

CSRD Implementation in Native American Sites:

Cross-Site Lessons Learned

Dorothy Aguilera

December 8, 2000

INTRODUCTION

This is a report of seven schools that participated in a study of Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) programs in schools serving Native American communities. The participating schools ranged in size from 65 students to 656 students and included pre-kindergarten, elementary and secondary levels. All the schools in this study served predominately Native American populations (54%–100%) with the exception of the charter school, where 26% of the students were Native American, 16% Hispanic, and 58% Anglo.

Southwest Open High School is a public charter alternative secondary school in the Montezuma-Cortez RE-1 School District and located in Cortez, Colorado. Pierre Indian Learning Center is a Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) off-reservation boarding school for grades 1–8 in Pierre, South Dakota. Located in Macy, Nebraska, the Umonhon Nation Public School is a one-school district that serves students in grades preK–12. Four Winds Community High School is a one-school district for students in grades 9–12 students. Tate Topa Tribal School, a tribal grant school for students in grades K–8, is housed in the same educational facility as Four Winds Community High School. Located in Fort Totten, North Dakota, these schools are governed by two separate school boards. Pleasant Grove Elementary School is a preK–8 public school in a one-school district in Shawnee, Oklahoma. Seboyeta Elementary is a small K–6 school in rural New Mexico. The final school, Lake View Elementary, is a K–5 public school in Page Unified School District and is located in Page, Arizona.

Based on their school improvement status, these schools were invited to be involved in the federal Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) program. This program provides a minimum of \$50,000 in financial support to local schools to engage in a comprehensive change process facilitated by the adoption of a research-based reform model. The study was designed to investigate the processes involved in selecting school reform models, challenges and successes of school reform plans, factors of tribal influence on comprehensive school reform, and training and development issues that supported school reform efforts in these Indian schools.

The study was a cross-laboratory project between McREL, SEDL, and WestEd and CSRD schools in selected sites in their respective regions that serve a high percentage of Native American students. Each of these labs has a significant Native American population, and each is committed to using its R&D resources to address that population. WestEd coordinated the project; each lab sponsored case studies, participated in the overall design of the study, and collaborated on development of research questions. Four of the sites were in McREL's region, two in SEDL's region, and one in WestEd's region.

Detailed case studies provided a close examination of the unique situations that existed in each school community and the ways in which schools made use of the Comprehensive School Reform

Demonstration programs to meet student needs. In addition, this research investigated the different ways that tribal cultures influenced comprehensive school reform efforts. Factors affecting each school's comprehensive reform plan were investigated by creating case study profiles of each school, district, and community. Each case was examined based on the distinctive factors that existed in the seven school community sites and influenced the reform process.

Following the writing of individual case studies, a cross-case analysis was conducted. Assistance at this phase was provided by staff at the Center for Indian Education at Arizona State University. They conducted independent analysis of themes to add to the rigor of the study, participated in discussions of emerging themes and evidence to support them, and reviewed written documents.

This report is based primarily on the stories of the people involved in reform in the schools. We have tried to honor the spirit and meaning of what the research participants shared with us over the past year about their personal experiences, ideas, and visions about their children, their school community, and the reform programs. The case studies are stories of the various life experiences and views of the people who learned and worked at the school and in the community. We hope that those who read this report will treat it as a story and learn something from the experiences of those who walk the talk daily in our nation's schools and communities.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The cross-laboratory project involved McREL, SEDL, and WestEd, who initialized the study in Spring of 1999. At that time, a collaborative process to select schools located in or within close proximity to tribal communities began. The primary selection criterion was that the school had successfully been awarded CSRD funding based on the "school in need of improvement" status listed by the state. Educational laboratory directors, then, contacted their regional State Department of Education's CSRD Coordinators and key officials at the Bureau of Indian Affairs to assist them in identifying and selecting schools for this study. State CSRD coordinators actively participated in the selection of the seven schools involved in this study.

Following identification, administrators at each of the schools were contacted about the national study and to see if they would like to participate in the case study research. Letters describing the study were sent to all the sites and also introduced the researchers who would be conducting site visits and generating reports. Along with the research description was an explanation of the study timeline, the expectations of sites in terms of data collection methods, and related documents that would need to be made available to researchers.

Once schools were identified and contacted, district superintendents, principals, and CSRD site facilitators participated in the final selection process with both the state CSRD coordinators and the laboratory directors. Because of the nature of this study, it was important for key players in the schools to be receptive to a process that required close examination of their reform efforts. Originally, two schools were selected in the McREL region in September 1999, and in March of 2000, two additional sites were notified and chose to participate in the national case study research. SEDL finalized their selection of two school sites in November of 1999 and WestEd selected one school in December of 1999.

Preceding the first site visit, each school was provided a set of study protocols that described the purpose of the study, the research questions, information about the researcher conducting the study, and contact information. The researcher subsequently contacted each site to provide that initial study information and to negotiate the site visits based on the school calendar. Particular care was taken by the researcher to schedule site visits when there was a broad range of school community activities and events that would be conducive to collecting data related to the research questions.

Site Visits. Site visits were scheduled around the fall and spring terms of the school calendar year. Data collection was conducted in four of the schools (McREL and SEDL regions) between November and December of 1999. A McREL school site was revisited in December to enable the researcher to collect data during a scheduled training by the model developers.

Three schools were visited again in January 2000, and final site visits were completed in two schools in April and the third in May 2000. Once the additional McREL schools were selected, the study protocols and timeline information were sent, and negotiations to visit the sites were completed, initial site visits were made to these two schools in March. Those schools were revisited, one in April and the other in May 2000. Final site visits were completed in the two SEDL schools at the beginning of this current school year in September 2000. The WestEd researcher conducted two site visits in February and April 2000. Baseline data were collected at each site using protocols that are contained in this document in the Appendix section. Data included demographics of the school, district and school statistics, and community information relating to the research questions.

A cross-lab meeting was held in the McREL office in Aurora, Colorado in February 2000 to discuss the progress of the study, to introduce WestEd researchers, and to revise research questions. At that meeting a progress report was distributed by the McREL researcher to the participants; this report described the types of data being collected in one site. The numerous researchers who conducted the initial school visits collectively shared a brief description of the case sites. Decisions were made to revise the research questions and McREL announced the addition of two more sites from its region to the national case study research.

