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Abstract

This case study describes and examines the process of implementation of the Universal Curriculum, a school program which emphasizes the study of social and environmental topics, at two elementary schools in British Columbia, Canada. One school, enrolling approximately 230 students, was located on a small island in Howe Sound, and the other, enrolling approximately 320 students, was located in a Greater Vancouver suburb. The process of implementation was designed and led by the researcher/consultant, and transpired over a ten month period, September 1989 to June 1990.

The problem motivating the study concerned past difficulties in implementing the Universal Curriculum as a school-wide project with full staff participation and long-term commitment to the program. The purpose of the study was to design and carry out a process of program implementation, in accordance with certain key criteria from the literature on school change, intended to enhance the prospect of successful implementation. These key criteria were as follows: (a) on-going consultant support, (b) administrator leadership, (c) central office support, (d) parent support and participation, (e) a substantial time commitment, and (f) a staff steering committee.

Participants used the key criteria as a basis for expressing their perceptions of the implementation process. These perceptions were expressed in two questionnaires and during interviews. Additional sources of data consisted of the researcher's observations, and school documents. Each of these four categories of data was analyzed separately; similar responses were grouped, in order to reveal emerging themes.
Interpretation of the data in relation to the literature on school change indicated:

1. A relationship seemed to exist between the meeting of the key criteria and successful implementation of the program.

2. No criterion, in isolation, appeared to be effective in enhancing full, long-term program implementation. In concert, the criteria appeared highly beneficial.

3. The two criteria which appeared to be the most important to the process of program implementation were: (a) consultant support, and (b) administrator leadership.

4. Two conditions pertaining to the professional orientations of the school staffs, which were present prior to adoption of the program, seemed to affect successful implementation. These conditions were: (a) a good match between the program goals and the beliefs of the participants, and (b) a history of staff collegiality.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

Background to the Study

The Universal Curriculum is an innovation which guides teachers to integrate into the regular curriculum, a strong focus on global literacy. Global literacy refers not only to an understanding of local and planetary issues and crises, but also to a commitment to take actions that express one's values. The following five themes of the program are intended as the basis for global literacy: Global Citizenship (a sense of responsibility as a member of a world community); Peaceful Cooperation (peace education); membership in the Family of Humankind (multicultural education); Stewardship of the Planet (environmental education); and Planning the Future, taking into account the first four themes.

The Universal Curriculum (henceforth referred to as the U.C.) is a philosophy for teaching and learning, rather than a body of specific content. By incorporating the U.C. themes and processes into already existing, prescribed curriculum it is intended that classroom studies will be expanded to include current and significant issues of a political, social and an environmental nature. A more detailed description of the Universal Curriculum, its themes and processes, is outlined in Chapter 4: Description of the Project.

It is seldom easy to implement a new program in a school and, frequently, attempts to do so fail (Fullan, 1982). Staff development for the U.C. has been no exception, perhaps made even more difficult to implement because of the teaching process it advocates, rather than the nature of the content it identifies. Teachers who have implemented the U.C. in their
classrooms have declared that it is far more difficult to implement than programs based on stipulated content accompanied by prepackaged lesson-by-lesson teacher guides. Although some U.C. print materials are available (including examples of U.C. classroom application), the program requires teachers to teach the regular curriculum with a new focus. These teachers have confirmed that this creative process is very demanding.

The Universal Curriculum was implemented for the first time at an elementary school in North Vancouver (1985-1986), at which I was a grade 4 teacher. During this year, although a few teachers enthusiastically integrated the themes into their teaching, the majority of the staff either ignored it or merely gave token inclusion to the themes and implementation process.

The Problem Motivating the Study

It is important to note that, at the North Vancouver site (1985-1986), there was no on-going or systematic plan for the implementation of the innovation, which prominent researchers in the field (Fullan, 1982; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Huberman & Miles, 1984) agree is an essential component of educational change. I hypothesized, therefore, that a major reason many of the teachers did not implement the program to any great extent was that they were left largely on their own, with virtually no training and without a system of on-going support and assistance.

As one of the teachers at the North Vancouver site, I had experienced firsthand the struggle to translate the philosophical intent of the program into a practical reality in the classroom. I was also well aware of the degree to which teachers did or did not implement the program, during that crucial first year.
Therein lies the problem, the motivation for this study: the U.C. is a very complex program to implement for experienced teachers committed to the program, and even more difficult for a whole staff to implement.

I wanted to understand more fully the reason for the limited success of the program, in that only a handful of the teachers fully implemented the U.C. Furthermore, what could be done to assist individual teachers and whole staffs, at other sites? In the second chapter, integrated into the literature review, is a more detailed account of the implementation of the U.C. at the North Vancouver site (1985-1986).

The question might be asked, why should anyone care whether or not the Universal Curriculum is implemented in schools? Or, put another way, what's so important about this program? First, I must confess that the assertion that the program is a significant innovation is my own bias. It seems to me, a teacher with sixteen years of classroom experience, to be an innovation that can make learning more meaningful and exciting for students. The originator of the Universal Curriculum and professor emeritus at Simon Fraser University, Dr. Maurice Gibbons, makes a compelling argument for the urgent need for the program. He contends that the problems that plague the planet, such as poverty, starvation, disease, racism, environmental devastation and armed conflict, are issues that can and should be addressed by students of all ages.

To preserve our planet and civilization, we will have to make changes as dramatic as those that are pushing us to the brink. Education is one powerful instrument of such change. Giving young men and women the determination and skills they need to cope with worldwide human, environmental, economic, political, and military problems will lead to a new global consciousness. (Gibbons, December 1985/January 1986, p.72)
The U.C. is certainly not the only significant innovation in education with similar or complementary objectives. On the contrary, the U.C. integrates with, and can be greatly enhanced by, such other instructional and/or philosophical innovations as teaching for thinking (the conscious use of teaching strategies that foster critical thinking in students), cooperative learning (students learning with and from their peers, in small groups), and whole language (a holistic approach to the teaching of reading, writing, speaking and listening). As an example of such an integration of innovations, students might study an armed conflict (eg. the Gulf war), using U.C. processes (described on pp. 50-52), in cooperative groups, while being guided by the teacher to think critically about the issues involved during discussions and during reading and writing assignments.

The U.C. is also very much in tune with the principles of the British Columbia, Ministry of Education's Year 2000 initiatives, which may be seen as another incentive for implementing the program. In the new Intermediate Program draft, for example, under the heading of "The Educational Context", it states,

Projects involving cooperative learning, critical thinking, and active participation of students exist in all school districts. These activities help students be at home in our world which, although diverse in beliefs and cultures, is interdependent and in need of creative, cooperative problem solvers. (1991, p.12)

In the same document, the "educated citizen" is defined, in part, as "[someone who is] aware of the rights and prepared to exercise the responsibilities of an individual within the family, the community, Canada, and the world" (1991, p.15).
Therefore, I would affirm that there is a recognized need (indeed, even a mandate, in British Columbia) for educators to provide their students with opportunities to address current issues and problems in order to acquire the necessary problem solving skills. The Universal Curriculum, with its five themes that foster the development not only of knowledge, but values, responsibility, commitment, and most importantly, actions toward a better world, is a program that guides teachers to address this need in their classrooms.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to answer the following two questions:

1. How might the Universal Curriculum be implemented as a staff development project, with a majority of the teachers participating in the implementation process and committing to its long-term use? Put another way, how might the teachers be enabled to apply the broad reaching U.C. themes and processes into their classrooms?

2. What would happen if a comprehensive plan of teacher training and ongoing support, similar to that proposed in the educational change literature, was carefully put into practice for one year, at a school?

Criteria from the literature on educational change, primarily that of Fullan (1982), and Huberman and Miles (1984), were used to design the project, and were also the basis for formulating the two questions above. These educational change/staff development criteria are summarized as follows:

1. Rather than a single workshop offering, a more intensive long-term plan of implementation is of key importance. That means that the role of workshop leader must be extended considerably to include that of consultant,
whose job it would be to go beyond the provision of in-service, to the fostering of program leadership within the school and to the facilitation of a process of ongoing consultation, for approximately one year.

2. After adoption of the program is established, it would be advantageous for the school administrators to remain highly involved in the implementation process.

3. It would also be wise to seek district level support, as support from district personnel may well provide teachers with further incentive and encouragement.

4. Likewise, the same literature indicates that it can be very beneficial to seek parent support and participation.

5. Another significant factor in the overall plan of program implementation is a commitment, from the teachers and administrators, to reserve time for the program (e.g. time at staff meetings; professional development time). In addition, the availability of release time for teachers would allow them to work with partners or in small groups, to make specific plans for U.C. integrated, classroom studies.

6. Finally, the overall plan should include the formation of a staff program committee to keep a pulse on the progress and needs of the teachers and to make appropriate recommendations. For example, one of the committee's jobs might be to spearhead ideas for school-wide U.C. projects and/or events.

**The Scope of the Study: Effecting School Change**

This project uses qualitative analysis, in the form of a case study, which focuses on the implementation of a curriculum project at two schools. The
implementation process was designed in accordance with criteria identified in the literature on educational change as being essential in successful implementation of a curriculum innovation. The Universal Curriculum is pertinent to the study only in as much as it was the vehicle (the program) used to apply the design criteria. Although I believe the Universal Curriculum is a high quality innovation (in terms of its comprehensiveness and integral relatedness to other recent curricular and instructional changes in education), neither its merits as a quality program nor its relationship to the literature on global education are focuses of this study.

The study took place, in 1989-1990, at two elementary school sites, one located in a Greater Vancouver suburb, and the other on a small island in Howe Sound. I was both the program consultant and the researcher for the study.

The case study focuses on the teachers' and administrators' perceptions of what happened, based on their personal experiences throughout the process of program implementation. The perceptions of the teachers and administrators, which comprise the findings of the study, were documented primarily through interviews and questionnaires. These instruments used the criteria identified in the change literature as the basis by which the teachers and administrators evaluated the program. That is to say, the participants were asked to reflect upon the extent of the presence and importance of the criteria as they related to the implementation of the Universal Curriculum in their respective schools. In effect, they were asked to evaluate the whole process of implementation of the U.C. according to these criteria. They were also given an opportunity to provide feedback on the criteria themselves and whether they felt these (or perhaps others) were indeed important.
The participants (the teachers and administrators) were also asked to assess the impact that the implementation of the U.C. had on themselves and their students, in effect, to evaluate the U.C. These data are used, not as an indication of the merits of the program which I've stated is not the focus, but rather as evidence of the extent to which the program was implemented and therefore evidence of the merits of the criteria.

**Organization of the Thesis**

This paper is organized into seven chapters as follows:

**Chapter 1. Introduction:** In this chapter the background to the study and the problem, which was the reason for undertaking the research, is discussed. What the study comprises, a case study involving staff development of the U.C. at two schools, is described briefly. The organization of the paper is outlined.

**Chapter 2. Review of the Literature:** This chapter discusses the educational change literature most relevant to the study. Integrated into this chapter, is a further description of the initial attempt to implement the U.C. in the North Vancouver school (1985-1986), mentioned in chapter one. By integrating this "story" with the literature review it is intended that the literature chapter be read as an integral part of the paper.

**Chapter 3. Methodology:** This chapter describes the methodology of the study of the two schools implementing the U.C. (1989-1990). It explains how the data, consisting primarily of the subjects' perceptions of the implementation process, were collected and analyzed. I also explain why I have chosen to do a case study and have taken a qualitative approach to my research.
Chapter 4. Description of the Project: The two schools being studied, their histories and socio-economic settings, as well as the subjects (the teachers and administrators), are profiled. The Universal Curriculum and the specific program applications undertaken in the two schools are described in more detail.

Chapter 5. Findings: In this chapter, the perceptions of the participants, consisting of the data from the interviews and two questionnaires, are analyzed. Any other relevant documentation (staff meeting minutes, school newsletters, newspaper articles), and observation notes from my visits to the school, are also discussed.

Chapter 6. Interpretation of the Findings: This chapter interprets the findings in relationship to the literature. These interpretations, which discuss the extent of successful implementation of the U.C. at the two schools, are derived from careful analysis of the perceptions of the subjects. No attempt is made to definitively prove success or failure at either school.

Chapter 7. Summary: This chapter briefly summarizes the entire study. Recommendations are made for future attempts to implement the U.C. as a staff development program. Implications for further study are discussed.

Summary

In chapter one I have described briefly the background of the study, the problem which motivated me to investigate the literature on educational change/staff development, the purpose of the study which includes a summary of the key criteria used to design the study, the scope of the study, and finally, the organization of the thesis.
In chapter two the educational change literature most relevant to the study is discussed. The *story* of the initial attempt to implement the Universal Curriculum in 1985-1986 is woven into the literature review, providing an expansion of the problem and also making an interesting comparison with the case study (the implementation of the U.C. at the two schools in 1989-1990).
Chapter 2. Review of the Literature

In this chapter an account is given of the first attempt to implement the Universal Curriculum as a staff development project, including the strategies which were utilized to implement it, at Mountain View Elementary School (fictitious name) in North Vancouver, in 1985-1986. The major purposes of the chapter, however, are to: (a) analyze the effectiveness of the strategies which were used to influence the change; and (b) examine the implications for future attempts to successfully implement the program, in light of the research on the topic of school change.

Background

In the Spring of 1985, Mountain View Elementary School adopted the Universal Curriculum as a school focus for the following 1985-86 school year. The U.C. program is not based on particular curriculum content, but rather requires teachers to examine the way they teach, especially in the subject areas of social studies and science. In their new roles as global educators, teachers learn to guide students toward an awareness of significant and current social and environmental issues, to lead students to make contact with people (for example, experts on a topic under study) in order to examine the issues, and most importantly, teachers learn to help students plan and implement some action in order to effect positive change. For example, students studying a particular culture are not merely given a textbook tour of the culture, but also examine the aspirations, struggles and concerns of the people, both in the students' own community and globally. Then, on the basis of knowledge and
first-hand experience, students are guided to take some appropriate action, in order to make a difference.

It is important to understand the complexity of the innovation, in terms of the change in behaviors and attitudes expected of teachers. As illustrated in the above description, the program requires teachers to apply a philosophy to their teaching, rather than to apply a package of materials with step-by-step procedures. Teachers are expected to create the necessary and considerable extensions to their teaching units on their own. For these reasons, I believe that the program would have been a monumental endeavor, at Mountain View, even if knowledge of the change literature had been applied.

At Mountain View, the time between adoption of the program and implementation was minimal. It was adopted in May, 1985, and implementation began the following September. During the summer, seven staff members including the principal, participated in a one week orientation and planning session, in order to plan their own initial Universal Curriculum teaching units. The decision had been made to have the five day in-service during the summer, rather than use up the full year's allotment of professional days, largely because the district office had agreed to pay teachers for their summer work, which the district administrators considered curriculum development. In this way, the school could retain all of its professional days for further staff development (including the U.C.) during the school year. It was hoped, by the principal, that commitment to the planned innovation, in addition to the extra salary incentive, would be sufficient to motivate the majority of the staff to volunteer. Of course, because it was held during the summer, it could not be mandated, and, as it turned out, only 40% of the staff attended. The time for interaction and planning,
during the summer in-service, appeared to be of value to the participants, enabling all of them to implement at least one unit of study with a Universal Curriculum focus. It seemed that the level of conceptual clarity of the program gained by the seven participants, during the summer session, was not shared by the remainder of the staff.

In September, a half-day workshop was provided by the participants of the summer in-service program, in an attempt to equip the entire staff to carry out the program. No further in-service took place. The principal, a strong advocate of the innovation, did apply some pressure, simply by keeping the Universal Curriculum on the agenda of many staff meetings. The brief discussions at staff meetings served as reminders to teachers that they were expected to implement the U.C., although it was agreed, at the time of adoption, that not all teachers would be expected to implement the program to the same extent. In other words, a single relatively short unit of study was acceptable, for the first year of implementation.

A committee was formed, consisting of five teachers and the principal, whose purpose was to plan and present strategies for maintaining a high level of staff participation. It was proposed by the committee that the school declare one week in February as U.C. Week, which would showcase the variety of U.C. projects that would be shared and celebrated by all students, teachers and perhaps the community. After much debate over a period of several weeks, the idea was abandoned because of a lack of staff support. Many teachers did not feel confident enough about their practice and did not think that they would have enough time to get ready for what was perceived to be a major event.
Aside from the implementation of the U.C. at Mountain View, the World Citizens for a Universal Curriculum (W.C.U.C.), a non-profit organization, had been established with the intention of eventually spreading the program to schools throughout the world. To this end, another committee was formed, in November 1985, with the sole purpose of planning a major U.C. conference for the Spring of 1986. The members of the conference committee included teachers, administrators and parents, both from Mountain View and from outside of the community. Although the planned conference was for the most part a separate initiative from that of the Mountain View implementation, for the Mountain View teachers who participated on this committee, the experience reinforced and overlapped the work that they were doing in their classrooms. The initial summer in-service work had resulted in the inequitable preparation of teachers, by virtue of the fact that only seven staff members had participated. Therefore, the teachers who participated in the planning of the conference (mostly the same teachers who had received the summer in-service training) were the only ones to receive support and interaction, during the implementation phase. It seemed that the teachers who received the longer in-service training and also the support and interaction through the committee work, became better equipped to implement the U.C. in their classrooms, than the teachers with benefit of neither experience.

All of the Mountain View teachers implemented the U.C., at least in some small way. Some major units with U.C. focuses were implemented by the teachers who were involved in committees and received the summer in-service training. Unfortunately, in June of the same year, 1986, six staff members left Mountain View, most of whom were the strongest implementers of the program.
Most of the teacher replacements were first or second year teachers. The loss of the strongest teacher models of the U.C. had a devastating impact on the second year of implementation.

During the second year of implementation, 1986-87, the program became virtually non-existent. Although the staff had agreed to continue the U.C. focus, most teachers implemented the program in merely cursory ways, for example, by putting up bulletin board displays. Perhaps these teachers were simply unable to carry out the program, due to the continued lack of training and support. The principal stated that he could barely cope with the steadily increasing demands for U.C. in-service training in schools throughout B.C., in his role as the director of the W.C.U.C.. These became overwhelming, when added to the demands for his assistance by several beginning teachers at the school, and the day-to-day demands of running a school with many students behind in their academic and social development.

The third year, 1987-88, saw another significant staff turnover, leaving less than half the original staff who had implemented the program in the first year. The principal, realizing that he had overextended his capacity to direct the W.C.U.C. and effectively run his school, began planning a more realistic redistribution of his U.C. responsibilities to other committee members and spoke about a renewal of the U.C. initiative at Mountain View. Unfortunately, the principal died, in February 1988, before he was able to begin such a renewal.

**Analysis**

According to the literature on school change, and illustrated by the following analysis, three essential conditions seemed to be lacking at Mountain
View: (a) a comprehensive plan for program implementation as a process (including substantial training and on-going support), rather than as an event; (b) the practicality of the innovation, in relation to the users' expertise, beliefs and perceived needs of the school/students; and (c) staff collegiality.

