

Figure 1. An overview of the Decatur organizational change process to Feb. 2005
(Grayed items have already been completed.)

Phase I. Initiate a Systemic Change Effort		7 months
1. Facilitators assessed and enhanced their own readiness for the process and formed a Support Team. (GS Event 1)		Oct - Nov '00
2. Facilitators explored working with four school districts and established a relationship with Decatur. (GS Event 2)		Dec - Feb '01
3. Facilitators assessed and enhanced Decatur's readiness (GS Event 3.1)		Jan - Feb '01
4. No contract was signed for Phase II. Not needed (pro bono) (GS Event 3.2) Core Team developed a broad agreement for the change process for all stakeholders to sign and sought board approval (Now Event 10 in GSTE)		Mar - May '01
Phase II. Develop Core Team		12 months
5. Facilitators and superintendent formed the Core Team (GS Event 5)		Feb - Mar '01
6. Retreat was designed and held to develop Core Team dynamic (GS Event 6)		Apr - Jun '01
7. Core Team understanding was developed of the systemic change process, systems design, dialogue, and small-group facilitation (GS Event 7)		Jun - Nov '01
8. Used community forums to assess and enhance district and community capacity and culture for change. (Begin by redesigning the event) (GS Events 4, 10, 11)		Jan - Feb '02
9. Did not develop an agreement/contract with the Core Team and School Board for a systemic change process and funding, scope out resource needs, and plan a proposal for external funding (New Event) – Not needed (pro bono)		-
10. Partially developed a compact with all stakeholders to engage in a systemic change process (see 4); did not have a large public signing ceremony (New)		Mar - May '01
Phase III. Develop the District-Wide Framework and Capacity for Change		27 months
11. Core Team expanded into the Leadership Team, Core Team members became facilitators, facilitator became an advisor and “critical partner” (GS Event 13)		Nov - Dec '02 Again in Oct '03
12. Did not hold a retreat to develop the Leadership Team dynamic (GS Event 13)		-
13. Facilitators are developing Leadership Team understanding of systems, design, mental models, the systemic change process, dialogue, and small-group facilitation (Address throughout Events 14-15, hold 1-day retreats) (GS Event 13)		Jan '03 → ongoing
14. Leadership Team began to develop a district-wide framework with broad stakeholder participation (community forums). This entailed identifying changes in the community's educational needs. The Team took this opportunity to enhance district and community interest in, and culture for, systemic change. (GS Events 11, 17 & 18)		Dec '03 - Feb '04
15. Leadership Team is finishing development of a district-wide framework with broad stakeholder participation (community forums). This has entailed developing core values or beliefs for an ideal school system, regarding both ends and means. The Team is taking this opportunity to enhance district and community interest in, and culture for, systemic change. It is developing pyramid groups and other means for broad stakeholder involvement. (Leadership Team is being involved to some extent in redesigning the event) (GS Events 11, 17-18)		Feb - Nov '04
16. Leadership Team identifies current and recent change efforts and decides what relation those should have with this effort (decides how to integrate them) (Begin by redesigning the event) (GS Event 9)		Feb - Dec '02 Oct - Nov '04
17. Leadership Team develops a change process strategy with broad stakeholder input. This includes district office capacity-building (a Professional Development Academy – PDA), leadership development, and budget. Leadership Team gets funding for Phase IV. Advisor's role is defined and funded for Phase IV. (Begin by redesigning the event) (New Event)		Sep '04 - Feb '05

IV. Create Ideal Designs for a New Educational System**10 months**

18. Leadership Team forms and develops the capacity of (through a series of 1-day workshops) several building-level Design Teams and conducts a workshop on the district framework. (Begin by redesigning the event.)	6 weeks Mar - Apr '05
---	--------------------------

The 25-member Leadership Team will have a 2-hour meeting to redesign and plan the event, which offers detailed guidance and options for team member selection and the workshops. Two teams will be funded in year 1 and two more in year 2. Each Design Team will likely have four teachers, the principal, a student, a staff member, three parents or community people, and a facilitator. Three one-day workshops will be conducted per Team. Decatur's highly competent systemic change coordinator, Gary Pellico, will devote considerable time to redesigning and conducting the workshops.

19. Design Teams create ideal building-level designs and criteria for evaluating those designs with broad stakeholder involvement. Leadership Team supports and monitors the Design Teams.	17 weeks Apr - Aug '05
--	---------------------------

Each of the two Design Teams will meet for a half-day every two weeks for eight weeks during the remainder of the school year and for 20 half-days over the summer to design an ideal school. The Leadership Team will have three two-hour meetings to keep abreast of Design Team progress and mindset evolution. Pellico will devote considerable time to supporting the teams' efforts. This will be repeated for the next two Design Teams in year two.

