This practical reference guide to selected resources may assist local school districts in learning about and applying effective schooling practices; the guide has special usefulness to Illinois readers. With an emphasis on finding characteristics of effective schools, the booklet has sections devoted to the following: (1) computer search printouts of Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) abstracts of related documents and journal articles; (2) copies of an ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management research article, "Schools—and Their Principals—Do Make a Difference," and a "The Best of ERIC on Educational Management" newsletter which presents annotations of 11 documents on school effectiveness; (3) diagrams and tables summarizing the findings of numerous effective schools studies; (4) a selective listing of characteristics of effective schools compiled by the authors from a variety of sources including brochures, case studies, and research studies; and (5) instructions for obtaining the information from the indicated sources, including an ERIC documents order form, a listing of Illinois ERIC locations, and notes on how to read and use an ERIC abstract entry. (DCS)
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... the characteristics are a discovery. First you identify schools that produce the outcomes you're interested in. Then you watch them and try to figure out what makes them different from ineffective schools."

— Ronald Edmonds
JOURNAL ARTICLES
EJ280332 USO98062
Research on Effective Schools: A Cautionary Note.
Rowan, Brian; Arion, and others
Educational Researcher, v12 n4 p24-31 Apr 1983
Available from: Reprint: UMI
Language: English
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); POSITION PAPER (120)
Suggests that current techniques for assessing school effectiveness are based on narrow concepts of effectiveness; hide inconsistencies in findings across types of students, grades, or subjects; and do not reflect curricula. Emphasizes that school improvement plans should be based on classroom/school-centered research rather than on comparisons of schools. (Author/MJL)

EJ280390 U509802
Effective Schools: Knowledge, Dissemination, Inquiry.
Bickel, William E.
Educational Researcher, v12 n4 p3-8 Apr 1983
Available from: Reprint: UMI
Language: English
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); REVIEW LITERATURE (070); POSITION PAPER (120)
Examines factors that might explain the increased interest in research on school effectiveness; summarizes three articles that deal with school improvement and effectiveness research; and stresses the importance of using exceptional schools' research in developing school improvement strategies. (MJL)

EJ280248 (SP512917)
Using Research on Teaching, Schools and Change to Help Staff Development Make a Difference.
Vaughan, Joseph
Journal of Staff Development, v4 n1 p5-24 May 1983
Language: English
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); REVIEW LITERATURE (070); PROJECT DESCRIPTION (141)
This article synthesizes research on teacher effectiveness, school effectiveness, and organizational change and interprets what the findings imply for staff development in the schools. Nine research-based themes for staff development efforts are outlined. (PP)

EJ279579 EA516399
NASSP Bulletin, v67 n463 p83-91 May 1983
Available from: Reprint: UMI
Language: English
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); NON-CLASSROOM MATERIAL (055); REVIEW LITERATURE (070)
Describes a framework for moving from the general school effectiveness factors to specific practices and behaviors focusing on strong leadership by the principal. Outlines the general functions of instructional leadership, then narrows to one function, monitoring student progress, and derives specific principal behaviors. (MLF)

EJ279514 EA516334
Response to Goodlad: It Just Ain't So.
Yatvin, Joanne
Educational Leadership, v40 n7 p23 Apr 1983
Available from: Reprint: UMI
Language: English
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); POSITION PAPER (120)
Agrees with John Goodlad's analysis of 'schooling-in-an article in this issue but disagrees with those who maintain that parents want babysitting rather than education.' (JM)

EJ279513 EA516333
Response to Goodlad: What about Successes?
King, Mathew
Educational Leadership, v40 n7 p23 Apr 1983
Available from: Reprint: UMI
Language: English
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); POSITION PAPER (120)
In response to an article by John Goodlad in this issue, the author describes an unconventional program in his own school and recommends examining such successful programs as well as our educational failures. (JM)

EJ279512 EA516332
Response to Goodlad: A Painful Picture.
Francke, Eleanor
Educational Leadership, v40 n7 p22 Apr 1983
Available from: Reprint: UMI
Language: English
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); POSITION PAPER (120); NON-CLASSROOM MATERIAL (055)
In basic agreement with an article by John Goodlad in this issue, the author briefly outlines steps a school can take to reassess its goals and formulate an improvement program. (JM)
Response to Goodlad: Exceedingly "Effective" Schools.

Rogers, Vincent
Educational Leadership, v40 n7 p2t Apr 1983
Available from: Reprint: UMI
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); POSITION PAPER (120)
Attempts to integrate the findings of John Goodlad's "A Study of Schooling" described in another article in this issue with the findings of the effective schools movement. (UM)

Response to Goodlad: Unrealistic and Unfair.

Burns, Dorothy
Educational Leadership, v40 n7 p20 Apr 1983
Available from: Reprint: UMI
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); POSITION PAPER (120)
The author maintains that John Goodlad's rigid insistence on the school's accomplishment of idealistic and lofty goals is unrealistic and unfair. These goals are merely something to work toward. (JM)


Hobar, Nicholas
Electronic Education, v2 n6 p15, 18-19 Feb 1983
Language: English
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); GENERAL REPORT (140)
Outlines a framework for analyzing research and development trends in classroom management and school effectiveness in terms of (1) learners and learning, (2) teacher education, (3) educational programs, (4) classroom management, (5) school effectiveness, (6) a network of schools, and (7) school systems. Eleven sources are appended. (EJS)

Effective Schools--Effective Principals: How to Develop Both.

Hager, James L.; Scarr, L. E.
Educational Leadership, v40 n5 p38-40 Feb 1983
Available from: Reprint: UMI
Language: English
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); PROJECT DESCRIPTION (141)
Achievement is up in Washington State's District 414 where administrators have reorganized their responsibilities in order to spend more hours on instructional leadership. (Author/UM)
What's Still Right with Education.

Hodkinson, Harold L.

Phi Delta Kappan, v64 n4 p231-35 Dec 1982

Available from: Reprint: UMI

Language: English

Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); REVIEW LITERATURE (070); POSITION PAPER (120)

A study of the statistics on enrollment trends, popular attitudes, school effectiveness, standardized test scores, and educational reforms convinces the author that the American educational system is strong, effective, and beginning to gain the popular support it deserves. (PGD)

Effective Schools: Accumulating Research Findings.

Cohen, Michael

American Education, v18 n1 p13-16 Jan-Feb 1982

Available from: Reprint: UMI

Language: English

Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); POSITION PAPER (120); REVIEW LITERATURE (070)

Discusses what effective schools do to raise achievement levels. Cites the problems and misinterpretations that have arisen about the Equality of Educational Opportunity Report done by James Coleman in 1966. (JOW)

Research Synthesis on Effective School Leadership.

Sweeney, James

Educational Leadership, v39 n5 p346-52 Feb 1982

Available from: Reprint: UMI

Language: English

Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); REVIEW LITERATURE (070)

Reviews recent research on school effectiveness to identify the behaviors of effective principals. Maintains that effective principals emphasize achievement, set instructional strategies, provide an orderly atmosphere, frequently evaluate student progress, coordinate instructional programs, and support teachers. (Author/UM)

School Effectiveness Research: Key Issues.

Gray, John

Educational Research, v24 n1 p49-54 Nov 1981

Language: English

Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); POSITION PAPER (120)

Identifies a number of key areas for further research on school effectiveness. The author draws up a framework of questions by which future studies might be assessed. He also argues that certain aspects of the way in which research on school effectiveness is conducted should be rethought. (CT)

Exemplary Schools and Their Identification.

Austin, Gilbert R.

New Directions for Testing and Measurement, n10 p31-48 1981

Language: English

Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); REVIEW LITERATURE (070); PROJECT DESCRIPTION (141)

Information from state assessment programs may be utilized to identify the characteristics of schools performing in an exemplary fashion so that effective practices can be adopted and imitated in other schools. Various effective school practices and findings, revealed by school studies conducted in six states, are distilled in this paper. (AEF)

Effective Schools: Mirror or Mirage?

Tomlinson, Tommy M.


Language: English

Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); PROJECT DESCRIPTION (141)

Identifies and analyzes characteristics which are frequently mentioned as contributing to effective schools. Among the characteristics are that they improve the effectiveness and efficiency of students' work by organizing material and instruction, increase the amount of work students perform per unit of time, reduce distractions, and encourage students to achieve their potential. (DB)

Brandt, Ron

Educational Leadership, v38 n8 p642-43,645 May 1981

A member of the research team that reported characteristics of unusually effective London (England) high schools discusses how educators can use the findings to improve their own schools. (Author/MLF)

Can Our Schools Get Better?

Goodlad, John I.