**Implementation as a Process versus an Event**

Although the first year of implementation of the program at Mountain View was somewhat successful, the U.C. did not seem to have a profound long-term impact on the school. Although many factors may have contributed to this long-term condition, one factor had a positive effect, probably accounting for the limited success of the first year, and that was the strong advocacy of the program by the principal. The principal vigorously promoted the adoption of the program and then made it clear that he expected all staff members to implement it. Unfortunately, there was no process of training and support.

Administrative pressure has been shown by Fullan (1982), Wilson and Corbett (1983), and Firestone and Wilson (1985) to be positively correlated to successful staff development. Unfortunately, as the same research indicated, administrative advocacy alone, without substantial and active support throughout the implementation phase, is quite an ineffective variable in influencing change. Fullan (1982) stated that one way for the principal to express active support is to participate in workshops and future discussions (e.g. to address needs) concerning the innovation. For the Mountain View teachers involved in the summer in-service training and in the two committees, the principal at Mountain View did provide the necessary active support. However, for the remaining staff, the enthusiasm or advocacy of the principal may have had an adverse effect. As explained by Fullan (1982), "strong
directive principals may do more harm than good" [when there is] "the general pressure for change but no clear or specific support from the principal as to what they are supposed to do" (p. 139). In other words, the strong advocacy of the principal at Mountain View seemed to have influenced effective implementation for some of the teachers, but might have been a detriment for those teachers who did not receive tangible principal support.

Furthermore, the intensity of the principal's efforts to get the program going during the first year, seemed to leave him energy-depleted. He was not able to maintain the same intensity during the second year, which basically would have meant beginning all over again, considering the large staff turnover. As administrative pressure was the major, and likely for some teachers the only, motivating factor, or even a detrimental factor as described previously, when administrative pressure was reduced considerably the second year, so too was implementation reduced.

Because the principal was so involved in directing the W.C.U.C., in effect initiating the program all over the province of B.C. and beyond, he was unable to concentrate on the implementation needs at Mountain View. At any rate, there really was no comprehensive plan for implementation. For the majority of the staff, a half-day workshop and brief reminders at staff meetings were the full extent of the training and support that they received. It would seem that this typical implementation model, as described by LaRocque (1987a), whereby the policy itself is assumed to be enough to affect change, diminished the U.C. initiative at Mountain View from the start. The program initiators (including myself) operated as though change was an event rather than a process.
Ironically, the teachers who, on their own initiative, volunteered for the summer in-service program and worked on the two committees, did receive, almost by accident, the necessary training and on-going support that is so important in a process for successful implementation. McLaughlin and Marsh (1979) stated that, "training and support variables alone accounted for a substantial portion of the variation in project success and continuation" (p. 76). It is not surprising, then, that the teachers who did receive the extra training and support were the same ones who were the most successful at implementing the program. Unfortunately, most of those teachers left Mountain View at the end of the first year. Planned structures for substantial training and on-going support were required on an equitable basis for the entire staff, in order to affect widespread staff development. Those structures were not present, and consequently, many of the teachers remained isolated and unclear about the meaning of the program in practice. It would appear, therefore, that scheduling the important initial five day in-service during the summer and thus making it voluntary, was a mistake.

Another source of potential support, aside from that of the school administrator(s), is assistance from central office personnel. Pressure, as well as on-going assistance (e.g. training and resources) from the central office administrators can be a very important factor in the implementation process (Huberman & Miles, 1984). When programs are initiated at the school level rather than central office, although pressure from district administrators may not be as relevant, certainly the sanction of central office, acknowledgement of achievements and on-going assistance may provide additional incentives for teachers. Acknowledgement alone, by central office personnel, of the teachers'
efforts and eventual success in implementing the program may be perceived by
some teachers as a reward. The principal and teachers at Mountain View did
receive the approval of central office and even some financial support; the
teachers who participated in the summer in-service program received
remuneration. Otherwise, however, central office took a rather low profile in
that there was virtually no on-going assistance given, no participation in the
program, and no acknowledgement of the accomplishments of the users. This
is not necessarily a criticism of central office personnel, as the U.C. was a
school rather than central office initiative and it is unclear to what extent their
support was sought by the principal. Nevertheless, it might have been
beneficial to have acquired the assistance of central office, beyond the initial
stage.

Parent support is another potentially significant factor in successful
implementation of new programs. Given that,

most parents are concerned and interested in programs and changes
[in schools] . . . and given [their] potential impact on student learning, and
the fact that this vast resource is largely untapped for educational
purposes, it's a crying shame there are so many barriers to parent
involvement. But then again, neither the barriers nor the potential has
been properly recognized and worked on in most schools and
communities (Fullan, 1982, p. 203).

At Mountain View, the full potential of parent support and participation was not
tapped. The U.C. themes were introduced to the parents by the principal in his
welcoming address at a meet the teachers evening, in September of 1985.
However, the themes were not described as part of a program called the
Universal Curriculum which had been adopted as a major focus for
implementation at the school. It was feared by the staff, that some parents might
oppose the program and be highly critical of it. The few parents who were asked did participate, for example, in the planning of the U.C. conference, but for the most part, parents remained unaware of the full scope of the program and the commitment the staff had made to implement it. Although somewhat risky, a greater attempt to make parents aware of the program along with an open invitation to participate might have strengthened the implementation process and overall impact of the program in the school. In fact, as suggested by Huberman and Miles (1984), parents might have become powerful advocates of the program, assisting with its implementation, praising the efforts of the teachers, and even applying pressure on central office for additional support.

**Practicality of the Innovation**

Another major condition contributing to the long-term inefficacy of the program was the neglect of the developers to make the program practical. As stated previously, it was assumed that an acceptance of the philosophy of the U.C. would be sufficient to bring about the necessary change in practice. Teachers were expected to design their own units or substantially change their existing units of study, on their own. It must be understood, according to Doyle and Ponder (1977-78), that teachers acquire the meaning of a proposed change, in terms of such practical factors as their perceived need for the change, a clear conception of how to carry it out and in terms of the personal costs and benefits. Doyle and Ponder referred to these aspects as the practicality ethic. All too often, "Innovations are 'rationally' advocated from the point of view of what is rational to the promoter, not the teachers. . . . teachers'
reasons for rejecting many innovations are every bit as rational as those of the advocates promoting them" (Fullan, 1982, p.115-116).

Another factor of practicality is that of the personal fit of the innovation with the beliefs and teaching styles of the users. Huberman and Miles (1984) refer to this user disposition as goodness of fit. When there is a good fit, the innovation feels right to the teachers; it's consistent with their beliefs and they predict that it will benefit their students. Although goodness of fit alone is not a good predictor of successful implementation, it may be beneficial in the presence of other planned factors of on-going support for the implementation of the innovation (Huberman & Miles, 1984). As for the goodness of fit of the U.C. at Mountain View, the enthusiastic response at staff discussions that led to the adoption of the program indicated that indeed many of the teachers believed in the philosophy and intent of the innovation. A great deal of time and effort went into the adoption stage; many meetings took place to outline the program and make certain that the decision to adopt it was collegial. Unfortunately, equal attention was not given to the process of implementation.

As a result of the almost total neglect of the Mountain View teachers, with respect to understanding and dealing with their practical concerns related to the innovation, some of the teachers may have been unable to gain conceptual clarity of the program. Clearly, most teachers did not implement the program in its intended form, but rather made only superficial gestures (e.g. bulletin board displays). As explained by McLaughlin (1976), when teachers do not really change the way they teach as a result of an innovation, mutual adaptation, which is essential for successful implementation, cannot occur. Instead co-option, or changing the program to suit the already existing practices of the
teachers, is all that actually happens. This was indeed the case for many of the teachers at Mountain View.

Just as it was assumed by the program implementers at Mountain View that theory to practice is a simple procedure, they also assumed that because the teachers adopted the philosophy or theory of the program, that they would automatically be committed to the practice. The only teachers who became increasingly committed to the program were those who practiced it energetically. Mistakenly, it was expected that commitment would precede practice, when in fact as Guskey (1986) explained, teacher commitment is a result not of adoption, but of successful implementation. In addition, it was presupposed that the teachers had a clear understanding of the meaning of the required change at the outset, when in fact, meaning or conceptual clarity is a gradual outgrowth of a change in teacher practice (Fullan, 1982). Since an effective plan of implementation did not exist, the majority of the teachers did not practise the program in more than a superficial way and therefore were unable to achieve conceptual clarity. At the same time, without the necessary growth in conceptual clarity, teachers certainly could not carry out the fundamental intent of the innovation in practice and thus couldn't be expected to become committed to it. Around and around these interrelated conditions went, creating the scenario for the failure of the hoped for school-wide and long-term change.

**Staff Collegiality**

School linkages (or the lack of them) also had considerable impact on program implementation. Generally speaking, Mountain View was a loosely linked school, as defined by Wilson and Corbett (1983), in that teachers had a lot of individual discretion. With respect to the implementation of the U.C., there
were reasonably tight structural linkages, in that the principal did exercise pressure, although certainly not to the extent of strong-arming teachers.

On the other hand, cultural and interpersonal linkages were loose; most staff members worked in isolation from, rather than in collaboration with, their colleagues. However, within the staff, there was a group of teachers, most of whom taught grades 4 to 7, who shared very similar beliefs about teaching and were often involved in various staff committees. It was almost always that group of teachers which was most influential at staff meetings and spearheaded school projects, everything from talent shows to promoting new innovations such as the U.C. In effect, those teachers formed a tightly linked subgroup, as defined by Wilson & Corbett (1983), which no doubt influenced the success during the first year. The trouble with the tightly linked subgroup model is that when a large staff turnover occurs, there is little or nothing left to fall back on, which is what happened at Mountain View. When the key players of the U.C. left at the end of the first year, the principal was left, for the most part, with several new teachers who knew little about the U.C. and teachers who had previously participated in the program in only the most superficial ways. There were notable exceptions, in that several teachers, both experienced and inexperienced, appeared to continue to practise effectively the program into the second and third years.

No doubt, there were other extenuating circumstances that contributed to the disappointing outcome of the U.C. at Mountain View. The death of the principal cannot be underestimated as a major contributing factor. Nevertheless, the lack of knowledge and application of school change theory seemed to have had a negative effect.
Implications

At first, I found the preceding analysis rather depressing. However, on the basis of what could be learned from the analysis, I was encouraged to continue to strive toward successful implementation and indeed institutionalization of the U.C. The challenge to implement the U.C. successfully, in light of the knowledge I had acquired from the educational change literature, had been rekindled.

The very challenge of starting again in different schools led directly to the first implication. As a program consultant, I would need to focus greater energy on following through the process of implementation which is begun in schools. That might very well restrict the ability to reach a great many schools in a short period of time. In the past, the program had been introduced in the form of single-offering workshops many times, yet not one school which exemplified the program in its essence had been established. That fact did seem to make a point; brief introductions don't lead to full implementation. Therefore, I hypothesized that if the U.C. consultant put less energy into giving many U.C. introductory workshops in an attempt to reach the global community, although this is the ultimate goal of the U.C., and put greater energy into long-term staff development of the program, then perhaps a solid ground swell of the U.C. might be accomplished. In fact, I would argue that such an emphasis might further the ability to expand, as a result of the credibility that strong school models would afford to the program.

Specifically, following through the initiatives that are begun, means that contact with schools struggling to implement the program would be continued for at least one year. The U.C. consultant would need to plan strategies to help
schools through the change process, as opposed to conducting introductory workshops hither and thither. The new consultant role would include that of the workshop leader, but would go much further. Primarily, the consultant’s role, in each school, would be to complement the principal’s leadership and to provide structures for on-going interaction between the teachers. For example, the consultant could encourage the establishment of a staff steering committee to help facilitate this interaction between the teachers. This, in turn, would intensify participation, and foster leadership and a sense of ownership on the part of the teachers.

Introductory workshops, then, must still serve as the starting point, whenever possible, of a relationship between the U.C. consultant and the school. Furthermore, in order to attend to the issue of practicality discussed in the analysis, the very nature of the workshops would need to change. In the past, far more emphasis had been placed on explaining the philosophy of the program than on illustrating the philosophy with practical examples and facilitating discussion with participants. This latter approach would initiate the process of gaining subjective meaning of the innovation, which is so essential (Fullan, 1982). Granted, the general philosophy is very important, and must be continually reinforced, so as not to lose sight of the overall intent of the program. But here again, reinforcement of the overall philosophy should realistically be seen as an on-going process. If it is not, it is mistakenly assumed that the philosophy can be fully understood and that participants will become committed to the U.C. program prior to practising it. It bears repeating that research clearly indicates (Fullan, 1982; Guskey, 1986; Huberman & Miles, 1984) that
conceptual clarity and commitment take place gradually, as a result of successful practice.

Beyond the introductory workshops, the same balance between philosophy and practicality would need to be extended into the process of implementation. One way of doing that would be to facilitate the working together of teachers in order to develop or expand their units of study, rather than expecting them to develop the needed curriculum in isolation. Even if the program developers work toward a larger repertoire of U.C. unit examples to help with this process, it would still be a worthwhile endeavor for teachers to recreate the wheel (to develop their own curriculum) for two reasons. Firstly, developing units to match the specific needs of particular students has obvious value, and secondly, as pointed out by both Fuilan (1982) and Huberman and Miles (1984), recreating the wheel directly affects the process of conceptual clarity. In other words, developing one's own U.C. curriculum would most likely enhance a deeper understanding of the program and foster commitment. In fact, the experience of the Mountain View teachers who did have the opportunity to develop curriculum during the summer in-service training, all of whom later implemented the program, bears out the same conclusion.

Finally, it is obvious that a substantial time commitment by the users would be required in order to implement the U.C. program as a process rather than an event. It would take extra time on the part of teachers to recreate the wheel. Time would be required for the initial and perhaps follow-up in-service training, as well as for on-going discussion (e.g. at staff meetings) and for staff steering committee meetings. Some of the school's district allocated professional development time and educational leadership time might be
committed to meeting these time requirements, which would need the full consent of the teachers, the principal and perhaps the central office.

**Summary**

In Chapter Two: Review of the Literature, the initial attempt to implement the U.C. as a staff development at Mountain View School was analyzed in relationship to the literature on school change. The experience at Mountain View and the resulting analysis, particularly the recommendations proposed for future staff development of the U.C., became the motivation for the research.

The levels of *goodness of fit* and *staff collegiality* are cultural variables present in schools prior to initiating the program, and therefore beyond the control of the program consultant. However, these variables were among the criteria for site selection. Certain key criteria, described as advantageous to the implementation of a new program, were used to design this study. These were: (a) consultant support, (b) administrator leadership, (c) central office support, (d) parent support, (e) a time commitment, and (f) a staff steering committee.

In Chapter Three: Methodology, I describe the strategies used to implement the U.C., as staff development programs, in the two schools used in this case study. The type of data collected and the methods of analysis used to draw conclusions are explained.
Chapter 3. Methodology

In this chapter the assumptions of the study are explained. These include discussions of several perspectives on and orientations to education, as well as rationales for qualitative methodology and the case study approach utilized in this study. The remainder of the chapter explains the organization of the study, as follows: (a) the conceptual frame of the study, (b) the collection of the data, (c) the analysis of the data, (d) the interpretation of the data, and (e) the verification of the interpretation.

The Assumptions of the Study

The assumptions of the study are basically the beliefs, values and biases of the researcher. In this case, I was both the researcher and the program consultant at the two schools in this project, so undeniably my beliefs, values and biases had some bearing on the study. It is my intention to clarify my beliefs, values and biases, at the outset, for the consideration of the reader.

Differences in Perspectives and Orientations

The first underlying belief is that it is legitimate to have different, though equally valid, perspectives. Although I would argue that there are certain universal truths, even universal values (e.g. basic human rights), which are obviously the basis for the Universal Curriculum, there are many more commonly held truths that are relative to one’s own perspective. Many educators make arguments and counter arguments without any awareness of the conflicting perspectives at the core of their disagreements. Furthermore, the realization and acceptance of the fact that there are many legitimate
perspectives, as complicated and messy as this state of affairs might be, does not indicate an inferior understanding of the world. "Those that recognize that there are multiple ways of looking at the world and many ways of describing it have not given up their rationality" (Eisner, 1983, p. 24).

Eisner (1979) argues that there are five basic orientations to curriculum, and that most educators have unconsciously adopted one as a preference, driving most of their professional endeavors. For example, says Eisner, some educators take a largely academic rationalist point of view, in which the traditional study of literature, history, philosophy and the sciences (education in its purest form), is viewed as the main, if not sole, function of schools. Others might take a social reconstruction or a self-actualization orientation toward curriculum, in which the socialization of children or the development of their personal identity and self-concept are viewed as high priority functions of schools. Considering the nature of the program under study, the Universal Curriculum, it is likely not a surprise to the reader that I am biased toward both the social reconstruction and the self-actualization paradigms of curriculum.

Rationale for Qualitative Methodology

Another core underpinning of any study is the researcher's orientation to research itself. My orientation to research leans toward qualitative methodology. The purpose of qualitative research is to gain "an understanding [of] the social phenomenon from the actors' perspectives through participation in the life of those actors" (Firestone, 1987, pp. 16-17). Qualitative methodology is defined basically as research procedures that render rich descriptive detail primarily from the perspectives of the actors, and which persuades by demonstrating that the researcher was immersed in the setting.
and can therefore make sense of the situation (Firestone, 1987; Jacob, 1988; Marshall & Rossman, 1990).

Accordingly, I do not take the logical positivist argument that valid research must be scientific (empirically and/or measurably verifiable) in nature (Phillips, 1983). Rather, I believe, as Phillips asserts, that qualitative research is an equally valid form of research and even has certain advantages over other forms of research, including quantitative. One of the major advantages of qualitative research is the accessibility and meaning that it affords to classroom teachers (Miles & Huberman, 1984b). Whereas, much quantitative research tends to be written for academics, the narrative (as opposed to statistical) nature of qualitative research makes it easily readable and relevant to many teachers, which in turn may increase the likelihood that the research will affect classroom practice. It is my intention that this paper be of interest and practical use to classroom teachers and administrators and my hope that these practitioners will easily relate to the experiences of the teachers and administrators described in the study and be engaged by the essentially narrative style of this paper.

Furthermore, for some research questions, an in-depth, close-up look from within what is essentially a social setting (e.g. a school) is more appropriate than a more formal, scientific experiment conducted by researchers who have minimal personal contact with the actors (Erickson, 1986). This is not to say that one method of research is superior to another, but rather that the selection of a particular methodology should complement, rather than conflict with, the nature of the inquiry and the question(s) being asked. In this study, I endeavored to find out how teachers and administrators could be assisted in implementing the Universal Curriculum as a long-term staff development
project. It seemed to me, therefore, to be essential that the focus of the inquiry be the perspectives of the teachers and administrators themselves.