20. Leadership Team forms and capacitates a district-level Design Team (Begin by redesigning the event)	2 weeks Sep '05
---	--------------------

The Leadership Team will have a 2-hour meeting to redesign and plan the event. The district Design Team will likely have one member from each of the two school Design Teams, a school board member, the superintendent, an influential community business leader, a state representative to the legislature, an influential official from the Indiana Department of Education, a member of the governor's office, and a facilitator. Four half-day workshops will be conducted.

21. District Design Team creates a design for ideal district administrative and governance systems, and systems for evaluating that design, with broad stakeholder involvement. Leadership Team supports and monitors this Design Team.	12 weeks Sep - Dec '05
---	---------------------------

The District Design Team will meet for a half day every two weeks for 12 weeks to design an ideal district administrative and governance system. The Leadership Team will have three two-hour meetings to keep abreast of District Design Team progress and mindset evolution.

V. Implement and Evolve the New Educational System**3 months →**

22. Design Teams create building-level processes for evolving as close as possible to their ideal designs. This includes identifying existing programs and resources, and identifying gaps where they must design their own. Leadership Team supports and monitors the Design Teams.	20 weeks Sep '05 - Feb '06
--	-------------------------------

Each Design Team will meet for a half-day every two weeks for 20 weeks to design its implementation process. The Leadership Team will have four two-hour meetings to keep abreast of Design Team progress and mindset evolution and will provide political support. Pellico will devote considerable time to supporting the teams' efforts.

23. Design Teams and PDA prepare for implementation with remodeling, equipment installation, resource procurement, teacher training, etc.	26 weeks Mar - Aug '06
---	---------------------------

The expenses for remodeling, equipment installation, and resource procurement will be paid by Decatur and other external grants. However, the two school Design Teams will still need to meet for planning, coordination, and training. Each team will meet for a half-day every three weeks for 12 weeks during the school year and 10 days during the summer. The Leadership Team will have one two-hour meeting to keep abreast of Design Team progress and will provide political support. Pellico will devote considerable time to supporting the teams' efforts.

24. Carry out implementation plans, formative evaluations, and revisions of the evolving designs and the implementation processes.	School year '06-7 & summer '07
--	-----------------------------------

The Design Teams' work during the school year will not be supported by this project, but each of the two teams will be paid for 10 days during the summer to work out problems in their designs and implementations. The Leadership Team will hold four two-hour meetings to monitor progress and provide political support. Pellico will devote considerable time to supporting the teams' efforts.

Professional Development for the Leadership Team

1. Learn to Design their own Change Process

- a. Systems Design
- b. Change Process – GSTE
 - i. What has happened so far and how?
- c. Other change efforts
 - i. In Decatur
 - ii. Outside (Select Examples)

2. Develop Systems Thinking

3. Help Building Teams Develop Learning Community – Culture, Skills, Mindset and Team Spirit

- a. Guidelines from DuFour
- b. Senge's five disciplines:
 - i. Personal Mastery
 - ii. Team Learning (Internal Communication)
 - iii. Shared Vision
 - iv. Mental Models
 - v. Systems Thinking – See #3 below
- c. Key ideas to guide the LT's work:
 - i. Consensus
 - ii. Collaboration
 - iii. Constructive Criticism
 - iv. Communication (Two-way)
 - v. Disclosure
 - vi. Trust
 - vii. Managing Conflict
- d. External communication – how to communicate 2-way with constituents

4. Evolve mindsets from industrial-age thinking to information-age thinking

5. Build Motivation

- a. Accomplishments
- b. Incentives
- c. Enjoyment
- d. Urgency/need for systemic change

***Weekly Readings and Videos*

Decatur Leadership Team Reading Packet 1

Focus Questions for *Senge, Schools that Learn, Chapter 1*

The following questions address important issues
for our Journey Toward Excellence:

1. Do you agree with Senge that the "one size fits all" educational system is no longer appropriate for Decatur? (pp. 9-10)
2. Why is "how people think" important to systemic change? How important do you think it will be in Decatur? (pp. 19-20)
3. Do you think a larger vision and purpose are important for Decatur? Why or why not? (p. 22)
4. In what ways do the Decatur middle and high schools fit the factory model of schools? Prepare a list of characteristics. (pp. 30-32)
5. Senge says the following industrial-age assumptions about learning are bad. Do you think they are all bad for Decatur? Why or why not?
 - ◆ The deficit view of children. (pp. 36-37)
 - ◆ The overintellectualized view of learning. (pp. 37-38)
 - ◆ The one-size-fits-all classroom. (pp. 39-41)
 - ◆ The classroom as the only place learning occurs. (pp. 41-42)
 - ◆ That there are smart kids and dumb kids. (p. 42)

Decatur Leadership Team Reading Packet 2

Focus Questions for *Caine & Caine, Education on the Edge of Possibility, Chapter 1*

The following questions address important issues
for our Journey Toward Excellence:

1. The authors describe four ideas that "can guide us in trying to understand change." Which of them do you agree with, and what evidence is there for each in Decatur? (pp. 10-11)
2. Do you agree that we cannot control the nature of change in Decatur? If so, what are the implications for our change process? (p. 12)
3. The authors cite a teacher: "What if I can't stay up with the 'good' teachers in this paradigm shift? There goes my sense of self." What are the implications of this for our change process? (p. 13)
4. The authors argue that systemic change cannot be controlled, but it can be influenced. How can it be influenced? What are the implications of this for our change process? (p. 15)
5. The authors argue that "society as a whole must become more intelligent." What are the implications of this for our change process? (p. 16)
6. The authors offer a list of 12 "brain/mind learning principles." Which ones do you agree with? (p. 19)
7. The authors found that there is often a difference between what people say they believe and what they actually believe. Do you think you ever exhibit such a difference? What are the implications of this for our change process? (p. 22)
8. The authors state that "to successfully improve education, we have to change the mental models that educators have of learning and teaching." This means that educators have to spend considerable time sharing their experiences with the brain/mind learning theory. Do you agree? If so, what are the implications for our change process? (p. 22)
9. The authors found the sharing time to generate "enormous enthusiasm and excitement" but also "the constant threat of exhaustion and frustration." What are the implications of this for our change process? (p. 23)
10. The authors describe three instructional approaches representing three perceptual orientations. Are they consistent with your experience in Decatur? (pp. 24-26)
11. The authors argue that "most work on restructuring education is currently directed at a shift from Perceptual Orientation 1 to 2, and that this thrust is essential." Do you agree? If so, what are the implications for our change process? (p. 26)

Decatur Leadership Team Reading Packet 3

Focus Questions for *Senge, Schools that Learn, Chapter 1, Part 2*

The following questions address important issues
for our Journey Toward Excellence:

6. Senge says the following industrial-age assumptions about school are bad. Do you think they are all bad for Decatur? Why or why not?
 - ◆ Schools are run by specialists who maintain control. (pp. 43-45)
 - ◆ Knowledge is inherently fragmented. (pp. 45-46)
 - ◆ Schools communicate "the truth." (pp. 46-48)
 - ◆ Learning is individualistic and competition accelerates learning. (pp. 48-49)
7. Senge says that "basic institutional innovation" is likely to occur now. Do you think it is likely to occur in Decatur? Why or why not? (pp. 50-52)
8. How appropriate is the "living systems" metaphor for Decatur? Why? (pp. 52-57)
9. Do you agree with Senge that students should lead the change? Why or why not? (p. 58)

Workshops for Decatur

Leadership Team Learning Track Workshops

Use project-based learning

Project:: Design the remainder of their change process

Content:

- Remainder of GSTE

- Much of Duffy's SUTE

- Schlechty's approach

- Case studies: Tyack & Cuban (3), Saturn

- Senge's five disciplines of a learning organization, dialogue

- Key markers of industrial and information ages

Design Team Workshops

Team building

Societal shift, key markers of industrial and information ages

Systems thinking, Senge's five disciplines of a learning organization, dialogue

Systems design, idealized design, stakeholder ownership

The systemic change process

Brain-based learning

Learner-centered instructional methods

New technological tools to foster student learning

New roles for teachers to support self-directed learning

Decatur's framework

Content for LT Workshops

Why a building-level focus? To implement the framework of beliefs, mission, and vision, the stakeholders for each building need to design an **ideal** school and teaching/learning process. Then they can develop a strategic plan for evolving as close as possible to their ideal.

What types of people should be on the building-level teams? How many? What selection process?

What training/preparation will the team members need? Building-level design teams will need to be learning communities developing their knowledge about systems thinking, the systemic change process, brain-based learning, learner-centered instructional methods, new technological tools to foster student learning, new roles for teachers to support self-directed learning, and much more.

What approach/process should the teams use to design their ideal schools?

How much time will teams need to devote to the process? Building-level design teams will need to devote a lot of time to the design work (perhaps a half day every two weeks and 20 half days over the summer). If the NSF proposal is funded, it can only support two teams in 2005 and two more teams in 2006.

What support will the teams need? Building-level design teams will need help throughout their work, primarily in the form of logistical support (finding information on methods, curricula, technology, and so forth). Do you need a district-level office to support the building-level teams, like Phil Schlechty advocates?

What role should the LT play in monitoring and guiding the teams?

How should you deal with current change efforts?

What strategy should you use for the change process?

- Should you try to change all schools at once? How many teams do you have enough people, expertise, and money to support each year? Consider high school. Consider parents (or teachers) who don't want to change.
- Should large schools be divided into smaller, more personal/caring communities that could have quite different designs to meet different student needs and provide some measure of choice within the system?
- How can you minimize resistance to change?

Will district-level changes be needed to support the new schools? Some important changes may be needed in district-level administration and governance to fit well with the building-level changes. Should we create a district-level design team? If so, who should be on it: representatives from each building-level team, the district administration, school board, local employers, Indiana Department of Education, governor's office, and state legislature?

Perhaps you should seek to understand more about barriers, options, and their consequences. This requires systems thinking and understanding the change process.