Sept. 4: Introduction, Course Overview, and Expectations; P-12 Education at the Crossroads

Reading

Exercise and Writing Assignment
There will be a team-based exercise in class. After class, we will ask you to prepare a paper of no more than one single- spaced page, which is due as a MS Word attachment emailed to CPRL@law.columbia.edu by Friday September 6 at 9:00 a.m. In that paper, please respond to the following questions:
- What plan did your team come up with (bullets/summary)?
- In developing a plan, what went well for your team, and what could have gone better?
- What was your role in the team’s deliberations? How did you contribute to the team’s achievement of its goals or to addressing any challenges the team encountered? In hindsight, what might you have done differently to improve the work of the team?

Sept. 11: When Bureaucracy Works and Fails in General and in US P-12 Public Education

Reading
2. Cary Coglianese & David Lazer, Management-Based Regulation: Prescribing Private Management to Achieve Public Goals, 37 L. & Soc. Rev. 691 (2003), at 691-706 (read through the preamble to Part III only)
3. John E. Chubb & Terry M. Moe, Politics Markets and America’s Schools (1990), at 3-6, 37-45, 47-51 (through the end of the first full ¶ on p.51), 56-64 (through the end of the first full ¶ on p.64)

Sept. 18: Bureaucracy and the Problems of Too Little Central Expertise and Too Much Street-Level Discretion

Reading
2. James Q. Wilson, Varieties of Police Behavior (1968), Chapters 1, 2, 3, and 9 (stopping at the end of the run-over paragraph on p. 297). If you are short on time, read Chapters 1 and 9 (through p. 297, top) and the following
portions of Chapters 2 and 3: pp. 16-22 (runover para. only), 30 (single full para.), 34 (new section) -36 (runover para. only), 44 (first full para.) - 45 (runover para. only), 48 (new section) - 49 (end of full para.), 52 (first para.) - 54 (end of full para.), 57-58 (runover para. only), 60 (first fullpara.)-68 (runover para. only), 70 (last para.) - 75 (end of page).

3. Michael Winerip, A Bronx Bureaucrat Gets Things Done by Leaving His Desk, New York Times

Sept. 25: Professionalism/Craft and Managerialism as Alternatives to Bureaucracy

Reading
1. Diane Ravitch, The Death and Life of the Great American School System (2010), Ch. 9 through the flag for note 11
2. Liebman & Sabel, A Laboratory Dewey Barely Imagined, supra, at 213-31 (excerpt #3)
6. Review from Session 2: Cary Coglianese & David Lazer, Management-Based Regulation: Prescribing Private Management to Achieve Public Goals, 37 L. & Soc. Rev. 691 (2003), at 691-706 (read through the preamble to Part III only)
7. Charles F. Sabel & William H. Simon, Minimalism and Experimentalism in the Administrative State, 100 Geo. L.J. 53 (2011), at pp. 2-11 [Note: in this and other articles, footnotes are for your information only; you are not required to read them.]

Oct. 2: Pragmatism, or Structured Learning from Experience, as an Alternative to Bureaucracy, Professionalism, Managerialism, and “Minimalism”

Reading
1. Sabel & Simon, Minimalism and Experimentalism in the Administrative State, supra, at pp. 1-2, 11-17 (stop at the flag for footnote 98
2. Christopher K. Ansell, Pragmatist Democracy: Evolutionary Learning as Public Philosophy (2011), Chapters 1, 5 (pp. 3-19, 84-101)
4. Optional: Mass Insight, New York City’s Chancellor’s District: District Turnaround Strategic Profile (PPT).