The research design was revised to include four primary types of data and identify specific data sources conducive to providing the information related to research questions. Site visits and data collection tools were developed and organized based on the following design:

- To introduce researcher to key players in the schools;
- To collect baseline and demographic data;
- To collect data involving model developers and onsite and offsite training and technical support activities;
- To collect data on community organizations and agencies;
- To observe a variety of naturalistic settings with family and community involvement that relate to social, cultural, and academic interactions among participants; and
- To collect data related to second year training activities, reform programs, school community events, updates on administration, staff, students and families and the overall progress toward a reform plan.

The research questions and data sources listed in Table 1 guided this study.

Table 1
Research Questions and Data Sources

Data Source	Information	Instrument
Question 1: What are the major contextual factors that might influence outcomes?		
Review CSRD applications	Contextual history of school community, current and past socio-cultural and economic demographics School reform/leadership roles Identified needs/how model addresses needs	Document analysis Coding form Case study write up
School principal School CSRD Site Coordinator Teachers Cultural Program staff	Contextual history of school community Match school goals, social, emotional, cultural, academic needs w/model Creating a fit between model, culture, academics Role of tribal community/culture in school reform Tribal community/culture influence operation and culture of school Fit reform with tribal community context Leadership roles/key people in reform Relationship among stakeholder groups/school Resources available/addresses needs Story of school reform	Interview Observation
District staff (Superintendent and director of curriculum and instruction)	Support systems to sustain reform Contextual history of school reform efforts in district	Interview
Question 2: What schoolwide reform model was chosen by the school and why?		
Review CSRD applications	Rationale for CSRD funding and the academic needs of students for the model selected Model fit w/school community initiatives Identified needs/how model will address them Stakeholder/leadership roles	Document analysis Coding form Case study summary write-up
School principal School CSRD Site Coordinator Teachers Cultural Program staff	Selection process Fit w/schoolwide initiatives Stakeholder roles/goals/concerns w/model Role in the reform model selection Appropriate model for students/teachers Identified needs/cultural and academic Model fits needs of school/community/students Model fit w/tribal context/issues/concerns Development/implementation reform plan Status of school-defined education reform plan Rationale for selection (student needs)	Interview Observation
District staff (Superintendent and director of curriculum and instruction)	Status of complex education reform in district Role in reform model selection Plans to evaluate reform/plans to sustain it Support systems for reform plans	Interview

Data Source	Information	Instrument
Question 3: What did the model developer and school do to address the Native American context?		
Review documentation and products related to reform plan development and implementation *	Variety of roles of the model developers to support the implementation of the reform model	Document analysis Coding form Case study summary write-up
School principal School CSRD Coordinator Teachers Cultural Program staff	Relationship with model developers Adapt model in terms of cultural context Adaptation made in training/tech support due to cultural context Fit between model and tribal context Challenges presented by tribal culture in reform Reform program builds on strengths/resources of community	Interview Observation
Model developers	Assess situation when model enters school Relationship with school staff and administrators Adapt model in terms of cultural context Adaptation made in training/tech. support due to cultural context Fit between model and tribal context Challenges presented by tribal culture in reform	Interview Observation
Question 4: What has the school accomplished since beginning work on this initiative based on stakeholder perspectives?		
Review documentation and products related to reform plan development and implementation *	Contain information about the process of implementing school reform plans, i.e., training tech support, curriculum, instruction, assessments, more family involvement in the design and implementation of reform plan	Document analysis Coding form Case study summary write-up
School principal School CSRD Coordinator Teachers Cultural Program staff	Training and technical support provided Changes in curriculum, instruction, assessment Changes in family involvement Evaluation/assessment process for reform plan Indicators of progress/impact on students Perception of model being appropriate so far District support for integrating culture in reform	Interview Observation
Model developers	Assess student response/progress to model Assess this school's progress as compared to other school's Indicators of progress/impact on students Factors influencing reform model specific to this school, i.e., tribal culture, language and tribal community context	Interview Observation

** Notes: Model training materials, activity and event flyers, handouts, calendars, lesson plans, newsletters, reform plan, strategic action plans, etc.*

Data Collection. Data was collected primarily through ethnographic research methods. Informal and formal interviews were conducted to describe the history of the school and community, and obtain a brief overview of their school improvement/comprehensive reform plans. The participants in the study included CSRD program facilitators, state CSRD coordinators, principals, superintendents, district administrators, school board members, community and tribal agency and organization staff and directors, community members, parents, students, counselors, and teachers. In addition, informants gave their initial and ongoing impressions of the CSRD initiative, descriptions of past, current, and future planned reform programs and activities, professional development and technical support/training activities with model developers. CSRD facilitators, teachers and support staff, administrators, and parents were interviewed to ascertain their perceptions of the reform activities to date during each site visit. Over 70 participants were formally interviewed at least once and 20 of these were interviewed with each site visit, while numerous others were informally interviewed.

Model developers, trainers, and researchers working with staff and administration at each site were interviewed at least once through face-to-face interviews, phone interviews, and email correspondence. Numerous administrators from feeder schools, tribal agency programs and tribal colleges located in or within close proximity to the school community sites in this study were also interviewed. Facilitators, culture and language program staff, superintendents, and principals were personally contacted to plan each consecutive site visit. Researchers notified model developers upon the initial site visit and preceding the final site visit.

Printed materials and documents were collected from district and school administrators, teachers, support staff, language and culture program staff, model developers, tribal colleges, feeder schools, community organizations, and tribal agencies. These ranged from school calendars, event flyers, program brochures, CSRD applications, school improvement plans, standardized test scores, model developer evaluations, self-assessments by schools, student/ parent/teacher surveys, community and tribal organizations, and agency reports and brochures. Internet resources that were accessed included Department of Education reports and statistical documents, BIA Office of Indian Education reports and statistical information, tribal government reports, demographics, socioeconomic, cultural, and historical information.

Observation and numerous participant observation by researchers included: family, school and community sponsored activities and events; teaching and learning practices in regular classrooms; music and art, language and culture classes; computer labs; library work; vocational shop classrooms; science fairs; back-to-school nights; math night; pow wows; graduation ceremonies; memorial service; college career fair; job shadowing; school board meeting; family support meeting; reform model orientation; special guest presentations; student presentations in public and school settings; holiday celebrations; health clinic walk-a-thon; buffalo hunt ELOB expedition; schoolwide assembly; performing arts by students, staff and administrators; graduation family banquet; schoolwide

graduation ceremony; pot lucks; pre-kindergarten and day care programs; sports events; staff training; and a variety of celebration and awards events.