A qualitative approach to educational research, then, is sometimes most appropriate (as is the case with this study) in answering the question, "What is happening, specifically, in a social action that takes place in this particular setting?" (Erickson, 1986, p. 121). It is, as expressed by Erickson (1986), the "invisibility of everyday life" (p. 121) that sometimes requires research. In other words, everyday life (e.g. in a school) may seem so ordinary and familiar, that the very essence of what's happening there may be overlooked, without the close analysis of ordinary data (e.g. the perspectives of teachers and administrators). It was this aspect of making visible the "invisibility of everyday life" (in this case, attaining insights into the day-to-day struggles to implement the U.C. at the two sites of this study) that interested me most and motivated my research.

**Rationale for the Case Study Approach**

The particular form of qualitative research that I have chosen for this project is the case study approach. A case study is defined as a social inquiry which "examines a bounded system of a program, an institution or a population" (Marshall & Rossman, 1990). In this study, it is two populations of staff members (teachers and administrators), at each of two schools, who are being examined. Stake (1983) gives a further account of the distinguishing features of most case studies, as follows:

[Most case studies feature] descriptions that are complex, holistic, and involving a myriad of not highly isolated variables; data that are likely to be gathered at least partly by personalistic observation; and a writing style that is informal, perhaps narrative, possibly with verbatim quotation,
illustration, and even allusion and metaphor. Comparisons are implicit rather than explicit. Themes and hypotheses may be important, but remain subordinate to the understanding of the case (pp. 283-284).

I have chosen to do a case study for two main reasons: First, because case studies usually recount the events and stories that occur within the school setting, they tend to be more meaningful to the practitioners in the field (Miles & Huberman, 1984b). I have already stated that the interest and value of this study to school practitioners was one of my aims. Furthermore, since I have been primarily a classroom teacher for the past sixteen years, I quite naturally relate to this form of study myself. School settings are familiar and comfortable for me and therefore I knew that I would enjoy the aspect of immersion in the school environment, which is afforded by the case study method of inquiry.

Second, I was not concerned about causal relationships nor about law-like generalizability. Stake (1983) argues that, "In fields such as education and social work, where few laws have been validated and where inquiry can be directed toward gathering information that has use other than for the cultivation of laws, a persistent attention to laws is pedantic" (p. 283). I was more interested in finding possible relationships between variables and outcomes, in finding emerging themes, and in gaining deeper meaning and understanding of a bounded time and place. It is precisely when the aim of a case study is to improve understanding and extend experience that this form of inquiry is used to the best advantage (Stake, 1983). With regard to the methodology of this study then, improved understanding and extended experience were the primary goals. Specifically, I intended to achieve these goals relative to the implementation process of the Universal Curriculum, designed in accordance
with the criteria recommended by the literature on educational change, from the perspectives of the teachers and administrators.

I have discussed, at some length, the assumptions of this study because, as I have already stated, all arguments have the basic beliefs and values of the arguer at their core. Put concisely, all arguments are value laden. It follows, therefore, that all forms of research, which essentially make arguments, are also value laden. Howe (1985) asserts, "It is impossible within social research to sharply distinguish factual from value claims . . . the attempt to bracket values in the name of truth and science in order to protect pluralism and avoid bias only results in more insidious bias" (p. 12). The assumptions of this study have been described to offer the reader a basis by which to judge as well as understand the study.

The Conceptual Frame of the Study

Recall the problem: the difficulty of implementing the Universal Curriculum as a staff development project. Recall also, that certain key criteria, recommended for successful implementation of new programs by the literature on educational change, were used to design this study. These criteria, explained in more detail in chapter two, are summarized as follows: (a) long-term consultant support, (b) administrator leadership and participation, (c) central office support; (d) parent support, (e) a substantial time commitment made by the teachers and administrators, and (f) the formation of a staff steering committee devoted solely to program implementation. As many as possible of these criteria were applied to the process of implementation at the two schools in this study. The perspectives of the teachers and administrators,
primarily related to the presence and significance of the criteria from the literature, define the outcomes or findings of the study. Basically, these factors form a linear depiction of the conceptual frame of the study, from adoption of the U.C. program, to application of the key criteria, to the outcomes as perceived by the actors. Figure 1. displays a more concise diagrammatical representation of the conceptual frame.

Figure 1  The conceptual frame: Implementation of the U.C. program, in accordance with key criteria from the literature on educational change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Adoption</th>
<th>Key Criteria</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a group of teachers and administrators initiate the U.C. program as a staff development</td>
<td>consultant support, administrator leadership, central office support, parent support, time commitment, staff steering committee</td>
<td>outcomes as perceived by the teachers and administrators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The double, reversed arrows between the key criteria box and the outcomes box, indicate the continual interplay between them. That is, I received feedback from the actors during the process of program implementation, not just at the end of the study. This feedback in process, in turn, influenced the emphasis put on certain of the key criteria. For example, in my role as program consultant, I arranged a pen-pal exchange between the two schools, as a direct result of teacher requests made at a meeting I attended at one of the schools in
March, 1990. Thus, their feedback in process impacted on the emphasis put on the criteria of consultant support.

The Collection of the Data

The data for this case study were collected from two elementary schools (Kindergarten to grade 7). One school, which I will call Site One, was located on a small island in Howe Sound. The second school, which I will call Site Two, was located in a Greater Vancouver suburb. At Site One, virtually the entire staff, consisting of ten teachers, one community school coordinator, the school secretary, two teacher aides, and both administrators, adopted the program and were involved in the study. At Site Two, a smaller group of five teachers and two administrators (approximately half of the staff) were involved in the study. The schools are described in more detail in Chapter Four: Description of the Project.

The data were collected from the following sources:

Questionnaires

Two questionnaires (see Appendix A, p. 122) were distributed to the participants at both sites, the first at the beginning stages of the implementation process, in November of 1989, and the second at the end of the study, in June, 1990. The questionnaire responses were anonymous; no space for names was provided and they were distributed and collected by a designated teacher. Each questionnaire consisted of five or six questions, with blank spaces in between for the respondents to write their comments. The questions related primarily to the key criteria recommended by the literature on educational change for successful implementation of new programs. For example, one
question in the first questionnaire asked, "Specifically, in what ways would you like the following people to be of assistance to you and the staff: the principal; the program consultant; the staff steering committee; other?" The objective of both questionnaires was to elicit the opinions and perspectives of the respondents.

From the outset of the study, the participants did have a basic knowledge of the key criteria from the literature. These criteria were discussed at the time of adoption of the program, in my attempt to convince the participants to include as many of them as possible in the implementation process. In addition, attached to the first questionnaire, was a one page outline, listing and explaining the key criteria, for the information and consideration of the participants in responding to the questions.

Interviews

Interviews were conducted with eight of the fourteen participants at Site One, including both of the administrators. The interviewees were selected randomly or were interviewed upon their requests. The interviews took place, on site, at the end of the study, on June 18, 1990, which was two weeks after the second questionnaire was distributed. The interviews were scheduled in half-hour time-slots during regular class time. A substitute teacher supervised classrooms while teachers were being interviewed. Once again, the objective was to discover the perspectives of the actors. The actors at Site Two were not interviewed; they had become discouraged and disillusioned by the lack of support from the principal and most of the staff, which I judged to be the reason for their disinterest in being interviewed.
I took detailed notes during the interviews, carefully documenting many remarks verbatim. Immediately following each interview I read over my notes, while filling in more details and adding a summary of my observations and general impressions.

The nature of questions asked during the interviews was different from those asked on the questionnaires in that I avoided asking questions directly related to the key criteria from the literature. Instead, for example, I asked simply, "What is it that you'd like to say about the whole experience of implementing the U.C. in your classroom and at your school?" This very open-ended type of question was asked in order to encourage participants to say whatever they felt was important, which may or may not include comments related to the key criteria, but which may also include different, new criteria as well as any other observations. In this way, the interviews were intended, in part, as a way of checking the data from the questionnaires. Given the chance to say anything, would the participants say things consistent with the data from the questionnaires?

Observations

I recorded my observations immediately following all site visitations. These notes took the form of anecdotal comments describing the events I had witnessed, paraphrased statements made by actors, as well as the overall impressions I had gained from the experience. Opportunities to observe included: the initial in-service conducted by me; follow-up introductions of the program to parents; informal dinner or pub meetings to discuss progress, needs and directions; and, my participation in school events related to the program (e.g. the "Waterworks" project at Site One).
School Documentation

All school documentation pertinent to the implementation of the U.C. (e.g. school philosophy statements, staff meeting minutes, parent newsletters) were examined. The extent and frequency of documentation, regarding the U.C. program, was investigated as an indication of its level of priority. These data, in turn, were used as a check against the perceived level of program importance stated by the actors, either on questionnaires or during interviews.

Of the four types of instruments (questionnaires, interviews, observations, and school documentation) the latter two were secondary to a much more intensive collection of data from questionnaires and interviews.

The four-fold instrumentation was intended to ensure triangulation, a Miles and Huberman term, meaning that there is more than one type of measurement strategy. The use of several data collecting instruments, according to Miles and Huberman (1984b), allows the findings from each to be checked, one against the other, which potentially strengthens interpretation of the data.

It is important to note that the above description of data collection was completed, in its entirety, at Site One only. At Site Two, the second questionnaire was not completed and no interviews were conducted, due to problems at the site (the details are forthcoming). As a result of this and the fact that Site One had twice as many participants, there were far more data collected from Site One than from Site Two. Therefore, in this regard, the project is primarily a case study of one site (Site One). Because the project could have been based on the dominant site alone, considering the aims of the study as described in the rationales for qualitative methodology and the case study
approach to research, I contemplated omitting Site Two from this thesis altogether. However, I decided to include it, for two reasons. First, Site Two makes an interesting comparison to Site One. Secondly, I felt it might make important contributions to the study, in that, some of the problems at Site Two might be interpreted in relation to the key criteria. This is a topic for discussion in Chapter Six: Interpretation of the Findings.

The Analysis of the Data

The Questionnaires and Interviews

The data from the questionnaires and the interviews were handled in much the same manner. I examined each set of data separately, for example, the set of the first questionnaires from Site One, then the set of the first questionnaires from Site Two, and so on. With each set I proceeded with the following steps:

1. First, all of the raw data were read. Then I wrote a summary of my first impressions, which included possible emerging themes. These possible themes (e.g. the teachers' need for more time to plan U.C. projects) would be tested by closer analysis later on (see steps 3 and 4).

2. All of the data were transcribed onto a computer disk. In this way, paper copies could be made that were uniform, easy to read, and compacted onto fewer pieces of paper than the plethora of handwritten data. The interview data were organized by person interviewed; that is, each interview was transcribed intact. The data from the questionnaires were organized by question (e.g. all the responses from question 1, from the whole set of
questionnaires, were grouped) to facilitate easy examination of the whole range of responses to each question.

3. Codes, representing a wide range of variables, often the key criteria (e.g. administrator support, consultant support, time, etc.), were invented to test the themes I had thought were plausible from the first reading of the data. The data were then coded accordingly. For example, to test the previously mentioned theme of time, the code "Ti" was written into the margin, wherever the variable time occurred in the data. To further distinguish between statements about time to plan, as a need, as opposed to a strength, the time variable was split into two codes, N/Ti (time as a need) and Str/Ti (time as a strength). Although I did not recall any mention of an abundance of time to plan U.C. projects (time described as a strength), I nevertheless included the code Str/Ti, as a check.

Sometimes, new codes had to be invented during the process of the coding. For example, in the second questionnaire, in response to a question asking respondents to make recommendations for continued implementation of the U.C. program for the following year, the need for time was discussed in a new context. Consequently, the code R/Ti (recommendation for more time) was added.

A separate set of codes was invented three times, one for the first questionnaire, one for the second questionnaire, and another for the interviews. Each set of codes consisted of an average of twenty separate codes.

4. Finally, all of the codes were listed in categories (e.g. program strengths, program needs, outcomes, recommendations, etc.) on a one-page display (see Appendix B, p. 128). The corresponding number of times each
variable was coded, was entered onto the display. Under each category, the list of codes was ordered from those with the greatest to the least number of times they were coded.

**Observations and School Documentation**

The data from the observational notes and the school documentation were examined separately, but in the same manner. They were examined following the analysis of the questionnaires and interviews and were used to cross-check the findings from the questionnaires and interviews, which were the primary sources of data. Because the data from the observations and the school documentation were not as extensive as that from either the questionnaires or the interviews, it was not necessary to devise an elaborate system of analysis, such as a coding system similar to that described above. Instead, the data were read and re-read many times, searching for, and making careful note of, data which were consistent with and especially data that conflicted with the findings from the primary sources.

**The Interpretation of the Data**

How, then, were the conclusions of the study drawn? I use the term **conclusions** cautiously because it has a variety of connotations for different people, largely depending on their orientations toward research. For the most part, I did not use a highly systematic approach to drawing conclusions. In this study the conclusions are **interpretations** of the data. The **interpretations** of this study, consistent with my previously stated aims (to gain a greater understanding of everyday life and expand experience through immersion in a
bounded time and place), should only be applied, with any degree of certainty, to the two schools that were studied.

In this study then, I more frequently refer to the term *interpretations*, rather than *conclusions*. The difference may seem subtle at first, but in fact, the difference between the two terms is quite characteristic of the difference between qualitative and quantitative methodologies. The term *interpretations*, defines more accurately the result of a qualitative approach to research. By the term *interpretations*, I mean that the elements of reflection and intuitiveness on the part of the researcher, largely determine the claims that are made. Erickson (1986) explains the interpretive aspect of qualitative research as follows:

Interpretive fieldwork research involves being unusually thorough and reflective in noticing and describing everyday events in the field setting, and in attempting to identify the significance of actions in the events from the various points of view of the actors themselves. (p. 121)

Similarly, Smith (1987) states that social knowledge is gained by a process of "Verstehen [a German word, meaning to understand], or subjective, participative understanding and cannot be verified by appeal to external criteria" (p. 177). Even Miles and Huberman (1984a), who tend to use a rather systematic approach to qualitative research, including the drawing of conclusions, state that, "most conclusion-drawing tactics amount to doing two things: reducing the bulk of data and bringing a pattern to them. Such tactics are sometimes rationally trackable, sometimes not" (p. 27).

Although the *conclusions* of this study were arrived at primarily through a process of reflection affording a kind of reasoning from the data, I also borrowed several of the more systematic strategies for drawing conclusions from Miles and Huberman (1984a, 1984b). The three strategies borrowed
from Miles and Huberman (1984a, 1984b). The three strategies borrowed were: (1) noting patterns or themes; (2) counting; and, (3) making metaphors. In retrospect, these strategies were more than simply complementary to my reflective style of drawing conclusions; they actually became a part of that style.

1. **Noting Patterns or Themes**

Searching for patterns or themes was a device I used throughout the process of data analysis. Whenever several actors made similar statements, I suspected that a theme was emerging that could be tested by coding the data. The process of coding the data led, quite naturally, to the strategy of counting.

2. **Counting**

Counting, though more often associated with quantitative research, is often used to a lesser degree in qualitative research (Miles & Huberman, 1984b). In this study, I counted the number of times each code was applicable to the data, thus assisting me in discovering and/or affirming emerging patterns and themes.

3. **Making Metaphors**

This strategy appealed to me because of the intuitive, reflective nature of metaphor. This strategy involves the search for one or more metaphors, perhaps as an extension of a pattern or theme, that would illustrate the essence of what was happening, affording richer meaning to the study. Miles and Huberman (1984a) put it this way: "We can illustrate with making metaphors, a frequent and productive tactic for moving interpretively from the denotive to the connotative, much as a novelist or poet does" (p.27).
Verifying the Interpretations

I verified my interpretations, thus maintaining the integrity of the study, by rigorously testing them as follows:

1. I was constantly on the lookout for negative or conflicting evidence. Whenever I found it, I included it in the findings and considered it when formulating interpretations.

2. I checked and rechecked the data for accuracy in my findings (e.g. the correct application of the codes to the data).

3. I used a research partner to play "devil's advocate", critically questioning my analysis, causing me to carefully consider my claims.

4. I sought and received feedback, specifically regarding the conclusions of the study, from at least one informant from each of the two sites.

5. I used several instruments to analyze the data (triangulation, described previously), to help find conflicting data.

Summary

In this chapter, aside from describing the organization of the study, I have explained my biases at some length. To be human is to be biased. However, I have also described the steps taken to guard against drawing faulty interpretations as a result of my biases.

In the following chapter, Description of the Project, the demographics of the two school sites are described. In addition, the Universal Curriculum, as well as the specific project applications of the U.C. at the two sites, are described in further detail.
Chapter 4. Description of the Project

In this chapter, the project is described in detail, as follows:

1. Description of the Sites: Both sites one and two are described with regard to their school organizations, the participants, and the demographics of their surrounding communities. Background leading to the selection of these sites is also discussed.

2. Description of the Universal Curriculum Program: The background of the U.C., as well as the two cornerstones of the program, the themes and processes (methodology), are discussed in greater depth.

3. Description of the Site Projects: The unique application of the U.C. program at both Sites One and Two (the specific classroom and school-wide units of study) is described.

Description of the Sites

It was my intention to find one or, at most, two school sites suitable for the study. The criteria for site selection were: (a) the site should be an elementary school; (b) as far as could be ascertained in advance, the site should seem to exemplify goodness of fit and staff collegiality; and (c) the staff as a whole, or a smaller group of at least six staff members, including administrators, would agree to make the ten month commitment (September to June) to implement the program and participate in this study.

In the early Fall of 1989, the subjects at both Sites One and Two adopted the U.C. and agreed to be a part of this study for the remainder of the 1989-1990 school year. At that time, the users at both sites understood that they
would be asked to submit key school documentation, complete two questionnaires and possibly be interviewed. In return, I offered my services as a consultant, which included initial in-service, as well as on-going guidance in the planning and implementation processes.

**Background to Site One**

I had placed an advertisement, outlining my offer of consultant services as part of a research study, in the 1989 Spring issue of *Forcefields*, the U.C. newsletter. A parent in the community surrounding Site One saw the advertisement, and showed it to several staff members at the school. It was discussed at a staff meeting, and as a result of some initial interest, I was invited by the head teacher to make a presentation to the staff, just before summer break in June 1989. Upon returning for school-opening in September, the staff met and confirmed their intention to adopt the U.C. as a school-wide focus for that year.

Site One, a school located on a small island in Howe Sound, enrolled approximately 230 students, in nine divisions or classes, from kindergarten to grade six. The professional staff consisted of nine classroom teachers (one of whom also ran the library), one learning assistance teacher, the community school coordinator, the head teacher (who also taught learning assistance), and the principal. Additional staff included the school secretary, the community school coordinator, two teacher aides and one custodian. Itinerant district staff included a nurse, a counsellor, a speech/language pathologist, and a challenge (enrichment) teacher.