Preparation for Class Exercise
Imagine a public agency with which you have some familiarity. Before class jot down some notes identifying:
- features of the operation or outcomes of that agency that strike you as harmful to the agency’s effectiveness or as evidence of its ineffectiveness
- which one(s) of the McKinsey & Co. “7S’s” (see framework below) those features suggest are faulty or incomplete
Oct. 9: Classic Private- and Public -Sector Learning Organizations in Action and their Recent Emergence of “Big Data”

Reading
2. Steve Lohr, Sizing Up Big Data, N.Y. Times, June 20, 2013

Oct. 16: Public-Sector Learning in Action? Baltimore and New York City

Reading
2. New York City School System under Bloomberg/Klein:
   c. Joel Klein, Yes, New York City Schools are Improving, NY Daily News Opinion, Sept. 10, 2012
   e. James S. Liebman & Jonah Rockoff, Moving Mountains in New York City: Joel Klein’s Legacy by the Numbers, Ed. Week (Nov. 30, 2010)
   f. Optional: For a discussion of how the NYC system plays itself out for two very different schools in the same building, see Daniel Lautzenheiser, A Tale of Two Schools: What New York Dep’t of Education is Getting Right, Huffington Post (July 24, 2012)
   g. In Class: James S. Liebman, Keynote Address PPT, Seattle Portfolio Event, July 8, 2013.


Reading
1. Only students with last names beginning with A-I: Environmental Regulation
2. **Only students with last names beginning with J-Q:** Texas School Reforms

3. **Only students with last names beginning with R-Z:** Drug Courts
   b. Martha Minow, School Reform Outside Laboratory Conditions: A Response to Liebman & Sabel, 28 N.Y.U. Rev. L. & Soc. Change 333 (2003) (excerpts) [NOTE: It is important for each group of students to consider criticisms of so-called “experimentalist” reforms. Although Dean Minow’s piece responds to an article about education reform, not drug courts, consider how her three criticisms (lack of capacity, resources and consensus) might also apply to the drug court context.]
   c. James S. Liebman & Charles F. Sabel, The Fragile Promise of Provisionality: A Reply to Responses, 28 N.Y.U. Rev. L. & Soc. Change 369 (2003) (excerpts) [NOTE: It is important for each group of students to consider criticisms of so-called “experimentalist” reforms. Although Dean Minow’s piece responds to an article about education reform, not drug courts, consider how her three criticisms (lack of capacity, resources and consensus) might also apply to the drug court context.]
   d. Gov’t Accounting Office, ADULT DRUG COURTS: Studies Show Courts Reduce Recidivism, but DOJ Could Enhance Future Performance Measure Revision Efforts (2011)

**Assignment for Class and Writing Assignment**

**Class Assignment:** Come to class prepared to make a 5-minute report to other members of the class on the arrangement that you read about for class: what problem(s) it was designed to solve; how it was designed to work; and, given the criticisms and responses in the reading and your own judgments, how well you think it does work.

**Writing Assignment:** Write a ~2-page paper, due as a [MS Word attachment emailed to CPRL@law.columbia.edu by Tuesday October 22, 2013 at 3:00 p.m.], addressing any one of Discussion Questions 2-5 above. Feel free to focus on only a single: trait of the arrangement, alternative method of addressing problems, similarity or difference between the arrangement and one or more of the alternative methods of addressing problems, organizational or dis-organizational trait, criticism, etc.

**Oct. 30: Using Street-Level Adult Learning (Problem Solving) to Harness Street-Level Discretion and Increase Organizational Expertise**

**Reading**
1. [Review: Spear, High Velocity Edge, supra, at pp. 56-71, 88-91 (Toyota)]
2. Nell Scharff Panero and Joan E. Talbert, Strategic Inquiry: Starting Small for Big Results in Education (2013), at pp. 11-28, Figure 2.1 (p. 32), pp. 38-45 (“Changing school culture”), Figure 6.2 (p. 129), 152 (bullet-point conclusions).
3. Elizabeth Chu et al., Getting Big to Go Small: Case Studies of Collaborative Inquiry Teams in New York City, Nov. 2012, at draft, pages 2-11, 19-34 (DRAFT: do not circulate)
4. Collaborative Inquiry in Teacher Teams Data (NYC – PPT)
6. Jim Frederickson, Are We Learning the Right Lessons from New Dorp, Atlantic blog, Sept. 28, 2012,
8. Roxanna Elden, Data-Driven and Off Course, Ed. Next (Winter 2011)