Analysis. For this case study, data analysis consisted of constructing a detailed description of the case and its setting for each of the seven school sites. Historical and contextual information were laid out chronologically throughout the case write up. Bounding the case in its larger context, tribal system, educational system, and community setting to ground the reader in pre-school reform efforts and situations unique to each case, was quite involved in terms of time and effort applied to completing this study by researchers and the time involved for all the hundreds of participants who contributed the data for this study. School and community features that made each case distinctive were examined based on model selection process, culture and language issues, community context, overall implementation process, model components, reform plan development, organizational changes, instructional changes, assessment tools, resource capacities, and administrative support of innovation and education improvement. At the district level, structural, organizational, human, and resource capacities and use were examined to identify district support systems targeted at sustaining reform efforts.

Five forms of data analysis and interpretation were used in this case study so that informants' voices, first-hand experiences and visions could be realistically and authentically represented in the best contextual sense. Advocated by Stake (1995) and Creswell (1998) for case study analysis, these included: 1) categorical aggregation is a collection of instances from data from which issue-relevant meanings emerge; 2) direct interpretation is when the researcher examines a single instance and draws meaning from it without looking for multiple instances; 3) patterns are established based on the interrelatedness between and among categories that emerge from the data; 4) naturalistic generalizations are developed that suggest lessons learned from the case to apply to similar populations or for the case itself; and 5) description of the case involves a detailed examination of various facts about the case, the sites, key players, and activities.

A holistic approach to analyzing data examined the entire case, setting the case within its setting, contextually speaking, and reporting facts both chronologically and interwoven in the presentation of emerging categories and themes related to the whole case (Creswell, 1998). This is an intrinsic case study containing distinctive and unusual interest.

The CSRD site case studies will be examined using an analytic induction approach to identify factors, policies, and practices that play a role in the reform process and will include the elements of reform in the areas mentioned above. The identified factors, policies, and practices that support or hinder reform and innovations in districts, schools and communities will be defined and presented to the extent possible using the collected information.

Procedures for Verification. Qualitative research procedures and standards for verification used in this study included multiple perspectives from a variety of researchers (Eisner, 1991; Wolcott, 1994; Stake, 1995; Howe & Eisenhart, 1990; LeCompte & Goertz, 1982; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Extensive verification procedures were followed in the case study that prioritized the important question, “Do we have it right?” We used two procedural concepts to guide this process: triangulation and member checking. Triangulation of information is the search for the convergence of information and relates to data situations in designing the research and developing the case study. Multiple perspectives were sought throughout the data collection and data analysis periods for a variety of situations and contextual information about the cases. Several primary participants from the school community were provided rough drafts of this report to check for accuracy of the researcher’s interpretations and factual information. Especially important: Was the writer making sound assertions, neither over nor under interpreting? We also wanted the cases to present an equitable story based on perspectives from all sides of the issues related to the research questions. Throughout the data analysis process researchers checked in with the schools and communities to access additional information that would assist in clarifying a particular perspective, event, or issue that constituted a better understanding. External reviewers were solicited to review the report, and were representative of Native American professionals who also had tribal school and community experiences.

FINDINGS

This cross-case study has looked intensively at the experience of seven schools serving tribal communities, as they each adopted a comprehensive reform model in order to improve student and school performance. In all schools the reform programs had a positive impact on teaching and learning and the involvement of parents and community, due in no small part to the enormous commitment demonstrated by students, teachers, school leaders, and model trainers. Community leaders and families rallied behind schools to support comprehensive educational improvement for their children. Challenges remain, particularly in supporting critical child development needs, integrating language instruction thoroughly into the school curricula, and making learning more relevant to tribal culture. But the reform models provided a structure that enabled schools to take important strides toward building common professional school cultures, better linking assessment to instruction, and generally improving academic performance—reading and math scores, for example, increased in most schools.

Understanding what difference CSRD made in these Native American contexts and why spans a host of questions. What cultural, social, and academic challenges did the reforming effort face? How were the models chosen? What happened during implementation? Were adaptations required to make the reform models more culturally relevant? What lessons can be learned from these efforts so far? This section presents findings on these and related questions, then is followed by a summary discussion of lessons learned.

Major Contextual Factors Influencing School Reform.

Schools in this study were gearing up for reform in a variety of ways—for example, aligning curriculum with state standards and benchmarks—when invited to apply for reform program funding. We found that while these schools all participated in CSRD programs for basically similar reasons—low performance in reading and math tests—they each evolved somewhat differently even when they chose the same reform models. Yet all faced some common challenges, rooted in school culture, professional capacity, the particular needs of their students, and readiness for change. Here we look at those contextual factors that influenced adoption, implementation, and reform outcomes in these seven schools.

School Culture and Readiness. A key reform issue is whether a particular low-performing school is in fact ready to take on the enormous change process required by comprehensive reform models. A range of factors go to make up such readiness, but fundamental to deep reform is a cohesive school culture where a supportive and trusting atmosphere enables collaborative action toward a shared purpose. Indeed, such culture building is often a central task of comprehensive reform. While varied in their degree of teacher buy in, strong leadership, and funding resources, schools in this study

were not yet operating with the kind of cohesion it takes to improve achievement for all students. Many schools did in fact have goal oriented plans with similar objectives, but these were not utilized in collectively creating ways to improve student learning school wide.

Islands of Conventional Instruction. Teachers in these schools basically taught in isolation from one another. School leaders reported “islands” of teachers “stuck” in conventional teaching and learning practices. Team teaching, mentoring or coaching new teachers, was not common. Collaboration among teacher groups to improve educational practice across grades or even within grade levels was lacking in many schools. Teachers who work in isolation often perceive change as forbiddingly difficult because they are not part of a team with shared goals, common vision, and mutual support. While there were small pockets of teacher collegiality across schools, few schools had established norms of collaborative reflection and joint action. Few schools had teachers critically examining instructional practices and conducting self-assessments. During implementation most schools struggled with developing trusting and supportive relationships based on shared norms and collective visions for student outcomes.

Some schools lacked collaboration between administrative offices. In several schools, high rates of teacher turnover impeded collegiality and relationship building among teachers. So did time constraints, by limiting the professional development necessary for working toward the same goals and supporting each other systematically toward that shared vision. Although there was often dynamic top leadership, shared leadership was missing in most of these schools.