Phi Delta Kappan, v60 n5 p342-47 Jan 1979

Examines seven propositions concerning the schools, and offers suggestions indicating what is required if solid progress is to be realized. The areas discussed include accountability, standards by which the schools are judged, the school's social system, and models of change. (IRT)

Effective Schools: A Review.

Purkey, Stewart C.; Smith, Marshall S.


Critically reviews literature on school effectiveness challenging the assumption that school differences have little effect on student achievement, presents a speculative portrait of an effective school, and proposes directions for future research. (MP)
EDUCATIONAL DOCUMENTS

ED228716 EA015565

Quality High Schools: What Principals Have to Say. Monograph.
Sponsoring Agency: National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
Contract No.: 400-BO-0105-CCE-P3; EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
Language: English
Document Type: CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS (021); NON-CLASSROOM MATERIAL (055)
Geographic Source: U.S.; Oregon
Publication Date: 1982

A seminar for high school principals (held in Portland, Oregon, June 28-29, 1982) sought to stimulate and record interaction among participants on five key topics related to school improvement: standards for excellence, elements of effectiveness, productivity, the high school of the future, and causing change in high schools. Following presentations by recognized experts, participants engaged in guided discussions focusing especially on feasibility, practicality, and congruence with their own experiences. Each section of the report deals with one of the key topics and contains a brief summary of the ideas and perspectives given by the presenter, followed by summaries of small group reactions to the presentation. The appendix contains the agenda and a list of participants. (MLF)

ED229710 EA015558

Preparing the Climate for Public Education in Coming Decades.

Bacharach, D. L.; Berman, Martin L.
Language: English
Document Type: CONFERENCE PAPER* (150); POSITION PAPER (120)
Geographic Source: U.S.; New Mexico
Journal Announcement: RIESEP83

Problems in education have changed from those dealing with growth to the exigencies created by scarcity and retrenchment. The two major sources of scarcity, the long-range demographic changes in society and the changing energy situation, will permanently alter the style and standard of American life. Public education in the foreseeable future will be caught in a squeeze between increasing expenses and a declining clientele. A constructive answer to scarcity is a reconceptualization of the nature and function of schools to embrace community education as a life-long process. To make this adaptation, school management needs to change its organizational concentration from strategy, structure, and systems to that of staff, skills, style, and superordinate goals. Teachers can reconceptualize their traditional roles and be developers of curriculum and coordinators of the efforts of many people. Effective schools also have both public and parental involvement. In the wider political community, management should utilize the practices of networking, coalition building, cooperation, and collaboration. Finally, in stressing superordinate goals, managers must clearly define what it is that education does and develop priorities within that definition. (MLF)

ED229713 EA015562

19 Improving Schools and Why: Their "Formula for Success."

Clancy, Peter L.
Eastern Michigan Univ., Ypsilanti.
1982 21p.; Portions of appendices and photographs may not reproduce well.
EDRS Price - MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
Language: English
Document Type: CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS (021); RESEARCH REPORT (143); NON-CLASSROOM MATERIAL (055)
Geographic Source: U.S.; Michigan
Journal Announcement: RIESEP83

Students at 19 Michigan elementary schools in 17 districts showed a dramatic improvement in Michigan Educational Assessment Program test score results from 1976 to 1979. A three-pronged effort to identify the factors associated with the improvement involved a computer analysis of school demographic data, field interviews, and a symposium of 107 key personnel from 18 of the 19 schools who corroborated the field interviews. Analysis of the demographic data failed to reveal any positive correlation with success; however, a "Formula for Success" extracted from the interviews and symposium contains seven elements that constitute a "critical mass" that all schools possess. The seven elements are: (1) the staff has a high degree of intercommunication; (2) the instructional program contains the basic elements of mastery learning; (3) the principal is a strong leader with an understanding of curriculum and instruction; (4) the staff is stable, flexible, innovative, and skilled; (5) the parents are supportive because the school communicates with them, and in some cases community education programs make this possible; (6) the superintendent is a leader who communicates clearly and effectively; and (7) all the parties involved in the teaching-learning process know what is expected of them. (MLF)
A summary and critique is presented on research of effective schools, based primarily on a review of the reviews written about that work. It is pointed out that the majority of research findings came from studies of elementary schools and focused upon the characteristics of effective schools for minority and poor students. Most research reviewed for this analysis was exploratory and descriptive, aiming to find effective schools and then deducing characteristics associated with effectiveness. For most studies reviewed, researchers did not develop comprehensive, systematic, and detailed programs with implementation guides for school improvement. However, in many studies, identification was made of features of effective programs. One example noted is of a school staff committed to excellence with high expectations for students and strong administrative leadership. It is suggested that the attitudes, processes, and techniques which characterize effective elementary schools have relevance for secondary schools as well, in spite of differences in organizational structure and educational goals. The appendix provides lists of effective school characteristics which were culled from the reviewed research. (JD)
Principals Norm Setting as a Component of Effective Schools

Keedy, John L.; Achilles, Charles M.


EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
Language: English
Document Type: CONFERENCE PAPER (150); RESEARCH REPORT (143)
Geographic Source: U.S.; Tennessee
Journal Announcement: RIEAUG83

A study of how principals in effective schools set norms for teacher behavior, student achievement, and educational goals used data from six elementary schools in Tennessee that achieved scores on standardized reading tests substantially higher than scores predicted on the basis of the students’ socioeconomic levels. Four primary norm-setting techniques were identified: the principal can act as a resource provider for teachers; can adopt a ‘human relations’ approach, relating to teachers in ways that make them want to comply; can assert the authority of his or her position, pulling rank to obtain teacher conformity; or can model appropriate behavior consciously or unconsciously. Of these techniques, that of providing resources may have the most potential for principal effectiveness since it permits establishment of a social exchange system in which teachers can offer their compliance with norms in exchange for the resources provided. An appendix lists the twelve secondary norm-setting techniques identified in the study. (PGD)

Effective Principals: What Do We Know from Various Educational Literatures?

Persell, Caroline Hodges; And Others

1982 77p. Prepared for the national conference on the principalship, convened by the National Institute of Education (October 22-23, 1982).
Contract No.: P-81-0181
EDRS Price - MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
Language: English
Document Type: CONFERENCE PAPER (450); REVIEW LITERATURE (070); POSITION PAPER (120)
Geographic Source: U.S.; New York
Journal Announcement: RIEAUG83

The authors reviewed research on effective schools, literature on the implementation of educational innovation, and current theories of school organization. A synthesis of findings from this research indicates that differences among schools do have an effect on student achievement. Specifically, it is the school's culture that is responsible for that effect. Thirteen variables are identified as contributing to the development of a school culture conducive to academic achievement. Drawing on recent literature, the authors suggest federal and state policies that would be likely to facilitate the development of effective schools. Key recommendations include policies that promote building-specific, whole-school improvement efforts and that rely on outcomes as the preferable means of monitoring and evaluating school improvement efforts. (Author)
Effective Schools: Do Elementary Prescriptions Fit Secondary Schools?

Firestone, William A.; Herriott, Robert E.
Sponsoring Agency: National, Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
Grant No.: NIE-G-81-6030
EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
Language: English
Document Type: REVIEW LITERATURE (070); GENERAL REPORT (140)
Geographic Source: U.S.; Pennsylvania
Journal Announcement: RIEAPR083

Most of the recent research identifying organizational characteristics that seem to make schools unusually effective has been conducted at the elementary level and may not be applicable to secondary schools. Research currently underway suggests that the basic organizational structures of elementary and secondary schools dictate two different approaches to improving effectiveness. The secondary level is distinguished from the elementary level by structural looseness, departmentalization, and increased size. These factors undermine agreement on educational goals and block efforts of high school principals and administrators to influence classroom management. Secondary school principals are limited in their influence over programs and exercise symbolic leadership. Furthermore, it must be recognized that schools serve students of a wide range of socioeconomic and intellectual levels, and that high schools, in particular, must prepare these students for the outside world. Therefore, in defining secondary school effectiveness, it is necessary to consider more than the criterion of "basic skills." (Author/GC)

Considering the Research: What Makes an Effective School?
Westbrook, John D.
Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, Tex.
Sep 1982 45p.
Sponsoring Agency: National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
Contract No.: 400-80-0107
EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
Language: English
Document Type: REVIEW LITERATURE (070); BIBLIOGRAPHY (131)
Geographic Source: U.S.; Texas
Journal Announcement: RIEAPR083

Four general types of literature related to school effectiveness are reviewed in this paper and the more consistent research findings synthesized. The literature types considered are case studies (descriptions of effective and ineffective schools), program evaluations (examinations of effectiveness-oriented programs), and reviews of the school effectiveness literature. The literature is divided into three groups for coherent synthesis: group 1 consists of five case studies and a review of the literature, all of seminal significance and frequently cited; group 2 includes studies and reviews that address further the issues raised in the studies in the first group; and group 3 studies do not utilize measures of student achievement and are the least frequently cited. The synthesis of this literature begins with consideration of definitions and concepts of school effectiveness and qualifications limiting the applicability of the research findings. The review then discusses the major factors affecting school effectiveness as identified in the research, including time on task, expectations for student achievement, student success rates, curriculum alignment, staff task orientation, behavior management techniques, school environment, staff cooperation, instructional leadership, parent participation, and instructional practices. A bibliography lists the 107 documents reviewed. (Author/GD)
Issues in Identifying Effective Schools.