**Inquiry Team Exercise in Class**

**Nov. 6: Panel: How do Adults in Learning Organizations Actually Learn?**

**Panel:**
- Alexandra Anormaliza, Executive Director, Office of Instructional Support, New York City Department of Education.
- Susan Fine, Chief Academic Officer, New Classrooms.
- Alexa Shore, Director of Institutional Learning, Uncommon Schools

**Reading**
1. Speaker Bios
2. Review your notes for last week’s readings and class
   
   **Informal Assignment:** Come to class with three questions you would like to address to one or more of the panelists on the general topic of adult learning.

**Nov. 13: The Skilled Generalist: The Role and Skillset of Professionals in Learning Organizations**

**Reading**
2. Margaret Heffernan, Do Business Schools Have a Future, CBS.Com, April 10, 2013.
6. Arne Duncan, Teacher Preparation: Reforming the Uncertain Profession—Remarks of Secretary Arne Duncan at Teachers College, Columbia University, Oct. 22, 2009 (text, video)
10. Skilled Generalist Handout
11. **Optional:**
   b. Jamie Alter & Jane G. Cogshall, Teaching as a Clinical-Practice Profession (2009)

**Nov. 20: “Public-Learning” Arrangements vs. Professionalism, Managerialism, and Minimalism in Public Education in the “Education Miracle” Countries**

**Reading**
1. Human Capital Solutions with a Focus on Singapore
2. The Finland Rorschach
a. Charles Sabel, AnnaLee Saxenian, Reijo Miettinen, Peer Hull Kristensen & Jarkko Hautamäki, Individualized Service Provision as the Key to the New Welfare State: Lessons from Special Education in Finland (Sitra Studies 62 Dec. 2011), at pp. 4-15, 26-30 (skim), 30 (“The next national core curriculum”) 53, 57-64

3. Ontario, Canada
   b. OECD, Ontario, Canada: Reform to Support High-Achievement in a Diverse Context, in Strong Performers and Successful Reformers in Education: Lessons from PISA for the United States (2010), pp. 65-68
   c. OECD, Country Comparison of 2009 Reading, Math and Science PISA Outcomes, Figure.

Nov. 27 & Dec. 4: Student Presentations

Student Project Presentations: What is the project? What is its institutional context? To what extent does the project or its institutional context conform to one or more of the governance models we have discussed (bureaucracy, professionalism, managerialism, minimalism, experimentalism, other)? What are the team’s initial thoughts on what the project or its context suggest about the possibility of public learning and problem-solving, and what public learning and problem-solving suggest about the project or its context?

Order of Presentations:
November 27: NYCDOE Teacher Evaluation Team and Turnaround Team
December 4: Great Schools Connecticut (combined team) and NYCDOE New Forms of Accountability Team

Introduction to the Second Semester

In the second semester, we will address four questions about the development of effective evolutionary-learning organizations that we did not resolve in the first semester: (1) How can and should democratic participation factor into evolutionary learning? (2) What tools can an organization use to receive and respond to the “weak signals” of experience that are a hallmark of the evolutionary learning model? (3) More generally, how can organizations that currently function as bureaucracies transition to an evolutionary learning structure? (4) What arrangements are possible when the development of an effective evolutionary-learning structure is too complex or difficult for a single organization to accomplish on its own?

The semester begins with two sessions exploring the importance and challenges of broad community participation in experimentalist problem-solving. As usual, we will explore these questions using case studies as well as broader theoretical perspectives. We will then turn to several sessions covering actual “tools” that an organization might use to learn from its own experience. After familiarizing ourselves with the “balanced scorecard” approach to organizational goal-setting and evaluation, we will turn to qualitative evaluation of organizations (including schools), ask members of the class to construct their own balanced scorecard for use in guiding and tracking the success of schools, and then shift the perspective from evaluation of organizations to evaluation of an organization’s employees (i.e., teachers). The next session – a panel discussion on charter schools – forms a bridge between the discussion of experimentalist tools, on the one hand, and the question of organizational transition, on the other hand: charter schools arguably represent both. The last session before spring break directly addresses the question of transitioning from bureaucracy to evolutionary learning, focusing on case studies of a number of organizations that have made the leap. After spring break, we will address the fourth framing question with several sessions on learning “regimes” that link multiple organizations in a single experimentalist structure, or foster experimentalism in the spaces between organizations, or combine experimentalism with other governance models. After examining case studies of these regimes in the private and public sectors, we will address the question whether the US system of education federalism (in which, federal, state, and local governments all play a role) is or can be remade as such a regime. We will end the year with student project presentations and a panel discussion of the future of education reform.