High Numbers of LEP. All these schools faced the critical challenge of meeting the literacy needs of the limited English proficiency (LEP) students. A large number of students read below grade level. Secondary students in a few schools had scores lower than the 10th percentile in reading and language arts. A common reality in these school communities is that students had little proficiency in either Tribal languages or English. When parents are not proficient in either language, it is difficult for their children to obtain sufficient language skills to perform well in reading and language arts in the early grades. If children continue to read below grade level when they reach the third grade, it becomes much more difficult for them to perform at similar levels with other student populations. LEP students’ language needs require systematic methodology, materials, professionally trained English as Second Language (ESL) staff, and assessment, yet many schools had no resources to develop these.

Yet most schools lacked ESL expertise to match the pressing needs of the Native American population. Resources were also scarce in these schools for funding additional professional staff and teachers. In those schools that did have language and culture programs, teachers and language specialists lacked the resource materials to teach. Few schools were supporting systematic collaboration among classroom teachers and language specialists. Tribal language and culture was generally taught in isolation from the regular curriculum. Assessing language skills was not pervasive in many of these schools, particularly Tribal languages. Few schools had certified Native American

teachers in the regular classrooms. In the majority of schools Elders who were proficient in Tribal languages served as language specialists,. Collaborative efforts in several schools had initiated special language preservation projects where language specialists were beginning to assist schools in developing essential curriculum resources.

Social, Spiritual and Emotional Needs. Across all these schools, a tremendous amount of data underscored the critical importance of addressing the social, spiritual, and emotional development needs of young children and youth, support quite as essential to better academic performance in these communities as improved curriculum and instruction. Schools generally assumed that families provided support and nurturing for these needs. However, Tribal communities suffer from harsh living conditions and institutionalized political and cultural oppression that have spanned centuries. Children and adults have experienced extensive emotional trauma because of alcoholism, drug abuse, domestic violence and abuse. One in every three Indian men are incarcerated, family members of children in these schools. Extremely high suicide rates and alcohol related automobile accidents occur in Tribal communities. Healing from all these traumatic situations requires professional support and it also takes a considerable amount of time. Children are resilient and tend to bounce back from the problems that occur in their young lives, but nurturing them and teaching them compassion, empathy, respect, passion, and how to express their feelings is essential.

One of the most difficult challenges for schools is to effectively train teachers to support these crucial developmental needs of students. Implementing high quality interventions requires substantial time and consistency to change low self-esteem and counter the emotional suffering that negatively impacts academic performance, attendance and truancy, and produces institutionalized patterns of inappropriate behavior often resulting in failure in schools. Two schools in this study had targeted developmental needs of their student populations. Four years before CSRD, the BIA BEST School developed a Therapeutic model improving student behavior in the dorms and in classrooms and positively impacting the school culture. In addition, this school implemented a campus wide Beautification Program which dramatically improved student behavior in the dorms. In an attempt to change the school culture and patterns of problematic behavior, the Lightspan School implemented the Great Expectations methodology one year previous to the CSRD program. Great Expectations also positively impacted disciplinary incidents and school and classroom environments.

Disciplinary Policy for Youth. School leaders reported a general lack of consistency in disciplinary practices in these schools when they first arrived. Behavior problems were pervasive in dorms and classrooms in one school. Three schools reported extreme attendance and truancy problems that negatively impacted literacy skills, and dropout among older students. Youth in the upper grades in all the schools had developed patterns of resistance to school. Both middle and high school youth had attendance and truancy problems. The heaviest concentration of this was in the three high schools. Disciplinary action also increased among these upper grades. Security staff was hired in the two larger schools with youth to monitor hallways and keep students in classrooms and in school. Principals in

all the schools administered the disciplinary action. At one high school an assistant principal's primary role was disciplining students. In another high school, the principal conducted the disciplinary action along with truancy staff. Attendance, behavior and truancy continued to be high priorities at several schools. Consistency in disciplinary policy and practice was demonstrated in most schools and was reflected in the decrease in reported disciplinary incidents.

Elementary school principals spent much of their time disciplining a few children who "create problems in classrooms because they want to mask their low reading skills in order to not look dumb to their peers." Covering up their low performance with problematic behavior has become an institutionalized pattern for some children and results in a number of teachers, support staff, and administrators expending a tremendous amount of time and energy to handle these situations. Special Education experts reported that a number of children are tagged as certified Special Education because of extreme attendance problems throughout their schooling that affected their reading and math skills. Evaluating students as Special Education when they do not have learning disabilities is counterproductive for students and schools alike.

Prior to CSRD, Alternative Education programs were developed at two schools to offset the numbers of students who failed in the regular classroom environments. Few schools offered summer or after school programs that provided additional assistance and supported the special learning needs of students with low literacy skills. Tutoring was available through numerous school and community resources. Many of these programs and services had no systematic method for teaching and learning practices, assessment, and for identifying student needs in literacy or other content areas. Schools lacked the substantial resources necessary to incorporate these services into the school year or as summer programs.

Teen parent classes and services were provided at three schools with older students. Pregnancy among teens was common among the Native American students and youth populations. Generally, in these schools being pregnant was not deemed a "bad" thing, largely because teens having babies has long been socially acceptable in Tribal communities. However, teen pregnancy is also an institutionalized pattern of behavior among youth that results from low self-worth, lack of mentoring with positive adult role models, and often is linked to impoverished communities. Two schools had Even Start programs providing such additional services as a van to transport families from home to day care or Early Childhood centers and to school; and then home again in the afternoon. Parenting education classes were also available at these schools. Both schools had incorporated prevention programs for youth that involved wearing the "pregnancy suit" and structured 24-hour, week long "caring for the baby" assignments.

Model Selection Process and Rationale.

CSRD Models. Schools responded to improvement needs by selecting reform models that targeted low performing student populations, focusing particularly on reading and math skills. Some of the models highlighted motivation and engagement of students in academic learning, improved attendance and graduation rates, and disciplinary issues. Other models focused on reading and math skills in the elementary grades. Family involvement was also addressed through all of the CSRD models.