Kean, Michael H.


EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

Language: English

Document Type: EVALUATIVE REPORT (142); POSITION PAPER (120); CONFERENCE PAPER (150)

Geographic Source: U.S.; Illinois

Journal Announcement: RIEMAR83

Effective schools are typically defined as those schools which improve or maintain already-established high levels of student achievement. A number of issues and research needs are raised which relate to the identification of effective schools. Unless the nature of “effectiveness” can be described and agreed upon, researchers face the possibility of identifying variables related to the concept not accepted by those responsible for teaching children. Research, program improvement, school district-wide planning or funding decisions, and rating or ranking schools are all potential purposes for identifying school effectiveness. There is a need for a variety of different measures, for separating school effects from other influences, for selection of an appropriate achievement measure, for means by which scores or other indicators can be aggregated, for defining success related to objectives, and for consistency. The identification of “transition” schools (those emphasizing improved ratings, yet with low achievement scores) and “false negative” schools (with uniformly low ratings on success factors, yet high test scores) is considered. The effects of funding on schools, and the need for data linked to effectiveness indicators are examined. The critical issue suggested is the extent to which a school maximizes its effort to improve each student’s potential. (CM)

Programs of School Improvement: An Overview.

Edmonds, Ronald R.

National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC, Teaching and Learning Program.


EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

Language: English

Document Type: CONFERENCE PAPER (150); REVIEW LITERATURE (070)

Geographic Source: U.S.; District of Columbia

Journal Announcement: RIEFEB83

Government: Federal

Programs administered by state departments of education and by universities are outlined. Recommendations for program planning and evaluation are made. (FG)
A review of school effectiveness literature is presented in this paper. Research studies and other literature on this topic are examined, including case studies, surveys and evaluations, studies of program implementations, and organizational theories of schools and other institutions. Emphasis is given to organizational theories and findings concerning small organizations and program implementation, which suggest ways of approaching and understanding efforts to change schools. Attention is also given to identifiable characteristics of schools and school personnel and the way that schools actually operate and change. Effective schools are seen to be characterized by order, structure, purposefulness, a humane atmosphere, and the use of appropriate instructional techniques. It is noted that what appears to be lacking from the literature are suggestions on how to develop these characteristics in the schools. A different approach to school improvement is offered, involving the concept of a school cultural perspective in which schools are viewed as dynamic social systems made up of interrelated factors. In a portrait of an effective school, a description is given of the sustaining characteristics of such a school, including collaborative planning and collegial relationships, sense of community, clear goals and high expectations commonly shared, and order and discipline. A proposed strategy for change is outlined. (UD)
Focus on These 4 Factors to Affect What Students Learn.

Wolfe, Leslie G.
National School Boards Association, Washington, DC.

Educational Policies Service.


Concerning the 'factor of time,' the research on the characteristics of effective schools suffers from a lack of any sound theoretical foundation. In order to establish such a foundation, researchers used the methodology of clinical analysis to determine the goals, purposes, and beliefs underlying the overt behavior patterns found in the effective school improvement projects being conducted in four states and at least eight Connecticut school districts. The characteristics of effective schools found through this process consisted of salient, if not unrelated, variables. Analysis revealed a common theoretical basis for behavior across three effect domains: school effects, teacher effects, and student effects. The analysis also suggests listing overt behaviors as a method of identifying what actions might be taken at the school level to increase student achievement. Clinical analysis of one effective school characteristic, the opportunity to learn, supports a theory stating that the principles of behaviorism can be built into the school and the classroom and can ultimately be brought to bear on the student. (Author/PDO)


Flessenthal, Helen.


A case study of an effective, predominantly black, public elementary school in an eastern inner-city area, aimed to identify and define factors that relate to school effectiveness. The analytical method used, drawn from ecological psychology, emphasizes observing natural behavior in its normal environment and noting the links between the person and the environment. Information came from 35 structured interviews with students, administrators, educators, and parents and from behavioral observation in offices, classrooms, and other school areas. Data were gathered on interactions relating to leadership, instruction, expectations, school climate, evaluation, and parental involvement. The research results indicate that strong leadership from the principal was the most crucial factor in the school's effectiveness, especially as exhibited in the principal's impact on school climate, expectations, academic standards, and parent-school relations. A copy of the interview questionnaire is appended. (Author/RW)
Effective Schools. Seminar Report.
Carson, Mary R.; And Others
Seattle Public Schools, Wash.
Feb 1982 34p.
EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
Language: English
Document Type: PROJECT DESCRIPTION (141); NON-CLASSROOM MATERIAL (055)
Geographic Source: U.S.; Washington
Journal Announcement: RIEAUG82

Early in 1982 the Seattle (Washington) School Board organized a seminar on school effectiveness in Seattle. The seminar group, including teachers, administrators, a community representative, and a school board member, looked at relevant research and considered testimony by community groups, individuals, teachers, and students on school effectiveness. This report is the product of that process. It begins with a brief summary of research on effective schools. A short definition of effective schools is offered, describing them as those in which all students master basic skills, seek academic excellence in all subjects, and demonstrate achievement through systematic testing. The report then lists 12 characteristics that are necessary for effective schools in Seattle, ranging from clear goals to parent and community involvement. The next chapter presents a summary of problems identified by the seminar in 11 areas in Seattle schools, such as staff dedication, goals, time on task, and communication. Based on the problems identified, the report lists general and specific recommendations for making Seattle schools more effective. The roles of all participants in the Seattle schools are then delineated. A list of existing policies and policy recommendations relating to effective schools concludes the report. (Author/WM)

Instructionally Effective Schools. Research Area Plan.
Cohen, Michael; And Others
EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
Language: English
Document Type: REVIEW LITERATURE (070)
Geographic Source: U.S.; District of Columbia
Journal Announcement: RIEMAY82

As part of the National Institute of Education's Teaching and Instruction Program, the Research on Instruction Team has developed a program focusing on research on Instructionally Effective Schools. Such a school is defined as having a high mean level of student achievement and no educationally significant differences between different racial, ethnic, and social-class groups of students. This document presents the factors that support this particular emphasis for the program, summarizes the state of knowledge, and outlines proposed research. The section on the current state of knowledge presents the argument that school effectiveness is determined by school-level, classroom-level, and student factors and by the interconnections among the three. The discussion first describes the current knowledge base regarding effective instructional practices at the classroom and school levels; then it critiques this knowledge base and, in the process, identifies issues for future research. Ten proposed research projects are briefly described. Relevant educational projects at research laboratories and centers are described and their contributions to the issues discussed are identified. (Author/MLF)

EDRS Price - MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
Language: English
Document Type: REVIEW LITERATURE (070); NON-CLASSROOM MATERIAL (055)
Geographic Source: U.S.; Alaska
Journal Announcement: RIEJAY82

Government: State

This task force report attempted to clarify the responsibilities of Alaska's schools, identify the practices essential to effective schooling, and make recommendations to institute these practices in the state. Following an historical perspective on the role of education and Alaska schools, the report lists three kinds of school responsibilities--primary (fulfilled by the school alone), shared (fulfilled in conjunction with other agencies), and supportive (fulfilled through helping other groups that provide education)--and specifies goals appropriate to each. The authors make broad recommendations for curriculum content in kindergarten through grade twelve. From the literature, factors associated with effective schooling are identified, with special emphasis on effects of the principal's instructional leadership, class size, computer-assisted instruction, parent participation, learning time factors, and classroom organization and grouping. Specific recommendations are offered regarding the formal specification of school responsibilities, revision of the elementary school course of study, revision of high school graduation requirements, and state adoption of recommendations for effective schooling practices. Additional recommendations pertain to monitoring and reporting, inservice activities, continued effort to identify additional effective schooling practices, and evaluation and refinement of practices. Also recommended is a general implementation strategy for a two-year period. (Author/AM)

ED210322 UO21393

Applying the Characteristics of Effective Schools to Professional Development.
Kramer, Mary Jo

Available from: Connecticut Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, P.O. Box 1010, Manchester, CT 06040 ($3.50); E. Bourque, 214 Main Street, Southport, CT 06490 ($3.50).

EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
Language: English
Document Type: POSITION PAPER (120)
Geographic Source: U.S.; Connecticut
Journal Announcement: RIEMAY82

This paper examines the implications of research on effective schools for professional development at the State and local levels. The first part of the paper gives an overview of the research and a description of the characteristics of instructionally effective urban elementary schools. The paper then explores how these characteristics can be applied to inservice programs within schools. Issues discussed in this section include: (1) school and teacher expectations; (2) supervision and evaluation of instruction and teacher performance; and (3) community relations and communication. The paper concludes with recommendations for professional development that can be initiated by a State education agency. (Author/APM)
In summarizing findings on the principal's role in the school, this monograph assumes that the principal is a pivotal figure in the school and is the one who most affects the quality of teacher performance and student achievement. The author concludes that the studies reviewed demonstrate that the principal is a key factor in the success of the school. The booklet is divided into eight sections that examine studies related to the principal and (1) diversity versus uniformity in educational goals; (2) traditional versus nontraditional educational values and attitudes; (3) centralization versus decentralization in organizational relationships; (4) directiveness versus supportiveness in leadership behavior; (5) authoritative versus participative decision-making processes; (6) managerial versus instructional tasks as the principal's primary responsibility; (7) programmed versus adaptive approaches to change; and (8) interaction versus insularity in relations with the public. (Author/UM)
One major purpose of the Search for Effective Schools Project has been to explore the truth of the following two propositions: that both pupil response to instruction and the delivery of instruction are functions of pupil background, prior knowledge and level of achievement. That is, the project sought to demonstrate the existence of effective schools in which teachers succeed in imparting the basic skills of reading and mathematics to both poor and non-poor children. One goal was to locate variables that describe the educational resources offered by a pupil's family, and that in the case of some schools, appear to limit their educational effectiveness in teaching the basic skills. Using the Michigan Educational Assessment Program tests, administered to 4th and 7th grade pupils, each background variable was separately used as a pupil classifier. The pupils were then divided into five levels on the basis of mother's and father's education. It was found that effective urban schools do exist, and achieve high levels of performance in reading and mathematics for all children they enroll, including those from educationally disadvantaged backgrounds. (Author/GSK)
The research findings and literature compiled and summarized in this report seek to identify those characteristics possessed by school districts that are associated with quality education and effective utilization of resources. The report is designed to serve as a resource for those involved in evaluating present school district and school organization structure and in planning to improve education through the development of stronger, more effective educational administrative units and attendance centers. The findings should be of equal interest to educators, school board members, government officials, parents, and other electors interested in improving education. Following an initial narrative report on research in educational planning, twelve summary tables of research findings are provided. These tables offer data on factors related to elementary, junior, and senior high schools; comparative findings between high school size and (1) pupil achievement, (2) per pupil costs, (3) curricular offerings, (4) staff qualifications, (5) extracurricular programs, and (6) miscellaneous factors; factors related to school size in general; educational administrative unit size; and State enrollment guidelines for administrative units. A 140-item bibliography is included. (Author/EA)
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"... practitioners find the research sensible because it looks at the whole school, recognizes roles and role relationships, and acknowledges the subtle yet powerful interactions that exist between and among the members of the school social system."

— Lawrence W. Lezotte
Schools—and Their Principals—Do Make a Difference

In the late 1960s and early 1970s educators and the public were dismayed by research reports that apparently showed schools had little if any effect on the achievement of students. Student achievement and other educational outcomes, it was argued, were predetermined by the family's socioeconomic status (SES), or else were influenced greatly by pure luck.

These findings were rightly unsettling to educators, whose careers rest on the assumption that their efforts can make a difference in the lives of students. Furthermore, educators know from personal experience that their efforts and the efforts of their colleagues do, in fact, affect students. It seemed impossible that people could believe anything else! To make matters worse, when educators attempted to point out deficiencies in these research findings, they were attacked for expressing self-interest or for a desire to save their jobs.

As so often happens, the tables have now turned. Research is now showing that educators were right, that what takes place in the schools can make an important difference both in students' academic achievement and in their personal development. It is these newer reports that provide the focus for this Research Action Brief. But first we will look at some criticisms of the early findings.

Unfounded Pessimism

The research under criticism usually treated education as a "black box," the contents of which were inscrutable. Rather than study what happened inside the box, researchers looked at what went in ("input" variables such as student SES, student race, quality of buildings, expenditures per student, and teacher qualifications) and what came out ("output" variables or outcomes such as student achievement, lifetime earnings, and delinquency), and then drew correlations between their inputs and outputs.

Numerous critics argue that conclusions based on this kind of research are flawed. Michael Rutter and his colleagues, for example, criticized James Coleman's 1966 book *Equality of Educational Opportunity* for using student verbal ability as a measure of educational output. They argue that verbal ability is too heavily influenced by the home; a more proper way to measure school success in raising achievement would be to study a subject that is taught particularly in the schools, such as mathematics.

Rutter's group also argues that Christopher Jencks's 1972 book on inequality failed because it used inadequate input variables. These measures—easily quantifiable ones such as expenditures per student, class size, and teacher qualifications—had already been shown to have little effect on student achievement. Other aspects of schooling should have been examined instead.

Further, even if it were possible to show that family influence is greater than school influence, this would not establish that school influence is trivial or inconsequential. Again, to show that certain inequalities between groups do
schools Make a Difference

In 1979 two books appeared that demonstrated the importance of investigating what goes on inside the school. "Fifteen Thousand Hours," was based on a longitudinal study of secondary students in London; the other, School Social Systems and Student Achievement: Schools Can Make Difference, was based on a study of Michigan elementary schools. Each in its own way set about correcting what its authors saw as errors and omissions in the earlier works.

For "Fifteen Thousand Hours," the amount of time an English student spends in school until he or she is old enough to leave, Michael Rutter and his colleagues chose to conduct a longitudinal study. They felt that one flaw in the earlier studies was that not enough was known about students before they entered the particular period of schooling that was to be studied. Some early research looked only at the levels of achievement students had attained when they finished a period of schooling. For a valid judgment of the effect of schooling, one must also know as much as possible about the students before and after their exposure to the school period studied. The study began with a group of inner London ten-year- olds about to leave primary school. The students' verbal reasoning, behavior, parents' occupation, nonverbal intelligence, and reading level were studied as input (or "intake") variables. A group of these students was followed as it went through three years of schooling. The output variables studied were behavior, attendance, examination success, intelligence, and employment after leaving school. The group's classmates were also studied to make sure that the group was not in some way unusual. The settings of the schools and their interaction with the community were taken into account as "ecological" variables. But, most importantly, the schools themselves and the processes that take place within them were examined. Researchers evaluated the schools on the basis of academic emphasis, teacher expectations in lessons, rewards and punishments given students, general conditions under which students worked, responsibilities and participation allowed students, stability of teaching and student peer groups, staff organization, and skills of teachers. These "process" variables were examined together with the ecological variables, intake variables, outcome measures, and other variables in an attempt to identify as many influences on the students as possible.

The study came to ten main conclusions, including the following: the schools did differ significantly in student behavior, attendance, success in exams, and delinquency; although the mix of abilities of students attending the schools influenced these outcomes, the mix did not wholly account for the differences between schools; the differences between schools were not explainable by differences in physical facilities; the differences were systematically related to the schools' characteristics as social organizations; schools were influenced by ecological factors; and the way in which the process variables related indicates that there is probably a cumulative effect—that they work together to create what the authors term an "ethos" or set of values, attitudes and behaviors which will become characteristics of the school as a whole.

It is the ethos, or set of norms, of a school that seems to exert the most influence on students. Students who attended schools with different norms had different scores on the output measures. By assembling data on all the variables, it was possible to paint a picture of a school that exerts a positive influence. On the whole, "children benefit from attending schools which set good standards, where teachers provide good models of behavior, where they are praised and given responsibility, where the general conditions are good, and where the lessons are well conducted."

These aspects of good schools are furthered by teachers' expectations of student achievement and behavior and by the feedback the school provides on what is acceptable performance. It is the combination of these qualities that makes up the ethos, or norms and expectations, of a successful school.

Importance of School Climate

While Rutter and his colleagues write about a school's ethos, Wilbur Brookover and his coworkers on the Michigan study argue that "each school has a set of student status- role definitions, norms, evaluations, and expectations characterizing the behavior expected of students." Although the words are a bit different, in both cases the researchers are concerned with schoolwide standards and expectations that are set for students. Each team of researchers views the school as a social system: The school socializes its members to accept its norms.