Some demographic information about the community surrounding Site One, obtained from Census Canada (1988), is as follows: The total population
of the census area, which encompassed the island community on which Site One is located, as well as an adjacent and very sparsely populated, mountainous area on the mainland, was 4,085. There were a total of 1,520 households. These households included 695 families with school-aged children, of which 90 were single-parent families. The average number of children per family was 1.0. The immigrant population of this census area was 775, including 575 from Europe, 30 from Africa, and 5 from Asia. The number of people with university degrees was 660. The unemployment rate was 5.6 percent and the average yearly income, per household, was 45,930 dollars.

**Background to Site Two**

Circumstances leading to the selection of Site Two were quite different from those pertaining to Site One. Some of the staff at Site Two were already aware of, and, in fact, practising the U.C. in their classrooms. Two years prior to this study (in the Fall of 1987) the staff at Site Two had received a full-day workshop introducing the U.C., at which time they had agreed to implement the program as a school-wide focus for the 1987-1988 school year. The following year, perhaps partially due to staff changes, enthusiasm for the U.C. diminished. However, because of the U.C. history at the site and because I knew that a number of the teachers there remained very enthusiastic about the program, I initiated contact with the principal, in September 1989, outlining my proposal for, in their case, a renewal of U.C. implementation. The idea was discussed at the next staff meeting, and, as a result, an after-school meeting was arranged for any interested staff members to speak with me, further to the proposal. Following some discussion at that meeting, five teachers and both administrators agreed to make the commitment.
Site Two, a school located in a Greater Vancouver suburb, enrolled 320 students, in eleven divisions or classes, from kindergarten to grade seven. The professional staff consisted of ten classroom teachers, one librarian/learning assistance teacher, the vice-principal, and the principal. Additional staff included the school secretary, one teacher aide and one custodian. Itinerant district staff included a nurse, a counsellor and a speech therapist.

Some demographic information about the community surrounding Site Two is as follows: The total population of the census area encompassing Site Two was 6,625. The total number of households was 2,030. Of the 1,390 families with school-aged children, 200 were single-parent families. The average number of children per family was 1.4. The total immigrant population was 1,535, including 1,010 from Europe, 55 from Africa, and 320 from Asia. There were 385 people with university degrees. The rate of unemployment was 11.5 percent and the average yearly income, per household, was 40,471 dollars.

Description of the Universal Curriculum Program

Background

The World Citizens for a Universal Curriculum (W.C.U.C.) is a registered non-profit society, comprised of educators, parents and other citizens, which advocates a common global curriculum: a curriculum that includes an examination of important environmental and social dilemmas shared by all human beings. In 1985, Dr. Maurice Gibbons, professor emeritus in the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser University, British Columbia, conceived of a world-wide curriculum which would guide students toward making a better
future for themselves. Dr. Gibbons and the late Andy Neuman, who at that time was an elementary school principal in North Vancouver, co-founded the W.C.U.C., and, with the help of many like-minded educators, began the implementation of the Universal Curriculum in several Greater Vancouver schools.

In recent years, there has been a lot of talk about literacy. The cry for a back to the basics curriculum, with its aim being functional literacy, has been loud and adamant. Advocates for the U.C. argue that, although functional literacy is an essential part of education, it isn't enough to prepare students for the uncertain world which faces them today, a world in which we are all threatened by massive destruction of the environment and even human extinction. The Universal Curriculum is about a new kind of literacy, a global literacy or consciousness, which promotes actions toward the creation of a safe and productive future. It is about extending the school curriculum to include issues of substance, significance and relevance; it is about facing up to and wrestling with the following questions:

1. How can educators structure students' learning to enable them to take control of the future, not simply let it happen?

2. What are the human crises and how do we show students how to be informed, skilled and empowered to act?

Empowerment has recently become an over-used word, sometimes perceived as yet more educational jargon. Indeed, it's a word that, when used lightly and inappropriately, loses its full meaning and intended impact. However, to say that the essence of the Universal Curriculum is the empowerment of students, is not to use the word lightly. No other word will do
as a substitute. Empowerment, defined as "bringing into a state of belief in one's capacity to act effectively" (Ashcroft, 1987, p. 144), is precisely what is meant, in the context of the Universal Curriculum.

The U.C. Themes

The U.C. is not extra content per se, an addition to what many teachers would describe, in frustration, as an already overloaded curriculum. Rather, its five themes provide a focus for the study and extension of the regular or prescribed curriculum. The five themes are as follows (Gibbons, 1985):

1. We are all global citizens, who share the responsibility for resolving the world's problems. Our global citizenship takes precedence over all other affiliations.

2. We are all members of the family of humankind. We are responsible for understanding and caring for people of all cultures, ages, abilities and disabilities and economic circumstances.

3. We are all caretakers of the earth, which is our home and life support system. We are responsible for the maintenance and sensible use of the earth's resources and the care of all living things.

4. We are all responsible for fostering an attitude of peaceful cooperation in resolving our differences, in order to create a secure world for the generations ahead.

5. We are all responsible for planning a future, including the design of management strategies which advance the first four themes.

The U.C. Processes

The processes, or methods, outlined by the U.C. program, guide students through steps, in order to take environmental and social studies beyond the
initial gathering and reporting of information, toward using this information to understand key environmental and social issues. These also encourage students to develop their own points of view and values based on knowledge acquired from first-hand experience (in addition to print materials), to make commitments and, most importantly, to take action to influence the community in which they live. The dynamic of the Universal Curriculum is learning to act, showing children how to exercise their responsibilities. Specifically, the U.C. processes are as follows (Gibbons, 1985):

1. **Study:** Students learn about a topic of interest and significance to them, using print materials, film and people as resources. The students focus on the examination of the crucial issues central to the topic, from a variety of perspectives (all sides of issues).

2. **Strategize:** Students brainstorm many ideas for possible plans of action which in some way address one or more central issues of the topic, based on their knowledge and demonstrative of their developing personal perspectives. The process of elimination of possible plans of action is begun, toward consensus on the most significant but realistic plan(s) that in some way makes a positive contribution in keeping with their perspectives on the issues.

3. **Connect:** Students are helped to make further contacts with experts and others related to the topic being studied, taking care to communicate with people with opposing views. In this way, students may extend their knowledge and test their developing perspectives and values relevant to the issues under study.
4. **Act**: Students revise and refine their plan(s) of action and finally bring it to fruition. Included in the action, or immediately following, is some form of **celebration** of the achievement.

5. **Value**: Throughout the course of the study, students have been encouraged to develop their own values related to the issues examined. These values may vary among classmates and are not necessarily the values of their teacher.

The five processes, outlined above, do not necessarily follow one another sequentially. As well, there is likely to be some overlap and interplay between the processes.

By incorporating the U.C. themes and processes into curriculum studies, students can begin to learn to face problems in their immediate environment and teachers can learn to facilitate this process. The classroom, the school and the community surrounding the school are microcosms of the larger world, with similar and analogous problems. It is not intended, then, that students should discover solutions to the world's problems. For teachers, it would be overwhelming to think of developing and/or adapting the prescribed curriculum to deal with all of the major issues confronting humankind and to teach students how to save the world from destruction and make it a better place to live. Topics such as pollution, endangered species, forestry, the cultural roots of the students, the Vancouver harbour, conflict resolution, the nature of friendship, and issues of concern to senior citizens might be studied and may culminate in realistic action projects ranging from the recycling of school paper to becoming friends with and helping senior citizens in the community.
Description of the Site Projects

Site One Projects

Numerous (25 to 30) U.C. projects at Site One were inspired by the U.C. Some of these were classroom based, some were the collaborative efforts of two or more teachers, and still others were school-wide projects. It should be noted that many of the teachers at Site One had previously taught environmental and cultural studies in the past. In fact, several teachers had commented that they had been very much in tune with what they perceived to be the philosophy of the U.C. long before they had heard of the program. Projects such as an on-going recycling program and an after-school club, called the Cultures Club, had been established for several years. Participants in the Cultures Club, through discussions and viewing books and films, became more aware of the diversity of cultures within their small island community and beyond. The Cultures Club became increasingly popular with students from kindergarten to grade six. Although these and other projects preceded implementation of the U.C. at the school, the difference that the U.C. program made, in terms of classroom and school-wide projects and in teaching strategies, was nevertheless significant. With the advent of the U.C. as a school-wide focus, both the number and quality (the depth) of such environmental and social studies was considerably expanded. One of the teachers expressed the difference that the U.C. program had made as follows:

As a classroom teacher I had taught many of the topics discussed but without the framework of the program. This framework has helped to organize all these projects into something more meaningful. The division of the U.C. into five basic themes provided me with a structure from which to teach. The very fact that the teacher is more a guide than a lecturer
has made relevant many activities for both teacher and learner, allowing students to arrive, with guidance from the teacher, at their own conclusions. It also provides them with the opportunity to explore their own values. If their values are questioned, often personal growth will occur and global commitment will follow. Of equal importance to me is that students are empowered to cause change, both personal and global. This is happening in the classroom this year because of the implementation of the Universal Curriculum.

In the primary classrooms, topics for U.C. study included garden creatures, friendship and peace, paper recycling, rain, bears, Chinese New Year, composting, water pollution, whales, pond life, and tidal pools. Some of these studies, especially those as part of a water theme, were collaborative efforts, planned and team taught by several primary teachers. In keeping with the U.C. processes, students were encouraged to utilize their natural curiosity about the various issues inherent in these topics, and then take some actions to make a difference. Even the youngest of students asked about acid rain, endangered species of bears, or about a recent armed conflict they'd heard about in China. The teachers became cognizant of the concerns of the children and allowed these to direct and extend the focuses of their studies. Far from being overwhelmed or frightened by such dilemmas, the children were delighted that they could do something to help; everything from initiating a school-wide composting campaign, to raising money to donate to the International Wildlife Coalition to help protect whales. One class entered an art contest in the Province newspaper, called Building Bridges to Peace. These works were displayed at the 1990 annual Vancouver Children's Festival.

Intermediate classes (grades four through six) studied such topics as the Amazon Rainforest, poverty, packaging in fast-food restaurants, Howe Sound
pollution, oil spills, forestry and logging, endangered animals, the Carmanah Valley, recycling and composting, space colonization, paper making, cultural studies (e.g. Peru, Bali), and the local water and sewage systems. Student actions included fund raisers for the Wildlife Rescue Association and the Foster Parents Plan Water Project (for relief efforts in Bali), a campaign to reduce school garbage, tree planting on the school grounds, a multicultural bazaar, and the writing of pen pal letters to students at Site Two. The class studying Bali made a walking trek, of several miles, to fetch water, as a simulation of daily life in Bali, in order to appreciate the value of clean water, a commodity that most Canadians take for granted.

That year, both the Remembrance Day ceremony and the Christmas concert, at the school, focused on the theme of peace. These adaptations made to familiar school functions are further illustrations of the extent to which the staff was committed to the themes of the U.C. program.

Many of the projects listed above were a part of the Waterworks theme, a common focus on any issues relating to water (e.g. acid rain, endangered water animals, the lack of clean water in some countries) in which the entire school participated. The staff had felt the need to identify a common school-wide focus, within the broader context of the U.C., as a means to help them manage the massive undertaking of implementing the U.C. program. The theme of water was decided upon, because it would provide a narrower focus than any one of the U.C. themes, and at the same time was broad enough to inspire many specific topics of study. The staff's U.C. steering committee was instrumental in presenting the theme and helping to plan for a week-long celebration of the theme (Waterworks Week) which took place in April 1990.
Waterworks Week was organized in such a way that one day was devoted to field trip experiences, another day featured experts (e.g. environmentalists) who made presentations to large groups of students, and several days were spent in preparation for an open house, an evening event for the entire community, planned for later in the week. At the open house the entire school was on display. Samples of writing and art work covered the walls in hallways and classrooms. Projects were displayed both in classrooms and in the gymnasium, with students and teachers available to discuss them. Families were invited to participate by designing an invention that utilized water; these were placed on display in the gymnasium. A bake sale, sponsored by the grade three students, to raise money for their adopt a whale project, also took place at the open house. The evening function was very well attended by parents, students and staff. Both teachers and students felt elated with the success of the event.

Site Two Projects

At Site Two, the number of U.C. projects was not as many as that of Site One. Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that about half of the staff was not officially involved in the U.C., sometimes projects initiated by those teachers who were, affected the tone and the activities undertaken in the school as a whole. As one teacher explained,

A few teachers can make quite a difference on a staff. We [the teachers involved in implementing the U.C.] influenced other teachers probably without their awareness. I noticed, for example, that other teachers [not officially involved with the U.C.], when invited, took part in some of our projects. As well, these same teachers began to allow their students more freedom to talk and move about within and outside of their
classrooms, and often planned studies and activities in collaboration with other teachers.

That is to say, the implementation of the U.C. at Site Two may have had an impact beyond the obvious manifestations of the identified U.C. projects.

Most of the U.C. inspired projects at Site Two were teacher-partner efforts, that is, two teachers and their classes worked together. The Kindergarten and the grade 7 class worked on several projects together. After learning about the devastating effects of oil spills, these students set about raising money for the Wildlife Rescue Association. To that end they organized a bake sale at the school. Another of their joint activities was the planting of flower bulbs, to enhance the school grounds with Spring flowers. Aside from the content learning that might have occurred, and the learning about acting and taking responsibility, these students of two widely spread age-groups had the opportunity to learn other less obvious things from each other, namely, peer teaching/learning and leadership. It is not hard to visualize the younger children in awe of the older ones, and the older students behaving as leaders as they helped the small Kindergarten children to plant flower bulbs.

A primary class and a grade five class worked together to learn about the life cycle of the salmon. In the process, they became aware of and concerned about the depletion of salmon caused by uncontrolled fishing practices, water pollution, and dammed rivers. In order to do something to help, these students raised young salmon and later released them in an unpolluted stream.

To enhance these environmental studies, a representative of Greenpeace was invited to make a presentation to several classrooms. In addition, students throughout the school wrote letters to the federal and
provincial ministers of the environment, asking questions and expressing their concern regarding recent oil spills affecting B.C.'s coastline.

Another topic studied by several classes was forestry. The students of one of these classes arranged to give away seedling trees to students throughout the school, to plant at home, as a symbol of their commitment to the preservation of forests. In this instance, the whole school was involved in a U.C. project; many students, including those who were not in the classes studying forestry, were excited about their actions. Virtually all of the staff enthusiastically supported this project.

Another project, that most teachers at Site Two participated in, was the writing of pen pal letters between the students of Sites One and Two. Virtually all of the classrooms from both schools were matched by their approximate age/grade. Students were encouraged to write letters to their pen pals, for the purposes of expressing their concerns and ideas related to their studies, and to simply connect and make new friends with children who live in a different community than their own (one being a big-city suburb environment and the other a small island community).

Summary

In chapter four, the U.C. program and the two sites used in the study were described in some detail. In addition, the particular manifestations of the U.C. program (the various studies and activities) were described specific to each of the two sites. Because the development of U.C. curriculum is not the focus of this study, the site projects, in most instances, were not described in detail. Rather the intention was to provide an overview of the type, variety and extent of
the projects demonstrative of the implementation of the U.C. at each site, as important background information to the study.

This prior knowledge of the site projects leads to the next chapter which discusses, primarily, the perspectives of the participants with regard to the implementation of those site projects, which comprise the findings of the study. Chapter Five: The Findings, is an account of the data, specifically, the two questionnaires, the interviews, the observations and pertinent school documentation.
Chapter 5. Findings

In this chapter the data from the following sources are discussed: (a) the first and second questionnaires; (b) the interviews with the program participants, at the end of the one-year implementation of the U.C.; (c) my observations during visits to the sites; and (d) school documentation. The data were collected chiefly to ascertain the perspectives of the program users, regarding the process of implementation of the Universal Curriculum program.

From Site One, all four sources of data were collected. As stated in chapter 3, the sources of data from Site Two were limited to the first questionnaire and my observations during visitations.

The First Questionnaire: Site One

The first questionnaire (see Appendix A, p. 122) was completed during the beginning stages of program implementation, in November, 1989. One hundred percent of the fourteen questionnaires distributed were returned.

Attached to the questionnaire was a one page outline, describing the key criteria from the change literature, to be used as a reference in responding to the questions. The questionnaire consisted of four questions, with spaces provided for written comments from the respondents. One of the questions asked respondents to comment on their thoughts and feelings, generally, as they began the process of program implementation. The three remaining questions asked respondents to consider the key criteria from the literature on educational change, as follows: (a) the anticipated presence and significance of the key criteria, at the site; (b) the immediate as well as anticipated, on-going,
personal needs of the respondents; and (c) the suggested roles of the school administrators, the staff steering committee, and the program consultant, as resources to assist the staff in implementing the program.

**Initial Thoughts and Feelings of the Participants**

Questionnaire responses indicated a very enthusiastic, positive outlook, on the part of the participants at Site One, toward the implementation of the U.C.. A typical response to the question, "How are you feeling, generally, about implementing the U.C. as a major goal for the school year?" was, "delighted - hopeful - wonderful! I cannot think of a more relevant and exciting focus."

Fifteen positive feelings were expressed in response to this question.

Three negative feelings were expressed. These were not critical of the U.C. program, but rather described a lack of self-confidence in implementing the program, or a fear that the program would not continue beyond the one year focus. "My major concern," stated one teacher, "is that [the U.C. focus] would be a one year commitment and not a primary concern forever."

**Perceived Strengths**

Parent support was stated by two respondents as a significant factor in implementing the program. In addition, although the general enthusiasm among staff members and the commitment of the staff were not listed as key criteria for successful program implementation, these factors were stated as strengths, a total of seven times, by the respondents. One teacher put it this way:

[Site One] is the ideal school for implementing the Universal Curriculum Program. We have the encouragement from the community . . . I feel that our staff is very enthusiastic about this program which is essential if it is to be a success.
Another respondent, again attributed positive staff characteristics as strengths which would be highly significant in the implementation process, with descriptions such as, "cohesive", "positive attitude", "willingness to try new things", and a history of "team work."

Aside from parent support, only one respondent cited other key criteria as strengths of the site, upon beginning the implementation process. This teacher included administrative and steering committee leadership as significant strengths. Nevertheless, several of the key criteria were perceived as major needs, by many of the program users.

**Anticipated Needs**

*Time* was perceived as the most essential need for successful implementation; it was stated as a need 31 times. Time for discussion of the program at regular staff meetings, professional development time (days per year, allocated by central office, for the purposes of staff professional development), and leadership time (days per year, allocated by central office, for two or more teachers to work together to develop curriculum) were all described as crucial time needs. The following are a few examples of what the program participants had to say about this criteria: "Time must be put aside to plan, develop and implement and then review or evaluate the processes of the program."; "[The] criteria most essential on the list is time - release of time to develop programs initially. . . . I need time given to work with other teachers to formulate worthwhile programs to implement the U.C. in the classroom."; and I feel that the most essential factor for successful implementation of this program is leadership time. . . . Otherwise this programme will continue to exist within some classrooms in a random and piecemeal form. I would also like some further pro-d [professional development] time to
assist in the development of a cohesive and integrated curriculum. Time outside of lunch hour and staff meetings must be provided for the staff of this school.