These schools selected five different school reform models: Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound (ELOB); Building Exceptional Schools Together (BEST); Community For Learning (CFL); Lightspan; and Success For All (SFA). Schools with older students chose models (CFL and ELOB) that focused on providing opportunities outside the school that would engage youth in the application of classroom content in meaningful ways. An off-reservation boarding school selected the (BIA) Office of Indian Education Program model BEST, an expansion of the Effective Schools reform model. Three additional correlates were added to the Effective Schools model including curriculum and instruction, participatory management/shared governance, and cultural relevancy. This school previously implemented a Therapeutic model that focused on serving the special emotional and developmental needs of its student population. Schools serving PreK-12 also implemented additional reform models for younger students, generally SFA. Almost all the schools used the Accelerated Reader program to support reading and language needs of lower grades and one school also incorporated Skills Bank for older students. Two elementary schools, the largest and the smallest, chose SFA to improve literacy and math skills. One PreK-8 elementary school chose Lightspan, a technology based literacy and math model. This school previously incorporated a Great Expectations methodology that supported phonics and personal growth development needs of its students. One ELOB School did not implement ELOB in the elementary grades, only the secondary grades. This same school initially implemented SFA in grades K-5 and expanded the program into grades 6-8 when materials and training became available through the SFA model developers. The PreK-12 Community For Learning school originally wanted to implement the program only in the high school, but model developers pressured the facilitator to implement it schoolwide. This school is also the only facility that has both a BIA school and a public high school governed by one superintendent and two school boards. The BIA school also implemented a literacy block incorporating strategies and teaching and learning components similar to SFA in the elementary grades and supports that program with Accelerated Reader. One ELOB School is a charter alternative school serving disenfranchised youth that have not traditionally been successful in regular schools. This is the only school in the study which is a charter and that developed a Safety Net program, which serves Tribal youth, ages 12 to 24, within the Tribal Center facility based in their community setting. The following table describes the school demographics, CSRD models, and additional reform programs and resources.

Table 1
School Demographics, CSRD Models, Other Reforms, and Resources

School	Grade	Size	% American Indian	CSRD Model	% School age poverty	% Sp Ed	% LEP	Language Resource Center	Other Reform	Other School Programs
Umonhon	PreK-12	470	100%	ELOB	92%	40%	High	Yes	SFA Accelerated Reader	21 st Century
Four Winds	PreK-12	651	100%	CFL	97%	30%	High	Yes	Accelerated Reader	21 st Century Literacy Block Alternative Summer Vo-tech School to Work After School Tutoring
Southwest Open	6-12	155	26%	ELOB	60%	25%	High	Tribe		Tribal Safety Net SWOS Safety Net Wilderness Charter
Pierre Indian	1-8	250	100%	BEST	100%	44%	High	Yes	Therapeutic Model	Therapeutic Riding Tutoring After School
Seboyeta	K-6	65	45%	SFA	80%	18%	High	No	Accelerated Reader SFA Family Support Team	Summer
Pleasant Grove	PreK-8	231	54%	Lightspan	88%	10%	High	No	Great Expectation Accelerated Reader Skills Bank	Alternative Summer
Lake View	K-5	656	60%	SFA Math Wings	47%	16%	High	Yes	SFA Reading Wings SFA: Peace Path SFA Family Support Team	Tutoring Summer

Notes: Special Education students averaged 26% across all schools. LEP students averaged more than 60% across all the schools.

Selection Process. All the schools fell under the state's "school in need of improvement" status and were invited to apply for CSRD funding as early as 1997. School leaders played prominent roles in the CSRD selection process in all the schools, mostly due to their leadership roles and access to funding information. In one school, the superintendent, who was also principal at that time, had a significant role in gathering support for two reform models among staff, Board of Education and

community. In this same school, Tribal members participated in numerous ways through the Culture Center Foundation. In three schools, the CSRD facilitators played high profile roles including writing the grant. Two schools had additional assistance in writing the grant applications. Few parents played significant roles in the selection process in any of the schools; however, parents in many of these schools were either board members, Chapter House members, or worked in the schools and participated in varying degrees, generally through informal discussions.

For all the schools except two, the turn around time was a short month between the CSRD workshop sponsored by states and the deadline for submitting program applications. Although two schools had federal programs staff that generally conduct grant writing activities, these staff usually coordinated and directed all of the federally funded programs plus additional ones like alternative education and school-to-work. Time constraints on the selection process limited the ability of CSRD advocates to fully collaborate with a wider audience of key stakeholders in school and community in most of these schools.

Prescriptive CSRD Models. Three CSRD models were considered prescriptive because they provided curriculum materials, instructional guidebooks, and technology equipment that prescribed a step-by-step implementation process. Prescriptive models, such as CFL, Lightspan and SFA, required teachers to concentrate on individual student needs through a system of detailed lesson plans, ongoing assessments and thorough examination of teaching practices. Broad changes in classroom organization and instructional practices were initiated by two models, CFL and SFA. Lightspan advocated integration of a technology-based system which supported instructional practices for building literacy and math skills already being utilized by teachers. Lightspan provided an additional set of tools and assessments for teachers to align with lesson plans and to monitor student progress. The other models required radical changes in lesson plans, incorporating a structured set of instructional practices, which included cooperative learning, small groups and large groups, learning centers, and ongoing daily monitoring and assessments of student progress.

Process Oriented and Curriculum Based Models. The BEST, ELOB, and CFL models set in motion a process for transforming instructional practices, focusing on the needs of students, shaping the culture to support ongoing improvement efforts, and building ownership for change among key players in the school community. Model developers and schools alike described the approach to implementing these models as “fitting the model to the school.” Rather than supplanting existing curriculum, it was a developmental process for integrating and adapting the model components to fit the particular needs of teachers and students in a variety of classroom and school settings.

The Implementation Process

Resistance to Model. The selection process affected buy-in. Although 80% teacher buy in for the models was required (with the exception of Lightspan) the process of changing teaching and learning practices was slow and resistance was common in all schools. Many teachers felt pressured to accept a model for which they had not actively engaged in the decision making process. Top-down driven processes for implementing CSRD programs occurred in most of the schools. In only one school did all teachers actively participate in the CSRD selection process. Time constraints created undue pressure on teachers to implement fundamentally different instructional practices and assessments in their classrooms without sufficient planning time. Reform models meant not only changing their approach to teaching but also perceiving their students perhaps very differently than previously. CSRD models required teachers to continually examine their instructional practices, develop detailed lesson plans, meet in teams, focus on individual student needs in classrooms, and assess learning process and performance. Several school and district leaders perceived CSRD models as another “fad” that would soon pass. In one case, the high school principal chose not to pressure teachers, resulting in islands of teachers doing what they had done previous to CSRD. This situation changed as the principal realized the potential the model had to make a difference in the school. Training transformed that school leader’s perception of what school reform could be. Students also resisted, but less to school reform models than to irrelevancy of instruction and curriculum. CSRD programs were something new and different, and in many ways, the change was exciting to students.