Brookover and his colleagues examined a set of inputs (including the traditional ones of student SES and racial composition) and outcomes (academic achievement in reading and arithmetic, student self-concept about academic ability, and self-reliance). Like Rutter's team, they also looked at school process variables, which they divided into two groups—social structure and social climate. The social structure measures were teacher satisfaction, parent involvement in the school, differentiation in student programs, the principal's report of his or her time given to instruction, and the use of open and closed classrooms. School climate was made up of fourteen measures of student, teacher, and principal perceptions of and attitudes toward the expectations and norms of the school.

Sorting through all of these variables to establish their effect on students was a difficult task because it is hard to identify the effects of individual variables. The traditional measures of student SES and racial factors, for instance, are tightly interrelated with the researchers' new measures of school climate factors. For instance, the student SES and racial composition of the student body can affect the expectations of teachers and thus influence the school's climate.
A successful school, then, has a climate that furthers success. That climate arises from a set of expectations and norms concerning student behavior. A successful school is one in which principals and teachers inculcate in students a sense that they can succeed. Principals and teachers set high standards and convince students that these standards can and will be met. These expectations are apparent in the way the school day is filled with activities whose purpose is to instruct and in the way that achievement is consistently rewarded. Brookover and his colleagues argue that a school is a social system that produces what it was designed to produce. The successful school is designed to expect and get success.

A Critical Mass of Qualities

The studies led by Rutter and by Brookover do differ from the early research both in their approach and in their conclusions. They looked at students before and after school experiences and saw a difference in their achievement that depended on which schools they attended. Then the researchers looked inside the schools to see what happens in them that could account for the differences. Not surprisingly, they found a complex social organization whose various qualities work together to shape students. It is these characteristics of the schools, expressed in terms of expectations, norms, climate, and ethos, that the early researchers missed.

To some, these concepts may sound a bit vague or abstract. It would, perhaps, be preferable to find that school success is attributable to specific programs or innovations. Schools, however, do not succeed because a specific program or approach, whether organizational or instructional, was adopted. A school succeeds because a host of factors work together to mold it into a well-functioning unit.

This understanding matches an observation Gilbert Austin makes in his analysis of the research literature on schools that raised student achievement beyond expected levels: Schools seem to need to accumulate a "critical mass" of positive qualities to be successful. None of the successful schools studied had all the positive qualities in common (many of the qualities focused on principal and teacher expectations and attitudes), and equally successful schools could have many different, as well as many similar, qualities.

Just as there is no single program that ensures success, so there doesn't seem to be any specific positive quality or group of qualities that guarantees results. Each school is unique and must be considered on the basis of its own characteristics.

The Principal Shapes the School

Amid this diversity, Austin's analysis revealed one quality that did seem constant. Schools that were unusually successful all had a principal, or other leader, who was exceptional. These leaders exerted influence through the respect teachers and students had for the leaders' knowledge of the instructional aspects of the school.

The idea that it is the principal who shapes successful schools is not radically new; it is one that has been with us for generations and shows up in other research. Ronald
Edmonds, for example, reviewed studies on effective schools and found leadership to be a key factor. In his summary of the "indispensable characteristics" of effective schools, he listed as first "strong administrative leadership, without which the disparate elements of good schooling can be neither brought together nor kept together." Edmonds sees leadership as the most important factor in school effectiveness.

Jean Wellisch and colleagues looked at twenty-two elementary schools that had raised the reading and mathematics achievement of their students, who were generally disadvantaged and low achieving. These successful schools had active administrators who were concerned about instruction, communicated their views, took responsibility for decisions on instruction, coordinated instructional programs, and emphasized academic standards.

Although these administrators were strong leaders, they were not dictators. A common method of exerting leadership was through regular sessions with teachers in which the principal discussed and reviewed teacher performance. By conferring with teachers and by demonstrating interest and support, principals can be involved in decisions concerning instructional matters without reducing a teacher's sense of authority.

Terrence Deal and Lynn Celotti emphasize the importance of the principal assuming the role of a senior colleague or a "symbolic" leader to influence teachers. A principal who offers advice and support as a colleague may be more effective than one who uses the official weight of the office to get results. And, a principal who can capitalize on the various myths, rituals, and ceremonies of a school can use them to extend his or her leadership.

Implications

The message of the literature seems clear. The schools are not helpless in the face of the forces that influence a student before he or she gets to school. Schools can and do make a difference in the achievement of students. The way that they effect change is by creating an ethos or set of expectations and norms that expect and support achievement.

The one person in the school who has the most influence on the establishment of the environment that will produce achievement is the principal. Establishing that environment is no small task, nor is it reducible to a simple formula. The principal who makes a difference brings to the job more than technical expertise. He or she dedicates mind, heart, and will to the achievement of one overriding goal: the success of every student. It is this desire to see students succeed that propels the principal to set high standards, communicate those standards to teachers and students, and make sure students are rewarded for achievement and reminded of the standards if they fail. In sum, the effective principal is one who sees to it that his or her expectations for student success permeate the entire school.
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School Effectiveness


Studies of school effectiveness vary widely in their designs. Such methodological parameters as level of data aggregation, stratification level, strategy of data analysis, and choice of dependent and independent variables differ greatly from study to study. The methodological choices a researcher makes are important, say the authors, because "taken together, they help to define the de facto conceptual framework" of a study. Understanding the conceptual framework, in turn, is essential for identifying the "inherent meaning" of a study and for comparing its results to other studies.

In this paper, the authors critique the 1966 Coleman report and other school effectiveness studies, with special attention to the conceptual framework underlying each study. "Our intent is to show how different conceptualizations of school emerge from the use of different methodological parameters," they state, "and to show further how altering one or more of these parameters can alter dramatically inferences made about school and school effectiveness."

The conceptualization underlying the Coleman report is as follows: "The school as a whole, by virtue of its static resources and facilities, influences pupils' general cognitive outcomes as measured by commercially available standardized tests." Home background influences are considered "prior to and independent of school influences" in this conceptualization. But a later researcher reanalyzed the same data using different methods that, in effect, altered the latter part of the Coleman report's conceptualization to read: "The school's influence is not necessarily independent of pupils' home background characteristics." This study found that 35 percent of the variation in student achievement was due to school factors, as opposed to the 10 percent found by Coleman. The authors go on to show how modifications of other methodological parameters can influence both the conceptualization of a study and the conclusions drawn from its results.

2. Austin, Gilbert R. "Exemplary Schools and the Search for Effectiveness." Educational Leadership, 37, 1 (October 1979), pp. 10-12, 14. EJ 208 050

Until the mid-1960s, educators were certain that they could teach children of all backgrounds, given adequate resources. Doubts began to surface, however, with the publication of the 1966 Coleman report and other similar studies. These studies concluded that family background factors—not variations in school facilities, curriculum, and staff—were the primary determinants of academic achievement.

Other researchers during this period, however, were taking a different approach to the school effectiveness question. They identified the exemplary or highly effective schools in a sample and then described the characteristics of these schools.

"The major finding of these studies," states Austin, "is that there is no one single factor that accounts for a school being classified as exceptional. These schools appear to have a critical mass of positive factors which, when put together, make the difference." Each of the factors associated with effectiveness was not found in every exceptional school. Austin points out, rather the factors "are characteristic of the group as a whole."

In the exceptional schools, the principal's leadership was 'strong,' meaning, for example, that the schools were "'being run' for a purpose rather than 'running' from force of habit." Principals also participated strongly in the classroom instructional program, felt they had control over the functioning of their schools, and held high expectations for both teachers and students.

All staff had "greater experience and more pertinent education." Teachers had freedom to choose teaching techniques, were more satisfied with opportunities to try new techniques, expected more children to show high achievement and display good citizenship, and were rated as warmer and more responsive. Students had more positive self-concepts and a greater "feeling of controlling their own destiny." Austin concludes that "the individual characteristics of principals, teachers, schools, neighborhoods, and home influence a pupil's achievement far more than particular instructional models."


"What is the current state of knowledge regarding the determinants of educational effectiveness? To find out, the President's Commission on School Finance asked Rand Corporation to critically analyze the vast research literature on this topic. The result is this comprehensive report, which, the authors emphasize, is not simply a "classical survey of research listing findings without much evaluation of the results." Rather, it is a critical survey that analyzes each study according to both its "internal validity" and its
studies on process show "no consistent effect on student achieve-
and the interactions between teachers and students. Classroom
approaches concentrates on the *processes* applied to students
credible "in the light of accumulated knowledge."

The authors organized their analysis according to the five basic
research approaches utilized by researchers. One of these
approaches concentrates on the "processes" applied to students
and the interactions between teachers and students. Classroom
studies on process show "no consistent effect on student achieve-
ment" of different teaching approaches, class size, or instructional
methods, the authors state. Laboratory studies on process suggest
the importance of the sequencing and organization of learning
materials and the complexity of interaction effects between
students, teachers, and methods.