Next to time, leadership from the administrators, the staff steering committee and the program consultant were perceived as the most essential criteria. For example, one respondent suggested roles for the principal and consultant, as follows:

I would like the administrator and program consultant to schedule regular meetings (every month or two) so the teachers can consolidate what they are doing. I feel that it is important for the staff to 'touch base' periodically.

Another teacher defined the leadership roles as follows:

Administrator: to encourage, support and to jump in whenever possible to 'live' the concept. Program Consultant: to keep a watchful eye on our endeavors and offer encouragement and reminders of [the] commitment. Staff Committee: to help each classroom establish its commitment and projects.

One respondent cautioned that, without significant administrative leadership, the staff would "flounder, become disheartened," and the program would "lose impetus."

The only other criterion seen by the participants at Site One as a major need was that of resources. Respondents specified all kinds of resources: print and film materials, community members willing to assist with their projects, people with expertise on given topics under study, and teachers at other sites with experience in implementing the U.C..

Often, several criteria were discussed as inter-related. For example, the principal could be a powerful advocate for the program, explained one participant, by convincing central office to allocate extra funds for release time
for teachers to plan U.C. classroom applications. As well, the criteria of
leadership and resources were seen as inter-related by several respondents,
who suggested that both the administrators and the program consultant could
help to locate and organize resources.

**The First Questionnaire: Site Two**

At Site Two, four out of a possible seven questionnaires were completed
and returned, in November 1989. These indicated that, in contrast to Site One,
the participants of Site Two felt discouraged about the prospects of program
implementation.

**Initial Thoughts and Feelings of the Participants.**

Twice as many negative as positive feelings were expressed by the
respondents. Positive feelings were mostly declarations of their commitment to
the ideals of the U.C. program. However, these were overshadowed by their
feelings of despair over what they perceived as superficial administrative
support, and feelings of isolation at a school where many staff members did not
acknowledge the program or their efforts. One teacher referred to the manner
in which the U.C. program participants met quietly and out of sight of the rest of
the staff, as being "banished to backroom meetings."

Another participant explained,

We have an administrator who gives lip-service to U.C. but wants us to
do it quietly without disturbing the other staff members. To me this is the
most frustrating kind of support. We also have no steering committee.
Although there is enthusiasm for implementing U.C. among a fair size
core of individuals, people go off in pairs for specific projects . . . My
interests are in the area of 'global family' [and] other people's are not. I
feel alone.
This teacher felt particularly isolated, because, even within the group of program participants, very little was planned or shared as a whole group and the teachers who planned collaboratively, in partner groups, did so in isolation from the larger group. Unfortunately, all of the other teachers were interested in topics related to the environment, so this teacher felt virtually alone in pursuing a multicultural theme.

Another respondent felt similarly disheartened, declaring,

Very few of the criteria are actually 'realistic' as of now. . . . Personally, the goals and philosophy behind Universal Curriculum are the basis of my entire teaching process with my students. I would certainly appreciate support and encouragement from the listed criteria which at present is not forthcoming.

**Perceived Strengths**

Regarding strengths of the implementation process, most of the participants' perceptions were similar to those of Site One, in that the users' commitment to the U.C. philosophy was the predominant response. Some of the participants expressed not only a strong belief in the program, but also security in one another's support. For example, one respondent said, "We as a staff are fortunate to have a strong core group of people to give [one another] feedback and support."

It was also predicted, by one respondent, that parent support for the individual teachers participating in the program and for their various U.C. projects would be forthcoming. Parent support, however, would most likely consist of support for the teachers rather than the U.C. program, as the principal did not wish to make the program widely known to parents.
Anticipated Needs

Administrative leadership was stated most often (8 times) as a major need. One respondent said, "I would like to see [the] administrator more involved and more supportive - U.C. has to be talked about more at all levels and the work teachers are doing must be recognized and acknowledged."

Another participant said,

I believe that administrative leadership is the most essential component in implementing a school program. If this leadership is present, Pro-D time will be made available, relief time will be a priority, U.C. issues will be a part of staff meeting agendas and guidance and support will be offered in involving parents and other key personnel (i.e. central office).

One teacher offered some historical background of the U.C. at Site Two, describing a reduction in administrative support for the U.C., from the time the program was adopted initially by the staff two years prior, to the subsequent situation.

The success of U.C. during the first year of implementation was greatly aided by the support of the principal. It was such a significant programme that it was introduced to me at my first [job] interview. With the loss of support and reduction to 'lip service,' the second year was not as successful and no new staff members were comfortable adapting [the] U.C..

The need for time was described four times as being very crucial. Staff professional development time, primarily for the planning of program applications to the classroom, was discussed by several respondents. One user expressed a need for in-service training on cooperative learning, an essential teaching strategy embedded in the U.C. processes. The need for
time at regular staff meetings for program discussion was also stated as a priority.

The need for a steering committee, although not mentioned by most of the respondents, was seen as a high priority by the teacher who felt such a sense of isolation. This teacher explained,

We need a staff committee that will work on something as a school - not just isolated projects that just involve two people. We need to be openly able to air our frustrations, our needs... to keep ourselves aware of other people's successes, failures and frustrations, in order to work through our own.

The program consultant was discussed by two respondents as another essential need. "The program consultant," one participant explained, "is needed to give reassurance and clarify uncertainties. Informal meetings [with him] and phone access are of great benefit."

The Second Questionnaire: Site One

The second questionnaire (see Appendix A, p. 122) was completed at the end of the year-long process of program implementation, in June, 1990. Twelve out of fourteen questionnaires were returned.

The questionnaire consisted of four questions, with blank spaces in between for the respondents to write anecdotal comments. One question asked the respondents to comment on their levels of satisfaction with the Universal Curriculum program itself. The three remaining questions asked them to reflect on topics directly related to the literature on educational change as follows:
(a) the degree and nature of changes in the teachers, students, and in the school as an organization, as a result of implementation; (b) the significance of
the criteria present or lacking during implementation; and (c) the likelihood of
continuance of a U.C. focus at the school.

**Level of Satisfaction with the U.C. Program**

The completed questionnaires revealed that the feelings of staff
members at Site One toward the UC program, at the end of the first year of
implementation, were almost entirely positive. Most respondents indicated that
they were satisfied with the outcomes of the program, felt it had been well worth
the effort and proclaimed their intention to continue the focus at the school for at
least one more year. One teacher said,

The learning environment provided by the U.C. will increase the
likelihood that students will be prepared to meet the future with a sense
of personal worth, a respect for others, a willingness to take risks and a
view of their potential. In short, [the U.C.] lays the foundations for
students to become global citizens.

Another example of teacher satisfaction with the U.C. program is evident
in this statement:

[The U.C.] deals with topics that children are concerned about . . . It
helps them look at a situation from different perspectives, enables them
to brainstorm ideas and solutions and to follow through on their ideas.
This gives them hope for the future.

Regarding continuance, one respondent said, "I think that the U.C. has
been a big success at [the school] this year. It needs to continue as a focus in
order to build upon the achievements of the 1989-1990 school year."

A few negative feelings toward the program (4 in all) were expressed.
Two of the negative comments were brief statements of concern with the
complexity and/or philosophical nature of the program, as follows: "the scope of
the U.C. is incredibly broad," and "not practical enough for some, too open-ended."

One teacher felt that the program was too dependent upon the motivation (and perhaps the underlying personal philosophies) of the program implementers. This teacher said,

I think the U.C.'s strength is also its weakness. Its success depends on personal motivation. When motivation is as good as it is here, the teaching and learning environment is superb. Motivation has to be fed though to keep it going.

Another teacher was concerned that the program might not be suitable for children in the primary grades. This teacher stated, "I still think that primary students should focus on 'hands on' first hand experiences rather than be confused by global issues that demand a deep understanding of religious, political and historical factors."

**Strengths of the Implementation Process**

Consultant leadership was discussed most often, by participants, when asked to comment on the criteria which they perceived as helpful in the implementation process. Specifically, the consultant was credited with imparting inspiration, particularly in sparking the initial commitment to adopt the program. As one teacher put it, "The initial discussion [in-service] regarding the U.C. at the school proved to be a motivating factor." In addition, the consultant was appreciated for providing lots of positive feedback, throughout the year, which the staff found very encouraging. In this regard, one teacher said, "Encouragement from the external consultant gave us inspiration and motivation to go on." Another respondent commented, "Gary Squire was an outstanding resource and positive motivator."
Three other criteria were described as strengths almost as often as consultant leadership. These criteria were staff steering committee leadership, parent support, and staff commitment to the project.

Regarding staff steering committee leadership, virtually all of the comments (with one exception) indicated that the leadership demonstrated by the steering committee was highly significant. Such comments as, "the steering committee helped us organize", "good planning from steering committee", "great steering committee leadership", and "excellent U.C. steering committee," were common.

The respondent who expressed some negativity about the steering committee did not comment on its effectiveness, but rather declared disappointment in not being a member of the committee. This teacher remarked, "Those on the steering committee seemed to derive greater benefit. I would have preferred the whole staff (we're not that big) to be the steering committee. A few of us missed out."

Parent support, for example, the positive feedback following the parent U.C. in-service (January 23, 1990.), parent assistance with the various U.C. classroom projects, and parent participation during the Waterworks Week, was considered encouraging and motivating by the staff members. As one respondent put it, "The encouragement of the parents was such a key to the flow and intensity of the program. . . . parent/community involvement was quite significant." Another teacher remarked, "As so many in our community were involved in our studies and projects, local awareness [of environmental issues] did increase."
Although staff commitment was not listed as one of the criteria on which participants were invited to comment, it was declared a significant factor by six of the twelve respondents. They explained that staff commitment, regarding the implementation of the U.C., was very much a matter of being attuned to the Universal Curriculum philosophy from the outset. One teacher remarked, "The fact that our whole staff seemed to feel that the philosophy of the U.C. was an important philosophy for us to adopt, individually and as a group, made it much easier for us to implement."

However, one respondent suggested that staff commitment to the U.C. was not unanimous. This teacher stated, "I was surprised to see how some people reacted to the five themes. Not everyone seemed quite ready to accept these themes and that does inhibit what is passed on to the students."

Effective administrative leadership had been a significant criterion in the implementation process, for several respondents. Most of these comments were specific in referring to the head teacher, as for example: "I feel that the administrative leadership of the head teacher played a key role in the successful implementation of the U.C.".

**Needs of the Implementation Process**

By far, time was perceived as the most crucial factor lacking. Although the U.C. was given time on some staff meeting agendas, and some staff professional development time (2 days) was allocated to the UC, many teachers felt they needed more time, especially to plan projects collaboratively. One respondent put it this way, "Lack of time and energy seemed to be the only drawback. I believe the staff did feel a lot of pressure as we neared our focus week." Another teacher commented, "We had some time to plan but not
enough. The extra time needed had to be personal time." One teacher explained the need for time specifically as ". . . time on each staff meeting agenda for thoughtful discussion, and planning time for departments or teachers with a common theme."

Administrative leadership was an issue for two respondents who indicated their dissatisfaction with the level of commitment from the principal. One teacher said simply, "needed more support from principal." A comment from another respondent seemed to imply that continued implementation of the U.C. the following year would hinge upon the support of the principal, on which some doubt was cast. This teacher said, "I predict that [the U.C.] will continue to be a focus for at least another year because of several staff members who will attempt to keep it going. I hope that it will be clearly and enthusiastically supported by the principal."

Central office support was also stated a few times as something lacking, which was felt would have provided extra encouragement. As one teacher put it, "If the district administration even acknowledged [the U.C.], it would be a plus."

Outcomes of the U.C. Implementation

All of the respondents were enthusiastic about the positive changes they perceived in both students and teachers at the school. They described increased awareness in students of important local and global issues. As well, increased student self-esteem, motivation and a sense of empowerment were stated as outcomes. One teacher perceived in students a, ". . . development of social conscience, a feeling of empowerment (we can and must act to improve the situation), and a greater awareness of other cultures and individual
differences." With regard to increased student motivation, one teacher said, "Students learned more about the themes we worked on because the topics were often chosen by them. They seemed much better able to 'get into' the topics and really benefit by them."

Many teachers felt that, as a result of the UC program, they had begun to shift to a more student-centered style of teaching: ideas for many projects came from the students and learning became more experiential (where students learn by experimenting and doing-for-themselves, as opposed to an emphasis on listening to, watching and reading about the knowledge of others). "I have a greater ability to step back and let the students take the lead in determining what's important," said one teacher. Another teacher said, "Because of the nature of the subject matter and the program, we have had to teach from an investigative base. It has been successful and exciting."

Some respondents noted that, due to the implementation of the U.C., there was more collaboration among colleagues. As one teacher put it, "We have increased interactions [between four primary teachers] with our centers and having four classes rotate. The method was very successful. We intend to continue with the U.C. and these teaching methods." Because of the U.C. focus, there was "much enthusiasm in teaming in groups," said another respondent.

One teacher declared that there was no change in the way she taught. This teacher said,

The U.C. did not really change my behaviour with regard to teaching. The children in my class are routinely taught about the world around them and the various problems. The U.C. fit into our social studies program very nicely.
Most respondents (11 out of 12) stated that they would like the school to continue a U.C. focus for at least another year, because, although they had accomplished a lot in one year, as one respondent said, "I feel that we've only touched the tip of the iceberg this year. There is so much involved in the U.C. that one year is just not enough." Another teacher said, "It has to be an on-going focus because we have on-going problems. How do we hope to help if our efforts are for a limited time only?" Another respondent put it this way, "I think it is important to continue with the U.C. The children need the information about the world situations in order to better understand how to help."

One teacher indicated that more U.C. might be "overkill" and would rather focus on another innovation, such as cooperative learning, the following year: This teacher said,

I think it would be natural to continue linking the U.C. to curriculum and lifestyle changes . . . I think overkill could be a problem if we take the U.C. per se rather than integrate it with other learnings. . . . We have a big year ahead with the new Primary Program; how about taking, for example, 'cooperative learning' as a school theme?

Recommendations

Consistent with the needs discussed above, the most frequently stated recommendation was that a greater time commitment be made to implement the U.C. in 1990-1991. Comments such as, "I would like to have the time available to plan with other staff, perhaps to work on some muti-age groupings for some projects," were common. Several other respondents stated that the staff would need to commit time for discussion of the U.C. at regular staff meetings and for professional development days, in order to maintain the focus. One respondent
stated, "I recommend that the staff make the U.C. a professional development goal for 1990-1991, so our Pro-D days and energies can again be directed toward further implementation of the U.C. program." A few teachers expressed concern that without the time commitment, the U.C. would be put aside because of pressure to implement the British Columbia, Ministry of Education's Primary Program and the time consuming accreditation process the school was slated to undergo the following year.

Several teachers saw the need to address continued staff commitment to the U.C. focus, because a few of the most enthusiastic contributors to the project were leaving the school and would be replaced by new teachers, perhaps with no knowledge of the U.C. New staff was seen as another reason for additional in-service training, in that they would need assistance in understanding the program and in getting started.

The continuation of a staff U.C. steering committee was seen to be of key importance by several teachers. The steering committee was described as a mechanism for encouragement, support and long-term goal setting.

One respondent cautioned that a theme of limited scope (similar in scope to the water theme the school had adopted that year), derived from the larger U.C. themes, needed to be decided upon for the following year. Otherwise, it was feared that the staff would be overwhelmed by the broad scope of the five U.C. themes.

**The Interviews: Site One**

Eight out of the fourteen participants were interviewed, including both administrators, three weeks after the second questionnaires were distributed.
The questionnaires were collected on the same day the interviews were conducted, June 18, 1990. The questionnaires asked the participants to respond specifically to questions related to the staff development criteria from the literature. I took a different approach with the interviews. I asked only two or three very open-ended questions, just enough to get the interview started and then occasionally another to keep it going. For example, the question was asked, "What do you want to say about the experience of the implementation of the Universal Curriculum at your school?" In this way, the specific topics were left up to the interviewees. I took this approach in order to permit them to say things that they hadn't previously stated on the questionnaires, and/or to repeat assertions stated in the questionnaires, assertions they felt strongly enough about to repeat without prompting from the interviewer.

Participants' Feelings toward the Project

The data from the interviews were consistent with that of the second questionnaire, in that the participants again spoke very positively, during interviews, about the whole project. It was their position, overall, that the implementation of the U.C. had been very worthwhile and successful, most notably evident in the positive changes in behaviour of both teachers and students. The participants, once again, indicated that they expected continuance of the U.C. as a focus at the school, for the 1990-1991 school year.

The following are just a few comments illustrative of the positive feelings toward the project. One primary teacher said,

I felt that sometimes in the past, [a school focus], last year's writing focus, for example, was to impress the parents. This year [the Waterworks project] was for the kids. And it was much easier for me to do because I was really motivated.
The community school coordinator said, "The Universal Curriculum ties in so wonderfully with community education philosophy. I'm filled with great hope. [This project] has freed me and sanctioned me to do the things I've always tried to do." And this from the principal: "The first year [of U.C. implementation] was a roaring success and I can't see the enthusiasm waning."

A few negative feelings (5 separate comments) toward some aspect of the project were expressed, although each interviewee who had a negative comment also pointed out that s/he was pleased with the project overall. One teacher felt frustrated with the process of staff decision making, specifically the decision to make water the school theme for the U.C. projects. This teacher felt that the students should have had input into that decision. Furthermore, this teacher stated that, "It's not the staff steering committee or the consultant, but rather [individual] teacher initiative that counts." Despite these concerns, this teacher also said enthusiastically, "I think it's a great program and it's important for it to carry on," indicating a wish that the U.C. focus continue in spite of the concerns.

There was some concern that the U.C. focus might have been given too much emphasis. With reference to the Waterworks projects, one teacher said, "Waterworks was really big. Some intermediate teachers may feel that it took too much time away from their regular programs. It may have been a bit overwhelming. For some, it even got a bit competitive." The same concern was voiced by the principal, who, although he expressed much pride in the staff's accomplishments regarding the U.C. focus, said he would like to "step back" a little. He attested to being "traditional" as a preface to asking the question, "How much of the prescribed curriculum was lost?"
Strengths of the Project

The perceived strength that was discussed most often (by five out of the eight interviewees) was that of staff commitment to the philosophy of the U.C.. It was their position that the majority of the school staff had similar attitudes about environmental, social and political issues (agreement with the five themes of the U.C.), prior to adoption of the U.C.. Furthermore, some of the teachers had taught similar themes to those of the U.C. in their classrooms, to some extent, prior to the year of U.C. implementation. Therefore, with the adoption of the U.C. as a school focus, they were afforded not only the permission but also the necessary strategies to teach in a way they had already believed in but had previously not had the opportunity and expertise to put fully into practice.

Regarding the staff commitment to the U.C. philosophy, one intermediate teacher said, "The U.C. formalized the philosophy already in place at the school." When the principal was asked to state what he thought were the main reasons that the project had been, as he described, a "roaring success," he responded, "Everybody was on board; this made it easy."