Facilitator Roles. Facilitators in six of the schools had other duties and responsibilities outside the CSRD program. Additional roles among the facilitators ranged from principal, federal programs/grant writer, classroom teacher, and special education teacher. Only the largest elementary school’s SFA program had two full time coordinators, one for the Reading Wings and another for the Math Wings. Two elementary schools also had a half time facilitator. Generally, CSRD facilitators wore multiple hats and were excessively busy with instrumental duties and responsibilities of high profile administrative positions. The SFA program was the exception in these schools, having a facilitator or coordinator whose only duty was to conduct the program management, monitor implementation and progress in classrooms. Based on the size of one school, the facilitator was a half time position. Generally, reform model program costs exceeded the CSRD funding available and schools did not have access to other resources targeting additional administrative positions. However, one SFA School went to great lengths to collaborate with the district to match CSRD funds to support the facilitator position. The degree to which this facilitator conducted instructional leadership positively impacted student outcomes, largely because the facilitator spent a tremendous amount of time observing, monitoring, assessing and supporting individual teachers in classrooms.

Instructional Leadership. Facilitators and coordinators in five of the schools provided instructional leadership in varying degrees that positively impacted the reform implementation process. Instructional leadership roles included coaching, modeling, monitoring and assessing teaching and learning practices. The Lightspan School's principal/facilitator spent lots of time observing teaching and assisted teachers in learning to examine data analysis of test scores to improve instructional practices. Co-facilitators in the CFL School conducted biannual classroom observations that utilized the model developer instruments to assess teaching and learning practices. An extensive process was involved in this fourteen-page survey of CFL classrooms that required the facilitators to spend in excess of 5 hours for each assessment. An ELOB School had a facilitator that was also a full time teacher. Another ELOB facilitator was also the principal. In three SFA Schools that targeted facilitators and coordinators for instructional leadership, student achievement in reading and math increased. The Lightspan School also experienced increased scores in primary grades. But while a major key to effective implementation and student outcomes is instructional leadership, few full-time facilitators were provided for these programs.

Constraints of Time and Resources. Across all the schools, teachers and school leaders struggled with time constraints hampering the teacher's individual and team planning times, CSRD training for all staff, and professional development goals set by district, state, and individual schools. One of the most compelling findings was the level of training involved in CSRD programs that targeted instructional practices in the classroom. All the programs focused on radically changing the way instruction was delivered in the classrooms prior to CSRD and on individualized teaching and learning practices aimed at specific student outcomes. Yet while teachers and facilitators received lots of training, the process for teachers to begin to apply these new practices was slow. Overall, schools did not factor how much time it would take teachers and administrators to effectively understand and implement the model components into classrooms. Generally, teachers and facilitators were overwhelmed with the amount of work involved in implementing CSRD programs. Across all the schools, time became a factor that influenced the reform outcomes. Some models required extensive individualized education plans for each student called prescriptions (CFL vignette describing ALEM). Models that required teams of teachers to meet generally fell short of goals because time was limited.

In addition, the number of special needs students was sizeable, and too few classrooms had special education teachers. Classroom teachers were struggling with learning all the new approaches, strategies, assessments, and instructional practices while continuing to deal with enormous issues concerning exceptionally low reading and math skills, and behavior and attendance problems. Professional development needs of the teachers and administrators tended to be high among these schools because of the academic, social and personal needs of the student populations. Few schools had the time or resources to provide warranted professional development to staff that covered all of these important areas that required attention.

Readiness Issues. Several faced similar readiness issues that influenced the implementation process, including resistance to change, lack of support for planning time, not enough resources, and lack of instructional leadership. Although model developers target professional development to remedy many of these issues, often schools lacked readiness to embark on reform journeys. These schools continue to struggle with various constraints in the school environment that concern trust, collegiality, shared vision, collaboration, and teamwork. Such constraints often impeded CSRD program implementation in some of the schools. Many of these issues were identified through self-assessments, and model trainers sought to address them through technical support. The loss of strong leadership in one school adversely affected staff morale and created barriers to sustaining model components, which had previously been effectively implemented in classrooms. Dynamic leadership that leads the reform in schools often leaves a giant void when that leadership changes, especially when leadership roles are not shared and embedded in the school culture and supported by professional development and a strong system of instructional leadership throughout the school. Ongoing and effective professional development combined with a strong, shared leadership in these schools is critical to succeeding in comprehensive reform.

Language Issues. Language specialists and teachers were not collaborating in a systematic way in most of these schools to facilitate more ESL services to enhance language skills as teams of teachers. An exception was the BEST School language teacher who worked with classroom teachers across grades to develop activities designed to increase skills in both languages. In addition, one ELOB School's Culture Center provided Tribal language resources, Elders, who collaborated with regular classroom teachers to incorporate culturally appropriate expeditions for youth. In another school, ESL teachers collaborated with language specialists who were SFA tutors to improve language skills in both languages. To meet the challenge of students not being fluent in either language, schools must improve the ESL expertise of the staff. Professional development was conducted with two schools to enhance classroom teacher's understanding of language and culture among these populations. Several schools conducted tribal language and culture programs that were curriculum based.

Schools continue to struggle with these issues and challenges even with CSRD models specifically designed to support language and reading skills. A major problem is the degree to which a large number of these students have missed out on school because attendance and discipline issues interrupt schooling. Another factor is young children start school without basic skills in either language because parents remained caught between the tensions of two worlds and two languages. This systemic failure to effectively teach language skills to generations of Native Americans remains a problem unresolved by schools and Tribes. Notwithstanding, several schools and Tribal communities in this study have begun to collaborate to provide and preserve these critical languages and cultures. It is particularly important for these schools to continue to give priority to both languages and to provide professional staff to support the complex language needs of these populations.

Another strategy for improving student success in one school was to hire an additional teacher to work specifically with 9th grade retained students, which was historically a high number. A summer program for at-risk students such as the 9th graders was implemented this year to assist these students in improving academic skills and progressing to the next grade level. Summer programs also were available in three elementary schools. Targeting the academic needs of at-risk students was generally the function of these summer programs. Teachers also tried to make the summer school fun and interesting for youth. Teachers incorporated school-to-work activities and connected the classes to building community enterprises run by older students and teachers in the school.