Sessions #15: January 22, 2014: Public Problem Solving and Democracy: Part I

Reading:
5. Bridgeport:
6. Optional: Oliver C. Moles, Jr. & Arnold F. Fege, New Directions for Title 1 Family Engagement: Lessons from the Past, Handbook on Family and Community Engagement, at 3 (title page), 5 (introductory § only), 8 (very end of page) – 12

Sessions #16: January 29, 2014: Public Problem Solving and Democracy: Part II
Reading:
1. Christopher K. Ansell, Pragmatist Democracy, supra at 134-40, 166-83
2. Jeffrey Henig et al., Parent and Community Engagement in NYC and the Sustainability Challenge for Urban Education Reform, inO’Day et al., supra, at 33-38, 43-45 (ending with first paragraph of “The Three Groups” section), 46, 48-54

Writing Assignment: Write a ~2-page paper, due as a MS Word attachment emailed to CPRL@law.columbia.edu by Tuesday January 28, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. that incorporates discussion of any two of the case studies in the first two sessions (Traxton, D.C., Bridgeport, NYC) to address the issues raised in questions 2 and 3, above: is it possible to avoid interest-group politics? And if so, what is (are) the alternative(s)?

Reading:

Session #18: February 12, 2014: The Role of Qualitative Review in Strategically Structured Public Learning: Using Leading Indicators to Build Expertise and Harness Street-Level Discretion
Reading:
3. Anemonah Hartocollis, New York City Ties Doctors’ Income to Quality of Care, N.Y. Times, Jan. 11, 2013
4. Qualitative Evaluation of Schools:
   b. Quality Review Rubric 1: NYC Quality Review Rubric, Composite of 2007-2010

Session #19: February 19, 2014: Building a Better State or Local Balanced Scorecard for Public Education
Reading:
1. Example 1: New York City’s Accountability System
   c. New York City Accountability and Results, 2002-2012
d. NY Times Room for Debate, Making the Grade in NYC (Oct. 9, 2012)
f. Optional: New York City Department of Education, What’s Next for School Accountability in New York City, November 2013

2. Examples 2-3: Differentiated Accountability and Support Systems included in ESEA Waiver applications for New Mexico and South Dakota, as described in Center for Education Policy, What Impact Will NCLB Waivers Have on the Consistency, Complexity and Transparency of State Accountability Systems? (2012), at 1-13, 20-21, 24-27


4. Example 4: Zoom team slides on RAES system

5. Example 5: The Pew Forum on Education Reform, Excerpts from “A Tribute to Al Shanker” (reprinted from Ed Week, May 14, 1997), pp. 35-37 only (“Al Shanker Speaks ...”)

**Writing Assignment:**
Balanced Scorecards (BSC): As an MS Word or Excel attachment, prepare and email to CPRL@law.columbia.edu by Tuesday February 25, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., an outline or sketch of a balanced scorecard for use by a state education department, school district, or school to hold school(s) accountable for satisfying the relevant jurisdiction’s goals for promoting student learning and development. In your paper, please indicate:

1. The school or set of schools to which your balanced scored card applies
2. The kinds of measures you consider to be “valid” for this purpose, as that term is defined in the Discussion Questions for Session 18.
   Your outline or sketch need not address all of the following matters but should consider some of them, among other topics that you believe are important:
3. The appropriate mix of quantitative and qualitative (e.g., test score and other) measures, in any, and of leading and lagging indicators, if any
4. The tools you would use to determine how well schools and/or educators are performing on those measures
5. The weights to be accorded to different measures
6. Whether outcomes would or would not be publicly disclosed
7. The stakes or consequences, if any, attached to particular outcomes