One teacher expanded on the high level of staff commitment to the U.C., explaining that this commitment was an example of the culture of the school. This teacher explained that "working together" as a staff was typical behaviour at the school, because the staff enjoyed each other and had similar teaching philosophies. This teacher stated emphatically, "This is an incredible staff. The teachers here are much less teacher-centered than at some other schools. There are no yellers here; it's more of a democracy. Everyone gets along on this staff."
However, one staff member pointed out that the level of staff commitment to the U.C. focus varied. This teacher stated that s/he "doubted the sincerity" of some staff members and that some teachers "felt it [commitment to the U.C. focus] less powerfully". This view may be illustrated in the following questions from another teacher: "Is what we're doing going to change things? What's the impact of U.C.? How much should we stress [with children] that we're in trouble?"

As for the criteria from the literature, the one stated most often in interviews as a major asset in the implementation process and a main reason for the success of their school-wide U.C. project, Waterworks, was that of the staff steering committee. Leadership by the head teacher, who was also a member of the steering committee, was also given much credit. As one participant said, "The steering committee was really important and the coordinating role that [the head teacher] played was crucial."

**Outcomes of the U.C. Implementation**

As was the case with the second questionnaire, in the interviews the participants were more enthusiastic about the changes they perceived in themselves and in their students, as a result of the project, than about anything else. Regarding changes in teachers, some participants spoke of teaching style changes and/or personal lifestyle changes. One teacher said, "It's the little everyday things, the new lifestyle habits, like recycling at school and at home, that are the big successes."

Once again, consistent with statements made in the second questionnaire, several participants pointed to an increased degree of collaboration between staff members as a very positive change. For example,
four primary teachers teamed, using a learning centers approach (where students proceed from one activity station to the next) to design their combined Waterworks project. The collaboration among members of the steering committee and, as a result of their work, between the committee and the rest of the staff is another example of this increased collaboration.

One teacher spoke of an increased comfort level in discussing with primary children issues that might be construed by some as controversial. This teacher said, "I used to be afraid to talk about these issues [eg. hunger; pollution] with kids, but not anymore because I know that kids can really do something about the problems." In addition, this teacher had begun to allow children to make some of the decisions about their own learning. This teacher said with obvious pride, "Kids made the decisions about the actions they would take, after [completing] the research."

As for changes in students, the interviewees agreed that the U.C. implementation had had a positive impact on students. Two outcomes regarding the impact on students were spoken of most often: (a) Students had become more knowledgeable about local and global issues, and (b) had become personally involved in the issues by taking actions of their own to help make things better. The following are some of the comments made by interviewees: "Waterworks was all based on children doing," "Kids were making decisions," "The kids felt knowledgeable. First they felt depressed [by environmental problems], then later uplifted by their actions," and "Kids were empowered; they wrote to companies [about their concerns]."

Another important outcome of the implementation of the U.C., discussed by several participants, was what was described as a "bringing together" of the
staff with a common purpose. Referring to the U.C., the principal said, "It was a terrific focus for pulling the school together." They seemed to be saying that although the staff had already been philosophically united, it was the U.C. focus that gave form to their philosophy, a specific mode of expression. These staff members expressed a great joy in sharing a common goal, the U.C., with their colleagues on staff.

Recommendations for Continued Implementation

Once again, time was perceived to be the greatest need. Specifically articulated were time to discuss plans for continued implementation of the U.C. as a whole staff (not only at regular staff meetings, but also at planning sessions devoted solely to the U.C. focus) and release time for teachers to plan collaboratively. Although, some time had been provided during the first year of implementation (e.g. two professional development days, and some time for the steering committee to plan), the feeling commonly expressed was that lots more time would be needed to maintain the same level of energetic participation demonstrated during the first year of implementation. One of the four primary teachers who team taught their Waterworks centers said, "It was great to share ideas and resources, but we could only do it at recess. We need more time to do these things."

One of the teachers emphasized that the staff, especially considering staff changes, would need continued input and incentives in order to continue a U.C. focus. New staff, it was pointed out, would need to gain an understanding of the U.C. program and would need to be convinced of its worthiness as an innovation. Furthermore, it was explained that even returning staff would
benefit from additional in-service on the Universal Curriculum, which might refresh their knowledge of the program and renew their motivation.

Another teacher recommended a rough planning formula for the following year. It was suggested that a specific theme focus be decided on by the staff early in the year. Then, long-term goals might be agreed upon, for example, to work toward a theme week in April (similar to the Waterworks Week), in which the whole community would be invited to participate, in order to celebrate and showcase the work and actions accomplished by the students. Finally, it was recommended that there be lots of staff dinner meetings throughout the year, as had been the custom in the past, to plan and celebrate their U.C. projects.

Observations

Site One Observations

My observations at Site One are based on five visits to the school, aside from the day the interviews were conducted. These observations were recorded as anecdotal notes, describing all that I saw and heard relating to the implementation of the U.C. program, made immediately following each visit. All five of the visits were at the invitation of the staff and varied in purpose, including the staff's initial U.C. in-service workshop, a program planning meeting, a parent in-service workshop, a U.C. Open House called Waterworks, and a year-end U.C. meeting and celebration.

The initial staff in-service on the U.C. program took place in the early evening, on June 27, 1989. The head teacher had heard of the U.C. and my search for a school at which to implement it, from a parent. She introduced the
idea to the staff who in turn invited me to make a presentation. At that time, I described the U.C. themes and processes with examples of classroom applications. In addition, I outlined my proposal for a one-year staff commitment to implement the program, which would include my services as a program consultant. My impressions of the staff, upon this first meeting, were very positive. Although the meeting was held after school hours on the hectic, last week before summer break, the entire staff attended and I found everyone to be very friendly and welcoming. Dinner was catered, which I learned was their habit whenever school commitments kept the staff longer than their usual ferry departures to the mainland where most of them lived. I noted that the staff members, including the two administrators, were very much at ease with one another, laughing and joking with one another frequently. They attended with genuine interest to my presentation, asked lots of questions, and finally expressed a great deal of enthusiasm for adopting the program. They were to meet at the beginning of September to make their final decision, when a few new staff members would be in attendance. I left feeling that Site One would be an ideal school for the project and almost certain that the staff would make the commitment in September.

Although the staff did indeed adopt the U.C. program in September, 1989, and I did have contact several times with the head teacher who was to be my liaison, I did not meet with the staff again, until December 7th. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the progress made as well as needs for continued implementation, and to make plans for a school-wide U.C. project. I was invited to advise, address concerns, and, from my point of view, to congratulate and encourage the staff in their continued efforts. Again, the
meeting included a catered dinner. I was impressed with the amount of preparation that had been done prior to the meeting by the steering committee; it appeared they had done the groundwork, having ideas ready to present to the staff for discussion. The meeting was chaired by the head teacher, fulfilling the purposes stated above, through open discussion, and recording, on large chart paper, positive and negative feelings toward the program, as well as ideas for a school-wide focus. As before, I found the staff very vocal, openly expressing satisfaction as well as criticism, and most friendly and respectful of one another. One teacher, new to the staff, expressed hesitation with regard to applying U.C. themes in primary classrooms. I was struck by the care taken by others, to accept and acknowledge these concerns before adding further information or opposing views for consideration. As a result, this teacher, who spoke to me privately after the meeting, gained a better understanding of the program, and misgivings resolved, felt enabled to begin the application of the program. The staff reached consensus on the school-wide focus of water and the steering committee was given permission to continue planning toward a focus week, which would showcase and celebrate all of the water related studies in the school, to take place sometime in the Spring.

On my third visit to the school (January 23, 1990), two of my associates, Dr. Maurice Gibbons and Melanie Zola, and I made a presentation, introducing the U.C. program to the parent community. Prior to this meeting, the parents had been made aware of the school focus on the U.C., through school newsletters. The meeting was organized and hosted by the community school coordinator, with permission from the staff. On this occasion, as was the custom at regular parent council meetings, only a few staff representatives attended.
Approximately twenty parents were present. After a brief formal presentation, discussions in small groups and then in the whole group were facilitated. Parents were generally very supportive of the program goals and enthusiastically proclaimed their intentions to become involved with their children, in the various U.C. classroom studies undertaken. One parent was critical of the program, dismissing it as an old and failed 1960's concept, reminiscent of the peace movement and such educational innovations as open area classrooms. This parent preferred what was described as a thorough concentration on the basic skills of reading, writing and arithmetic. I learned, later that evening, that this parent had been very critical of the school's recent U.C. adapted Christmas Concert (1989), which emphasized a theme of global peace. In spite of these criticisms, or perhaps partially sparked by them, the remaining discussion was highly supportive of the innovation.

My fourth visit to the school was on the occasion of the Waterworks Open House, on the evening of May 3, 1990. This special community event, as well as the whole Waterworks Week, of which the open house was only a part, was described briefly in Chapter Four: Description of the Project. To add to the previous description, the following is a brief summary of my general impressions of the evening. The entire school was full of people of all ages, talking and laughing, moving from one room to the next. Everywhere, mainly for the benefit of parents and other guests, students and teachers were discussing, demonstrating, and pointing out the many water-related projects, worked on for weeks or months prior to the celebration underway. After the parents and students had left for home, I relaxed with the staff for a few minutes, in the staff
room, before heading for the next ferry departure. The tone in the staff room was one of exhaustion but also elation at a job well done.

On June 11, 1990, I attended one more dinner meeting, which was organized for the purposes of celebrating the year of U.C. implementation, reviewing the accomplishments, and making recommendations for continued use the following school year (1990-1991). A long list of accomplishments was recorded and posted on pieces of chart paper. The phrase, "We can make a difference," was underlined at the bottom of the list. Several staff members expressed concern that the implementation of the new B.C. Ministry of Education mandated Primary Program, as well as the accreditation process slated for the following school year, would take precedence over a continued focus on the U.C. Some teachers felt that the program would no longer need to be designated as a focus, that it would continue automatically, while others argued that it required on-going, energetic emphasis if expected to continue. I was not disappointed that this significant debate was not resolved at this meeting, only happy that it was begun.

Site Two Observations

I met twice with the program participants of Site Two. Both meetings were initiated by me. The first meeting marked the official adoption (or more accurately, re-adoption) of the program and the second meeting, several months later, was intended to review the progress made and address needs.

A total staff commitment to a renewed U.C. focus was proposed to the staff, by the principal and one of the teachers, at a staff meeting in October of 1989, but was met with resistance from several teachers. Instead, they agreed that the U.C. focus could be established on a voluntary basis, for a small group
of staff members who wished to make the commitment. Consequently, an after school meeting with me was arranged, and all interested staff members were invited to attend.

This meeting took place at the school, on November 13, 1989. The principal, the vice-principal, four classroom teachers and the librarian were in attendance. All but one, a teacher, had participated in the previous U.C. focus at the school, in 1987-1988. I had met them for the first time, in the Fall of 1987, in my role as one of the workshop leaders who introduced the U.C. to the staff on a professional development day. The following year (1988-1989), I had supervised two student teachers at the school in my capacity as a faculty associate in the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser University. During these two years, I had established friendly relations with the staff. As a consequence, this meeting to institute a renewed U.C. focus with this small group of acquaintances was quite relaxed and informal. Everyone seemed to be in very good spirits, jesting with one another, just as I had come to expect on the basis of my prior visits.

At this time, I explained how I would be on call as a consultant to assist them with the process of program implementation, in exchange for their assistance in allowing me to collect data for my masters' degree thesis. After a brief discussion, all those in attendance agreed to adopt the U.C. as a year-long focus. We adjourned to a neighborhood pub to celebrate the event.

The second meeting, on March 29, 1990, was not such a happy occasion. We met at the neighborhood pub. This time only four teachers attended. Both administrators, whom I saw briefly at the school before leaving for the pub, excused themselves, explaining that they were too busy to attend.
The teachers lamented that they felt abandoned by the principal who gave them no support or encouragement in their efforts to implement the U.C., and, at times, those same teachers felt alienated from the rest of the staff who made quite clear their disinterest in the program.

The teachers spoke at length about their theories regarding the lack of principal support and the rift between themselves and the other staff members. They explained that, in their opinions, the principal had never been a strong advocate of the U.C., but rather chose a path of least resistance, meaning that the principal went along with whatever the majority of the staff wanted. They felt that the principal had always been cautious in supporting the program, perceiving it as too controversial. The principal considered it too risky to inform the parents of the focus and cautioned teachers against classroom projects that encouraged students to take a stand on what might be considered controversial issues (e.g. student letter writing to local politicians, regarding environmental problems).

It was felt that, previously, in 1987-1988, when the U.C. had been enthusiastically embraced by the staff, most of the impetus and leadership for the innovation came from one highly respected teacher, newly assigned to the school. They explained further that the principal understood that this influential teacher, who was renowned in the district for an expertise in curriculum and instruction, would be a significant and positive influence in the school. This teacher had introduced the idea of a U.C. school focus to the staff, as a program that would address their concerns about a growing problem of student aggressiveness and cultural prejudice. The principal, they hypothesized, understandably wanted to keep such a talented teacher on the staff, and
therefore supported this teacher's initiatives including the U.C.. However, the program was met with less enthusiasm, by the staff, the following year. Then, at the end of that year, when the teacher who had, in effect, led the innovation left to teach in another district, the principal lost interest in the U.C..

Regarding the problem of alienation from the rest of the staff, the teachers implementing the U.C. believed that a few other staff members were somewhat threatened by the prospect of U.C. implementation. These teachers who were disinterested in a continued U.C. focus, with all the time and energy it required to implement, may have feared becoming a minority of non-participants on staff, perhaps overshadowed by the teachers implementing the program. Therefore, it was surmised that these staff members who were disinterested in the U.C. preferred that the program maintain a very low profile in the school, and consequently, went so far as to suggest to new staff members that they need not get involved or take the program seriously. Thus, the program participants felt that their efforts to implement the U.C., to the extent intended by them, had been effectively undermined by both the non-participants and the principal.

It was obvious to me that the remaining program participants were very discouraged. As it was already late in the school year (March 29th), they seemed resigned to the situation. Nevertheless, they did feel that they had continued to implement the program successfully in their own classrooms, in spite of the obstacles.

**School Documentation: Site One**

All school documentation, which might include references to the U.C., were collected by the head teacher at Site One and passed on to me. This
documentation included: (a) in-house documents (e.g. memos, staff meeting agendas and recorded minutes), (b) parent and community newsletters, and (c) news coverage in the local community newspaper and an issue of Forcefields, the U.C. newsletter.

In-House Documents

I obtained documents from eight staff meetings (consisting of 6 regular staff meetings, 1 staff committee meeting, and 1 U.C. steering committee meeting), spanning the months from August 1989 to March 1990. Documents from five of these meetings contained direct references to the U.C. program. Several references were brief reminders of upcoming events (e.g. the Shared Visions conference in October, and my visit to the school on December 7th). The staff meeting in November included a report on the U.C. from the head teacher. The documentation indicated that staff meetings in January and March included lengthy discussions regarding U.C. studies and projects, particularly related to the school-wide focus theme of water. In April, an eight-page memo was distributed to the staff, outlining ideas, projects, resources and an itinerary of events for the Waterworks Week, scheduled for the week of April 30th to May 3rd, 1990.

Parent and Community Newsletters

Of the four newsletters obtained, all contained references to the Universal Curriculum. One article called, Shared Visions Well Attended, in a November issue of the community school newsletter, described the U.C. conference, listed the staff members who made a presentation there, and explained that the U.C. program had been chosen by the staff as a curricular focus for the year. Other issues of this newsletter included an invitation to the
U.C. presentation to parents scheduled for January 1990, and a lengthy report on the Waterworks Week. In the community school program guide, Winter Program 1990, in which out-of-school programs for adults and children are described, two programs indirectly related to the U.C. philosophy were included: the Cultures Club for children, and the Global Environment series of workshops for adults. Noted prominently at the bottom of the program guide was the following reference to the U.C.: "In keeping with the Universal Curriculum focus, this program is printed on recycled paper."

News Coverage

I obtained two issues of the local community newspaper (January, February, 1990), each containing a letter to the editor expressing opposing views regarding the school's Christmas concert, December 1989. The first letter was from an angry parent who disliked the concert's theme of peace, which she felt took precedence over the traditional, religious theme. Changes in the concert, emphasizing the peace theme, had been made consciously by the staff, who intended the concert to include U.C. philosophy. This parent felt that the staff had attempted to, "throw away old established values/ethics and replace them with a dictum of confusion and insert political messages." This parent asked, "What kind of message does a pre-school child get from the demonstrated 'rap' skits which totally disregard the observation of reverence towards Christmas?"

The second letter, co-authored by two parents, was in response to the first letter. These parents wrote, "We enjoyed [the school] concert," and expressed their appreciation for "a most enjoyable evening." They stated, "We would rather see the school system fostering this kind of independence,
creativity and enthusiasm than witness a time-worn play woodenly acted out, as those we had to endure as children."

The staff members of Site One had been invited to write testimonials describing their experiences and perspectives, during the process of U.C. implementation, for the Spring 1990 issue of the U.C. newsletter, *Forcefields*. All fourteen participants at the site submitted testimonials, which became a four-page article complete with photographs. All of these submissions were highly positive, demonstrative of their enthusiasm for the program. The following is one teacher's contribution in its entirety, which, in this instance, I feel is more powerfully illustrative of the level of commitment typical of users at Site One, than samplings from several contributors:

Confessions of a Biodegradable Skeptic:

Yes, there's at least one on every staff who does need some convincing - especially when [that person] is a new staff recruit trying to understand what all this U.C. religion is that everyone else seems to have unquestioningly adopted.

'Sure,' I thought, 'how can one disagree with what seems to be well-intended? But should this really be the focus of learning for my [primary] students? Maybe I'll compromise by fitting it in at the end of the year. I'll keep quiet about my doubts. After all, how do I find time to create yet another new program?'

Little did I know how the strength of commitment by staff and parents, the inspiration of Gary Squire, not to mention the humbling influence of my own class, were to conspire to quickly change my attitude. It didn't take long to realize that these teachers meant business, that personal doubts could, in fact, be voiced without a 'put down,' and that Gary Squire would so intelligently answer any and all questions. However, the most influential force in my change of attitude were those informed, concerned open minds which I have the honor to nurture.
The power of young minds can recycle adult thought processes. Here we were, launching a series of themes (teacher choice, of course) from Rain to Bears to Chinese New Year. We hadn't been into 'Rain' long when the question arose: 'What happens when the water with bad stuff in it evaporates, condenses and falls down someplace else?' We were on to acid rain before we knew it and there was no letting go.

Eventually we managed to launch teacher choice number two - Bears. We enjoyed the teddy bear's picnic day, but try answering the question, 'Why are there so few pandas left?' in one day. Our subsequent study of endangered species/habitats has been on-going for two months and the concern and interest is unflagging.

