AASA JOURNAL OF SCHOLARSHIP & PRACTICE

AASA
THE SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS ASSOCIATION
WWW.AASA.ORG

Research and Evidence-Based Practice Advancing the Profession of Education Administration

Volume 18 No. 1

Table of Contents

Editorial Review Board

Sponsorship and Appreciation

The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* would like to thank AASA, The School Superintendents Association, and in particular AASA's Leadership Development, for its ongoing sponsorship of the *Journal*.

We also offer special thanks to Kenneth Mitchell, Manhattanville College, for his efforts in selecting the articles that comprise this professional education journal and lending sound editorial comments to each volume.

The unique relationship between research and practice is appreciated, recognizing the mutual benefit to those educators who conduct the research and seek out evidence-based practice and those educators whose responsibility it is to carry out the mission of school districts in the education of children.

Without the support of AASA and Kenneth Mitchell, the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* would not be possible.

Leading and Sustaining a Strong Culture for Post-pandemic Schools

Ken Mitchell, EdD
Editor
AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice

Peter Drucker's adage, "Culture eats strategy for breakfast," has been misconstrued as rationale for a leader's resignation to powerful cultural forces. Indeed, traditions, espoused values, underlying assumptions and beliefs, and the influence of "tribal elders" inhabit the deep cultural foundations of organizations. Drucker, the legendary management guru, recognized the rootedness of such foundations. He did not, however, concede to their intractability. But before leaders can act, culture needs to be understood.

Leadership actions do not have to be about radically reforming or subverting an organization's culture. Instead, they should organically and collaboratively reshape that which needs revitalization by building upon and respecting established values and traditions. Entering leaders attuned to an organization's culture and climate as they develop their strategic initiatives will likely find more success than those predisposed to disrupting the status quo, even when conditions might call for radical change.

Being highly collaborative can slow things down, but the results from work that engages the stakeholders, and leaders who empathize with those dealing with ground-level challenges and strategize through organizational learning have the potential of making enduring shifts in the culture. Heifitz (2009) describes the lasting influence of adaptive change that addresses root cause issues, often embedded within the culture. There are no shortcuts or innovations du jour. The work is hard and requires patience.

The Spring 2021 issue of the *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice* is about such work. Our contributors examine, through their studies and experiences, the responsibility of leaders to intentionally foster healthy and equitable cultures and climates, especially as we approach post-pandemic schooling:

- How can leaders better understand climate?
- How do leaders develop a culture to foster staff resiliency?
- How do leaders influence culture by their school business decisions?
- How do structures and routines strengthen culture and climate?

Mullen, Shields, & Tienken (2021) in "Developing Teacher Resilience and Resilient School Cultures" consider the current COVID-19 moment, in a timely piece that asks the question: "What factors and processes contribute to teacher resilience and the ability to overcome adversity?" Before sharing their original research, they cite literature that emphasizes the importance of a caring school culture:

> A supportive, caring school culture is crucial for teacher resilience (Ryan, 2020; Tait, 2008; Yost, 2006). Environments with high expectations, clear administrative goals, meaningful participation of teachers in decision-making, and collaboration among teachers all influenced teacher resilience and retention.

Lake Placid (NY) Superintendent, Roger Catania, in a pandemic-inspired commentary, uses an equity lens to provoke district leaders to reflect on how their decisions to work with corporations influence social and economic inequities that affect children, schools, and society:

> "As we are invited to reimagine education in a post-pandemic environment, we must be willing to consider ways that public institutions can impact an environment in which social and economic inequality prevents children from advancing in life. Demanding that we only do business with corporations whose employment and organizational practices favor a better life for all citizens is not asking too much."

Mayger (2021) shares her original research that provides leaders with a practical and proactive consideration of developing structures that contribute to the organizational culture: "How do organizational routines facilitate continuity and improvement in community schools?" The researcher found that "developing structures that routinize constructive norms rather than depending on individual actors to behave in beneficial ways," sustains school improvement at the cultural level and in consideration of the climate. Citing the literature, "Changes are most likely to take hold in organizational climates where there is strong interpersonal trust and stakeholders develop common expectations for their individual roles and responsibilities (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; FitzGerald & Quiñones, 2018; Medina et al., 2019; Sanders & Harvey, 2002)," Mayger then shares advice from a participant in her study:

> "You need to make sure that the people that you have involved believe in what you're doing with the model. And you need to constantly remind people why they are here. Because if you don't do that, *you* do the groundwork, and then, all of a sudden, everything falls apart. The real work is to sustain the model."

Zullig, Keith, & Hubner (2021) share their original research about the development and use of a school climate survey (SCM). Claiming there is "a relative dearth of psychometrically sound measures available to assess students' perception of their school's climate," the researchers provide school leaders with evidence about their instrument's application while assuring us that "the SCM can provide a comprehensive *and* nuanced look at students' school environment perceptions, yielding valuable hypotheses about their school behavior, subjective well-being, and academic success."
Finally, in a review of *Responsive Schooling for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students* (Zacarian & Soto, 2020), Art Stellar critiques a work that encourages culturally responsive leadership to help their educators in addressing the cultural differences of their students.

The publication of the Spring 2021 issue of the *JSP* comes at a time of optimism: It is the spring, a time of renewal. There is a hopefulness that the pandemic is beginning to recede. The world is warily reopening.

As I work with and listen to aspiring and experienced school leaders, I am observing an energy and a renewed yet cautious confidence about the challenges that remain: *We are tired. This was difficult, but we have not been able to get through this by simply enhancing our technical skills. We have learned new lessons about rapid adaptation, compromise, collaboration, and student priorities. Sadly, we have also witnessed a greater exposure to the unresolved inequities that victimize our children and pervade our culture and society.*

A leader's failure to understand and attend to a school system's culture and climate, especially during the times in which we live, enables organizational stagnation while doing nothing to advance the instructional priorities. With Drucker's admonition as context, we invite the reader to consider the ideas and research of this issue's contributors about ways to enhance the cultures of their institutions. We are at a hopeful and opportunistic moment for such work.

References

Heiftiz, R. & Linsky, M. (2002). *Leadership on the line: Staying alive through the dangers of change.* Harvard Business School Press.

Research Article _____

Developing Teacher Resilience and Resilient School Cultures

Carol A. Mullen, PhD
Professor
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies Program
School of Education
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA

Lee Brantley Shields, EdD
Assistant Principal
Rustburg High School
Campbell County Public Schools
Rustburg VA

Christopher H. Tienken, EdD
Associate Professor
Educational Leadership, Management, and Policy
College of Education and Human Services
Seton Hall University
South Orange, NJ

Abstract

Teacher resilience in a pandemic is a timely topic for America's superintendents. This literature review focuses on teacher resilience and retention, with relevance for building resilient school cultures. The question guiding analysis of studies was, "What factors and processes contribute to teacher resilience and the ability to overcome adversity?" Findings were that individual and contextual factors of resilience impact teachers' ability to persevere, as well as schools' capacity to retain novice teachers. Resilience is associated with retention, job satisfaction, and other positive outcomes. Actions for developing teacher resilience and resilient school cultures are identified. K–12 teachers who attend to factors of resilience can better adapt and overcome adversity. School district leaders who encourage teacher resilience can foster resilient school cultures.

Key Words

contextual factors, individual factors, literature review, school culture, teacher resilience, teacher retention

Cultivating resilience to adversity is gaining attention during the COVID-19 pandemic. Around the globe, unforeseen adversities present educational institutions with extraordinary challenges. The adaptability and well-being of educators is being tested. Stay-at-home, physical-distancing, and other directives take a toll on people and schools. **Wellness pedagogies and practices of schools that treat health and caring as priorities matter to survival (Ryan, 2020).**

Helping teachers to be resilient could be an imperative in times of crisis that threaten school cultures. Little is known about why veteran teachers choose to remain in the classroom, making teaching their life's career, and what characteristics of resilience they demonstrate. As educational leadership and administration (EDL/EDA) scholar–practitioners, we offer a timely study for resilience-building within the teacher self and in schools.

While much research investigates individual and contextual factors of resilience, few sources address veteran teachers' resilience. In response, we bring to the fore an often-neglected aspect of teacher development—veteran teacher resilience, connecting to retention, culture, and leadership.

Developing resiliency is a complex developmental process. Effective adaptations to the environment and learning from challenging situations are involved. *Resilience* generally refers to optimism, bouncing back from adversity, or bettering oneself through challenges. We define *teacher resilience* as a capacity to adapt that has been developed or learned, and using strategies to overcome adversity and achieve "good outcomes despite serious threats to

adaptation or development" (Masten, 2001, p. 228; Ainsworth & Oldfield, 2019; Mansfield et al., 2012, 2016; Taylor, 2013).

Encouraging teacher resilience and fostering resilient schools is, arguably, a key responsibility of school district leadership (Ryan, 2020; Sedivy-Benton & Boden-McGill, 2012) that the pandemic has magnified. Understanding that teacher resilience is vital to improving teacher retention and educational organizations, we wanted to know the major challenges teachers encounter and strategies for dealing with them. In order to analyze studies, however, we needed to consider what both facilitates and obstructs the development of resilience for novice and preservice teachers.

Teachers are the backbone of school communities, yet they leave their schools and even teaching in droves. In the United States, teacher education programs cannot seem to produce enough graduates to replace them (Qarni & Pianta, 2018).

Research confirms that poor working conditions, inadequate administrative support, noncompetitive compensation, and subpar induction programs contribute to teacher attrition (Allensworth et al., 2009; Boyd et al., 2011; Curtis, 2012; Dupriez et al., 2016; Fontaine et al., 2012; Kukla-Acevedo, 2009; Sedivy-Benton & Boden-McGill, 2012).

School communities suffer from teacher shortages (Boyd et al., 2011). In Virginia, for example, 22% of teachers do not return after year one and 50% leave after year four (Qarni & Pianta, 2018).

These proportions can be even greater in underperforming, poorly resourced schools that struggle with employing well-qualified

teachers. Retaining teachers is particularly challenging in rural communities with low socioeconomic status and schools serving a disproportionate ratio of underserved groups (Allensworth et al., 2009). Such demographic factors impact teachers' decision to remain in the classroom (Perrachione et al., 2008).

To improve teacher retention and attract teachers, schools increase salaries, create induction programs, incorporate professional development (PD), and add performance incentives (Garcia et al., 2009). Perhaps surprisingly, the impact of teacher resilience on retention is under-researched (Mansfield et al., 2016), particularly concerning veteran teachers. The present review adds to the body of knowledge so teachers and schools can benefit.

This paper presents school district leaders with a review of literature on teacher resilience and retention that extends to building resilient school cultures.

The question guiding analysis of studies was, "What factors and processes contribute to teacher resilience and the ability to overcome adversity?" Next, we describe our research methods, followed by a teacher resilience framework we adopted, our synthesis of findings, and then conclusions.

Methods

This systematic review of literature was organized to address factors and processes that contribute to veteran teachers' decision to remain in their school and the profession. Criteria and search terms were established for searching peer-reviewed empirical studies published between 2000 and June 2020. To analyze documents, we derived our search terms from the guiding question and initial review of Mansfield et al.'s (2012) descriptive

framework. Keywords included *teacher retention* (2,842), *teacher shortage* (2,395), *teacher commitment* (2,285), *teacher hope* and *passion* (1,211), and *teacher resilience (and resiliency)* (219).

For topical abstracts, the article was read and jointly analyzed. Results narrowed, yielding 283 abstracts for inspection. In Microsoft Excel, a chart (summarizing methods, findings, implications for research and practice, etc.) organized the 91 sources chosen. Within the documents, search terms were counted and extracted, with keyword-embedded contexts tracked. Emergent themes, reflecting intercoder reliability, were identified.

Teacher Resilience Framework

Teacher resilience expert Caroline Mansfield created a framework that we used to organize the review. Based on 23 aspects of teacher resilience as perceived by graduating and early career teachers, Mansfield et al. (2012) identified 4 dimensions of resilience:

- *Professional factors:* committed students, organization and preparation, effective teaching skills, adaptability, reflection;
- *Social factors:* strong interpersonal and communication skills, problem-solving, developing support and relationships, seeking help;
- *Motivational factors:* optimism, persistence, focus on improvement, self-efficacy, setting realistic goals and expectations, maintaining motivation and enthusiasm, enjoying challenges;
- *Emotional factors:* sense of humor, not taking things personally, regulating emotion, bouncing back from challenges, coping skills, caring for one's own well-being

Developing this frame, we assigned individual factors (e.g., professional autonomy) and contextual factors (e.g., commitment) of resilience for each dimension (e.g., professional). Table 1 identifies factors attributed to Mansfield et al.'s (2012) dimensions of resilience.

Table 1

Factors Illustrating Resilience Dimensions

Professional	**Social**	**Motivational**	**Emotional**
Professional autonomy	Positive relationships	Optimism	Religion
Commitment	Problem solving	Education viewed as important	Values
Flexible locus of control	Opportunity to build professional relationships	Self-efficacy	Beliefs
Professional skills	Meaningful participation in decision making	Calling to teach	Emotions
Making a difference	Induction/coaching programs	Intrinsic motivation	Passion for their career
Reflection		Perseverance through challenges	Love for children
Work conditions		School culture	Ability to bounce back
Small class size		Motivated students	Administrative support
Competitive compensation		Funding for programs	Parental support
Reduced workload		Clear administrative goals	Behavioral climate
Sound PD			
Facilities			
Safety			

Note. Individual and contextual factors are specified from sources reviewed; contextual factors are differentiated with shading; the factors illustrate Mansfield et al.'s (2012) dimensions of resilience.

Resilience Findings from Studies

Individual and contextual factors of resilience impact teachers' development and ability to persevere. These also influence school leaders' capacity to retain new and early-career teachers. Teachers who choose to stay in the classroom and profession likely demonstrate characteristics of resilience. Resilience is associated with retention, job satisfaction, and other positive outcomes for teachers and schools.

Actions for developing teacher resilience and resilient school cultures are identifiable in organizational resilience, which is a school's capacity to adequately react to the

unexpected and recover from disruption and crises (Duchek, 2020). Individual factors (e.g., self-efficacy) of resilience occur inside the teacher, whereas contextual factors (e.g., administrative support) originate outside (Ainsworth & Oldfield, 2019;

Mansfield et al., 2016). Table 2 highlights these factors, each with a number denoting how many sources mentioned it (e.g., 10 of them observed *self-efficacy* as an individual factor, 7 sources cited *administrative support* as a contextual factor).