The authors also analyze the "input-output" approach, which
assumes that a student's educational outcomes are determined by
the quantities and qualities of educational resources made available
by personal, family, and community characteristics; the
"organizational" approach, which assumes that the history and
societal demands on a school are more important than what is
actually done in the school; the "evaluative" approach, which
includes studies of the effects of large-scale interventions in educa-
tion, such as Title I and Head Start programs; and the "experiential"
approach, which is represented by the varied literature on educa-
tional reform.

The authors conclude that "research has not identified a variant
of the existing system that is consistently related to students' educa-
tional outcomes." This does not mean that "nothing makes a
difference, or that nothing 'works':" the authors emphasize.
"Rather, we are saying that research has found nothing that 'con-
sistently and unambiguously makes a difference' in student
outcomes."


"Some aspects of school social environment clearly make a dif-
fERENCE in the academic achievement of schools." This is the fore-
most conclusion of a study of ninety-one Michigan elementary
schools conducted by Brookover and his colleagues and reported in
this article.

The authors use the term "school climate" to refer to aspects of
the school social environment they studied. School climate, they
state, "may be broadly conceived as the norms of the [school] social
system." Specific school climate variables measured included student
"sense of academic futility," student "perception of teacher push and
teacher norms," teacher "perception of principal's expectations,"
and "parent concern and expectations for quality educa-
tion" as perceived by the principal.

From state and school records, the researchers obtained data on
socioeconomic status of students' families, racial composition of
each school, and achievement scores. Questionnaires were then
administered to students, teachers, and the principal of each school
to measure school climate variables.

The authors found large differences between schools in student
achievement. "The socio-economic and racial composition of the
schools can explain a significant portion of this variance," they
state. However, the climate variables can also explain a significant
portion of the variance. In other words, socioeconomic and racial
variables and the climate variables appear to be generally related.
There are exceptions, however. Some low-SES schools "have
school climates favorable for achievement and some high SES
schools have school climates that are not highly favorable for
achievement." Favorable climate rather than high SES or racial
composition is, the authors believe, the necessary condition for high
achievement.
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Social scientists and opinion makers continue to espouse the belief that home and family background factors are the chief
determinants of student achievement. But effective schools do
exist in urban and poor areas, Edmonds argues, and their success, as
several research studies show, stems from such school-controlled
factors as leadership, expectation, atmosphere, and instructional
emphasis. In this article, Edmonds reviews some of these studies and
argues for the general thesis "that all children are eminently
educable and that the behavior of the school is critical in determin-
ing the quality of that education."

A 1971 study, for example, identified and characterized four
instructionally effective inner-city schools. All four schools had
"strong leadership," had high expectations for all of their students,
had "an orderly, relatively quiet, and pleasant atmosphere," and
"strongly emphasized pupil acquisition of reading skills and rein-
forced that emphasis by careful and frequent evaluation of pupil
progress."

Another study, conducted in 1976, compared two groups of Cali-
fornia elementary schools that differed only on measures of student
achievement. In comparison to teachers in the lower-achieving
schools, teachers in the higher-achieving schools reported signifi-
cantly greater amounts of principal support, were more task
oriented in their classroom approach, "exhibited more evidence of
applying appropriate principles of learning," and were more satis-
fied with their work.

The most tangible and indispensable characteristics of effective
schools, Edmonds concludes, are strong administrative leadership,
a "climate of expectation in which no children are permitted to fall
below minimum but efficacious levels of achievement," an
emphasis on the acquisition of basic school skills, flexibility in the
assignment of resources to meet fundamental objectives, and a
school atmosphere that is relatively orderly and quiet.
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Beginning with the 1966 Coleman report, large-scale statistical studies have failed to find significant relationships between what goes on in schools and student achievement. These distressing results, say Klitgaard and Hall, are "perhaps the most counterintuitive findings in public policy research in the past decade."

These authors propose an alternative view of the data on school effectiveness, which, instead of considering the average effects of school policies, asks whether exceptional or outstanding schools really do exist. The question, as the authors put it, is this: "Do some schools consistently produce outstanding students even after allowance is made for the different initial endowments of their students and for chance variation?" As long as the number of such schools is not large, they state, the mathematics of previous studies allow for such a possibility.

The authors reanalyzed several data bases from studies on Michigan, New York City, and "Project Talent" schools. They controlled only for "non-school background variables" such as SES and implicitly assumed that what was left over represented the influence of school factors and random variation.

Data from the Project Talent and New York City schools showed little evidence of consistent overachievers. The Michigan data, however, provided some evidence of unusually effective schools. For example, of 213 nonrural schools that reported scores for "four grade-year-test combinations, 72 were at least one standard deviation above the mean all four times," whereas only 13 would be expected by chance. These 72 schools showed significant differences from the average on three school-related factors. Classes were smaller, more teachers had five or more years of experience, and more teachers earned $11,000 or more.

In the late sixties and early seventies, many studies were conducted that found home and family variables to be much more strongly related to student performance than school-based factors as teacher preparation, instructional materials, physical plant, or dollars spent. Today, however, states Lipham, many researchers are concentrating on "the examination of specific school processes and behaviors associated with student achievement." The researchers are comparing the administrative and instructional processes of schools that have similar socioeconomic characteristics but wide differences in student achievement.

Among the many variables examined in these studies, Lipham says, "the leadership of the principal invariably has emerged as a key factor in the success of the school." In this excellent publication, Lipham summarizes a great deal of recent educational research and literature that identifies the characteristics of effective principals and effective schools.

The recent emphasis on strong leadership for effective schools "may in some sense return to the 'great person' approach to leadership," says Lipham. But studies of effective schools have focused not on the great person approach but instead on the "behaviour-of-the-leader-in-situation." Successful principals, he has found, use a "situational" leadership style and vary their behavior as the situation warrants.

Numerous studies show that the principals of effective schools are committed to improving the instructional program, have a strong knowledge of classroom instructional activities, frequently participate in these activities, monitor the effective use of class time, successfully attempt to improve instructional processes, and have positive attitudes toward both teachers and students. Thus, the single most important factor in determining the success or failure of a school, states Lipham, "is the ability of the principal to lead the staff in planning, implementing and evaluating improvements" in the school's instructional program.

Several other chapters of this publication focus on the goals, values, decision-making processes, public relations, and organizational relationships of successful schools and principals.


"Despite the overwhelming relationships we know exist between school attainment and social class, the individual school can be effective for students of all social groups." This is the main conclusion of a five-year longitudinal study of unusually effective London high schools entitled Fifteen Thousand Hours, coauthored by Michael Rutter, Peter Mortimore, and others.

The "outcomes" of education measured by these researchers were attendance, behavior in school, delinquency out of school, and academic achievement. The most effective high schools, according to these measures, had teachers who showed a positive attitude toward learning, were generally more organized, emphasized rewards rather than punishments, made conditions for students as pleasant as possible, and involved students more in the management of their own learning.

Mortimore believes, however, that particular actions and methods are less important than the existence in a school of a "positive ethos," which he describes as "a positive attitude by teachers toward young people and a positive attitude toward learning." A positive ethos depends on "leadership—strong, positive leadership that manages to capture the enthusiasm of the teachers without being either too democratic or too autocratic." A good ethos or school climate also depends on high expectations for teacher and student performance, consistency in the treatment of students, and the giving of "realistic feedback" to students.

Changing a school's ethos from negative to positive, however, "is extraordinarily difficult," states Mortimore, "because once you set up a system everything in the school relates to it." Real change takes time and constant effort. But educators can make their schools more effective, Mortimore concludes, "though it will be hard work and they must expect some setbacks."

Since the publication of the original "Coleman" report in 1966, educators have been told again and again that "schools don't make a difference" and that family background factors have the preponderance of influence in determining student outcomes. "The new Coleman report dramatically reverses this pessimistic conclusion," states Ravitch, "and finds instead that schools do make a difference, regardless of the family background of students."

The "new" Coleman report Ravitch refers to is entitled "Public and Private Schools" (PPS) and is part of "High School and Beyond," a major longitudinal study funded by the Department of Education. Altogether, nearly sixty thousand high school students in over one thousand schools were surveyed, along with their teachers and principals.

PPS, Ravitch cautions, should be viewed from two distinct viewpoints, one political, the other educational. Even before the report was available, critics who were fearful that the study would promote tuition tax credits or educational vouchers "denounced
oleman's methodology and even his personal integrity in their efforts to discredit his finding that private high schools are, on the whole, better than public high schools." But there is surprisingly good news in the report, too, if educators would pause to listen, states Ravitch.