I felt pretty good about Chinese New Year - that's what U.C. is all about. 'We'll eat Chinese food, dance Chinese dances, write Chinese writing and just get a flavour of the culture without getting into any of that sensitive stuff.' Little did I know that [one boy's] uncle had been in Beijing last summer! What a lesson in comparative cultures [this boy] gave!

We're only halfway through the school year and it seems that whatever avenues of study we pursue, the Universal Curriculum is there weaving itself into the fabric of our work. We don't have to wait for ready-made packages of materials and lessons. The children of [this community] seem intent on acting to improve their planet. My role has changed from director/planner to listener/facilitator as we examine issues, gather information and take action.

Our next theme? We're postponing it for a few weeks so we can finish our endangered species posters, write our letters asking for more information on threatened habitats, try out our acid rain tester, empty the compost and graph the amount of garbage collected... the curriculum is writing itself with the help of the children and they are embarked on their future on this planet.
Summary

This chapter summarized the data collected from Sites One and Two. Primarily, the data comprised the perceptions of the program users, regarding the process of U.C. implementation, related to key criteria from the literature on educational change. Sources of data consisted of two questionnaires, interviews, observations and school documentation.

In the following chapter, Interpretation of the Findings, these data are examined and interpreted, in relationship to the literature on educational change.
Chapter 6. Interpretation of the Findings

In this chapter, the findings, consisting primarily of the perspectives of the program users, are interpreted in relation to the literature on school change. Careful consideration is given to data which affirm as well as data which contradict or extend the theories discussed in the literature.

In this study, the foremost question to be answered relates to the problem motivating the study (the difficulty in implementing the U.C.), as follows: How might a school staff be assisted in implementing the Universal Curriculum, leading to a long-term staff commitment to the innovation? Specifically, answers are proposed to the following questions, inherent in the principal question of staff assistance:

1. What was the significance of designing an on-going implementation process, which corresponded with certain key criteria from the literature: (a) consultant support, (b) administrator leadership, (c) central office support, (d) parent support, (e) allocation of time, and (f) a staff steering committee?

2. How did the issues of the practicality of the program (the ease with which the users were enabled to carry out the program), and the goodness of fit (the match between the program goals and the beliefs of the users), affect the outcomes of program implementation?

3. How did the level of staff collegiality (the degree to which staff members tended to work together toward shared goals) impact on the process of program implementation?
Program Implementation In Accordance with the Key Criteria

The design of this study was based on the hypothesis that a substantive plan for the on-going process of program implementation, in accordance with certain key criteria from the literature on school change, would enhance the likelihood of successful staff development (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1979; Fullan, 1982; Huberman & Miles, 1984; Firestone & Wilson, 1985; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991). In contrast to the initial attempt to establish the U.C. at Mountain View Elementary, where no plan of implementation existed (as described in chapter two), a comprehensive plan of on-going program implementation was attempted at Sites One and Two of this study. Recall that this plan was designed according to the following criteria: (a) on-going consultant support, (b) administrator leadership, (c) central office support, (d) parent support and participation, (e) a substantial time commitment, and (f) a staff steering committee. During the course of program implementation, these criteria became the participants’ goals.

Consultant Support

Consultant support was central to the process of implementation; as the consultant, I was not only responsible for staff training in, and continued support of, the U.C., but also for raising the staffs’ awareness of the benefits, if not the necessity, of realizing such goals as parent support and a staff U.C. steering committee. To this end, the six criteria (listed above) were recommended to both staffs as important goals. They were encouraged to attain as many as possible in order to enhance the implementation process. These goals were introduced as a part of the initial program of in-service and reinforced through the duration of the project.
Although I do not claim that the participants had a deep understanding of the criteria (goals), which requires an examination of the literature, they were aware of them and convinced of the need for them, as indicated by their responses on the questionnaires and during interviews, and by their active pursuit of them. In regard to the pursuit of these goals, however, there were some differences between Sites One and Two. At Site One, although some debate took place regarding the extent to which the goals had been attained, the staff was united in pursuit of virtually all of them. In contrast, at Site Two, the principal, who was the person with the influence and authority to spearhead the attainment of these goals (e.g. central office support; parent support; the allocation of time), withheld support, preferring that the program participants proceed cautiously and on their own. Another difference between the sites was that the participating teachers at Site Two did not form a program steering committee, perhaps the only goal which could have been achieved without support from the principal. The establishment of a program steering committee at Site Two might have provided a forum for regular discussion and planning and resulted in a strong sense of support for one another (support that one participant lamented was lacking). The staff steering committee was a component that proved to be very beneficial to the participants at Site One.

The experience at Site One indicates that it is possible for an outside consultant to have considerable impact on initiating and influencing on-going staff development. On the second questionnaire, the participants at Site One cited consultant leadership as a program implementation strength more often than any other factor. As the program consultant, I did assume major responsibilities in the process of program implementation, as described above.
Why, then, was the same consultant leadership at Site Two so ineffective? This is consistent with the literature; while consultant leadership may play a central role in staff development, it is not enough to effect school change in the absence of other essential criteria (Fullan, 1982).

**Administrator Leadership**

I found that leadership/support from the school administrators was the most significant factor, aside from consultant leadership, influencing the implementation of the U.C. in this study. This conclusion was drawn not solely on the basis of the findings from Site One, where the participants felt the program had been most successful, for indeed these participants emphasized staff commitment to the U.C. philosophy and the steering committee leadership as their greatest strengths. However, comparison of the data from the two sites, in this regard, was quite revealing. For example, considering the data from Site Two, it became apparent that without administrator leadership the possibility of attaining most of the other criteria was minimized. The participants at Site Two stated repeatedly their frustration with the lack of support from the principal which they felt severely limited their endeavors to fully implement the program.

It is my interpretation that the reason the participants at Site One did not attribute administrator support the same importance as those at Site Two, was that they were accustomed to having it, and therefore it could easily go unrecognized. The participants at Site One clearly recognized that the staff steering committee and parent support were highly significant factors, factors which seemed to have been overlooked as partially attributable to administrator leadership. The steering committee was initiated and led by the head teacher, and the pursuit of parent support was encouraged by the administrative team.
Aside from leading the steering committee, the considerable efforts on the part of the head teacher helped to maintain a strong school focus on the U.C. throughout the year. This was noted with emphasis by several teachers as well as the principal.

The principal at Site One was criticized several times as giving only weak support to the program. The staff seemed to perceive the principal as generally supportive of all of their efforts, although not necessarily as a strong supporter of the Universal Curriculum. My conversations with the principal, particularly during the interview, corroborated this perception. The principal's admiration for, and pride in, the accomplishments of the staff was apparent, but at the same time the principal openly expressed reservations regarding the program's untraditional orientation to curriculum. The participants' concerns about the principal's perceived lack of support, at Site One, can be put into perspective, if considered along with all of the data regarding administrator support. First, because the head teacher at Site One provided significant support, it was not as critical to receive a high level of support from the principal. Secondly, in contrast to the circumstances at Site Two, the principal at Site One did give permission and considerable encouragement to the staff in their efforts to implement the U.C..

The Allocation of Time

Another interesting comparison between the two sites was in regard to the time available to the participants for program implementation. Certainly, the need for more time to plan, for regular discussion and for continued in-service was a high priority for the participants at both sites. However, as the actors at Site Two were painfully aware, the allocation of time for program development
was largely a matter of principal support (just as it was for virtually all of the other key criteria). Consequently, these teachers perceived administrator leadership as a much greater need than time.

The participants at Site One, on the other hand, consistently emphasized *time* as by far their greatest need. Once again, comparison of the data from the two sites helped to put participant perceptions into perspective. My interpretation is that the time allocated to the U.C. program development at Site One, which greatly exceeded that of Site Two, was sufficient for the program users to implement the U.C. extensively and, in their own eyes, very successfully. Clearly the U.C program was given significant priority at Site One and a great deal of time was dedicated to its implementation.

Nevertheless, I do not dismiss the expressed need for more time, by the participants at Site One, who so energetically and willingly gave of their own time, to implement the U.C.. Implied in their emphasis on the need for more time, particularly in regard to their recommendations for continued implementation the following year, was an unwillingness (or inability) to continue to implement the program with the same intensity. To expect these teachers to work perpetually in a state of exhaustion would be unrealistic and unfair. In my view, their request for more time for continued implementation was well founded.

The participants, at Site One, stated that they required more time, particularly to plan collaboratively with partners or in small groups. According to the literature, at least three years is required for a new program to become institutionalized (Fullan, 1982; Huberman & Miles, 1984). Therefore, a plan for continued program implementation (for the second and third years) would need
to be worked out; a plan that would serve to further their progress in the on-
going process of program implementation, toward institutionalization. A focus on increased collaborative planning of U.C. studies might have been a desirable component of a plan for the second year of U.C. implementation.

**Parent Support, Staff Steering Committee, and Central Office Support**

The three remaining key criteria (parent support, staff steering committee, and central office support) were also seen by the participants as beneficial to the implementation process, although not quite as significant as the three discussed in detail above.

At Site One, parent support was viewed as a considerable asset to program implementation. These parents enthusiastically endorsed the program, and participated in the various classroom and school-wide U.C. projects and events.

The staff steering committee was also perceived as highly beneficial, as the power driving a continuous and high-energy focus on the program. This committee served as the generator of ideas for U.C. classroom applications, the forum for problem solving, and the initiator and planner of school-wide U.C. projects.

Of least importance to the participants was central office support. They seemed to view the central office personnel as disconnected to their school-based and school-initiated U.C. project. Acknowledgement and approval from central office personnel, rather than actual assistance in implementing the program, were the only aspects of support deemed as desirable.
Practicality and Goodness of Fit

Practicality

The practicality of a new school program, as discussed in the review of the literature, is an issue that requires consideration before and throughout the process of program implementation. Practicality, with regard to school change, refers to the ease with which program users are able to implement the innovation. Do they have a clear understanding of how to carry it out, and have they taken into account the personal costs and benefits (Doyle & Ponder, 1977-78)? As discussed previously, the U.C., a program which calls upon teachers to apply creatively themes and processes to their regular curriculum, is more demanding of its users, in terms of time and energy, than some other programs that are based on stipulated content and accompanied by lesson-by-lesson guidebooks. Practicality, then, was considered to be a critical factor with regard to the process of implementation of the Universal Curriculum, in this study. Eventually, I came to the realization that practicality, defined in terms of ease of implementation, actually encompassed all of the key criteria.

Thus the concept of practicality was not so much an issue separate from that of the process of program implementation, as it was another way of viewing the criteria, by which program implementation can be analyzed and evaluated. For example, the practicality of the U.C. was largely dependent upon the abilities of the consultant to assist the participants in developing conceptual clarity about the program. Conceptual clarity, as discussed by Fullan (1982), referred to the users' need to gain a clear understanding of the themes and processes of the U.C. and how to apply them, in order to more easily enact the program. The participants at both sites judged that they received adequate
consultant assistance (initial in-service and continued support), enabling them to implement the U.C. This was corroborated by examples of their classroom applications of the program.

Another example of viewing practicality as encompassing one of the key criteria involves the allocation of time to implement the program. As adamantly stated by the participants, the adequate allocation of time is required to make practical (more easily accomplished) the implementation of the program. Similarly, all of the other key criteria were also necessary in order to afford practicality to the efforts of the users, in that each of them served to make the program easier to implement. In this regard, the participants at Site One, by virtue of their attainment of most of the goals identified by the criteria, were rendered a greater measure of practicality, and thus were enabled to implement the U.C. beyond a few classroom applications. By the end of the first year of program implementation, Site One had become a vital and fully participating Universal Curriculum school, and the prospects of continued implementation appeared to be promising.

**Goodness of Fit**

**Goodness of fit** of the innovation, with the beliefs of the users, also has a bearing on the practicality of the program. It follows that if the basic beliefs of staff members are consistent with the philosophy of the U.C., then the program has, at least, the potential of becoming a practical reality. The participants' beliefs at both sites were consistent with the U.C. philosophy; basically, that the students acquire knowledge of, and become actively involved in, social and environmental issues, as major emphases in schools.
At both sites, the participants repeatedly attested to their commitment to the program as a great strength assisting implementation, on questionnaires and/or during the interviews. It is interesting that most avowed their commitment to the program as a prior condition to its implementation, in contrast to what the literature states; that the development of user commitment to a program is a gradual process as a result of successful implementation, as is the case with conceptual clarity (Fullan, 1982; Guskey, 1986). Initially, I regarded this user perception of prior and constant commitment to the program as a possible inconsistency with the literature. Upon further analysis of the data, however, I realized that their references to commitment attested to their commitment to their beliefs about education. Indeed, their beliefs were perceived as very much in tune with the U.C. philosophy from the outset. Therefore, it was actually the goodness of fit, not commitment to the program as defined in the literature, that they had declared so ardently as a great strength assisting implementation.

It is my interpretation that, at Site One, commitment, as defined in the literature (a user characteristic as a result of successful implementation), was realized by the end of the first year of implementation. By that time, much of their praise for the program included specific examples of positive changes they perceived in the students and in their teaching, as a result of program implementation. As a result of their satisfaction with the outcomes of program implementation, most of the participants indicated their intention to continue the process the following year. This is the commitment that Guskey (1986) referred to, in the literature. I have made a distinction, then, between what the participants often referred to as a commitment to the program, which I have interpreted as a commitment to their prior beliefs (called goodness of fit in the
literature), and their assertions that the program had indeed assisted the enactment of their beliefs (evidence of actual program commitment).

The *goodness of fit*, as applied to the program participants, appeared to favour the potential of successful implementation at both sites. However, this *good fit* with the beliefs of the participants, at Site Two, was not sufficient to bring about full-scale implementation and the probability of program endurance, in the absence of most of the criteria. Furthermore, when *goodness of fit* was applied to the staff as a whole, at each site, the difference between them was considerable. At Site One, because the whole staff believed the U.C. to be a worthy program and therefore worked towards its implementation, the program was easier to effect for each of the users. They also felt strongly that the program was needed and would benefit their students, which motivated them to work hard to enact the program, in spite of the cost (the personal time and energy). This mutual endeavor of the entire staff at Site One, based on their members' mutual beliefs, served to fuel continued motivation and make possible a strong network of support. In contrast, at Site Two, the *goodness of fit* was very weak when applied to the staff as a whole. Consequently, the participants at Site Two, felt isolated from the rest of the staff and discouraged in their attempts to implement the U.C., in the absence of the staff's acknowledgement and approval.

The *goodness of fit*, at Site One, can be likened to the fit of comfortable slippers. Indeed, the participants there seemed to wear the Universal Curriculum, comfortable with its philosophy, just as naturally and easily as wearing slippers.
Staff Collegiality

With regard to staff *collegiality*, marked differences existed between the two sites. At both sites, the participants perceived their levels of *collegiality*, which they referred to as the degree to which staff members "got along" and "worked well" with one another, as major factors, dramatically affecting the outcomes of program implementation. At Site One, *collegiality* among the staff as a whole was perceived as a major strength, enhancing the implementation process. In contrast, at Site Two, participants lamented that the staff's lack of *collegiality* was detrimental to their efforts to implement the U.C.

As outlined in the review of the literature, *collegiality* refers to the degree to which staff members, at a given school, work together toward shared goals. Wilson & Corbett (1983) refer to schools with high levels of *collegiality* as tightly linked and, conversely, schools where *collegiality* is weak, as loosely linked. Characteristically, teachers in a loosely linked school have a great deal of discretion regarding curriculum taught and methods of instruction used. Generally, Site One would have been described as a loosely linked school, in as much as the teachers appeared to have a great deal of discretion. Tightly linked schools are also characterized as having strong principals who lead school change, applying pressure to ensure that teachers carry out new programs, which are often mandated by the central office (Wilson & Corbett, 1983). Regarding the implementation of the Universal Curriculum, the principal at Site One was supportive of teachers, encouraging and acknowledging their efforts, but was not a driving force behind the initiative. Therefore, tight structural linkages cannot be credited for what I have declared as the high degree of collegiality at the site.
However, it is my interpretation that the cultural and interpersonal linkages, at Site One, were tight. Staff members enjoyed working together, because, to a great extent, they shared very similar orientations to curriculum. On the basis of their enthusiastic testaments of commitment to the philosophy of the U.C., I would characterize their orientation as social reconstructionist, in that the teachers placed considerable emphasis on the socialization of students (Eisner, 1979). Consequently, this like-minded staff worked together as a unified whole, toward a shared vision, the successful implementation of the U.C..

As an outsider visiting Site One, I sensed a measure of warmth and comradeship between staff members. I looked forward to my visits, as though I were a guest in someone's home; a harmonious home, where family members liked and respected one another. I am not suggesting that they were an impossibly ideal family, reminiscent of television families in the 1960's. Members of this family, like those of any functional family, had their differences. However, as I had occasion to witness, they had sufficient trust in and respect for one another to discuss and negotiate solutions to their differences.

Regarding Site Two, I would characterize the staff as having been loosely linked, both structurally and culturally. Structurally, there was no strong principal leadership, with respect to the implementation of the U.C.. Initially, I had thought that the principal had intended to participate in the project, indicated by the principal's presence and agreement at the time of program adoption. However, I had very little contact with the principal after that meeting, and the participating teachers described his/her support as being virtually nonexistent. Regarding cultural linkages, staff members did not appear to be
like-minded or similarly oriented toward curriculum. Many of the teachers were
described, by the program participants, as being very traditional in their
approach to education and, consequently, these teachers opposed the
implementation of the U.C..

The teachers participating in the implementation of the program at Site
Two, were able to carry out classroom-based U.C. applications and even a few
collaborative efforts that involved several classrooms, in spite of their isolated
position on the staff. Similar to the situation at Mountain View Elementary
(described in chapter two), these program participants comprised a tightly
linked subgroup of like-minded educators, embracing the aims of the U.C.. My
interpretation is that this situation may have been their only advantage, aside
from consultant support, attributing to the implementation of the U.C. achieved
in their classrooms.

Summary

In this chapter I have interpreted the findings in relationship to the
literature on school change. The interpretations are summarized as follows:

1. A strong relationship was found between the attainment of the goals
defined by key criteria in the literature on school change and successful
implementation of the Universal Curriculum. This interpretation is based on
substantial evidence of school-wide implementation and intended continuation.
Each one of the criteria was perceived by the participants as beneficial to the
process of implementation and, in concert, as highly advantageous. At Site
One, where virtually all of these criteria were met, the participants discussed
their feelings of success in implementing the program and indicated their
intention to continue the U.C. focus into the following year. The participants at Site Two, on the other hand, for whom most of the criteria were not met, discussed their feelings of discouragement and doubted that the program would be continued.

2. The consultant seemed to have considerable impact at Site One, as initiator and continued supporter of the implementation process. The consultant helped to effect the plan for on-going implementation, guiding the participants to pursue the goals identified by the key criteria. However, consultant leadership and support, alone, were ineffective, as illustrated at Site Two.