Table 2

Factors Influencing Teacher Resilience

Individual Factors of Resilience		Contextual Factors of Resilience	
Factor	Source	Factor	Source
Self-efficacy	10	Administrative support	7
Positive relationships	7	Meaningful participation in decisions	7
Passion for their career	5	School culture	6
Optimism	4	Work conditions	5
Commitment	4	Competitive compensation	5
Emotions	4	Reduced workload	5
Intrinsic motivation	4	Opportunity to build relationships	5
Perseverance through challenges	4	Sound PD	3
Religion	3	Behavioral climate	2
Flexible locus of control	3	Empowerment	2
Professional autonomy	3	Motivated students	1
Making a difference	3	Small class size	1
Reflection	3	Parental support	1
Problem solving	3	Financial support for programs	1
Ability to bounce back	3	Clear administrative goals	1
View of education as important	2	Autonomy in the classroom	1
Calling to teach	2	Facilities	1
Professional skills	2	Safety	1
Values	1	Induction/coaching programs	1
Beliefs	1		
Love for children	1		

Individual factors of teacher resilience
Teachers' drive to perform—their motivation—is considered the most prevalent "personal resource" for resilience. Having a sense of purpose or vocation defends against burnout, and taking initiative exercises one's agency.

Efficacy is another important resource (Mansfield et al., 2016). Motivational resilience influences teachers' ability to persevere in the classroom, be effective, and show improvement. Students' capacity to persevere, learn, and improve influences

teachers' motivation, which guides classroom work, facilitates achievement, and maintains expected behaviors (Chiong et al., 2017).

Seeking to discover why teachers stayed in an urban school, Walker (2004) identified as influences (a) effectiveness working with youngers; (b) good relationships within the district; and (3) a sense of self-satisfaction. Polidore et al. (2010) found that the individual resilience factors of three veteran African American female teachers who faced significant adversity in their careers were moral/spiritual support, flexible locus of control, control of events, importance of education, positive relationships, bias for optimism, enjoyment of change, and deep commitment. Taylor's (2013) study involving four African American rural teachers supported these factors, adding self-efficacy owing to their belief that they could make meaningful contributions to teaching.

Besides these resilience attributes, Gu and Day (2013) identified a calling to teach, as did Bennett et al. (2013), who found that veteran teachers felt passionate about their career. Hong (2012) confirmed self-efficacy and positive student relationships as variables of teacher resilience, also identifying beliefs and emotions. Comparing teachers who leave and stay, Hong uncovered that those who departed displayed weaker self-efficacy and had less administrative support.

Yost (2006) examined the personal self-efficacy of novice teachers who were adjusting in their first year. They attributed their earlier positive student teaching experiences to feeling self-confident and competent. Perrachione et al. (2008) added that personal teaching efficacy influences retention and that teacher interaction with students and job satisfaction are also important individual factors.

Fostering resilience through learning experiences can boost teacher confidence and self-efficacy (Tait, 2008). Novice teachers that demonstrate resilience, personal efficacy, and emotional intelligence were able to show competence, act on opportunities to develop confidence, and engage in problem solving. Notably, they could "rebound after a difficult experience; learn from experience and set goals; take care of [themselves]; and [remain optimistic]" (Tait, p. 69; Yost, 2006).

Martin (2016) explored retention pertaining to special education teachers, whose retention is generally lower than general education teachers. The inquiry centered on how passion and perseverance for long-term goals may impact retention. Special educators who displayed these qualities, and devoted themselves to teaching, were observed as having positive relationships, persevering despite obstacles, and working hard at what they love.

Teacher perspectives on hope as a sustaining influence led Levine (2013) to conclude that veteran teachers feel they make a difference through their student advocacy. They seem to be guided by a faith-based call to teach and attain professional autonomy and respect. Towers (2017), who explored why long-serving teachers stayed in challenging London primary schools, learned that they felt fulfilled from influencing children's lives, sharing bonds and dynamic relationships with colleagues, and having love for students and staff. The teachers expressed feeling comfortable and confident in their abilities and displaying self-efficacy at work.

Contextual factors of teacher resilience
The ability to become (more) resilient may fluctuate depending on environmental

conditions and challenges. Owing to the influence of contextual factors, cultivating teacher resilience requires a multipronged approach to resilient adaptation and functioning in school cultures. Perrachione et al. (2008) identified highly motivated students, peer support, positive school environment, and small class size as contextual factors impacting teachers. Leadership, culture, and teacher workload can be turned into resilient-promoting interventions to support teachers and enhance resilience (Ainsworth & Oldfield, 2019).

Regarding teachers' decision to stay or leave, Kukla-Acevedo (2009) found that workplace conditions (e.g., administrative support, financial support, paperwork, and stress) impacted the decision. In Dupriez et al.'s (2016) study of teacher turnover and the reasons beginning teachers leave, job conditions and teacher qualifications were predictive variables; being under-qualified and lacking qualifications made it difficult to handle job conditions. Even teachers with additional qualifications (e.g., graduate degrees) were likely to leave, owing to environmental challenges like weak school cultures and problems with teaching.

A supportive, caring school culture is crucial for teacher resilience (Ryan, 2020; Tait, 2008; Yost, 2006). Malloy and Allen's (2007) research at a rural elementary school with high teacher retention was conducted to determine whether culture and practice can impact teacher resilience. Environments with high expectations, clear administrative goals, meaningful participation of teachers in decision-making, and collaboration among teachers all influenced teacher resilience and retention.

Developing teacher resilience and perseverance through a strong community of

practice, purpose, attention, opportunities, respect, and PD are supported in research. These factors were referenced by satisfied teachers in Australia whose reasons for staying included having opportunities to implement their ideas collaboratively, partake in decision-making, and experience PD and interaction; also important was having classroom control and proficiency (Whipp & Salin, 2018).

In support of these outcomes, US-based veteran teachers gave seven reasons for staying: purpose in teaching, positive relationships, passion for teaching, supportive school culture, passion for curricular content, accommodating work schedule, and no other opportunities available (Authors, 2020). Le Cornu (2013) advised principals to find ways for teachers to collaborate and experience professional learning communities (PLCs). Supportive collegial relationships are essential for developing and sustaining teacher resilience (Mansfield et al., 2016; Nydoye et al., 2010).

Evidently, support from school leaders substantially influences teachers' career decisions. Studying their intentions to stay or leave North Carolina charter schools, Nydoye et al. (2010) examined school leadership and teacher empowerment. School leadership proved to be a strong predictor of teachers' retention. Empowerment, a critical component in administrator support of teachers, played a role in whether they remained. Teachers also expressed the need for a support system and collaborative problem-solving.

Empowering teachers as leaders and participatory decision makers can increase a culture's resilience. Boyd et al. (2011) found that teachers who felt they had influence over school policy, administration, staff relations, student behavior, facilities, and safety were much more likely to stay. These outcomes

were echoed in Glazer's (2018) study of experienced teachers who left teaching despite having made major contributions.

Teachers who had little control over curriculum and test results, and felt a lack of agency, were more inclined to leave. Teacher autonomy and having influence and some control in the school help facilitate resilience within cultures perceived as supportive (Nydoye et al., 2010). Factors that teachers could not control—working conditions and administrative support—had significance in Sedivy-Benton and Boden-McGill's (2012) study, indicating that these areas of leadership do affect their retention.

To illustrate, teacher compensation impacts working conditions and teacher morale and retention. In one study, teachers mostly responded that they would stay in the profession until retirement or inability to do the job (Sedivy-Benton & Boden-McGill, 2012).

The higher the salary, the more likely they were to remain. In Texas, the more teachers were paid, the lower the turnover; in California, the probability of attracting highly qualified teachers to underperforming schools and retaining them with an incentive increased by 28% (Garcia et al., 2009). Struggling schools depend on reward structures to impact retention.

Teacher stress and burnout
Around 25% of teachers burn out in their first year (Fitchett et al., 2018). Feeling exhausted, they can lack a sense of personal accomplishment (Grayson & Alvarez, 2008).

Resilience can act as a buffer against distress and burnout, and contribute to wellness and positive relationships: "Teachers who develop higher levels of resilience feel less emotionally drained, derive a greater sense of satisfaction from their work, and can interact positively with others" (Richards et al., 2016, p. 530). Pretsch et al. (2012) also found that resilience can predict well-being in teachers above and beyond a vulnerability to stress and negative affectivity. Resilience, specifically intrinsic factors (e.g., motivation and self-efficacy), contributed to health perception and reduced perceived stress among the teachers they studied.

When teachers overcome extreme hardships (e.g., excessive workload, resource deprivation, weak administrative support, or poor compensation), they develop resilience and the capacity to excel (Boyd et al., 2011; Dupriez et al., 2016; Kukla-Acevedo, 2009; Sedivy-Benton & Boden-McGill, 2012). To offset problems that worsen working conditions, resilient teachers use various strategies (Castro et al., 2010).

Strategies that cultivate resilience
Critical thinking, problem-solving, help-seeking, induction, coaching, collaboration, self-regulation, relationship management, PD, PLCs, rejuvenation, and culture building are all resilience strategies benefitting teachers (Castro et al., 2010). Other teacher resilience strategies are acting from core values and focusing on student learning and interaction. Teachers who initiate advancing their skills and improving their cultures demonstrate resilience, possibly modeling it (Patterson et al., 2004).

To effectively support these strategies, goals are set. For example, coaching supports resilience just as do PLCs. To develop organizational resilience, teachers need support groups, a safe atmosphere, and targeted coaching or PD. Opportunities should facilitate participation in communities, networks, and leadership (Yonezawa et al., 2011).

Generally, PLCs address teacher development and student attainment; PD accounts for educators' interests (e.g., collective resilience in the wake of pandemics) and tenacious school problems (e.g., student dropout and re-engagement; Patterson et al., 2004).

Realities of teaching that impede novice teachers' adaptation must be made known to preservice teachers (Fontaine et al., 2012). Prevailing contextual factors of schooling that affect teacher self-efficacy and morale include poor working conditions, difficult work assignments, little administrative support, and lack of compensation (Curtis, 2012).

In their preparatory programs, teacher candidates must also learn about strategies that cultivate resilience. Gains can be realized from opportunities for resilience comprehension and development that build courage, teach skills and attitudes, provide helpful supports, cultivate quality relationships, and facilitate specific roles for preservice teachers and coaches (Mansfield et al., 2016).

Outcomes associated with resilience
Resilience predicts teacher morale, success, and other outcomes (Pretsch et al., 2012). In fact, resilience is associated with "numerous positive outcomes for teachers including job satisfaction, commitment, efficacy, motivation, well-being and positive sense of identity" (Mansfield & Beltman, 2019, p. 583).

Learning how to "bounce back" from challenging experiences, teachers gain insight and empowerment. They can even have a positive effect on weak school cultures (Allensworth et al., 2009; Perrachione et al., 2008).

Implications for Practice
Attending to factors of resilience can help teachers become more capable of overcoming adversity. School district leaders who encourage teacher resilience are on the way to developing resilient cultures. **Understanding that the pandemic may impact resilience, administrators can benefit from research-informed practices.** *Fundamentally, it must be* **recognized that a school's culture is everyone's responsibility, not solely the principals or other leaders.** By reviewing factors of teacher resilience, leaders will be better equipped to implement effective strategies and programming for encouraging resilience, enhancing satisfaction, and improving teacher retention (Fontaine et al., 2012; Yonezawa et al., 2011).

Advisable strategies follow, with actionable steps from research on school culture and leadership (*Louis & Murphy, 2017;* Mansfield et al., 2012, 2016). Effective school leadership:

- *Demonstrates supportive administration*: communicates a clear school vision through policy and procedures; recognizes teachers' hard work, initiative, and achievement; talks with teachers and discusses issues; makes decisions fairly; effectively uses PD time.
- *Streamlines teachers' workload*: effectively utilizes technology; reviews feedback and grading practices; makes collaborative planning efficient and appropriately uses resources; reviews data collection and management systems; efficiently communicates; considers workload implications as jobs and duties change; and monitors the work.

- *Creates a positive collegial school culture*: **demonstrates inclusive and collaborative leadership in a variety of ways (e.g.,** makes supports available within the school, and facilitates "relational resilience" so teachers and administrators are mutually supportive and trusting). Supports team building, PD, induction, coaching, buddy systems, and networking; collaboratively plans curriculum, etc.; and identifies resilient teachers.

Elected officials would be wise to provide (more) funding for programming (e.g., coaching) that supports school district leaders' initiatives for schoolwide collaboration. Outside support may not materialize, but school leaders can create those programs with their internal resources. Developing teacher resilience has greater urgency now due to the evolving model of PK–12 education in response to COVID-19.

With the sudden move to distance education, education leaders can generate internal resources by restructuring budgets to accommodate teacher PD. Funds for additional personnel, stipends, and training are warranted so teacher coaches do not burn out, but leaders must commit regardless of outside support.

Coaching should be a rewarding experience for coaches and coachees alike that improves school culture. For effective, high-quality coaching to transpire, more personnel may be warranted to reduce teacher workload. Novice teachers can be paired with a coach for a sustained period. By moderating teachers' workload, new teachers ease into the profession, gradually absorb the work, and learn how to manage their classrooms.

The veteran teachers we previously interviewed (Authors, 2020) indicated that their teacher preparation program lacked sufficient direct classroom experiences (also, Curtis, 2012; Fontaine et al., 2012).

Education leaders could reduce the initial requirements for obtaining a teaching license to allow teachers to complete the requirements needed to enter the classroom. Apprenticeships could be developed that enable teacher graduates to have quality experiences in the same school that may employ them.

Table 3 offers an action-based framework for fostering a climate of resilience, including recruiting and hiring, re-culturing, coaching, and professional learning.

Each action is delineated relative to steps and one of the four resilience dimensions; e.g., *professional learning* (the fourth *action* listed) involves a schoolwide PD on developing *professional* resilience, and so forth.