Time and again, Ravitch states, the new report "demonstrates that achievement follows from specific school policies, not from the particular family background of the students." Private high schools produce better results, according to PPS, not because they are private but because they "create higher rates of engagement in academic activities," have better attendance, and have students who do more homework and take more rigorous subjects. These findings, Ravitch concludes, contain clear implications for the improvement of both public and private schools and "should be a source of rejoicing for educators in public and private schools alike, or they confirm the importance and efficacy of their actions."

---

Scott, Ralph, and Walberg, Herbert J. "Schools Alone Are Insufficient: A Response to Edmonds." Educational Leadership, 37, 1 (October 1979), pp. 24-27. EJ 208 052:

Recent research has identified three sets of factors that are strongly and consistently related to student learning: student ability and motivation, quantity and quality of instruction, and the qualities of the home environment. These three sets of factors—the student, the school, and the home—are like a three-legged stool, state Scott and Walberg. The stool is only as strong as its weakest leg, so "strengthening the stronger legs is far less productive than strengthening the weakest."

Strengthening the strongest leg—the school—is what Ronald Edmonds and other researchers would like to do, Scott and Walberg contend. In this article, they criticize this viewpoint as well as the research methodologies used and conclusions drawn by Edmonds in three of his publications.

Some of Edmonds's results coincide with the conclusions of a comprehensive review of the research literature on the determinants of academic learning, conducted by Walberg and two colleagues. Scott and Walberg are skeptical, however, of the conclusions drawn by Edmonds that do not agree with this review "since the evidence he assembles is highly limited even in his two lengthy papers." Moreover, even Edmonds's own data demonstrate the important influence of background factors on school achievement.

Edmonds asserts that an overemphasis on home influence would "not only absolve educators of their responsibility to be instructionally effective, but [would] place unfairly the burden for learning on parents," according to Scott and Walberg. But emphasizing the role of the home in learning should not reduce appreciation of the role of the school, these authors state.

After further criticizing Edmonds's methodologies and arguments, the authors conclude that "educators alone are insufficient to increase learning productivity dramatically, and they need the cooperation of parents and students themselves."

---


Research on the effectiveness of classroom teaching techniques is abundant, but studies of the influence of the school as a whole on student outcomes are few in number. "Yet, what research there is," states Squires, "indicates that a school's processes, norms and values as a social institution do make a significant difference." Squires here reviews the best of the school effectiveness studies and derives from them numerous questions that, "when answered, identify areas where schools are effective and/or where they could improve:"

The "input-output" studies of the sixties attempted to determine which "inputs"—such as socioeconomic status (SES), availability of instructional materials, staff's education and experience, dollars spent, and so on—correlated with such "outputs"—as grades, achievement test scores, dropout rates, and so forth. The general conclusion of these studies was that "the most easily measured characteristics of school context, with the exception of SES and student attitudes, are not associated with student outcomes."

But what in the school environment, Squires asks, influences student attitudes? Several recent studies—including a five-year longitudinal study of London schools—support the notion that the norms and values of a school, along with certain characteristics of school as social institutions, influence both student attitudes and outcomes.

Specifically, such factors as academic emphasis, teacher skills, teacher actions in lessons, system of rewards and punishment, pupil conditions, responsibility and participation of students, and staff organization were found to be significantly related to student outcomes. Squires concludes by synthesizing a "model of school processes" from the research he reviews.
SUMMARY TABLES OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS STUDIES

“All of the characteristics identified are interacting aspects of the total social system; some specific characteristics may function differently in different schools.”

— Wilbur B. Brookover et al.
### SUMMARY OF WITHIN-SCHOOL FACTORS THOUGHT TO CHARACTERIZE THE INSTRUCTIONALLY EFFECTIVE SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Study Details</th>
<th>School Environment</th>
<th>Instructional Emphasis</th>
<th>Pupil Evaluation</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDMONDS LOTT MccARTHY</td>
<td>(20 Detroit and 5 Lansing Schools: achievement data plus case analysis)</td>
<td>Strong leadership, characteristics and behavior</td>
<td>Highest priority to pupil acquisition of basic skills.</td>
<td>Frequent.</td>
<td>Flexible allocation to follow priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENEZKY LAWSON SWEET</td>
<td>(Reading programs of two urban, minority schools, one high, one low achieving)</td>
<td>High expectations.</td>
<td>Highest priority to reading with clear goals; homogeneous groupings for reading; client-centered services; adaptable instruction.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Availability and coordination of extra personnel, time and materials; supplemental materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROOKOVER LEZOTTE</td>
<td>(Controlled for class. 21 high achieving/low achieving schools)</td>
<td>Directive about reading achievement; high task orientation; works closely with specialists; high-risk reading goals.</td>
<td>More time to social studies. More whole group instruction.</td>
<td>Teachers accept pupil test results as measure of their adult performance.</td>
<td>Many adult volunteers, fewer paid aides, high access to additional materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADAUS ET AL.</td>
<td>(Reexamination of school-effectiveness studies)</td>
<td>High expectations; high structure; clear goals.</td>
<td>Emphasis on cognitive development. Longer instructional day.</td>
<td>Tests closely related to syllabus. Test-taking skills stressed.</td>
<td>&quot;Shared purposefulness&quot; among school persons and home.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increasing amount of time on task

Student attitudes that the school cares; they can control success

Teachers interact with whole group more; monitor frequently; align curriculum

School staff share common goals; expect all students to achieve

Strong involvement of instructional leader in educational process of school

Other Factors

Commitment by school staff to goals/mission of the school

Orderly and safe school atmosphere

SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS CONTINUUM

(Diagram and tables on following pages excerpted from Considering the Research: What Makes An Effective School? by John D. Westbrook. ED 223008)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR(s)</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DEFINITION/ CRITERIA</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>SAMPLE</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
<th>MAGNITUDE OF EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coleman, J.</td>
<td>...;:j.1965</td>
<td>None stated</td>
<td>National Survey</td>
<td>&quot;School Survey Tests&quot; were administered to sampling of metropolitan and non-metropolitan 1st, 3rd, 6th, 9th, and 12th grade students across the nation. Care was given to involving proportional numbers of blacks and whites. Surveys were developed by Educational Testing Service. Teacher, principal, and superintendent questionnaires were used to collect additional data. Total number of surveys used in data analysis was approximately 570,000. Approximately 70,000 questionnaires were collected.</td>
<td>Coleman's report generally found that much of the difference in achievement outcomes across schools could be explained by the social status and/or racial composition of the school student body. The Coleman Report found the following in relation to student achievement: (1) when socioeconomic background is controlled, differences between schools account for only a &quot;small fraction of differences in pupil achievement&quot;; (2) the average minority student's achievement might suffer more in a school of low quality than would 'white students'; achievement&quot;, (3) student achievement is strongly related to the educational backgrounds and aspirations of the other students in the school.</td>
<td>Coleman's report contains various numerical comparisons according to various study variables.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber, G.</td>
<td>&quot;Inner City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools&quot;</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Defined effective schools in terms of:</td>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>4 public elementary schools (1 in Los Angeles, 1 in Kansas City and 2 in New York)</td>
<td>Characteristics not found to be part of effective reading program included:</td>
<td>None stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(s)</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>DEFINITION/CRITERIA</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>SAMPLE</td>
<td>FINDINGS</td>
<td>MAGNITUDE OF EFFECTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookover, W.B.</td>
<td>Improving School or Effective School = increase of at least 5% in percentage of students attaining 75% or more of tested objectives and a decrease of 5% or more in students attaining 25% or less of tested objectives during 1974-1976. Declining School = decrease of at least 50% in students attaining 75% or more of tested objectives and increase of 5% or more attaining 25% or less of tested objectives during 1974-1976.</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>8 Michigan elementary schools (6 &quot;improving&quot; schools and 2 &quot;declining&quot; schools).</td>
<td>Improving schools differed from declining schools in terms of: (1) emphasizing accomplishment of basic reading and mathematics objectives (2) expressing belief that all students could master basic skills objectives (3) having higher expectations for students educational accomplishments (4) assuming responsibility for teaching basic skills (5) spending more time in reading instruction (6) having principal who is an instructional leader, assertive, a disciplinarian and responsible for basic skill achievement (7) more accepting of concept of teacher accountability (8) having higher levels of parent-initiated contact but less overall parent-involvement (9) involving teachers in identification/teaching of compensatory education classes</td>
<td>None stated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(s)</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>DEFINITION/ CRITERIA</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>SAMPLE</td>
<td>FINDINGS</td>
<td>MAGNITUDE OF EFFECTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookover, W.B.</td>
<td>Beady, C.</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>HIGH ACHIEVING SCHOOL WAS determined on the basis of whether the school scored above the sample mean for the white/black racial groups</td>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>91 Michigan elementary schools randomly selected from all Michigan elementary schools in correlational study; 4 elementary schools in case study. Schools were paired by race, socio-economic status, and urban location. Each pair consisted of a high and low achieving school.</td>
<td>Study found the social system to explain approximately 85% of the variance between groups in reading and math achievement.</td>
<td>None stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood, P.</td>
<td>Schweitzer, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical results given for each outcome area enabling a gauge of the effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisenbaker, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical results given for each outcome area enabling a gauge of the effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutter, H.</td>
<td>Haughan, B.</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>No specific definition given. Variables (outcome) of study, however, indicate criterion areas.</td>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>12 Inner-London schools</td>
<td>Study of the following outcome variables occurred:</td>
<td>General results of study showed correlations between the more effective schools and certain outcomes. Those positively correlated with positive academic outcomes were in the areas of: display of student work, number of school outings, teacher views considered in administrative decision-making, students' report &quot;approachability&quot; of staff, positions of responsibility held by students (40-50%), teachers checked regarding assigning of homework, general standards of classroom discipline, school library use, frequency of teachers' interactions of whole class, student participation in assembly/class meetings, pupil conditions, homework given to students and teacher expectations for pupil success on exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hortimore, P.</td>
<td>Ouston, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical results given for each outcome area enabling a gauge of the effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, A.</td>
<td>Fifteen Thousand Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical results given for each outcome area enabling a gauge of the effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(s)</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>DEFINITION/ CRITERIA</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>SAMPLE</td>
<td>FINDINGS</td>
<td>MAGNITUDE OF EFFECTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds, R.</td>
<td>&quot;Effective Schools for the Urban Poor&quot;</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Effective school is one that &quot;brings the children of the poor to those minimal measures of basic school skills that now describe minimally successful pupil performance for the children of the middle class.&quot;</td>
<td>Review of the Literature</td>
<td>This review of the literature cites 38 studies/reviews/articles on the topic of school effectiveness. Edmonds identifies five &quot;indispensable&quot; characteristics of the effective school and suggests a new criterion level for the concept.</td>
<td>Edmonds' review of the literature identifies these effective school characteristics: (1) strong administrative leadership (2) climate of expectation in which no student is permitted to fall below minimum but efficacious levels of achievement (3) orderly and quiet atmosphere which is conducive to learning but is not rigid or repressive (4) philosophy that student acquisition of basic school skills takes precedence over all other school activities (5) frequent monitoring of student progress</td>
<td>None stated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selective Listing of Effective Schools Characteristics