Addressing academic needs in younger grades. Three schools tackled the low reading and language skills by implementing the Success For All reform model that concentrated a 90-minute literacy block across grades with different reading ability groups. Specialized training for teachers and literacy materials were provided to each of these schools through this model program. Tutors were hired and trained to focus on improving language skills with individual students with the lowest reading skills. Families and children also spent another 20 minutes reading in the home. Consistency and structured literacy skills building activities including vocabulary, phonics, spelling, writing, reading, and grammar were conducted each day with elementary school children. Generally, teachers in all three schools were pleased with the improved reading and language skills of students. Dramatic results were achieved in the smallest elementary school, where over one-half the students in grades 1-6 initially read at or below 2nd grade level and one year later, seventy-three percent of students in grades 1-6 are reading at or above their grade level. This school implemented the SFA Reading program, Roots and Wings (beginning readers start with Roots and in the third grade levels the program jumps to Wings). However, they had not yet implemented the SFA Math Wings program. The largest elementary school implemented a CSRD program, SFA Math Wings, two years after implementing a SFA Reading Wings program. This past year students showed more improvement in math scores than in reading scores across most of the grades.

Tutors in the SFA Schools played a huge role in effectively supporting individual needs of students. Initially, in populations with high literacy needs such as found in these schools, the SFA model mandates one-on-one tutoring services for the highest need students. As performance levels are reached across grades, tutors become more flexible in providing additional assistance to all students as directed by facilitator and teachers. Tutors were classroom resources for teachers and students that really supported an area of critical importance in these schools.

ELOB Schools also focused on literacy and math skills building. Expeditions integrated language arts standards along with all other content areas. Gallery Days relied heavily on language and communication skills, writing and research activities. Students maintained journals and portfolios of their work across classes and subjects. Schools reported students were writing, reading, researching and presenting more frequently than before CSRD programs. In one ELOB School, only the PE teacher had required research papers previous to reform.

Teacher Teams. Leadership teams were developed in the BEST School and the ELOB schools to design and assess strategic plans to specifically meet student needs. All schools struggled with time constraints of these additional meetings. Because of the commuting situation of teachers in many of these schools, committees and leadership teams met inconsistently. About half the schools were able to maintain some consistency with meeting and these groups attended to self-assessment reports and revising strategic plans. Prioritizing these types of leadership teams was essential to the process of monitoring student progress school wide and across grades. Teams analyzed data and identified weak areas that they could respond to immediately to assist teachers in the providing the instructional practices that would enable students to progress.

Shifting Teaching and Learning Practices. School leaders described how conventional classroom instructional practices were the norm across most of these schools prior to adopting CSRD programs. This created some issues especially among teachers who had been teaching for a number of years and did not value radical changes in their classrooms. A tremendous motivation to shift instructional practices was the fact that Native American populations and disadvantaged populations respond considerably better to hands on, culturally appropriate and authentic teaching and learning practices that integrate content areas and lend to outside the classroom projects. Implementation training began immediately in these schools and presented a variety of strategies and tools that often dramatically changed the approaches previously used to educate these populations.

Model Developer Assistance. Overall, schools were satisfied with the training and technical assistance provided by the model developers. Teachers and school leaders generally complemented the degree of expertise among trainers. One facilitator was somewhat unsatisfied with the training sessions she attended because they lacked specific information essential to effectively implementing the model in the school and instead focused on the model developer's research needs rather than the school's particular needs. A number of schools had not fully aligned curriculum with standards and benchmarks and implementation specialists/trainers assisted teachers and facilitators in that process. Family Support Team training through SFA was considered important in pointing schools in that direction and improving relationships between families and teachers and administrators.

Ongoing Assessments. Another common pattern in these schools was teachers and school leaders learning to conduct ongoing self-assessments. CSRD trainers assisted staff and administrators in developing skills for assessing and evaluating student progress and instructional practices. For some schools, this was the first time to participate in systematic methods for monitoring teaching and learning practices and also to link these to test scores and student performance. In most schools, the facilitator, teams of teachers, and or leadership teams conducted the assessments and evaluations. Generally, CSRD trainers monitored the facilitators and teachers by observing in classrooms, utilizing model instruments like rubrics, and working with individual teachers in the classroom to assess student progress and instructional practices. In one school, the principal conducted

extensive classroom observations. In another, the assistant superintendent of instruction participated in the observation, consulting with teachers to improve instructional practices and general classroom management skills. This was critical because of the high teacher turnover in that school and the fact that first year teachers were generally hired each year.

Implementation Challenges. Generally, CSRD models demanded a lot from schools. Schools did not replace current programs with CSRD; instead, they added these reform programs onto an already “full menu.” Although CSRD models supported varying degrees of flexibility, initially teachers were overwhelmed with the amount of time and work involved in learning the programs. Generally, time constraints made many teachers initially lack confidence in their ability to effectively implement the tools and strategies of the model in the classroom. Assessments were also problematic for the teachers in all the schools. One reason was that previously assessments were not as systematic, and in most schools standardized testing was the primary form of evaluating student performance. CSRD programs, on the other hand, initiated ongoing assessments that were structured, documented, and sequential. Monitoring student progress through instructional leadership methods was something relatively new in most of these schools. Additional issues like integrating Tribal culture and language and being creative with learning centers and materials were problematic for many teachers in the prescriptive models. One model, CFL, involves an extensive process, once teachers have mastered the classroom organizational structures and individualized prescriptions for students, that also places it into the next category of models. Block scheduling was recommended by model developers, whereas some schools already had this structure, others did not and this required some reorganization of classes and staff. Some teachers and school leaders resisted changes while others were more receptive to the degree of reform required by these models.

Although teachers continued to struggle with consistency of model components, mastering the assessments and monitoring student progress, the CSRD programs created tremendous change in these schools. As schools leaders pointed out, they still have a “long way” to go before reaching the level of classroom effectiveness that improves test scores. Schools had difficulty with unfamiliar monitoring and assessment systems, particularly in models that required teachers to develop their own rubrics for lesson plans/prescriptions, learning centers, and expeditions. Nevertheless, many schools have made progress in that area as well. Consistency and ongoing improvement across all grades and all students is the key goal in school reform on which these schools and the model developers focus.