Table 3

Action-based Framework

Action	Professional	Social	Motivational	Emotional
Recruiting and hiring	Hire teachers that are organized, reflective, and passionate about students and their content. Design interview questions to evaluate those characteristics.	Seek teachers that enjoy working with others and are relational, good communicators. Design interview questions to evaluate those characteristics.	Hire teachers that are self-motivated and view teaching as purposeful or a calling. Design interview questions to evaluate those characteristics.	Seek teachers who have displayed an ability to persevere through challenges or bounce back from failure. Design interview questions to evaluate those characteristics.
Reculturing	Support teachers with resources they need to be effective in the classroom. Reduce teachers' workload by not overloading tasks that are not essential or beneficial to student learning.	Provide teachers time each day for communicating with colleagues. Hold social gatherings before or after school to allow camaraderie to develop.	Recognize teacher strengths and successes. Provide support with student discipline and parental concerns by establishing clear expectations.	Maintain an open-door policy for teachers. Provide teachers with strong coaches and opportunities to collaborate. Display empathy and know the demands on teachers.
Coaching	Teacher coaches communicate school culture, expectations, policies and procedures. They give feedback on lesson plans and delivery, and classroom management.	Teacher coaches observe their coachee and are observed by the coachee (peer coaching). They meet to discuss strategies that improve planning, management, and instruction.	Teacher coaches work to develop coachees' strengths. They empower them to make decisions and offer constructive feedback. In the face of challenges, they provide helpful guidance.	Coaches support their coachees' communication with families. They advocate for them and assist in the struggle to adapt, and bounce back from failure, by applying coping strategies.
Professional learning	Division or schoolwide PD should take place to share information everyone needs. Social justice-oriented PDs raise awareness of such issues as implicit teacher racial bias.	Time should be assigned for community groups to discuss challenges and ways to improve. Building camaraderie among staff is a goal, as is developing collective resilience.	Teachers should be allowed to attend or design PD that they find pertinent so they can focus on improving and developing resilience. District leaders may steer the learning focus.	PD should be implemented for protecting mental health, handling adversity, communicating with parents and dealing with difficult ones, and maintaining work–life balance.

Conclusion

Veteran teacher resilience and retention are understudied, and the literature depends on small sample sizes. A compensatory move of our review process was to consider teacher resilience and retention more generally.

Most teacher resilience literature is from teacher educators, so we encourage more contributions from EDL/EDA. EDL/EDA researchers do study school cultures and dynamics that shape "healthy" and "productive" environments (e.g., Louis & Murphy, 2017; Ryan, 2020), so we urge consideration of teacher resilience as a crucial factor.

Individual and organizational resilience is extremely topical given pandemic-induced systemic disruption.

To this end, we have reviewed literature that examines resilience and actions for developing teacher resilience and resilient school cultures. The latter was satisfied through the generation of a framework for leaders to consult on behalf of their jurisdictions, such as personnel actions for strengthening teacher resilience.

For this review, we used teacher resilience research to advance thought and action in and beyond "this moment of COVID-19" (Mitchell, 2020, p. 4). Teachers can benefit from being mindful of factors of resilience and increasing their ability to deal with, and learn from, hardship, applying what they know to guide others.

School leaders who embolden teacher resilience can cultivate adaptation in systems not limited to individual teachers and idiosyncratic or reactive situations. Understanding that the pandemic is likely affecting levels of resilience, leaders can utilize research to adapt their cultures.

Finally, we encourage readers to utilize the research-based practices that make sense in their own settings for developing people and cultures that support resilience.

We undertook this study hoping it would offer insight to those seeking to invest in resilience—there is no time like the present. Retaining good teachers so they can cultivate 21st-century learning in schools that model resilience for children is something all citizens need to take seriously.

Author Biographies

Carol Mullen is professor of educational leadership at Virginia Tech. A Fulbright Scholar alumnus, she has served as president of ICPEL and is president-elect of the Society of Professors of Education. Her doctorate is from the University of Toronto/OISE. E-mail: camullen@vt.edu

Lee Brantley Shields is an administrator at Rustburg High School in Virginia. He was a physical education teacher at two high schools before moving into administration and serving as a school leader. His doctorate is from Virginia Tech. E-mail: lee79@vt.edu

Christopher Tienken is associate professor of educational leadership, management, and policy at Seton Hall University. He is editor of the Kappa Delta Pi *Record* and a former visiting professor at two universities in Italy. E-mail: christopher.tienken@shu.edu

References

Ainsworth, S., & Oldfield, J. (2019), Quantifying teacher resilience: Context matters. *Teaching* and *Teacher Education*, *82*, 117–128.

Allensworth, E., Ponisciak, S., & Mazzeo, C. (2009). The schools teachers leave: Teacher mobility in Chicago public schools. *Consortium on Chicago School Research*. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED505882

Authors. (2020).

Bennett, S. V., Brown, J. J., Kirby-Smith, A., & Severson, B. (2013). Influences of the heart: Novice and experienced teachers remaining in the field. *Teacher Development*, *17*(4), 562–576.

Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Ing, M., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2011). The influence of school administrators on teacher retention decisions. *American Educational Research Journal, 48*(2), 303–333.

Castro, A. J., Kelly, J., & Shih, M. (2010). Resilience strategies for new teachers in high-needs areas. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(3), 622–629.

Chiong, C., Menzies, L., & Parameshwaran, M. (2017). Why do long-serving teachers stay in the teaching profession? Analyzing the motivations of teachers with 10 or more years' experience in England. *British Educational Research Journal*, *43*(6), 1083–1110.

Curtis, C. (2012). Why do they choose to teach and why do they leave? A study of middle school and high school mathematics teachers. *Education, 132*(4), 779–788.

Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*, *13*, 215–246.

Dupriez, V., Delvaux, B., & Lothaire, S. (2016). Teacher shortage and attrition: Why do they leave? *British Educational Research Journal*, *42*(1), 21–39.

Fitchett, P. G., McCarthy, C. J., Lambert, R. G., & Boyle, L. (2018). An examination of US first-year teachers' risk for occupational stress: Associations with professional preparation and occupational health. *Teachers and Teaching*, *24*, 99–118.

Fontaine, S., Kane, R., Duquette, O., & Savoie-Zajc, L. (2012). New teachers' career intentions: Factors influencing new teachers' decisions to stay or to leave the profession. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 57*(4), 379–408.

Garcia, C. M., Slate, J. R., & Delgado, C. T. (2009). Salary and ranking and teacher turnover: A statewide study. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership*, *4*(1–11), 1–8.

Glazer, J. (2018). Learning from those who no longer teach: Viewing teacher attrition through a resistance lens. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, *74*, 62–71.

Grayson, J., & Alvarez, H. (2008). School climate factors relating to teacher burnout: A mediator model. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 1349–1363.

Gu, Q., & Day, C. (2013). Challenges to teacher resilience: Conditions count. *British Educational Research Journal*, *39*(1), 22–44.

Hong, J. Y. (2012). Why do some beginning teachers leave the school, and others stay? Understanding teacher resilience through psychological lenses. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *18*(4), 417–440.

Kukla-Acevedo, S. (2009). Leavers, movers, and stayers: The role of workplace conditions in teacher mobility decisions. *Journal of Educational Research*, *102*(6), 443–452.

Le Cornu, R. (2013). Building early career teacher resilience: The role of relationships. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *38*(4), 1–16.

Levine, A. C. (2013). The sustaining power of hope: Perspectives of public school teachers. *Research in the Schools, 20*(1), 57–75.

Louis, K., & Murphy, J. (2017). Trust, caring and organizational learning: The leader's role. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *55*(1), 103–126.

Malloy, W. W., & Allen, T. (2007). Teacher retention in a teacher resiliency-building rural school. *Rural Educator*, *28*(2), 19–27.

Mansfield, C. F., & Beltman, S. (2019). Promoting resilience for teachers: Pre-service and in-service professional learning. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 46*(4), 583–588.

Mansfield, C. F., Beltman, S., Broadley, T., & Weatherby-Fell, N. (2016). Building resilience in teacher education: An evidenced informed framework. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, *54*, 77–87.

Mansfield, C. F., Beltman, S., Price, A. E., & McConney, A. (2012). "Don't sweat the small stuff": Understanding teacher resilience at the chalk face. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*(3), 357–367.

Martin, D. B. (2016). *A look at grit: Teachers who teach students with severe disabilities.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Brandman University, Irvine, CA. https://digitalcommons.brandman.edu/edd_dissertations/59

Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *The American Psychologist, 56*(3), 227–238.

Mitchell, K. (2020). A consideration of time in our COVID-19 moment. [Editorial]. *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice, 17*(2), 4–5. https://www.aasa.org/uploadedfiles/publications/jspsummer2020.final.v2.pdf

Patterson, J. H., Collins, L., & Abbott, G. (2004). A study of teacher resilience in urban schools. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, *31*(1), 3–11.

Perrachione, B. A., Rosser, V. J., & Petersen, G. J. (2008). Why do they stay? Elementary teachers' perceptions of job satisfaction and retention. *Professional Educator*, *32*(2), 1–17. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ862759

Polidore, E., Edmonson, S. L., & Slate, J. R. (2010). Teaching experiences of African American educators in the rural south. *The Qualitative Report, 15*(3), 568–599. https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol15/iss3/6

Pretsch, J., Flunger, B., & Schmitt, M. (2012). Resilience predicts well-being in teachers, but not in non-teaching employees. *Social Psychology of Education, 15*(3), 321–336.

Qarni, A., & Pianta, R. (2018). *Opinion: Stemming the tide of teacher turnover in Virginia*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/stemming-the-tide-of-teacher-turnover-in-virginia/2018/12/28/6757e1a6-07d0-11e9-a3f0-71c95106d96a_story.html

Richards, K., Levesque-Bristol, C., Templin, T., & Graber, K. (2016). The impact of resilience on role stressors and burnout in elementary and secondary teachers. *Social Psychology of Education*, *19*(3), 511–536.

Ryan, A. (2020). Conceptualizing a pedagogy of wellness for rural district leadership: Leading, healing, and leading self-healing. *Journal of Educational Administration.* https://doi.org/10.1108/jea-06-2019-0100.

Sedivy-Benton, A. L., & Boden-McGill, C. J. (2012). Unpacking the effects: Identifying school and teacher factors and their influence on teachers' intentions to stay or leave the profession. *Research in the Schools*, *19*(2), 75–89.

Taylor, J. L. (2013). The power of resilience: A theoretical model to empower, encourage and retain teachers. *The Qualitative Report, 18*(70), 1–25. http://www.nova.edu/ssss/qr/qr18/taylor70.pdf

Tait, M. (2008). Resilience as a contributor to novice teacher success, commitment, and retention. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *35*(4), 57–75.

Towers, E. M. (2017). *'Stayers': A qualitative study exploring why teachers and headteachers stay in challenging London primary schools.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). King's College London, London, England. https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.lib.vt.edu/pqdtglobal/docview/1937402595/947c2f42c25e4a78pq/1?accountid=14826.

Walker, A. D. (2004). *A case study of why teachers choose to remain in one urban school district.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA. https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.lib.vt.edu/pqdtglobal/docview/305105020/ 7fbd8a987fc84ca8pq/1?accountid=14826.

Whipp, P. R., & Salin, K. (2018). Physical education teachers in Australia: Why do they stay? *Social Psychology of Education: An International Journal*, *21*(4), 897–914.

Yonezawa, S., Jones, M., & Singer, N. R. (2011). Teacher resilience in urban schools: The importance of technical knowledge, professional community, and leadership opportunities. *Urban Education*, *46*(5), 913–931.

Yost, D. (2006). Reflection and self-efficacy: Enhancing the retention of qualified teachers from a teacher education perspective. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *33*(4), 59–76.

Incentivizing Equality Through Educational Expenditures

Roger P. Catania, PhD
Superintendent of Schools
Lake Placid Central School District
Saranac Lake, NY

Abstract

School district business practices are rarely examined for their impact on the school's educational mission. However, institutional purchasing brings school districts into direct contact with corporate partners whose employment practices contradict the school's mission for equity, mobility, and social equality. Too often districts fail to question their support for narrow business interests, and even less frequently do school systems challenge corporate practices that preserve the inequitable barriers facing families and the children schools serve. This article shines a spotlight on the ways that school districts—perhaps unintentionally—contribute to a system of social and economic inequality, and proposes that private companies wishing to do business with schools first demonstrate a commitment to employment practices centered on equitable salaries and benefits. Such a standard will favor business partnerships that support the overall educational mission, and will make a powerful statement supporting families, children, and society at large.

Key Words

Economic inequality, social equality, purchasing, expenditures, corporate accountability, educational mission, employment practices, business partners

Every day the emails come, one after another. Purchase the latest reading curriculum. Sign on to our virtual coaching. Check out our great deal on laptops and tablets. And now in the age of the coronavirus, the push continues. Buy our facemasks, our Plexiglas dividers, our virtual graduation systems, and our online mental health curriculum. We examine our budgets, complete our purchase orders, and pay our bills.

At the least, these insistent marketing practices can be a grating source of irritation and discontent for educators (National Superintendent's Roundtable, 2020). But that doesn't keep schools from buying. In 2017 schools spent over $10 billion on new equipment alone, making them important and welcome customers for private companies (Corman et al., 2020).

It seems that schools are good for business. However, business practices are not always good for public schools and the children and families that we serve. It's time for our public institutions to acknowledge and respond to this clash of interests. The benefit of doing so will extend beyond schools to society at large.

Conflict of Interest: Social Justice vs. Structural Inequality

School districts find themselves embroiled in a conflict of interest every day. The public school's historical mission is to serve children from all walks of life, to lower the barriers raised by inequities in wealth and privilege, and to promote a more just and equal society through education (Jefferson, 1779/1893; Mann, 1848). However, schools are also consumers, shopping with public dollars for devices, materials, textbooks, online access, services, and support offered by corporations whose goals and practices frequently contradict this mission for equality. With untroubled ease we send our checks to Apple, Frontline, Walmart, Google, Amazon, Pearson, and other wealthy corporations.

Some of these public expenditures contribute to lavish corporate campuses, multimillion-dollar salaries, and healthy investor dividends. With our help high-salaried accountants shelter those same profits, and generous political donations support a legislative agenda that preserves the United States' dubious distinction as a leader among industrialized nations when it comes to economic inequality (OECD, 2020).

School district dollars also help pay for many employed by these private companies and vendors who earn subpar wages, with minimal benefits, without security, and without the ability to support their families. These families send their children to our schools, children who too often struggle to overcome those same barriers we are hoping to lower.

We work hard to support and nurture children from poor and working-class backgrounds, but we rarely acknowledge our contribution to the structural plight that holds them back (Noah, 2010; Piketty & Saez, 2003; Reardon, 2011). It is time to put an end to that contradiction. By doing so we will provide leadership toward greater social and economic justice throughout society.

Scholars have advocated for family-friendly employment practices in private companies, pointing to the ways that income-inequality within an organization can aggravate inequality within society (Cobb, 2016; Haskins, Waldfogel, & McLanahan, 2011; Trask, 2017).

However, rarely do we examine how our public practices contribute to these inequities. Public oversight focuses narrowly

on the practices of public institutions but does not extend to our business interactions with the private sector. Taxpayers would never allow us to pay school (or municipal, or state) leaders seven figure salaries or limit support staff to starvation wages without benefits. However, when it comes to our vendors, we tend to overlook CEO compensation packages worth hundreds of times the wages of their lowest paid worker as a matter of public concern while spending public dollars that contribute to immense profits and inequitable wage gaps.