3. Administrator leadership appeared to be essential to the successful implementation of the U.C.. At Site One, the head teacher was a strong leader of the school's focus on the U.C. and the principal acknowledged and supported the efforts of the staff. Without it, several of the participants at Site Two were perpetually frustrated in their efforts to implement the program. It seemed that all of the other goals were unobtainable in the absence of administrator support.

4. The staff steering committee at Site One, comprised of a small group of staff members who met regularly to plan school-wide program applications, maintained a high priority focus on the innovation and in providing support for one another through their collaborative efforts. The absence of a steering committee, at Site Two, seemed to accentuate the feelings of isolation experienced by the program participants.

5. A substantial allocation of time for the staff development was important. At Site One, sufficient time was allocated to the program (e.g. a professional development day for the in-service workshop, leadership time for
the steering committee, time on staff meeting agendas), enabling the participants to implement the program. These participants declared their need for even more time to be allocated to continued implementation, particularly for collaborative planning of classroom applications of the program.

6. The practicality of the program was seen as a function of the ease or difficulty with which the goals identified by the key criteria were realized. In other words, each of the key criteria afforded measures of practicality to the implementation of the program.

7. Goodness of fit appeared to be another advantage enjoyed by the participants at Site One. The program seemed to fit them like a comfortable slipper. The degree of fit, regarding the match between the intent of the program and the beliefs of the users, was a condition present prior to adoption at both sites, and appeared to be unaffected by the implementation process. This investigation also allowed for the clarification the distinction between commitment as used in the literature and the term as used by the participants describing their initial value stance with regard to the Universal Curriculum.

8. Levels of staff collegiality appeared to be significant factors in the process of program implementation and were conditions present prior to adoption, at both sites. Again, Site One had the advantage of staff members with a history of working together toward shared goals. They interacted as a family in which the members liked and respected one another.

In the final chapter, the entire study is summarized. Based on the study, recommendations are made, with regard to future implementation of the Universal Curriculum. In addition, implications for further study are suggested.
Chapter 7. Summary

In this chapter the entire study is briefly summarized. Recommendations are made for future attempts to implement the Universal Curriculum as school-wide staff developments. Finally, implications for further study are suggested.

A Summary of the Study

In this case study I have examined the process of implementation of the Universal Curriculum, a school program which emphasizes the examination of social and environmental issues, at two elementary schools in British Columbia, Canada. Site One, enrolling approximately 230 students, was located on a small island in Howe Sound. Site Two, enrolling approximately 320 students, was located in a Greater Vancouver suburb. I was both the researcher and the consultant in the study, and, in these roles, designed and led the processes of implementation at the two sites. The study took place over a ten month period, September 1989 to June 1990.

The problem motivating the study concerned past difficulties encountered implementing the Universal Curriculum as a school-wide project, with full staff participation and long-term commitment to the program. The first attempt to implement the U.C. at Mountain View Elementary School in 1985-1986 was described and analyzed in juxtaposition to some of the central points made in the literature on school change. From this analysis, plans for the process of program implementation utilized in this study were drawn.

The purpose of the study was to design and carry out a process of program implementation, in accordance with certain key criteria drawn from the
literature on school change, intended to enhance the prospect of successful implementation. These key criteria were as follows: (a) on-going consultant support, (b) administrator leadership, (c) central office support, (d) parent support and participation, (e) a substantial time commitment, and (f) a staff steering committee.

The findings or outcomes of the study were based on data from the perspectives of the participants (the teachers and administrators). Participants were encouraged to consider the key criteria (e.g. administrator leadership) as a basis for analysis of the implementation process. Their perceptions were gathered from two primary sources of data: two questionnaires, and interviews. Thus the conceptual frame of the study consisted of a step-by-step progression from the adoption of the U.C. program, to the application of as many as possible of the key criteria, which led to the outcomes of the study as perceived by the participants.

Additional sources of data were observations and school documents. These latter sources of data were secondary to that of the questionnaires and interviews, and were used to help check the validity of the primary sources of data. Each of these four categories of data were analyzed separately; similar responses were grouped, in order to reveal emerging themes.

At Site One, all four sources of data were collected. At Site Two, the second questionnaires were not returned and the interviews were not conducted. The participants at Site Two felt discouraged by the lack of support for their work from the principal and other staff members. This discouragement may have contributed to their unwillingness to complete the second
questionnaire and to make time to be interviewed. In spite of the problems at Site Two, sufficient data were collected to make a contribution to the study.

The interpretations of this study were arrived at primarily through a process of reflection on the data. Several of the more systematic strategies for drawing conclusions were borrowed from Miles and Huberman (1984a, 1984b). These strategies were: (a) noting patterns or themes which emerge from the data, by a process of coding the data; (b) counting the number of times each code was applied to the data, to help discover and/or affirm emerging themes; and, (c) making metaphors to describe the essence of the participants' shared experiences, affording richer meaning to the study.

At Site One, most of the key criteria were met: the consultant provided on-going support for one year; strong administrator leadership was provided by the head teacher; a staff steering committee helped plan school-wide U.C. applications; special/additional time was allocated to program implementation; and, parents were informed of the program and, in turn, supported and participated in U.C. projects. In addition, many of the staff members at Site One professed their strong commitment to the philosophical ideals of the program, prior to, and throughout the implementation process. Expressed metaphorically, the program seemed to fit the staff at Site One like a comfortable pair of slippers. Their shared beliefs seemed to motivate them to work toward a common goal, the implementation of the Universal Curriculum. This high degree of staff collegiality can be likened to the working together of members of a family who enjoy and respect one another. At the end of the first year of program implementation, after successful completion of many classroom and school-wide applications of the U.C., the participants expressed satisfaction
with the program and their intentions to continue the implementation process into the second year.

In contrast, at Site Two, only one of the key criteria was met: the consultant supported the participants in their efforts to implement the program for one year. The participants consisted of a small group of teachers who felt isolated from the rest of the staff, unsupported by most of their colleagues including the principal. They found that, without administrator support, it virtually was impossible to meet any of the other criteria (e.g. time allocation). The staff as a whole did not have beliefs consistent with the program's philosophy and therefore were not willing to work collegially toward its implementation. The small group of program participants did successfully implement the program in their own classrooms. However, they became increasingly frustrated about, and even resentful of, the absence of support from the principal and their isolated position on the staff. These participants held little hope for an expansion of the U.C. implementation process for the following year.

Interpretation of the data in relation to the literature on school change indicated:

1. There appeared to be a relationship between the meeting of the key criteria relating to staff development and successful implementation of the U.C. program.

2. No criterion, in isolation, was effective in enhancing full, long-term program implementation. In concert, the criteria were highly beneficial.
3. The two criteria which appeared to be the most important to the process of program implementation were: (a) consultant support, and (b) administrator leadership.

4. Two conditions pertaining to the professional orientations of the school staffs, which were present prior to adoption of the program, seemed to be pivotal in affecting successful implementation. These conditions were: (a) a good match between the program goals and the beliefs of the participants, and (b) a history of staff collegiality.

Recommendations

The following recommendations with regard to future U.C. staff development initiatives are based upon the limited evidence from this case study and are the result of reflection upon the data. These recommendations are:

1. It would seem prudent to consider the two conditions which are existent in schools prior to the adoption stage: (a) The goodness of fit between the goals of the program and the beliefs of the staff members, and (b) the history of collegiality (where staff members work together toward shared goals) may have important bearings on the results. High levels of goodness of fit and staff collegiality might be considered as required criteria for the selection of future sites for U.C. implementation. It may also be important that these criteria for site selection be evident for at least the majority of the staff members, in order to optimize the potential for successful U.C. staff development.

2. Long-term consultant leadership and support appear to be necessary criteria for the successful implementation of the U.C.. The consultant provides
the initial training, in terms of clarifying the philosophical intent of the program as well as support for its practical classroom application. On-going support in terms of the establishment of a problem-solving process, additional in-service as needed, assistance in locating resources, and encouragement, appear to be important conditions to consultation.

3. The consultant also provides help in making the participants aware of the importance of attaining the goals defined by the key criteria: (a) on-going consultant support, (b) administrator leadership, (c) central office support, (d) parent support and participation, (e) a substantial time commitment, and (f) a staff steering committee. These seem to be related to assisting the staff in the achievement of these goals.

4. Similarly, it seems important that the participants be made aware that, according to the literature, implementation of any new program requires at least three years to become institutionalized. If this notion is reinforced from the outset of program implementation, perhaps participants will be more inclined to commit to this long-term process of program implementation. In this way the participants might be encouraged to make plans for second and third year implementation: How might they plan for staff changes that may affect on-going implementation?

5. Strong leadership, either from the principal or the vice-principal (head teacher), appears to be an essential criterion for the selection of a school for U.C. staff development. Although it may not be necessary to meet all of the key criteria identified by the literature on school change, administrator leadership seems to be vitally important to the process of program implementation. As well, the establishment of a staff steering committee, designed to maintain a
continuous and energetic school focus on the program, seems to be another condition that effectively drives the change process.

6. Substantial time allocated to program implementation is another criterion that appears to be an important condition for change. This condition allows for regular discussion time on staff meeting agendas, release time for the steering committee to meet and plan school-wide U.C. initiatives, and release time for teachers to plan classroom applications in collaboration with their colleagues.

Implications for Further Study

The following ideas for follow-up study might afford further insights into some of the points made in, and, questions raised by, this study:

1. Follow-up research could be done at Site One to assess the extent to which the U.C. remained a school focus, and, thus, substantiate and/or question some of the interpretations made in this study: Did the participants actualize the goal of long-term commitment to the program? Did additional release time for teachers to plan, collaboratively, classroom applications of the U.C. prove to be a vital issue after the first year of program participation?

2. A new study might be designed, similar to this one, but which also includes the recommendations made in this study. For example, a site might be selected for staff development of the U.C. (or some other program), in accordance with these recommended criteria: (a) a *good fit* between the program and the beliefs of staff members, (b) a history of a high degree of staff collegiality, and (c) the probability of strong administrator leadership.
3. The study described directly above (in number 2) might be conducted over a two or three year period, to gain a better understanding of long-term program implementation leading toward institutionalization.

4. The literature on school change might be studied further, specifically in two topics of inquiry raised by this study: (a) Is there evidence in the literature of a hierarchy of importance of the key criteria for staff development, as was suggested in this study? (b) What, if anything, does the literature have to say about the relevance of school cultures (e.g. staff collegiality) in relationship to school change?
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Appendix A: The Questionnaires

Questionnaire One:

Implementation of The Universal Curriculum

1. Read the attached page, Implementing School Programs (p. 125). The criteria stated are those generally identified as enhancing implementation of school programs. How do you respond to the listed criteria? (For example: What criteria do you see as being most essential/least essential? What criteria are realistic for your school? What strengths/needs do you perceive, in your school, at present? How might the needs at your school be addressed?)

2. How are you feeling, generally, about implementing the U.C. as a major goal for the school year?
3. What do you personally need, at this time, to assist you to implement the U.C., in your classroom? What do you imagine your needs might be later on?

4. Specifically, in what ways would you like the following people to be of assistance to you and the staff? (administrators, program consultant, staff committee, other)
IMPLEMENTING SCHOOL PROGRAMS

A substantial body of educational change research (Fullan, 1982; Huberman and Miles, 1984) indicates that the following criteria significantly enhance the implementation of any school program.

1. Administrative Leadership:
   - administrator participation in the innovation
   - indications of program importance (ie. time on staff meeting agendas)
   - recognition of efforts & successes (formal & informal)

2. Professional Development Commitment:
   - some pro-D designated for program implementation
   - more than front-end loading (on-going support)
   - may involve outside consultant, over time

3. Leadership Time:
   - relief time (ie. leadership days) for partner teachers or small groups of teachers, to develop projects
   - opportunities for teachers to observe each other teach

4. Regular Time on Staff Meeting Agendas:
   - discussion of incremental progress
   - discussion of needs and concerns
   - shared decision making

5. Steering Committee Leadership:
   - small committee (administrator and staff representation) to meet regularly to report needs, and plan strategies to assist teachers in program implementation

6. Parent Involvement:
   - information making parents aware
   - parent assistance in school (ie. with projects)

7. Central Office Involvement:
   - information to key personnel
   - eliciting active support from at least one key person
Questionnaire Two:

1. The following criteria are some of those used to measure the outcomes of the implementation of new school programs (Fullan, *The Meaning of Educational Change*, 1982).

- **Degree of Implementation**
  - degree of actual change in teaching behavior

- **Impact of the Innovation:**
  Assessment of -
  a. *students' benefits* (e.g., new learnings)
  b. *teachers' benefits* (e.g., professional development)
  c. *organizational benefits* (e.g., increased interaction, teaming)

Evaluate the extent to which The Universal Curriculum has been implemented in your school, on the basis of any or all these criteria.
2. Looking back, what factors helped you significantly to implement the U.C.? What ingredients, if any, were lacking? You may wish to make reference to some of the following factors: Administrative Leadership; Steering Committee Leadership; External Consultant; Professional Development Commitment; Time to Plan; Parent/Community Involvement; Central Office Involvement.

3. What do you perceive to be the strengths and weaknesses of the Universal Curriculum? (e.g., What personal hopes and expectations were met or not met?)
4. Researchers tell us that it takes about 3 years to fully implement a school innovation, especially if continuation is expected (Fullan, 1982; Huberman & Miles, 1984).

a. To what extent do you wish to see U.C. continue as a focus at your school?

b. If you would like U.C. to continue at your school, what recommendations would you make, in order to enhance the probability of a continued long-term U.C. focus?

c. What do you predict will be the long-term impact of U.C. at your school? Why do you think so?
Appendix B: Coding Results

Questionnaire One: Site One 14 returns out of possible 14

Coding Results

1. Personal Feelings (Fe) toward the project

   Codes
   Fe/pos (positive feelings) 15
   Fe/neg (negative feelings) 3

2. Perceived Strengths (Str)

   Codes
   Str/staf C (staff commitment) 4
   Str/Ent (general enthusiasm) 3
   Str/P.S. (parent support) 2
   Str/Lead/Adm (administrative leadership) 1
   Str/Lead/S.C. (steering committee leadership) 1

3. Perceived Anticipated Needs (N)

   Codes
   N/Ti (time) 31
   N/Lead/Adm (administrative leadership) 13
   N/Lead/S.C. (steering committee leadership) 13
   N/Lead/Con (consultant leadership) 11
   N/Res (resources) 10
   N/P.I. (parent involvement) 3
   N/C.O. (central office support) 3
   N/Foc (specific school focus) 3
### Coding Results

1. **Personal Feelings (Fe) toward the project**

   **Codes**
   - Fe/neg (negative feelings)  | 6
   - Fe/pos (positive feelings)  | 3

2. **Perceived Strengths (Str)**

   **Codes**
   - Str/Us C (user commitment)  | 4
   - Str/P.S. (parent support)   | 1

3. **Perceived Anticipated Needs (N)**

   **Codes**
   - N/Lead/Adm (administrative leadership)  | 8
   - N/Ti (time)                             | 4
   - N/Lead/S.C. (steering committee leadership) | 3
   - N/Lead/Con (consultant leadership)    | 2
   - N/Res (resources)                      | 1
   - N/C.O. (central office support)        | 1

4 returns out of possible 7
### Questionnaire Two: Site One

12 returns out of possible 14

#### Coding Results

1. **Personal Feelings (F) toward the project**
   - **Codes**
   - F/pos (positive feelings)
   - F/neg (negative feelings)
   - **Number of times**
     - F/pos: 13
     - F/neg: 4

2. **Strengths (Str) of Implementation Process**
   - **Codes**
     - Str/Lead/Con (consultant leadership)
     - Str/Lead/S.C. (steering committee leadership)
     - Str/P.S. (parent support)
     - Str/staf C (staff commitment)
     - Str/Lead/Adm (administrative leadership)
     - Str/Res (resources)
   - **Number of times**
     - Str/Lead/Con: 7
     - Str/Lead/S.C.: 6
     - Str/P.S.: 6
     - Str/staf C: 4
     - Str/Lead/Adm: 1

3. **Needs (N) of Implementation Process**
   - **Codes**
     - N/Ti (time)
     - N/Lead/Adm (administrative leadership)
     - N/C.O. (central office support)
     - N/Staf C (staff commitment)
     - N/Res (resources)
   - **Number of times**
     - N/Ti: 7
     - N/Lead/Adm: 3
     - N/C.O.: 3
     - N/Staf C: 2
     - N/Res: 1

4. **Outcomes**
   - **Codes**
     - Prg/Con/Y (wish to continue UC)
     - Pos/Chg/Stu (positive change in students)
     - Pos/Chg/Tea (positive change in teachers)
     - Pos/Chg/Gen (general positive change)
     - No/Chg/Tea (no teacher change)
     - Prg/Con/N (does not wish to continue UC)
   - **Number of times**
     - Prg/Con/Y: 13
     - Pos/Chg/Stu: 12
     - Pos/Chg/Tea: 12
     - Pos/Chg/Gen: 3
     - No/Chg/Tea: 1
     - Prg/Con/N: 1

5. **Recommendations (R)**
   - **Codes**
     - R/Ti (more time)
     - R/staf C (renewed staff commitment)
     - R/Lead/Con (more consultant leadership)
     - R/Lead/SC (continued steering committee)
     - R/Lead/Adm (greater administrative leadership)
     - R/C.O. (central office support)
     - R/Foc (specific school focus)
     - R/Net (networking with other teachers & schools)
   - **Number of times**
     - R/Ti: 5
     - R/staf C: 3
     - R/Lead/Con: 2
     - R/Lead/SC: 2
     - R/Lead/Adm: 1
     - R/C.O.: 1
     - R/Foc: 1
     - R/Net: 1
Staff Interviews: Site One
8 interviews

Coding Results

1. **Personal Feelings (F)** toward the project

   **Codes**
   - F/pos (positive feelings) 7
   - F/neg (negative feelings) 5

2. **Strengths (Str)** of the implementation process

   **Codes**
   - Str/Staf C. (staff commitment) 5
   - Str/Lead/S.C. (staff steering committee leadership) 3
   - Str/Lead/Adm (administrative leadership) 2
   - Str/P.S. (parent support) 1
   - Str/Res-mon (money resources) 1
   - Str/C.O. (central office support) 1
   - Str/Sch-Cul (positive school culture) 1

3. **Outcomes**

   **Codes**
   - Pos/Chg/Stu (positive change in students) 6
   - Pos/Chg/Tea (positive change in teachers) 4
   - Pro/Con/Y (wish to continue the U.C.) 4
   - Staff/P.T/ (staff pulled together with common focus) 3
   - Pos/Chg/Gen (general positive change) 2
   - No/Chg/Tea (no teacher change) 1
   - Pos/Chg/Com (positive change in the community) 1

4. **Needs/Recommendations (N/R)** for continued implementation

   **Codes**
   - N/R/Ti (more time) 5
   - N/R/Res-mon (more money to fund implementation) 1
   - N/R/Ins (additional in-service) 1
   - N/R/P.S. (more parent support) 1
   - N/R/Pln (more detailed, long-term planning) 1