with being a teacher at this school.

8. If you could go back to your college days and start over again, would you become a teacher or not?
   Mark (X) only one box.
   _____ Certainly would become a teacher
   _____ Probably would become a teacher
   _____ Chances about even for and against
   _____ Probably would not become a teacher
   _____ Certainly would not become a teacher

9. How long do you plan to remain in teaching?
   Mark (X) only one box.
   _____ As long as I am able
   _____ Until I am eligible for retirement
_____ Will probably continue unless something better comes along

_____ Definitely plan to leave teaching as soon as I can

_____ Undecided at this time

YOUR COMMENTS:
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APPENDIX B

Possible Questions for Teacher Interviews

1. How has mandated curriculum changed the way you group students in class? Has it been more or less effective than the way you have grouped students previously?

2. How has mandated curriculum changed the way you work within your grade level?

3. If you’ve spent a different amount of time at school outside of contract hours this year compared to last year, to what do you attribute that change?

4. Why do you think teachers might be unhappy with the recently adopted language arts series?

5. Why do you think the district office has taken a strong stance on the exclusive usage of the language arts adoption?

6. Should a school’s API score effect the curriculum it teaches? Why or why not?

7. What has been the most significant positive change in teaching over the past 5 years?

8. What has been the most significant negative change in teaching over the past 5 years?

9. If you had to give an analogy for your teaching career right now, what would it be?

10. What can principals do to support veteran teachers during times of transition?

11. What can districts do to support veteran teachers during times of transition?

12. Is there anything else you’d like to share with me?
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APPENDIX C

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SAN MARCOS

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Amy Copeland is conducting a master’s thesis in Educational Leadership on the effects of mandated curriculum on veteran teachers and what supports principals can provide during times of transition.

You have been asked to participate in this qualitative research study because you have experience in the teaching field which qualifies you as a veteran teacher. If you agree to participate in this research study, you will be asked to respond to a questionnaire, followed by an interview with the researcher. It is the goal of this study to gain insight and understanding into the effects of mandated curriculum on veteran teachers and to provide suggestions to principal leaders as to the needs of veteran teachers.

There are no risks in this experiment greater than those involved in daily conversations about the effects of mandated curriculum. The benefits to you are that you can reflect on your perceptions about mandated curriculum and act as a voice to clarify the effects mandated curriculum has on teachers, staffs, and districts.

Participation in this study is purely voluntary. You may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

In no part of this study will your identity be disclosed at any time. All information will remain confidential. This thesis will be shared with two faculty advisors at CSUSM. With your consent, the interview will be audio taped and professionally transcribed. All transcriptions and information will be destroyed upon the completion of this study. All participants will receive a copy of the researchers findings before December, 2004. This research has been approved by the California State University San Marcos Institutional Review Board. If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this survey, they can be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board at (760) 750-8820.

I agree to participate in this research study. Any questions I have at this time have been answered by the researcher. If I have any questions in the future, I will direct them to the Chair or the Institutional Review Board or to the researcher at (760) 751-2532.

Participant’s Name ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Participant’s Signature ___________________________ Researcher’s Signature ___________________________
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