We claim to have little control over the very social and economic inequalities that shackle our poorest children from being able to succeed alongside their most privileged classmates. And yet there is still much we can do about it. We can start by rejecting the use of taxpayer dollars to purchase from or contract with private companies whose actions compromise our mission.

A New Standard for Private Partners

We need to develop a standard of equitable and family-friendly employment practices that vendors and companies must meet before schools can willingly do business with them. Companies that meet this standard would be recognized as good corporate citizens that support equality and social justice through its organizational practices, representing the best of our private companies. Children raised by the employees of family friendly companies would be more likely to get the early head start and the ongoing support needed to succeed in school and life.

In addition to the individual gains for employees of family-friendly employers (Feeney& Stritch, 2019) such a standard would serve as an instrument to promote the greater good—an objective consistent with the public-school mission.

Reducing the Wage Gap and Increasing the Minimum Wage

Schools (and hopefully other public entities) should do business only with companies that promote this common good and can provide the evidence to prove it. Such companies would need to have a wage gap that is reasonably narrow and employment practices that are family friendly.

The gap in wages within many private companies is far wider than the gap within public school districts. Nationwide, the ratio of CEO pay to the median worker in 2012 was 354 to 1 (Cobb, 2016). In my own school district, the ratio of the Superintendent's salary to the median salary during the 2019-20 school year was approximately 2.6 to 1.

(For full disclosure, I am the Superintendent, and my 2019-20 salary of approximately $134,276 represented the highest salary in the school district. The median salary was $51,402, while first-year custodians in 2019 earned $17.45 per hour for an annual salary of $34,481).

One can imagine a gap that is modestly wider in other districts, perhaps 4-to-1 or even 5-to-1. But no approved vendor should have a ratio higher than 10-to-1.

Minimum wages would need to be higher as well. To do business with school districts companies should be required to pay employees a family wage that, at the minimum, keeps families out of poverty. In 2019 *USA Today* reported Walmart's minimum wage at $11 per hour, higher than the federal minimum of $7.25 but lower than is needed to keep a family of four out of poverty and even farther beneath most school custodial salaries (Tyko, 2019). No employee should earn less than $15

per hour to start, and preferably more, regardless of skills required for the position.

Family-friendly Practices

Vendors who do business with public schools should be required to meet a number of additional family-friendly standards. Work hours at family friendly companies must be stable and predictable, not subject to daily or even weekly schedule changes. All employees at family friendly companies must have paid sick days available to them as needed to care for themselves, a child, or another member of their family—at a minimum, 10 per year.

All employees at family friendly companies must receive family health, dental, and vision insurance coverage with no more than 20% of the cost covered by each employee. Maternity and paternity leave must be available to any employee at a family friendly company, with a minimum of 6 weeks paid leave. Paid vacation days must ensure that no employee works more than 50 weeks each year. And we must ensure that no family friendly company attempts to skirt around these requirements through the use of contract labor or part-time employment.

If businesses reject such demands as being unreasonable it should be noted that these employment practices are commonplace for public sector jobs. Public sector employment practices could become the model for private companies, at least those wishing to do business with the public sector.

Responsible Tax and Accounting Practices

Corporations that promote strong families must also pay their fair share of corporate taxes. In 2018 many of the largest and most profitable Fortune 500 companies paid far less than the statutory 21% corporate tax rate, including

91—Amazon and IBM among them—that paid no federal corporate taxes at all (Gardner, M., Roque, L., & Wamhoff, S., 2019). Federal education programs like Title 1, the National School Lunch Program, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) rely on federal taxes as a main source of funding, along with other vital programs like food stamps and Medicaid that support the health and welfare of our neediest students.

While these companies use tax-avoidance mechanisms that are technically legal, school districts and other public entities would be well served by choosing not to do business with companies who make use of those mechanisms.

It may be legal for corporations to engage in profit-shifting practices—like the use of tax havens—to avoid paying corporate taxes, but that does not make it moral, ethical, or socially responsible (Saez & Zucman, 2019, pp. 67-87). By attaching social responsibility to demand for corporate products, school districts—as major customers—could help shape corporate behavior for the better.

Corporate Transparency and Accountability

Private companies wishing to do business with school districts should make their business practices public and readily accessible.

We should use all available means to shine the light of transparency on any private vendor who wishes to do business with school districts, and perhaps with all public institutions.

Doing so will allow us to favor those companies whose employment practices support our overall educational mission and to distance us from the rest—a general calculus

that should guide all public-school business decisions. But right now, public employers are far more accountable than private entities. Sunshine laws, journalists, and employee unions apply pressure to keep school districts honest about their organizational practices. All salaries and benefits are publicly approved in open session, made available in public documents and on websites, and are always open to scrutiny. Unions use collective bargaining to fight against wage and benefit reductions.

Private vendors rarely face this same scrutiny. However, school districts could apply pressure on these same private interests by mandating that all vendors reveal salaries, benefits, working conditions, tax returns, and accounting practices.

To be an approved vendor each company would need to meet a minimum standard for employment practices that are equitable and family friendly. Any override would require boards of education to approve exceptions in a public vote. Professional associations like the School Superintendents Association (AASA), or the National School Boards Association (NSBA), utilizing their collective power, could play a central role identifying those vendors who meet the standard and apply pressure to those who don't.

We could invite unions like the National Education Association (NEA), the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), and the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) to support such an effort. Working together districts, professional associations, and unions would speak loudly with one voice to the nation at large. Ultimately, such a statement would benefit children and support our educational mission.

Conclusion: Reconnecting Educational Reform with Social Reform

Establishing a new standard of social responsibility for doing business with school districts would allow public schools to reconnect educational reform efforts with a wider social reform movement.

Despite our most optimistic beliefs, it is too often the case that children who live with poverty, instability, and insecurity are unable to achieve their hopes and dreams (Isaacs, Sawhill, & Haskins, 2008). Public education has as much to gain from improving the lives of families and children outside of school as it does from revamping institutional practices within schools and classrooms.

Previous educational reform efforts have taken a hands-off attitude when it comes to social inequities existing outside of the schoolhouse doors, opting instead to look within—at learning standards, testing, teacher evaluations, and other pedagogical strategies—and to hold schools accountable for academic gains. After dominating the educational reform agenda for the past twenty years, the school accountability movement has been relatively ineffective.

Meanwhile, nobody has held our corporate partners equally accountable. It is time for the public-school community to speak out against the structure of social and economic inequality that burdens our families and keeps students from achieving their dreams.

A new standard of social responsibility for doing business with school districts would bring a new focus to educational reform efforts. We can no longer ignore the harmful impact of social inequities on teaching, learning, and the

lives of our children. As we are invited to reimagine education in a post-pandemic environment, we must be willing to consider ways that public institutions can impact an environment in which social and economic inequality prevents children from advancing in life.

Demanding that we only do business with corporations whose employment and organizational practices favor a better life for all citizens is not asking too much. Favorable business and employment practices would help parents be better parents and children become successful learners. By taking this stand school districts would be making a powerful statement in support of families and children.

Such a statement would send the right message about the kind of society we wish to be by investing our hopes, dreams, and resources in children, families, and the institutions—private and public—that support them.

Author Biography

Roger Catania is the superintendent of schools for the Lake Placid School District in upstate NY. His scholarly interests include examining important questions regarding educational purpose, pedagogical innovation, school reform, and social reform. His scholarship in social foundations of education and his professional background as a teacher, school counselor, school leader, and college instructor all inform his work, helping him to consider the ways theory meets practice and past meets present (and future). Email: rcatania@lakeplacidcsd.net

References

Cobb, J. (2016). How firms shape income inequality: Stakeholder power, executive decision making, and the structuring of employment relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, *41*(2), 324-348.

Cornman, S. Q., Zhou, L., Ampadu, O., Hanak, K., Howell, M. R., & Wheeler, S. (2020). Revenues and expenditures for public elementary and secondary school districts: FY 17. Finance Tables. NCES 2020-303. *National Center for Education Statistics*.

Feeney, M. K., & Stritch, J. M. (2019). Family-friendly policies, gender, and work–life balance in the public sector. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *39*(3), 422-448.

Gardner, M., Roque, L., & Wamhoff, S. (2019). *Corporate tax avoidance in the first year of the Trump tax law*. Institute on Taxation & Economic Policy. https://itep.sfo2.digitaloceanspaces.com/121619-ITEP-Corporate-Tax-Avoidance-in-the-First-Year-of-the-Trump-Tax-Law.pdf

Haskins, R., Waldfogel, J., & McLanahan, S. (2011). *Work-family conflict: Look to employers and communities for solutions*. Princeton-Brookings. https://www.brookings.edu/wpcontent/uploads/2016/06/1005_work_family_haskins.pdf

Isaacs, J. B., Sawhill, I. V., & Haskins, R. (2008). *Getting ahead or losing ground: Economic mobility in America. Brookings Institution*.

Jefferson, T. (1779/1893). A bill for the more general diffusion of knowledge, 1779. *American Educational Thought: Essays From 1640-1940*, 41-48.

Mann, H. (1848). Twelfth annual report to the Massachusetts Board of Education. *The Republic and the school: Horace Mann and the education of free men*.

National Superintendent's Roundtable (2020). Research Brief: Just Stop It! http://www.superintendentsforum.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Just-Stop-It.pdf . (Accessed on 29 May 2020).

Noah, T. (2010). "The great divergence: What's causing America's growing income inequality? *Slate*, 3. https://img.slate.com/media/3/100914_NoahT_GreatDivergence.pdf

OECD (2020), Income inequality (indicator). https://data.oecd.org/inequality/income-inequality.htm (Accessed on 24 May 2020).

Piketty, T., & Saez, E. (2003). Income inequality in the United States, 1913–1998. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *118*(1), 1-41.

Reardon, S. F. (2011). The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor: New evidence and possible explanations. *Whither opportunity*, *1*(1), 91-116.

Saez, E., & Zucman, G. (2019). *The triumph of injustice: How the rich dodge taxes and how to make them pay*. WW Norton & Company.

Trask, B. S. (2017). *Alleviating the stress on working families: Promoting family-friendly workplace policies*. National Council of Family Relations. https://www.ncfr.org/sites/default/files/2017-01/ncfr_policy_brief_january_2017.pdf

Tyko, K. (2019, May 8) *USA Today,* May 8, 2019. Walmart managers take home an average of $175,000 a year. How much do their workers make? https://www.usatoday.com/story/money/2019/05/08/walmart-wages-what-do-walmart-managers-and-hourly-workers-make/1147546001/

Sustaining Complex Reforms: An Investigation of Organizational Routines in Community Schools

Linda K. Mayger, EdD
Assistant Professor
Educational Administration and Secondary Education
School of Education
The College of New Jersey
Ewing, NJ

Abstract

Many school improvement initiatives die out, are implemented superficially, or fail to improve student learning. Drawing from the literature on sustainability and organizational routines, this comparative case study examines the role organizational routines played in fostering stability and improvement in three well-established community schools. Data collection was conducted over three years and included time studies, interviews, and document review. The findings indicated that four organizational routines—leadership meetings, partnership alignment plans, quarterly data reports, and professional development—constituted a system that fostered shared responsibility, organizational capacity, commitment of resources, and collective action. The results highlight the importance of developing systems and structures that routinize beneficial norms, while also acknowledging the limits of organizational routines in prescribing individual behavior.

Key Words

sustainability, school improvement, school reform, organizational routines, community schools

Sustainable school improvement is difficult to achieve, especially in low-performing schools (Gross, Booker, & Goldhaber, 2009; Meyers & Smylie, 2017). Instead of spreading throughout an organization and persisting over time, many school improvement initiatives are implemented superficially or die out, having made little impact on students (Cuban & Usdan, 2003; Datnow, 2005). Failed school improvements are costly in terms of time and resources and contribute to a negative school culture, as teachers may become cynical and disillusioned when repeatedly compelled to adopt practices that are later abandoned (Brooks, Hughes, & Brooks, 2008; Hargreaves & Goodson, 2006).

The purpose of this comparative case study was to investigate how organizational routines facilitated the sustainability of a complex school reform model. Organizational routines are the processes that structure people's work and can foster both change and stability in schools (Feldman & Pentland, 2003). While the current study uses routines to illuminate sustainability in community schools, prior studies have explained school operations by investigating organizational routines such as instructional rounds (Hatch, Hill, & Roegman, 2016) and data teams (Hubers, Schildkamp, Poortman, & Pieters, 2017; Kallemeyn, 2014).

Community schools are an ideal venue for the current investigation because the community school model is a complex and flexible strategy that can be challenging to develop and maintain (Jacobson, 2016; Lawson & van Veen, 2016). Community schools provide an array of programs and supports tailored to the demonstrated needs of students and their families by capitalizing on community assets and building interdependent partner networks (Blank, Melville, & Shah, 2003; Dryfoos, 2005). Community schools typically share four characteristics: (a) integrated student supports, (b) expanded learning opportunities, (c) family and community engagement, and (d) collaborative leadership and practice (Maier, Daniel, Oakes, & Lam, 2017).

The community school model focuses on the whole child and seeks multifaceted, systemic solutions that reach beyond school walls, therefore stakeholders must hold broad conceptions about what a school is and does (Lawson & van Veen, 2016). However, researchers have found that school leaders have at times struggled to move beyond superficially implementing the structural aspects of the community school model and thus have failed to sufficiently develop the normative aspects required for intensive, interdependent collaboration (Adams, 2019; Adams & Jean-Marie, 2010; de Royston & Madkins, 2019).

The research question that anchored this inquiry was: How did organizational routines facilitate continuity and improvement in community schools? This work is situated in Curry's (1992) theory of institutionalization, which involves structural, cultural, and behavioral elements that are described in greater detail in the next section.

After using the literature to compile a theoretical framework of the factors that facilitate sustainability in community schools, I then applied the framework to identify four key organizational routines that contributed to sustaining the initiative in three focal schools. The findings revealed the importance of developing structures that routinize constructive norms rather than depending on individual actors to behave in beneficial ways. This paper closes with a discussion of the findings' implications in terms of sustaining

school improvement initiatives and the utility of organizational routines.

Organizational Routines

Organizational routines are repeated collective behaviors with two aspects. The ostensive aspect is a formal or informal "script" that provides guidance on how a social process is conducted. The performative aspect of the routine is the enactment of the script in a particular time and place (Feldman & Pentland, 2003). Routines reveal shared expectations and norms for behavior, thus shaping and expressing organizational culture (Nelson & Winter, 1984).