**Session #20: February 26, 2014: Evaluating Teachers Qualitatively and Quantitatively**

**Reading:**

1. Qualitative Teacher Evaluation Rubrics:
   c. NYC Abbreviated Danielson Rubric

2. Quantitative Measures of Teaching:
   c. Raj Chetty, John N. Friedman & Jonah Rockoff, The Long Term Impacts of Teachers, Executive Summary
d. Optional: watch Chetty et al. video (40 minutes): http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vh22HbZMHvM
   e. The MET Project, Ensuring Fair and Reliable Measures of Effective Teaching: Culminating Findings from the MET Project’s Three-Year Study (Jan. 2013),http://metproject.org/downloads/MET_Ensuring_Fair_and_Reliable_Measures_Practitioner_Brief.pdf, at page-before-p. 1 (“About the MET Project”) and pp. 6-20
3. **Teacher Evaluation in Operation:**
   d. Optional: Frederick Hess and Whitney Downs, Combatting the Culture of Can’t, Education Next, Spring 2013.

4. **The Reality and Value of Teacher Autonomy:**
   a. Ulrich Boser and Robert Hanna, In the Quest to Improve Schools, Have Teachers Been Stripped of Their Autonomy?, Center for American Progress, Jan. 21, 2014

   **Teacher-Observation Exercise:** To be described in class. In preparation for class, please familiarize yourself with the NYC Abbreviated Danielson Rubric listed above.

**Session #21: March 5, 2014: Panel: The Role of Charter Schools in Systematic Education Reform with**

- Cami Anderson, Superintendent of Schools, Newark Public Schools
- Gisele Shorter, Chief External Officer, ROADS Charter High Schools
- Henry Levin, William Heard Kilpatrick of Economics and Education, Columbia University Teachers College
- Michael Regnier, Director of Policy and Research, New York City Charter School Center

**Reading**

Speaker Bios: Cami Anderson, Gisele Shorter, Prof. Hank Levin, and Michael Regnier

1. **Charter Schools – the Evidence Thus Far in New York City and Elsewhere**
   a. Margaret Raymond, Multiple Choice: Charter School Study in 16 States (CREDO at Stanford University 2009), at 1-4 (Executive Summary excerpts), http://credo.stanford.edu/reports/MULTIPLE_CHOICE_CREDO.pdf
   b. Margaret Raymond, Charter School Performance in New York City (CREDO at Stanford University 2010), at 2 (Summary), http://credo.stanford.edu/reports/NYC%202009%20_CREDO.pdf

2. **Charter Schools as Components of School Systems:**

3. **Criticism of Charter Schools:**
Pre-Class Assignment: Email to CPRL@law.columbia.edu by Tuesday March 4, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. the two hardest questions you can think to ask the panelists about the role of charters in meeting the needs of underserved public school children.

Session #22: March 12, 2014: Transitioning from Bureaucracy to the New Age Organization

Reading
1. Ansell, supra, ch. 3, pp. 43-55, 61-62
2. Examples:
   a. Aldine, Texas: Heather Zavadsky, Bringing School Reform to Scale (2009), Ch. 2, District Approach #1 (Aldine School District)
   b. Norfolk, Virginia: Zavadsky, supra, Ch.6, District Approach #3 (Norfolk School District)