"The term effective school implies that all classrooms perform fairly well, rather than that a few outstanding classrooms raise the overall average."

— John H. Ralph and James Fennessey
CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS -- A SELECTIVE LISTING

A review of educational literature reveals various elements which characterize effective schools. These elements are derived from research studies, case studies, and informal observations of what works in schools. Program Planning and Development is providing this list of characteristics of effective schools as a basis for further discovery and discussion about elements of quality schooling. This listing is not conclusive nor comprehensive. No determination about the definitive effective schools characteristics is inferred. Other characteristics will be identified as the effective schools movement continues and the volume of literature increases.

Research-Based Characteristics of Effective Schools and Teachers:

- Teachers have high expectations of students.
- Student progress receives frequent monitoring.
- A "business-like" climate exists in classrooms with direct student activity and achievement orientation.
- Learning materials are appropriate to the level of difficulty.
- Time on task relates to achievement but not beyond the "point of no return."
- Effective teachers allow for sufficient time on task through routine classroom management skills.
- Students can learn criterion materials.
- Reading and mathematics teachers are receiving leadership from someone.

Gordon Cawelti
Executive Director,
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

(Good Schools, p. 87)

Top priorities for good schools (determined by participants at a conference held by the National Committee for Citizens in Education)

- Leadership by the principal and designated others;
- Student progress, school, and staff evaluation;
- Mutual agreement on school and classroom goals and objectives;
- Parent participation in school decision making;
- Parent participation encouraged;
- High expectations for every student and an emphasis on academics;
- The school as a problem-solving unit;
- Closer relationship between research about learning and actual practice;
- Training for all school staff, not just teachers;
- A productive school climate physically and psychologically.

(Good Schools, p. 90)
In the 1980 Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools, respondents suggested the following ways to improve schools:

- adequately trained teachers and principals,
- stress on reading, writing and computation,
- personal interest by teachers and principals about students' achievement,
- positive parent/teacher relationships,
- frequent check on student progress and effort.

(Good Schools, p. 90)

From a review of 38 studies/reviews/articles on school effectiveness, Ronald Edmonds identified these five "indispensable" characteristics:

1) strong administrative leadership;
2) a high expectation level from which no student may fall below proficiency;
3) atmosphere conducive to learning yet not imposing;
4) belief that basic school skills are priorities over all other school activities;
5) systematic monitoring of student progress.

(Edmonds, in Westbrook, p. 6)

A case study of eight Michigan elementary schools revealed differences between "improving" and "declining" schools. The improving schools:

1) emphasized basic reading and mathematics objectives;
2) believed all students could master basic skills objectives;
3) held higher expectations for students;
4) assumed responsibility for teaching basic skills;
5) spent more time in reading instruction;
6) had a principal who took active part in instruction, discipline, and basic skill development;
7) accepted the concept of teacher accountability;
8) had parent-initiated contact but less overall parent involvement;
9) involved teachers in identifying/teaching compensatory education classes.

(Brookover and Lezotte, in Westbrook, 1982)

A brochure distributed by the Ohio Department of Education lists the following seven factors as "basic" among all the effective schools studies:

1) sense of mission,
2) strong building leadership,
3) high expectations for all students and staff,
4) frequent monitoring of student progress,
5) positive learning climate,
6) sufficient opportunity for learning,
7) parent/community involvement.

("Effective Schools Program, 1981")
The Colorado State Department of Education has developed a checklist of effective schools characteristics which includes, among others:
  
  - a strong principal,
  - a clear sense of the school's purpose,
  - a safe environment,
  - sufficient time spent on learning activities.

(NAEP Newsletter, p. 6)

The Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory identifies this framework for improvement efforts:

Time allotment directly relates to what students learn.
Students' time on instructional tasks can be much higher than present.
Most students can succeed; systematic instruction produces basic skills mastery.

and supplements the framework with these other findings:

- A supportive, friendly climate to assure students' and teachers' safety;
- Clear purposes of the school, clearly communicated;
- High expectations about success;
- Carefully thought out and systematically implemented instructional methods and curriculum;
- Monitoring critical variables as a basis for decision making.

(MCREL, 1983)

A survey of educational research by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory resulted in identification of these effective schooling practices for use in the Alaska Effective Schooling Program:

- Leadership - needs identification; implementation; goal setting; improvement efforts
- School Environment - expectations for students and staff; time management; rewards and incentives; parent involvement
- Curriculum - objectives; resources; instructional strategies and techniques
- Classroom Instruction and Management - behavior and learning expectations; placement and grouping; time; review and reteaching; student/teacher interactions; rewards and incentives
- Assessment and Evaluation - alignment; procedures; use of assessment data; student performance monitoring.

(NWREL, 1983)
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Eastern Illinois University</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>425 North Michigan</td>
<td>Chicago Public Library</td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Joseph Regenstein Library</td>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>312/753-3766</td>
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<td>Southern Illinois University</td>
<td>618/692-2906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>312/492-7604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>National College of Education</td>
<td>312/256-5150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayslake</td>
<td>Learning Resources Center</td>
<td>College of Lake County</td>
<td>312/223-6601 Ext. 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macomb</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Western Illinois University</td>
<td>309/298-2411 Ext. 263,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Milner Library</td>
<td>Illinois State University</td>
<td>309/438-3675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palos Hills</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Moraine Valley Community College</td>
<td>312/974-4300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Forest</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Governors State University</td>
<td>312/534-5000 Ext. 2323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria</td>
<td>Cullom-Davis Library</td>
<td>Bradley University</td>
<td>309/676-7611 Ext. 530,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concordia College</td>
<td>312/771-8300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ext. 448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>Brookens Library</td>
<td>Sangamon State University</td>
<td>217/786-6633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>Media and Resources Center</td>
<td>Illinois State Board of Education</td>
<td>217/782-4433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbana</td>
<td>Main Library</td>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>217/333-2305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbana</td>
<td>ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>College of Education University of Illinois</td>
<td>217/333-1386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbana</td>
<td>ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills</td>
<td>National Council of Teachers of English</td>
<td>217/328-3870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKC/9027k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>