Organizational routines promote stability by fostering consistency in behavior (Sherer & Spillane, 2011). By signaling the way things are supposed to work in an organization, routines mitigate the need for each individual to reinvent how to conduct repeated activities (Hansen & Vogel, 2011). Moreover, when desired norms are embedded in the script of a routine, they are more likely to persist (Spillane et al., 2011). In one example, an instructional rounds routine promoted a common language and shared understandings about teaching and learning across a school district by involving administrators in collective classroom visits followed by reflection and feedback (Hatch et al., 2016).

Routines also can support organizational improvement. Some routines, such as data analysis protocols, are explicitly designed to serve as mechanisms for collective learning (Hargreaves & Goodson, 2006; Spillane et al., 2011). Leaders can also promote organizational improvement by creating or modifying routines, as exemplified by the principals who used grade-level meeting

routines to facilitate instructional transparency (Sherer & Spillane, 2011; Spillane et al., 2011).

Despite the usefulness of routines to organize behavior, their potential to prescribe individual actions is limited (Sherer & Spillane, 2011). First, it would be unmanageable to develop an ostensive script with enough detail to standardize every element of a social process. Second, individuals, based on contextual and personal factors, will vary in how closely they adhere to a routine's script, regardless of its detail (Feldman & Pentland, 2003; Hansen & Vogel, 2011). Hubers et al. (2017), for example, found teachers in Dutch secondary schools unsuccessful in using data use routines to promote school improvement. The authors attributed the superficial implementation to the routine's vague ostensive elements and insufficient teacher capacity to effectively enact the routine, thus suggesting design an enactment of organizational routines have a role to play in the sustainability of school reforms.

Sustainability

Sustainability represents only one potential outcome once an innovation has been introduced into an organization (Curry, 1992; Hargreaves & Goodson, 2006). Other possible results include (a) rejection; (b) superficial adoption with little influence on organizational functions; and (c) acceptance by an isolated segment of the organization. To develop a theoretical framework of the factors that contributed to the community school model spreading throughout a school and persisting over time, I organized the information found in the community school literature by the *structural*, *cultural*, and *behavioral* levels of implementation offered by Curry (1992). The results are illustrated in Table 1 and described in the following paragraphs.

Table 1

Factors Related to Sustaining the Community School Model

Structural
Organizational continuity
Consistent and sufficient funding
Dedicated time
Personnel with expertise
Explicit goals
Interconnected partner network
Cultural
Interpersonal trust across stakeholders
Internal and external legitimacy
Shared language, norms, and expectations
Shared vision
Collective responsibility for students
Focus on student, family, and community needs
Behavioral
Actions aligned to goals and vision
Evidence of process and progress
Open, two-way communication
Collaborative leadership

Structural

At the structural level, an organization must demonstrate sufficient capacity to implement an innovation and a sustained commitment to support it over time (Curry, 1992). Lack of organizational continuity is a key threat to sustained commitment because new leaders may demonstrate a superficial commitment to pre-existing initiatives and redirect their efforts in other directions (Adams, 2019; Anderson-Butcher et al., 2017; de Royston & Madkins, 2019; Medina, Cosby, & Grim, 2019). This redirection may deny an initiative of the adequate funding, dedicated time for planning and implementation, and sufficient personnel with appropriate expertise necessary to sustain it (Adams, 2019; Anderson-Butcher et al., 2017; Galindo, Sanders, & Abel, 2017; Jean-Marie et al., 2010). Initiatives are also more likely to persist when they have explicit goals to clarify the endeavor's purpose and align actors in a common direction (Valli, Stefanski, & Jacobson, 2016). A few structural elements

are specific to community schools, such as the community school coordinator (hereafter referred to as "coordinator"), who is often employed by a school's lead partnering organization to maintain programming and the requisite network of community partners (authors, 2019, Adams & Jean-Marie, 2010; Anderson-Butcher et al., 2017; Medina et al., 2019).

Cultural
At the cultural level of sustainability, a critical mass of individuals must support the initiative and espouse its norms and values (Curry, 1992). Although it is vital for all stakeholders involved to accept the legitimacy of a school improvement, it is most critical for district and building administrators to fully understand an initiative and prioritize its integration into the schools (Adams, 2019; de Royston & Madkins, 2019; Medina et al., 2019).

Changes are most likely to take hold in organizational climates where there is strong interpersonal trust and stakeholders develop common expectations for their individual roles and responsibilities (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; FitzGerald & Quiñones, 2018; Medina et al., 2019; Sanders & Harvey, 2002). A community school requires stakeholders to subscribe to a common vision that includes collective responsibility for fostering student success and an intentional focus on equitably addressing family and community needs (Adams, 2019; de Royston & Madkins, 2019; Green, 2018; Medina et al., 2019).

Behavioral
Whereas the cultural level of sustainability involves shared responsibility, the behavioral level requires evidence of collective action. In a sustained innovation, the organization's constituent members enact the initiative's key features and work toward achieving its ends (Curry, 1992). Key features of community schools include collaborative leadership and open communication that strengthens relationships, enhances information flow, and coordinates actors across the schools' partner networks (de Royston & Madkins, 2019; FitzGerald & Quiñones, 2018; Medina et al., 2019; Sanders & Harvey, 2002).

Successfully integrated innovations track both the fidelity of implementation and the intended outcomes, as individuals are more likely to remain engaged with initiatives that provide evidence that they are producing their intended results (de Royston & Madkins, 2019; Sanders & Harvey, 2002).

Methods
This comparative case study's design included interviews, documents, and time studies collected over three years to provide information about the viewpoints, formal structures, and behaviors of community school leaders.

Setting
Three schools were purposefully selected from the same school district. Selected schools were fully implementing the community school model for at least two years at the inception of the study, as indicated in Table 2. Adams and Wilson are elementary schools, and Central (pseudonyms) is a middle school. A demographic comparison of the three schools indicated that 79% to 94% of students came from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, and 75% to 94% identified as students of color.

Table 2

Community School Characteristics, Fall 2017

	Adams	Central	Wilson
Years implemented	13	8	6
Principals (consecutive)	1	5	1
CSCs (consecutive)	5	1	1
Partners	15	19	40
Initiatives	24	39	33
Student supports	13	15	12
Expanded learning	5	11	8
Family engagement	5	7	9
Collaborative leadership	1	6	4

Participants

The study involved 11 individuals who were most able to reveal how the community school initiative was designed and organized. The participants included five principals/assistant principals and four coordinators from the three schools, reflecting frequent turnover in the coordinator and principal positions at Adams and Central, respectively.

I also interviewed United Way's strategic development coordinator, to provide the viewpoint of the coordinating community-based organization, and the school district's chief academic officer, to obtain district perspectives. Seven participants identified as female, two identified as Black, three as Hispanic, and six as White. At the close of the study, two of the school principals had over 15 years of experience, and three had 1 to 5 years of experience. The coordinators' experience levels ranged from less than 1 year to 8 years. The district and United Way administrators had been in their positions for over 7 years.

Data collection and analysis

To illuminate the schools' structures, culture, enacted behavior, and organizational routines, the design required multiple sources of data, including semi-structured interviews, documents, and time studies. The 45- to 70-minute semi-structured interviews were conducted in 2017 for the purpose of understanding the principals' and coordinators' perspectives on how their schools were implementing the community school model, their vision and goals, and their leadership challenges and successes.

The time studies used experience sampling methodology (ESM) to provide a random sample of the school leaders' typical daily activities (Fisher & To, 2012) over a period of 30 days in 2014 and 2017, which revealed how often school leaders engaged in organizational routines. Data collection also included documents that showed the ostensive aspects of the schools' organizational routines.

Data were triangulated and analyzed in an iterative process. At the first level data were coded using a priori codes from the sustainability framework and in vivo codes to represent specific organizational routines. The second phase involved matrices for comparing sustainability factors and organizational routines across sites.

To ensure the accuracy, completeness, fairness, and validity of the descriptions and conclusions, I engaged most of the participants in face-to-face follow-up discussions where I shared my findings and solicited their reactions. Yet, despite my attempts to generate trustworthy results, this study is necessarily limited by its research design, including the positionality of the participants as school leaders and the contextual features of the specific schools we studied.

Results

The analysis indicated that the schools employed four specific routines to foster the structural, cultural, and behavioral conditions beneficial for sustaining the community school model, as indicated in Table 3. The routines common to all three schools were leadership meetings, partnership alignment plans, data reports, and professional development. In the following sections, the routines are described in detail, including how they contributed to continuity and organizational improvement in the three community schools.

Table 3

Organizational Routines that Facilitated Sustainability of the Community School Model

Facilitating elements	Leadership Meetings	Alignment Plan	Data Reports	Professional Development
Structural				
Organizational continuity			■	■
Consistent and sufficient funding	■	■	■	
Dedicated time	■	■	■	■
Personnel with expertise		■		■
Explicit goals		■		
Interconnected partner network	■			
Cultural				
Interpersonal trust	■	■	■	
Internal and external legitimacy	■	■	■	
Shared norms and expectations	■	■		■
Shared vision	■	■		■
Collective responsibility	■			■
Student/family/community focus	■	■		■
Behavioral				
Actions aligned to goals	■	■	■	■
Evidence of process and progress		■	■	
Open two-way communication	■		■	
Collaborative leadership	■	■	■	

Note. Shaded cells indicate participants described the organizational routine as incorporating or supporting the element.

Leadership meetings

Leadership meetings were the most important routine and one that showed up most often in the time study data. The United Way designed two types of leadership meetings: the Core Team and the Leadership Team. Both types of meetings were designed to strategically align stakeholders, resources, and programming around common goals and a shared vision.

According to Central's coordinator, the main difference between the two teams was that the Core Team went "a little more in depth, in detail, about the nitty gritty stuff." Monthly Core Team meetings included only representatives of the four major stakeholders: school (principal and coordinator), lead partner organization, school district, and United Way. Core Team meetings focused on strategic planning, checking progress toward goals, and discussing implementation logistics.

Leadership Teams were larger than Core Teams and invited widespread participation from all stakeholders in the school community including school staff, parents, and each of the community partners. Depending on the needs of the school, Leadership Team meetings took place quarterly (Central), bimonthly (Adams), or monthly (Wilson). The purpose of the Leadership Team meetings was to facilitate an exchange of information and strengthen ties with the partners. The coordinators also used leadership meetings to reinforce community school values and norms, as Wilson's coordinator described:

> If I get new people on board, I'm able to explain the community school model … And I always make clear to them, "What I do is that we work

together collectively to make an impact. When there are challenges, we look for your advice."

The other coordinators also used leadership meetings to develop shared understandings about community schools and to reinforce collective responsibility for student success.

Although leadership meetings facilitated continuity by engaging and enculturating partners, these meetings also systematized improvement by explicitly providing a forum for collaborative problem solving. Adams' principal described their Leadership Team meetings as "very interactive."

Central's and Wilson's leaders noted how working with their partners saved their afterschool programs after both schools lost a grant that paid for their afterschool program coordinators. By mobilizing their networks at their Core Team and Leadership Team meetings, the schools found organizations that were willing to fill the gap in services and funding. Two years later, the afterschool programs had more enrichment opportunities and were serving a greater number of children than they were before.

Partnership alignment plans

Each year, the Core Teams developed a partnership alignment plan to strategically guide their work throughout the year and serve as a reference point during their meetings. In the alignment plan, the teams signaled their priorities by ranking seven community school goals, such as literacy, school and neighborhood safety, and decreasing chronic absence.

The plan's template specified quantitative baseline data to be collected for academics and attendance and provided examples of strategies aligned to each goal. Next to each goal were spaces to indicate provider names, financial information, and related programming. The partnership alignment plan created a system for clarifying expectations and aligning stakeholder actions toward shared goals.

The transparency of the process fostered partner commitment. As the United Way strategist explained:

> I've gotten phone calls from lots of United Ways that are trying to figure out how to get a corporate partner involved in the work. They just want their money, really. I'm like, well, it can't just be about their money … It really has to be about building trust and making sure everybody is driving toward the same outcome, or you will have corporate partners that are really disillusioned with the speed at which progress can actually happen in an antiquated school system.

The alignment plan also was a data-informed process for setting priorities for the school and guiding the number of strategies being implemented. The United Way strategist reasoned, "If you are prioritizing basic needs first, and you have no strategies identified for the school year ahead, then you can't say that it's your first priority, or you have a heck of a lot of work to do."

At Adams and Wilson, the alignment plan served as a roadmap for the entire school, with one set of goals guiding both the community school initiative and the schools' core programming. Conversely,

Central's current principal admitted that during its first six years the community school initiative had operated as a distinct entity within the school with separate goals and "nothing was really aligned to anything."

One of the principal's initial actions upon assuming his position was to integrate the community school model into the core work of the school by collaborating with school staff to develop a student- and community-centered vision. According to Central's coordinator, "That's when from a system level it finally seemed to come together."

Data reports

Midway through this study, the United Way developed a routine for the coordinators to submit standardized quarterly data reports, thus coordinator time use related to data went from being undetectable in 2014 to being described in multiple time-study responses for each coordinator in 2017.

The data were used at Core Team meetings to monitor impact and to reveal underperforming strategies. Data reporting fostered continuity and consistency by requiring the same data each year from each school. Notably, the data spotlighted areas in need of improvement. Central's coordinator described how data informed her actions and fostered legitimacy:

> In the quarterly reports, we are asked about students who are chronically absent. There's an attendance component, a discipline component, and then the academic component. So, I'm very determined to initiate some more programming and show a decrease in absenteeism and an increase in our academics … we need

to be showing that this model is successful.

Along with the quantitative academic and attendance data required by the United Way, the Core Teams used a meeting check-in template that provided space for schools to share qualitative impact data for each of the alignment plan goals. Qualitative information, however, was neither standardized nor required in the quarterly reports.

The United Way strategist believed that data sharing fostered partner commitment and continuity by exposing partners to the scope of the school's needs and by documenting successes. The strategist explained, **"**We've decided to be really transparent," but also admitted, "The data continues to be a challenge." After more than a decade of collaboration, the school district and the United Way were still refining the processes necessary to support data integration between the organizations.

The main barriers to data use were structural and cultural. The first structural issue was the high level of coordination required for the district and United Way to provide the coordinators with access to school databases. Because the coordinators' employers of record were the schools' lead partners, the memoranda of understanding between the United Way and the schools had to designate the coordinator as an official of the school with permission to see individual student data.

Clarification of the logistics revealed cultural differences between the organizations, as the district administrator described:

We used to have all these little nitpicky issues come up, like FERPA, and I was calling it, like, the "issue du jour." Why am I spending so much time talking to my lawyer about FERPA and if we can share data and student information with the United Way? Why is this taking four hours? It was manufactured complexity. It was on our end. We had our procedures locked down so tight. And you know what? So did they. The United Way wanted something written for everything.