Writing Assignment: Write a ~2-page paper, due as a MS Word attachment emailed to CPRL@law.columbia.edu by Tuesday March 12, 2014 at 3:00 p.m., on your understanding of the “transformation strategy” (as defined below) that was implemented in Aldine, Norfolk, or New York City; what its strengths and weaknesses are (including compared to the transformation strategies used in the other cities); how you would have improved on that strategy; how useful you think the transformation strategy would be in different P-12 contexts (e.g., federal vs. state vs. local; large vs. small; urban vs. rural; collegial vs. conflictual; ones with strong or weak unions, etc.); how do Ansell’s insights bear on your judgments; and what does the example you focus on suggest about the validity of, or weaknesses in, Ansell’s analysis. By “transformation strategy,” I do not mean the governance or instructional strategy itself that each district adopted (e.g., “empowerment” in NYC), but instead the strategy the district adopted for moving the institution and its people to give up the old ways and embrace and adopt the new ways. For example, two districts that both decide to adopt a performance-management system focused on teacher-evaluation outcomes could make the transition to that common approach in very different ways, depending upon, for example, how abrupt or gradual the change is; how the change is introduced, explained and phased-in; who participated in deciding on a strategy and on the details of its implementation; etc. It is the latter set of choices that you should address in this paper.

Session #23: March 26, 2014
Learning “Regimes” and the Elastic Boundaries of Private-Sector Learning “Organizations”: Dis-integrated Firms, Interfirm Collaboration, and Private Associations

Reading:

Session #24: April 2, 2014
Learning “Regimes” and the Elastic Boundaries of Public-Sector Learning “Organizations”: From Rotten Cantaloupes to Equality Directives

Reading:

Session #25: April 9, 2014: Education Federalism as a Learning Regime?
Reading:
4. Martin A. Kurzweil, Disciplined Devolution and the New Education Federalism (2013) (Read the Introduction (pp. 2-7) and Parts II, III, and IV (pp. 23-57))

Session #26 & 27: April 16 & 23, 2014: Project Team Presentations
CMSD and GSCD will present on April 16th
NYCDOE and TX will present on April 23rd

Student Project Presentations: After providing the class with enough of a description of your project and its broader context to establish or reestablish a common understanding, please do both of the following:
1. Critically consider your project or its broader context from the perspective of experimentalism or, if you would prefer, from the perspective of one or more of the other governance models we've discussed. In what ways (if any) does the project or reform strategy proceed from, or is it grounded in, one or more of the governance model(s) we have discussed in class? How could the project or the broader reform strategy succeed more fully or efficiently if it were modified in some fashion along the lines suggested by one or another or a combination of the governance models? How does the project or the broader reform strategy deviate from the relevant governance model(s), and how do those deviations impede the project's or reform strategy's effectiveness? Overall, what could the leaders of your project or the broader reform strategy learn from your understanding of the theory underlying, and the best means of implementing, the relevant governance model(s)?
2. Critically consider experimentalism, or if you would prefer, one or more of the other governance models we've discussed from the perspective of your project or its broader context. Again, in what way does the project or strategy proceed from, or is it grounded in, one or more of those governance model(s)? What weaknesses, difficulties or challenges does your project or its broader context reveal about the theory of change and improvement that underlies the relevant governance model(s)? What light does the project or broader strategy shed on how easy or hard it is to implement the relevant governance model(s) effectively? How might those challenges lead you to modify the relevant governance model(s)? What do the challenges lead you to conclude about which model(s) would best facilitate the relevant reform strategy -- or about the validity and usefulness of one or more, or all, of the governance models in general? Overall, what could the proponents of the relevant governance model(s) learn from your project or its context?

Session #28: April 30, 2014: Summing Up; Looking Forward - Guest Speak - Joel Klein, Chancellor, New York City Dep’t of Ed. (2002-2010) and CEO of Amplify Education:
Reading (TBA – may be drawn from the following):
2. Stephanie Simon, For right, Common Core fight prelude to bigger agenda, Politico, January 7, 2014
3. Jim Liebman, 7 Steps to Motivate, Empower and Enable Progress, Education Funders Research Initiative
4. Marc Tucker, My Advice for NYC Public Schools, Education Funders Research Initiative
5. Michael Fullan, Forming Partnerships for Success, A Mayoral Priority, Education Funders Research Initiative
7. Paul Tomer, We Can’t Just Say ‘No’: Teachers Unions Must Lead Change, Real Clear Education, March 12, 2014