After the logistical issues were resolved, another, more complicated, structural issue presented itself in the form of coordinators' lack of data expertise. Training the coordinators required a large commitment of resources. The United Way loaned personnel to the district to make the data more accessible, and the district's Information Technology department supported the coordinators in learning to use the electronic database. Because the coordinators were not educators, they also requested professional development to learn how to interpret student achievement results.

Professional development
In addition to training the coordinators to use data, the United Way held bimonthly meetings for coordinators from the regional area to keep them apprised of changing procedures, to share strategies, and to enculturate new coordinators into the community school model. These regular opportunities for professional learning fostered consistency in implementation and served as a stabilizing force across personnel transitions. The United Way also

formed optional working groups that met regularly to share strategies and information in priority areas, such as attendance, early childhood education, and literacy. This hybrid model of requirements and flexible options disseminated evidence-based practices and innovations across schools.

The professional development routines, however, lacked a means for training school principals in the community school model. The principals claimed that they learned about community schools from "sitting in a meeting, learning as you go" and "a lot of it's on you to ask questions and the people who are working with you to get you acquainted with the community school model." The United Way strategist described Core Team meetings as the place where the principals' primary orientation took place, but she admitted that it was difficult to develop principals this way:

It's one of the weaker areas, for sure, of how we've been doing things, kind of from a legitimacy standpoint. I think it's going to have to tighten up if we're going to be able to go to scale or build more capacity or be really clear about who is doing what and in what way.

Having worked with five different principals, Central's coordinator emphasized the importance of educating principals about the community school model. "I think you cannot do it without a principal that supports the model, understands the model, and supports your effort in the model."

Discussion

Considering the difficulty that schools experience in achieving lasting change, I embarked on this study to uncover organizational routines that facilitated the sustainability of a complex school improvement initiative. The analysis identified four organizational routines that constituted a system for sustaining the structural, cultural, and behavioral aspects of the community school model, despite leadership transitions at two of the schools. Leadership meetings provided space for regular collaboration and promoted a culture of collective responsibility for student success.

Partnership alignment plans served as a structure for aligning stakeholder actions and resources with shared goals. Quarterly data reports made evident the outcomes of collective action and the areas in need of improvement. Professional development increased the capacity of personnel, enabled the dissemination of program improvements, and enculturated new coordinators.

This research is significant in its use of time study data to provide a random sample of what participants actually did on a daily basis to sustain an initiative, rather than relying solely on participants' recollections or attempting to directly observe behaviors that would likely be altered by a researcher's presence. Through this work, a deeper understanding of sustaining complex educational innovations emerged.

The focal schools exemplified Datnow's (2005) observation that "sustainability does not come easily; it takes extensive time and effort" (p. 148). It took the three focal schools variable amounts of time to fully integrate the community school model into the core work of the school. While one of the focal schools achieved full integration before year three, the school with the most

turnover in principals only moved past partial adoption during its seventh year. These findings indicate that complex school reforms need to be given sufficient time to take hold and also require intentional, coordinated support for continuous incremental improvement from the district and the other organizations involved (Adams, 2019; Anderson-Butcher et al., 2017).

In selecting schools with frequent leadership turnover, this study reinforced the critical importance of developing systems and structures that routinize beneficial norms rather than leaving it up to individuals to "do the right thing."

Although there were strong routines to support new coordinators, the focal schools lacked a means to ensure new principals deeply understood the improvement initiative taking place in their schools—a gap noted by other researchers (Adams, 2019; Galindo & Sanders, 2019; Medina et al., 2019). The coordinator at the school with high principal turnover identified this lack of targeted professional development for principals as one contributing factor in the school's slower integration of the community school model.

Although I originally assumed that organizational routines are producers of organizational culture and behavior, I now believe that effective routines are also the products of beneficial organizational conditions.

This new assumption is based on the emergence and evolution of the quarterly data reporting routine. This routine required a culture of trust between partners and a belief in the legitimacy of the initiative for the school district to grant

non-school personnel access to their student databases. The technical assistance that enabled coordinators to effectively use the district data systems required a substantial investment resources as well as strong cooperation between the district and the coordinating organization.

Without these factors, it is doubtful that the routine would have developed as fully as it did. This finding suggests that implementing a successful new organizational routine requires the same planning, support, monitoring, and adjustment as other organizational change initiatives.

The existence of three sustainability levels indicates that structures alone are insufficient to institutionalize school improvements. Although this study joins other organizational researchers, such as Sherer and Spillane (2010), in declaiming organizational routines as useful tools for fostering behavioral and cultural change, the limits of routines must be acknowledged (Hubers et al., 2017).

No matter how carefully leaders design a routine's script, the manner in which participants choose to enact the routine largely determines the outcome. Thus, individuals can conduct leadership meetings without engaging in meaningful collaboration or attend professional development sessions without taking action to improve their schools.

With this in mind, I encourage school leadership preparation programs and early career mentors to help emerging school leaders recognize how to both design and use organizational routines as tools for school improvement.

Conclusion

The recipe for sustaining complex reforms includes developing organizational capacity, committing resources, sharing responsibility, and acting collectively.

As this and many other studies have demonstrated, however, widespread and lasting school improvement is slow and difficult work that requires intentional organizational design and an ongoing investment in building school culture. As one of the participants eloquently articulated:

> *You need to make sure that the people that you have involved believe in what you're doing with the model. And you need to constantly remind people why they are here. Because if you don't do that, you do the groundwork, and then, all of a sudden, everything falls apart. The real work is to sustain the model.*

Author Biography

Linda Mayger is an assistant professor and program coordinator of the educational leadership program at The College of New Jersey. Before joining the academy, she spent 20 years as a teacher, administrator, and school board member in preschool, elementary, and middle level schools in several states throughout the U.S. This laid a foundation for her teaching and research, which focus on how schools can develop systems that meet the holistic needs of each child. Her research primarily investigates organizational practices and leadership in community schools and the effects of state policies on practitioners. E-mail: maygerL@tcnj.edu

References

Adams, C. M. (2019). Sustaining full-service community schools: Lessons from the Tulsa Area Community Schools Initiative, *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR), 24*(3), 288-313. doi: 10.1080/10824669.2019.1615924

Adams, C. M., & Jean-Marie. G. (2010). A diffusion approach to study leadership reform. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *49*(4), 354–377. doi:10.1108/09578231111146452

Anderson-Butcher, D., Paluta, L., Sterling, K., & Anderson, C. (2017). Ensuring healthy youth development through community schools: A case study. *Children & Schools*, *40*(1), 7–16. doi:10.1093/cs/cdx026

authors, 2019

Blank, M. J., Melville, A., & Shah, B. P. (2003). *Making the difference: Research and practice in community schools.* Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools.

Brooks, J. S., Hughes, R. M., & Brooks, M. C. (2008). Fear and trembling in the American high school: Educational reform and teacher alienation. *Educational Policy*, *22*(1), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904807311296

Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Cuban, L., & Usdan, M. (2003). What happened in the six cities? In L. Cuban & M. Usdan (Eds.), *Powerful reforms with shallow roots: Improving America's urban schools* (pp. 147–170). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Curry, B. K. (1992). *Instituting enduring innovations: Achieving continuity of change in education.* Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Datnow, A. (2005). The sustainability of comprehensive school reform models in changing district and state contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *41*(1), 121–153. doi:10.1177/0013161X04269578

de Royston, M. M., & Madkins, T. C. (2019). A question of necessity or of equity? Full-service community schools and the (mis)education of black youth, *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR), 24*(3), 244-271, doi: 10.1080/10824669.2019.1615920

Dryfoos, J. (2005). Full-service community schools: A strategy—not a program. *New Directions for Youth Development*, *107*, 7–14.

Feldman, M. S., & Pentland, B. T. (2003). Reconceptualizing organizational routines as a source of flexibility and change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *48*, 94–118. doi:10.2307/3556620

Fisher, C. D., & To, M. L. (2012). Using experience sampling methodology in organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *33*(7), 865-877. doi:10.1002/job.1803

FitzGerald, A. M., & Quiñones, S. (2018). Working in and with community: Leading for partnerships in a community school. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 1–22. doi:10.1080/15700763.2018.1453938

Galindo, C. & Sanders, M. (2019). Final thoughts: Working towards the sustainability of full-service community schools, *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR), 24*(3), 314-319. doi: 10.1080/10824669.2019.1615919

Galindo, C., Sanders, M., & Abel, Y. (2017). Transforming educational experiences in low-income communities: A qualitative case study of social capital in a full-service community school. *American Educational Research Journal*, *54*(15), 140S–163S. doi:10.3102/0002831216676571

Green, T. L. (2018). School as community, community as school: Examining principal leadership for urban school reform and community development. *Education and Urban Society*, *50*(2), 111–135. doi:10.1177/0013124516683997

Gross, B., Booker, T. K., & Goldhaber, D. (2009). Boosting student achievement: The effect of comprehensive school reform on student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *31*(2), 111–126. doi:0.3102/0162373709333886

Hansen, N. K., & Vogel, R. (2011). Organizational routines: A review and outlook on practice-based micro-foundations. *Economics, Management & Financial Markets*, *6*(3), 86–111.

Hargreaves, A., & Goodson, I. (2006). Educational change over time? The sustainability and nonsustainability of three decades of secondary school change and continuity. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *42*(3), 3–41. doi:10.1177/0013161X05277975

Hatch, T., Hill, K., & Roegman, R. (2016). Investigating the role of instructional rounds in the development of social networks and district-wide improvement. *American Educational Research Journal*, *53*(4), 1022–1053. doi:10.3102/0002831216653205

Hubers, M. D., Schildkamp, K., Poortman, C. L., & Pieters, J. M. (2017). The quest for sustained data use: Developing organizational routines. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *67*, 509–521. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2017.07.007

Jacobson, R. (2016). *Community schools: A place-based approach to education and neighborhood change.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Jean-Marie, G., Ruffin, V., & Burr, K. (2010). Leading across boundaries: The role of community schools and cross-boundary leadership in school reform. In S. D. Horsford (Ed.), *New perspectives in educational leadership: Exploring social, political, and community contexts and meaning* (pp. 217–238) New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Kallemeyn, L. (2014). School-level organizational routines for learning: Supporting data use. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *52*(4), 529–548. doi:10.1108/JEA-02-2013-0025

Lawson, H. A., & van Veen, D. (Eds.). (2016). *Developing community schools, community learning centers, extended-service schools and multi-service schools: International exemplars for practice, policy and research*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer International.

Maier, A., Daniel, J., Oakes, J., & Lam, L. (2017). *Community schools as an effective school improvement strategy: A review of the evidence.* Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.

Medina, M. M., Cosby, G., & Grim, J. (2019). Community engagement through partnerships: lessons learned from a decade of full-service community school implementation, *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR), 24*(3), 272-287. doi: 10.1080/10824669.2019.1615923

Meyers, C. V., & Smylie, M. A. (2017). Five myths of school turnaround policy and practice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *16*(3), 502–523. doi:10.1080/15700763.2016.1270333

Nelson, R. R., & Winter, S. G. (1984). *An evolutionary theory of economic change*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sanders, M. G., & Harvey, A. (2002). Beyond the school walls: A case study of principal leadership for school-community collaboration. *Teachers College Record*, *104*(7), 1345–1368.

Sherer, J. Z., & Spillane, J. P. (2011). Constancy and change in work practice in schools: The role of organizational routines. *Teachers College Record*, *113*(3), 611–657.

Spillane, J. P., Parise, L. M., & Sherer, J. Z. (2011). Organizational routines as coupling mechanisms: Policy, school administration, and the technical core. *American Educational Research Journal*, *48*(3), 586–619. doi:10.3102/0002831210385102

Valli, L., Stefanski, A., & Jacobson, R. (2016). Typologizing school-community partnerships: A framework for analysis and action. *Urban Education*, *5*(7), 719–747. doi:10.1177/0042085914549366

An Introduction to the School Climate Measure

Keith J. Zullig, PhD
Professor
Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences
School of Public Health
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV

Molly R. Matthews-Ewald, PhD
2M Research Services, LLC
Arlington, TX

E. Scott Huebner, PhD
Professor
Department of Psychology
College of Arts and Sciences
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC

Abstract

The School Climate Measure (SCM) is a comprehensive measure of school climate that has demonstrated significant psychometric support and available free of charge. The goal of this research-informed commentary is to provide readers with necessary knowledge to make an informed decision of the appropriateness of the SCM for use in their school or district. First, we review the development of the SCM with supporting peer-reviewed research. Second, we discuss the advantages of the SCM and ease in interpretation of scores. Finally, SCM applications are reviewed along with promising future steps. We conclude that the SCM can provide a comprehensive *and* nuanced look at students' school environment perceptions, yielding valuable hypotheses about their school behavior, subjective well-being, and academic success.

Key Words

school climate, assessment, school climate measure

In 2016, approximately 50.6 million children and adolescents were enrolled in public (non-charter) elementary and secondary schools the United States (NECS, 2019). School is one of the most important locations where children and adolescents acquire social skills and experience an increased sense of autonomy and personal expression (O'Malley et al., 2015).

Moreover, because schools are places where students develop behavioral patterns that may follow into adulthood (Eccles et al., 2011; Spengler et al., 2016), it is important that their school experience is positive in order to promote optimal educational and health-related outcomes. As such, researchers continue to examine the construct of school climate to determine how a student is influenced by her or his school environment.

Broad consensus of a definition of school climate remains challenging. However, it is clear that definitions have moved away from an exclusive focus on physical environments to conceptualizing school climate as a measure of a student's subjective school experience (Cohen, 2006; Zullig et al., 2015). Specifically, school climate is "… based on patterns of people's experiences of school life and reflects norms, goals, values, interpersonal relationships, teaching and learning practices, and organizational structures" (Cohen et al. 2009, p. 182), as well as feelings of safety, including order and rules and social and emotional safety (Cohen et al., 2009).

It is also clear there remains a relative dearth of psychometrically sound measures available to assess students' perception of their school's climate. More problematic is the lack of available measures that are (a) low burden and practical to administer, (b) designed for universal assessment (i.e., all students), and (c) free or inexpensive to use. These factors are important considerations for practicing professionals with limited budgets.

Development of School Climate Measure

Given these challenges, Zullig, Koopman, Patton, and Ubbes (2010) initiated a study to review the most widely historically cited self-report (i.e., subjective) school climate measures with the goal of developing a low-burden, psychometrically sound measure that would be free to the public and designed for universal assessment.

The result of this work led to the creation of the School Climate Measure (SCM), which contained 39 items measuring eight domains of school: 1. Positive Student–Teacher Relationships (9 items), 2. School Connectedness (6 items), 3. Academic Support (6 items), 4. Order and Discipline (7 items), 5. School Physical Environment (4 items), 6. School Social Environment (2 items), 7. Perceived Exclusion/Privilege (3 items), and 8. Academic Satisfaction (2 items). All items use the same Likert response option format: (*strongly disagree* [1] … *strongly agree* [5]).

Shortly after its development, the publicly available and free-to-use SCM was included in the PhenXToolkit (see Hamilton et al., 2011, for a review) as its measure of school climate. The PhenXToolkit was funded by the National Human Genome Research Institute to compile a core set of high-quality, well-established, low-burden measures intended for use in large-scale genomic studies.

To date, the SCM has undergone five studies examining its psychometric properties which are described next. The first study was conducted with 2,049 public school students (predominately White) from Ohio (Zullig et al., 2010).

The second and third studies were conducted in partnership with the Arizona Department of Education utilizing diverse public high school samples of 21,082 students (49% were non–White Hispanic) (Zullig et al., 2014) and 1,634 (80% were non-White Hispanic), respectively. More recently, a validation study was completed on a sample of 1,128 predominantly White (79%) public middle school students in the Central Appalachian region of the United States (Daily et al., 2018).

The first study by Zullig and colleagues (2010) randomly split the sample into exploratory and confirmatory samples and subjected the two halves to factor analytic and structural equation modeling techniques. Structural equation modeling revealed that the fully correlated model was found to fit the data well in the exploratory sample: $\square^{\square}$ = 1166.78 (df = 674, $p < .0001$), CFI = .95, TLI = .94, RMSEA = .04, goodness-of-fit index (GFI) = .91.

The fully correlated factor structure was then fit to the confirmatory sample. The model also fit the data well: $\square^2$ = 1245.37 (df = 674, $p < .0001$), CFI = .95, TLI = .95, RMSEA = .04. Overall, the GFI was .91. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis results confirmed an eight-factor solution (loadings with absolute values = .40). Item factor loadings ranged from .42 to .87. Coefficient alphas ranged from .65 to .91.

The second study (Zullig et al., 2014) was a replication and extension of the Zullig et al. (2010) study (described above). In the 2014 study, confirmatory factor analysis was performed, and factor loadings ranged from .45 to .92. Structural equation models also fit the data well: $\square^2$ = 14325 (df = 293, $p < .001$), CFI = .95, TLI = .95, RMSEA = .05. In this

replication study, the GFI was .94. Coefficient alphas ranged from .82 to .93.

In addition, large effect sizes were demonstrated between the SCM constructs and U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Youth Risk Behavior Survey school safety items and self-reported grade point average (GPA), most notably between academic support and (a) weapon carrying at school ($d = .77$), (b) being threatened or injured by a weapon at school ($d = .61$), (c) feeling safe at school ($d = .66$), (d) and GPA ($f = .40$). These analyses revealed that greater perceptions of a positive school climate were significantly associated with greater (and practically important) perceptions of school safety.

The third study (Zullig et al., 2015) expanded the original 8 domains to 10 with the inclusion of an Opportunities for Student Engagement domain and a Parental Involvement domain. The rationale for including an Opportunities for Student Engagement domain was consistent with Audas and Willms' (2001) definition of engagement, which they describe as the extent in which students believe they can participate in academic and nonacademic activities freely and equally (regardless of gender) without feeling excluded or disrespected for their differences.

In addition, the domain of parental involvement in schooling has long been shown to contribute to a school's climate (e.g., Haynes, Comer, & Hamilton-Lee, 1989; Hoover-Dempsey, Bassler, & Brissie, 1987). In this study, the eight original SCM domains (Positive Student-Teacher Relationships, School Connectedness, Academic Support, Order and Discipline, Physical Environment, Social Environment, Perceived Exclusion, and Academic Satisfaction) and two newly

developed domains (Parental Involvement and Opportunities for Student Engagement) were subjected to psychometric analysis. Like the first study (Zullig et al., 2010), the sample was randomly split into exploratory and confirmatory halves and subjected to factor analytic and structural equation modeling techniques.

Factor analysis confirmed a 10-factor solution (loadings with absolute values > .40). Item factor loadings ranged from .47 to .95. Coefficient alphas ranged from .70 to .92. Fit statistics indicated a good fitting model ($\chi 2=$ 1452.67 (df = 734, p < .01), CFI = .94, TLI = .93, RMSEA = .039). This process eliminated some original SCM items, such that the overall SCM increased only from 39 to 42 items with the newly developed domains. The current, 42-item version of the SCM is included in Appendix A at the end of the article.

The fourth study (Daily et al., 2018) assessed the psychometric properties of the SCM in a public middle school student population. In this study, confirmatory factor analysis confirmed all 10 domains with loadings ranging from .66 to .90 with strong internal consistency estimates (range .79 to .93), suggesting the saturation of items fit well within the latent constructs. Overall, the factor model fit the data well $\chi^2 = 2132.5$ (774), p = < .0001), CFI =.95; TLI =.94; RMSEA =.03.

Additionally, known-groups validity analyses comparing each SCM domain against self-reported academic achievement and school contentment showed that the students who reported higher academic achievement and school contentment demonstrated higher positive perceptions of school climate. This study examining the psychometric properties of the SCM also provided evidence that extended its use to early adolescents.

Finally, a fifth study involved a demonstration of the convergent and discriminant validity of the SCM total score. Consistent with expectations, the SCM correlated significantly with measures of adolescents' school satisfaction, global life satisfaction, and health-related quality of life; however, it correlated most highly with adolescents' school satisfaction scores, and less highly with their global life satisfaction and health-related quality of life scores (Zullig, Ward, Huebner, & Daily, 2018).

SCM Advantages and Interpretation
Aside from the SCM's psychometric support, ease of use, and accessibility, a distinct advantage of its use is its breadth of domains and multidimensional nature. In short, although a unidimensional total school climate score can be computed by combining all domain items, separate scores can be computed for each domain and the 10 domains do not rely on one another for school climate assessment.

For example, as highlighted in our work with the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) with their Safe and Supportive Schools (S3) Grant, ADE personnel selected four SCM domains (Positive Student-Teacher Relationships, Academic Support, Order and Discipline, and School Physical Environment) because these aligned well with their S3 grant responsibilities (see Zullig et al., 2014 for a review). The flexibility of the SCM allows schools and school districts to pick and choose which SCM domains match their school improvement efforts best in formative and summative evaluations.

Nationally normative data for the SCM are not yet available; however, understanding student perceptions and knowing whether students agree or disagree with various statements within the domains is arguably of considerable importance. With that said, we

offer the following interpretations based on the absolute scores based on data gathered to date in Table 1. Higher mean scores within each

SCM domain indicate more positive school climate perceptions.

Table 1

Rating and Interpreting Participants' View of School Climate with the SCM

Rating Scale	Adjectival Rating	Mean Interval Scale	Verbal Interpretation and Description
5	Strongly Agree	4.20 – 5.00	Very Positive School Climate
4	Agree	3.40 – 4.19	Positive School Climate
3	Neither agree nor disagree	2.60 - 3.39	Neither Positive nor Negative School Climate
2	Disagree	1.80 – 2.59	Negative School Climate
1	Strongly Disagree	1.00 – 1.79	Very Negative School Climate

Based on the scale provided in Table 1, the data results can be interpreted as:

Very positive school climate
Participants perceive the school climate as *very positive*, indicating that they strongly agree that their school climate excellently meets the factors that make the school environment good for students.

Students feel very comfortable, safe, and valued in an environment where they can interact with trustworthy people who care for them.

Positive school climate
Participants perceive the school climate as *positive*, indicating that they agree that their school climate satisfactorily meets the factors that make the school environment good for students. Students feel comfortable, safe, and valued in an environment where they can interact with trustworthy people who care for them.

Neither positive nor negative school climate
Participants perceive the school climate as *neither positive nor negative*, indicating that they neither agree nor disagree that their school

climate meets the factors that make the school environment good for students. Mean scores near or under 3.00 in any domain may be a concern, however, and should be further evaluated to determine whether additional support for the students may be warranted.

For example, when students cannot decide whether they believe a particular domain is positive or negative, it may be an indicator that not enough is being done at the school in a given domain. This might be especially indicative of a problem if the mean falls below 3.00, particularly if most other domain scores are 3.40 or higher.

Negative school climate
Participants perceive the school climate as *negative*, indicating that they do not agree that their school climate meets the factors that make the school environment good for students. Students feel uncomfortable, unsafe, and unvalued in their school environment.

Very negative school climate
Participants perceive the school climate as *very negative*, indicating that they strongly disagree that the factors are met indicating that school environment appears to be unacceptable for students. Students feel very uncomfortable, unsafe and unvalued in their school environment.

Summary and Applications
Promoting a positive school climate is an international concern. For example, findings from the 2015 Programme for International Students Assessment (PISA) state "Parents are more likely to consider important or very important that there is a safe school environment … that the school has an active and pleasant climate even more so than the academic achievement of the students in the school" (PISA, 2015: PISA Results in Focus, p.10).

In the United States, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA, 2015) was established to address the shortfalls of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. ESSA allows states more control over funding and increased flexibility in school assessments by incorporating at least one accountability measure related to school quality and safety perceived to support student health and academic performance.

Although additional research would be beneficial, the extant evidence suggests that the SCM meets this requirement, and nascent longitudinal research is also encouraging. For example, research by Daily et al. (2020) using the SCM demonstrated that positive perceptions of school climate helped middle school students maintain grades of A/B over time.

More impressive however, was the finding that students with grades of C/D/F demonstrated better academic success when school climate improved, suggesting that the enhancement of school climate may raise "all boats" (Daily et al., 2020).

While the SCM can be used in the context of the population (or sub-populations) of students in a school, it also holds the promise for use with individual students to determine their individual perceptions of the climate of their respective school.

For example, the SCM might be useful with groups of students (e.g., students in a special needs program, gifted students), individual students, and in school-wide assessments in ongoing (multi-time) surveys as well as one-time surveys. In all contexts, given the breadth of the SCM, it should provide a comprehensive *and* nuanced look at students' perceptions of their school environment, yielding valuable hypotheses about their school behavior, subjective well-being, and academic

success. The profile of scores should be particularly helpful in designing empirically-informed, targeted programs to promote positive school climates.

It should be noted that the SCM is in the public domain and can be used free of charge by interested school psychology researchers or practitioners (or related professionals) as long as the authors are credited using the following publication: Zullig, K. J., Collins, R., Ghani, N., Hunter, A. A., Patton, J. M., Huebner, E. S., & Zhang, J. (2015). Preliminary development of a revised version of the School Climate Measure. *Psychological Assessment*, *27*(3), 1072–1081.

Author Biographies

Keith Zullig is professor and chairperson in the department of social and behavioral sciences at the West Virginia University School of Public Health. He is an advocate for promoting optimal learning environments and healthy development for adolescents. E-mail: kzullig@hsc.wvu.edu

Molly Matthews is a senior public health research analyst at 2M. She has more than 10 years of experience in practical and effective approaches to support positive lifestyle and behavioral choices, including a broad background in public health analytics. E-mail: mmatthewsewald@2mresearch.com

Scott Huebner is a professor of school psychology at the University of South Carolina. He has served three terms as program director and has previously worked as a school psychologist and staff therapist in a community mental health center. E-mail: huebner@mailbox.sc.edu

References

Audas, R., & Willms (2001). *Engagement from dropping out of school: A life course perspective.* Human Resources and Social Development Canada. http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.466.7579&rep=rep1&type=pdf Accessed February 25, 2020.

Cohen, J. (2006). Social, emotional, ethical, and academic education: Creating a climate of learning, participation in democracy, and well-being. *Harvard Educational Review*, *76,* 201–237.

Cohen, J., McCabe, E. M., Michelli, N. M., & Pickeral, T. (2009). School climate: Research, policy, practice, and teacher education. *Teachers College Record, 111*, 180–213.

Daily, S. M., Mann, M. J., Dyer, A. M., Smith, M. L., & Kristjansson, A. L. (2020). School climate as an intervention to reduce academic failure and educate the whole child: A longitudinal study. *Journal of School Health*, *90*(3), 182–193.

Daily, S. M., Zullig, K. J., Myers, E. M., Smith, M. L., Kristjansson, A. L., & Mann, M. J. (2018). Preliminary valuation of the SCM in a sample of early adolescent public school children. *Assessment for Effective Intervention.* doi: 10.1177/15345084188157

Eccles J. S., & Roeser, R. W. (2011). Schools as developmental contexts during adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21*(1), 225–241.

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), S.117, 114th Cong. (2015). https://www.congress.gov/bill/114thcongress/senate-bill/1177/text Accessed February 11, 2020.

Hamilton, C. L., Strader, L. C., Pratt, J. G., Maiese, D., Hendershot, T., Kwok, R. K., . . . Haines, J. (2011). The PhenX Toolkit: Get the most from your measures. *American Journal of Epidemiology, 174*, 253–260. doi:10.1093/aje/kwr193

Haynes, N.M., Comer, J.P., & Hamilton-Lee, M. (1989). School climate enhancement through parental involvement. *Journal of School Psychology*, *27*, 87-90.

Hoover-Dempsey, R.V., Bassler, O.C., & Brissie, J.S. (1987). Parental involvement: contributions of teacher efficacy, school socioeconomic status, and other school characteristics. *American Educational Research Journal, 27*, 417-435.

O'Malley, M., Voight, A., Renshaw, T. L., & Eklund, K. (2015). School climate, family structure, and academic achievement: A study of moderation effects. *School Psychology Quarterly, 30*(1), 142–157.

PISA 2015: PISA Results in Focus. (2015). OECD Better Policies for Better Lives https://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisa-2015-results-in-focus.pdf . Accessed February 11, 2020.

Spengler, M., Roberts, B. W., Lüdtke, O., Martin, R., & Brunner, M. (2016). Student characteristics and behaviours in childhood predict self-reported health in middle adulthood. *European Journal of Personality, 30*(5), 456–466.

US Department of Education National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). Public School Enrollment, May 2019. Available at: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cga.asp. Accessed February 12, 2020.

Zullig, K. J., Collins, R., Ghani, N., Patton, J. M., Huebner, E. S., & Ajamie, J. (2014). Psychometric support of the School Climate Measure in a large, diverse sample of adolescents: A replication and extension. *Journal of School Health*, *41, 82-90.*

Zullig, K. J., Collins, R., Ghani, N., Hunter, A. A., Patton, J. M., Huebner, E. S., & Zhang, J. (2015). Preliminary development of a revised version of the School Climate Measure. *Psychological Assessment*, *27*(3), 1072–1081.

Zullig, K. J., Koopman, T. M., Patton, J. M., & Ubbes, V. A. (2010). School climate: Historical review, instrument development, and school assessment. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 28*, 139–152.

Zullig, K.J., Ward, R.M., Huebner, E.S., & Dailey, S.M. (2018). Associations between adolescents' school climate and perceived quality of life. *Child Indicators Research 11*, 1737-1753.

APPENDIX A

School Climate Measure Items

Domain 1: Positive Student-Teacher Relationships

Teachers and staff seem to take a real interest in my future
Teachers are available when I need to talk with them
It is easy to talk with teachers
Students get along well with teachers
Teachers at my school help us children with our problems
My teachers care about me
My teacher makes me feel good about myself

Domain 2: Order and Discipline

Classroom rules are applied equally
Problems in this school are solved by students and staff
The rules of the school are fair
School rules are enforced consistently and fairly
My teachers make it clear to me when I have misbehaved in class
Discipline is fair

Domain 3: Opportunities for Student Engagement

Students have same opportunity in class to speak, and be listened to, in class
Students can express feelings and thoughts about school work and life
Students "different" in any way are treated with respect
Nobody in my school is excluded from being successful
Females and males treated as equals at school
I can participate in a lot of interesting activities at school

Domain 4: School Physical Environment

The school grounds are kept clean
My school is neat and clean
My school buildings are generally pleasant and well maintained
My school is usually clean and tidy

Domain 5: Academic Support

I usually understand my homework assignments
Teachers make it clear what work needs to be done to get the grade I want
I believe that teachers expect all students to learn
I feel that I can do well in this school

Domain 6: Parental Involvement

My parents talk with teachers about what is happening at home
My parents are involved in school activities
My parents are involved in discussions about what is taught at school)

Domain 7: School Connectedness

My schoolwork is exciting
Students can make suggestions on courses that are offered
This school make student enthusiastic about learning
Students are frequently rewarded or praised by faculty and staff for following school rule

Domain 8: Perceived Exclusion/ Privilege

At my school, the same person always gets to help the teacher
At my school, the same students get chosen every time to take part in after-school or special activities
The same students always get to use things, like a computer, a ball or piano, when we interact

Domain 9: School Social Environment

I am happy with the kinds of students who go to my school
I am happy, in general, with the other students who go to my school

Domain 10: Academic Satisfaction

I am happy about the number of tests I have
I am happy about the amount of homework I have

Responsive Schooling for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students

Written by Debbie Zacarian and Ivannia Soto

Reviewed by Art Stellar, PhD

Schools struggle with linguistically different students often because educators do not appreciate the value of addressing the cultural differences of their students. English language learners are often taught in the same basic way as their English competent classmates, ignoring their cultural norms.

This is particularly true for new arrivals to this country. For example, a student coming to this country from somewhere else may be old enough to be in fifth grade, yet with little or no time in school. Consequently, such a student does not understand what classroom life is like and what the expectations are for common behavior. In addition, in the author's opinion, this student may have limited content exposure to both what we would consider typical life experiences and academic vocabulary.

Geneva Gay, founding mother of culturally responsive teaching, is one of the many experts quoted in this book. Others have added to this concept with what is referred to throughout the text as "balanced culturally responsive teaching."

Leaders who are culturally responsive must hire culturally responsive teachers who know how to use culturally responsive teaching techniques and then hold them accountable for using them effectively.

Meeting this standard necessitates engaging in these activities:

- Self-reflection;
- Explaining implicit bias;
- Exploring microaggressions, including micro assaults, microinsults, and micro-invalidations, and taking steps to address them;
- Embracing collaborative reflection
- Creating a mistake-safe, culturally responsive school;
- Applying excellence through an equity lens; and
- Using a culturally responsive scorecard tool. (P/ 95)

The authors have collected and created many guiding questions for both group discussions and self-reflection. The answers are to come from within or from one's colleagues. The only problem with this approach is that unless these questions are used in a structured setting with a knowledgeable leader, some of the answers may be inappropriate.

Hence, the best utilization of this book is in a college course or extended workshop setting. Teachers with some experience with diverse student populations can use this book as a guide with a knowledgeable instructor.

According to the authors and scholars they quote, teaching that follows the model described in this book is truly a collaborative affair:

> Literacy occurs when we socially interact with others to fully understand and contribute to what is occurring. To do this well with our students, we must have depth of knowledge about their personal, social, cultural, linguistic, academic, and world experiences so that we can build from these to support them to learn and build the ever-expanding depth of subject matter and social-emotional communicative knowledge that they need to be successful learners and citizens in their classrooms, schools, communities, and more. In addition, every student must also have meaningful and continuous social interactions to learn. As you will see in our book**, one teacher alone could never do this.** (emphasis added) p. 9.

Hence, it takes a team of highly dedicated teachers and staff members actively communicating about each student. Parents and community members must also be involved.

Service learning in the community is seen as a method for reaching out to the community. These are all noble endeavors and, if fully and properly implemented, could have a profound effect upon diverse student populations.

This may appear to be a utopian view. However, this reviewer has witnessed a few school-wide examples with a highly motivated principal and staff pulling off such a miracle. The problem is that this is a tough model to maintain over a long period of time.

It is equally hard to expand to multiple sites.   Part of the answer may include the proper use of technology, which is an omission in this book. The vision of *Responsive Schooling for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students* is compelling. Now we must make it into reality.

Reviewer Biography

Art Stellar has served 25 years as a school superintendent in diverse communities such as Boston and Taunton, MA and Oklahoma City. His teams have met improvement goals and raised student achievement; equity gaps have been reduced. He is especially proud of reaching milestones in poorer states and communities and knows it can be done. Stellar can be reached at stellaradvantage.com, 828-764-1785 or by e-mail at art@stellaradvantage.com.

Responsive Schooling for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students was published in 2020 by W.W. Norton & Company, NYC, 108 pp. $29.99 softcover.

Mission and Scope, Copyright, Privacy, Ethics, Upcoming Themes, Author Guidelines, Submissions, Publication Rates & Publication Timeline

The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* is a refereed, blind-reviewed, quarterly journal with a focus on research and evidence-based practice that advance the profession of education administration.

Mission and Scope

The **mission** of the Journal is to provide peer-reviewed, user-friendly, and methodologically sound research that practicing school and district administrations can use to take action and that higher education faculty can use to prepare future school and district administrators. The Journal publishes accepted manuscripts in the following categories: (1) Evidence-based Practice, (2) Original Research, (3) Research-informed Commentary, and (4) Book Reviews.

The **scope** for submissions focuses on the intersection of five factors of school and district administration: (a) administrators, (b) teachers, (c) students, (d) subject matter, and (e) settings. The Journal encourages submissions that focus on the intersection of factors a-e. The Journal discourages submissions that focus only on personal reflections and opinions.

Copyright

Articles published electronically by AASA, The School Superintendents Association in the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* fall under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-NoDerivs 3.0 license policy (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/). Please refer to the policy for rules about republishing, distribution, etc. In most cases our readers can copy, post, and distribute articles that appear in the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*, but the works must be attributed to the author(s) and the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*. Works can only be distributed for non-commercial/non-monetary purposes. Alteration to the appearance or content of any articles used is not allowed. Readers who are unsure whether their intended uses might violate the policy should get permission from the author or the editor of the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*.

Authors please note: By submitting a manuscript the author/s acknowledge that the submitted manuscript is not under review by any other publisher or society, and the manuscript represents original work completed by the authors and not previously published as per professional ethics based on APA guidelines, most recent edition. By submitting a manuscript, authors agree to transfer without charge the following rights to AASA, its publications, and especially the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* upon acceptance of the manuscript. The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* is indexed by several services and is also a member of the Directory of Open Access Journals. This means there is worldwide access to all content. Authors must agree to first worldwide serial publication rights and the right for the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* and AASA to grant permissions for use of works as the editors judge appropriate for the redistribution, repackaging, and/or marketing of all works and any metadata associated with the works in professional indexing and reference services. Any revenues received by AASA and the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* from redistribution are used to support the continued marketing, publication, and distribution of articles.

Privacy
The names and e-mail addresses entered in this journal site will be used exclusively for the stated purposes of this journal and will not be made available for any other purpose or to any other party. Please note that the journal is available, via the Internet at no cost, to audiences around the world. Authors' names and e-mail addresses are posted for each article. Authors who agree to have their manuscripts published in the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* agree to have their names and e-mail addresses posted on their articles for public viewing.

Ethics
The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* uses a double-blind peer-review process to maintain scientific integrity of its published materials. Peer-reviewed articles are one hallmark of the scientific method and the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* believes in the importance of maintaining the integrity of the scientific process in order to bring high quality literature to the education leadership community. We expect our authors to follow the same ethical guidelines. We refer readers to the latest edition of the APA Style Guide to review the ethical expectations for publication in a scholarly journal.

Themes and Topics of Interest
Below are themes and areas of interest for publication cycles.
1. Governance, Funding, and Control of Public Education
2. Federal Education Policy and the Future of Public Education
3. Federal, State, and Local Governmental Relationships
4. Teacher Quality (e.g. hiring, assessment, evaluation, development, and compensation of teachers)
5. School Administrator Quality (e.g. hiring, preparation, assessment, evaluation, development, and compensation of principals and other school administrators)
6. Data and Information Systems (for both summative and formative evaluative purposes)
7. Charter Schools and Other Alternatives to Public Schools
8. Turning Around Low-Performing Schools and Districts
9. Large Scale Assessment Policy and Programs
10. Curriculum and Instruction
11. School Reform Policies
12. Financial Issues

Submissions
Length of manuscripts should be as follows: Research and evidence-based practice articles between **2,800** and **4,800** words; commentaries between **1,600** and **3,800** words; book and media reviews between **400** and **800** words. Articles, commentaries, book and media reviews, citations and references are to follow the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, latest edition. Permission to use previously copyrighted materials is the responsibility of the author, not the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*.

Cover page checklist:
1. title of the article:
    identify if the submission is original research, evidence-based practice, commentary, or book review
2. contributor name(s)
3. terminal degree
4. academic rank
5. department
6. college or university
7. city, state
8. telephone and fax numbers
9. e-mail address
10. 120-word abstract that conforms to APA style
11. six to eight key words that reflect the essence of the submission
12. 40-word biographical sketch

Please do not submit page numbers in headers or footers. Rather than use footnotes, it is preferred authors embed footnote content in the body of the article. Articles are to be submitted to the editor by e-mail as an electronic attachment in Microsoft Word, Times New Roman, 12 Font. The editors have also determined to follow APA guidelines by adding two spaces after a period.

Acceptance Rates

The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* maintains of record of acceptance rates for each of the quarterly issues published annually. The percentage of acceptance rates since 2010 is as follows:

2012: 22%	2015: 22%	2018: 19%
2013: 15%	2016: 19%	2019: 19%
2014: 20%	2017: 20%	2020: 18%

Book Review Guidelines

Book review guidelines should adhere to the author guidelines as found above. The format of the book review is to include the following:

- Full title of book
- Author
- Publisher, city, state, year, # of pages, price
- Name and affiliation of reviewer
- Contact information for reviewer: address, city, state, zip code, e-mail address, telephone and fax
- Reviewer biography
- Date of submission

Publication Timeline

Issue	Deadline to Submit Articles	Notification to Authors of Editorial Review Board Decisions	To AASA for Formatting and Editing	Issue Available on AASA website
Spring	October 1	January 1	February 15	April 1
Summer	February 1	April 1	May 15	July1
Fall	May 1	July 1	August 15	October 1
Winter	August 1	October 1	November 15	January 15

Additional Information

Contributors will be notified of editorial board decisions within eight weeks of receipt of papers at the editorial office. Articles to be returned must be accompanied by a postage-paid, self-addressed envelope.

The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* reserves the right to make minor editorial changes without seeking approval from contributors.

Materials published in the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* do not constitute endorsement of the content or conclusions presented.

The Journal is listed in Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities. Articles are also archived in the ERIC collection. The Journal is available on the Internet and considered an open access document.

Editor

Kenneth Mitchell, EdD
AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice

Submit articles electronically: kenneth.mitchell@mville.edu

To contact by postal mail:
Dr. Ken Mitchell
Associate Professor
School of Education
Manhattanville College
2900 Purchase Street
Purchase, NY 10577

AASA Resources

✓ **Join AASA** and discover a number of resources reserved exclusively for members. See Member Benefits at www.aasa.org/welcome/index.aspx. For questions on membership contact Meghan Moran at mmoran@aasa.org.

✓ **Resources on COVID-19**
AASA aims to provide the best, most up-to-date information from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Emergency Management, the School Safety and Crisis Planning Community, Coronavirus Resources page and guidelines for reopening schools. Please visit links.aasa.org/3mIxIcH.

✓ **Resources for School Administrators** may be viewed at www.aasa.org/welcome/resources.aspx.

✓ Learn about AASA's **books program** where new titles and special discounts are available to AASA members. The AASA publications catalog may be downloaded at www.aasa.org/books.aspx.

✓ As the Superintendents Association's professional learning arm, **AASA's Leadership Network** drives superintendent success, innovation and growth, focused on student-centered, equity-focused, forward-reaching education. Passionate and committed to continuous improvement, Leadership Network faculty connect educational leaders to the leadership development, relationships and partnerships needed to ensure individual growth and collective impact. A snapshot of over 30 academies, cohorts and consortia is represented in the graphic below. To assist in navigating through the pandemic, AASA has produced and archived over 100 webinars since March 2020 on *Leading for Equity* and *What Works* at AASA, The School Superintendents Association. Contact Mort Sherman at msherman@aasa.org or Valerie Truesdale at vtruesdale@aasa.org to explore professional learning and engagement.

✓ **Webinars for EdLeaders**

Leadership Network
aasa.org/AASA-LeadershipNetwork-webinars.aspx

Leader To Leader Series:
www.aasa.org/LeaderToLeader.aspx

Leading For Equity:
home.edweb.net/aasaequity

The EmpowerED Superintendent:
home.edweb.net/supers

AASA Policy and Advocacy Blogs—The Leading Edge:
aasa.org/policy-blogs.aspx?blogid=84002

Upcoming AASA Events

AASA 2022 National Conference on Education, Nashville, TN, Feb. 17-19, 2022
Call for Proposals:
Opens March 24, 2021, 9:00 a.m., EST
Closes May 31, 2021, 11:59 p.m.; EST
Questions about Call for Proposals? Contact Gabriela Iturri, meeting planner, giturri@aasa.org