Situational issues of the different student populations continue to challenge each school. The low reading skills presented an enormous challenge for teachers and students alike in these schools. Implementing all of the model components seemed overwhelming to teachers and school leaders. The process oriented model trainers generally structured the training program to incorporate one correlate or design principle at-a-time to alleviate some of the stress placed on these teachers.

CSRD Program Adaptations. Modifications to the CSRD programs varied in each school. Family Support (SFA) was adapted to the relationship structure already in place in one school, rather than starting at relationship building from square one. Here, teachers and family resource liaisons built on the strong relationships they had previously developed to improve parent involvement.

Modifying schedules for CSRD training was difficult because of the time constraints. One school had a particularly rough start because training was scheduled when only elementary teachers were available and trainers had to return and conduct additional training with secondary teachers two months later.

SFA trainers at one school “picked up the pace” of the program, due to the “extremely low scores.” Strategies were incorporated to build student motivation to actively participate in reading and writing classroom activities. Because few viable library resources were available for either teachers or students at the school, the facilitator checked out over 100 books weekly to take to the school to access for teaching and reading resources.

Adapting ELOB to incorporate math problems and concepts was difficult in two schools. In one school, the math teacher continued to work with students in regular math classes and AP math students to develop expeditions that were hands-on learning experiences. At this school, teachers used ELOB to challenge students to increase their own expectations academically and in personal developmental growth areas.

Cultural Relevancy. The more prescriptive models generally impeded culturally relevant instruction. Pressured to use SFA materials, which had “no cultural relevancy” for Native American students, teachers in one school adapted the SFA program to integrate more language and culture curriculum materials. One teacher used min-thematic units to integrate cultural and language materials. Another SFA program facilitator incorporated community issues and problems into the literacy block; however, few teachers followed her lead in that school.

ELOB teachers in two schools were able to incorporate cultural resources for use in and outside classrooms based on lesson plans and innovative teaching and hands-on activities in the community. Expeditions were designed to cross content areas and focus on literacy and math skills. Both schools conducted schoolwide project-based learning activities that bridged content areas. One school focused on a historical Tribal event that involved a five-day 550-mile expedition requiring months of preparation and mini-learning expeditions. Another school conducted three-week wilderness expeditions and geographical expeditions into Navajo Country to learn traditional culture and historical knowledge from Dine’ people.

The BEST School supported culture and language considerably through integration of the five primary languages represented by students in classrooms. In addition, at families' request an array of traditional practices were taught to children. Three schools provided celebratory events centered on a Native American Week or Cultural Heritage events that represented the ethnic and cultural backgrounds of the student populations.

Instructional Practices and Curriculum. A critical factor in all the schools was the low performance in math and reading and the ways this impacted students across all grades, especially older students. Low skills also affected the instructional practices and approaches used by teachers. The fact that many students in secondary grades read at 2nd or 3rd grade reading levels made it a challenge to teach grade level materials. Although the models were flexible, trainers also found it difficult to adapt the curriculum materials to student's relevant interests or academic skill levels. In addition, trainers and teachers alike struggled with addressing culturally appropriate learning practices, and individual developmental needs, especially because of the number of special education students and range of special needs across classrooms.

Learning New Ways to Learn and Teach. Students did not necessarily acclimate to the cooperative learning and teamwork groups and learning practices. Teachers across all the schools, with the exception of the Lightspan program, had some difficulty in getting students to respond to the new and very different instructional practices. For some students and teachers this was their first experience with hands-on and student-driven activities. It took time to "unlearn" old and begin to learn new ways. One school had teachers develop learning centers, a new practice for teachers and students in which students were expected to take more responsibility in assessing and moving forward with a carefully managed progress plan that teachers developed (prescriptions and lesson plans). SFA had teachers write daily objectives on the board. CFL teachers had individualized prescriptions for students. A common feature was that students knew what was expected and they generally liked that.

Interests Shifted. In schools with SFA and Lightspan models, teachers and some parents reported that programs were an effective way to support reading, language arts, and math; however, students often became bored and lost interest in the materials. Some teachers tired of the redundancy in the program structure. SFA trainers recognized this issue and recommended shifting the teachers to the different levels to counter that redundancy and boredom for kids as well. Lightspan technology was slower than newer games that some kids had access to and the graphics were also less sophisticated as time progressed. The initial fun of "new games" and technology soon wore off; however, some of that disinterest could have been related to inconsistency in both classroom and home in utilizing the technology and software games. In addition, teachers did not utilize the tremendous variety of software offered in that program largely because of time constraints for learning each game and linking it to lesson plans.

Key Factors Common to Successful Comprehensive Reform

Additional Reform Programs that Focused on Developmental Needs. In the schools serving fewer students, disciplinary problems were approached differently than in the larger schools. For example, in one school a character education program, Great Expectations, was implemented (prior to the CSRD program) to improve classroom environment, self-esteem, pride in school, ownership in learning community, and responsibility for individual learning. In addition, the principal had worked hard to develop a good relationship with families. An ELOB school approached discipline through the school culture and relationship building with students and teachers. These teachers focused on team building and establishing trusting relationships with students to improve attendance, achievement, and overall motivation and interest of students. This school had a long history of targeting emotional developmental needs of its at-risk population. Yet another school implemented a therapeutic model that supported emotional and developmental needs of individual children, and drastically reduced the behavior problems. This BEST School also implemented a Beautification program that developed a sense of ownership and pride among students and teachers. In these schools, the school culture constituted a general respect, understanding, and nurturing and support for all children. Each of these schools also recognized a need to balance this all out with a well-rounded and rigorous academic program.

Two schools recently were awarded funds to develop 21st Century Learning Communities. These additional funds will go a considerable distance in comprehensive services to Tribal populations with extensive educational and developmental needs. Both schools have CSRD programs that will be enhanced by the 21st Century program and in turn, collectively these programs support the school improvement plans. In fact, these programs when combined considerably extend the comprehensive services that cut across school and community.

Ongoing Professional Development. A common factor in the schools was ongoing professional development for staff and school leaders. CSRD programs mandated on-site training and supported external professional development that included site visits to model program schools, and state and regional conferences facilitated by model developers. In addition, CSRD programs support ongoing and extensive professional development that encourages teachers and school leaders to think “outside the box” of the normal school structure. One school held week-long on-site summer institutes for teachers and staff to participate in a variety of instructional methodology, technology instruction, child development training, all of which aligns with strategic plans and supports the therapeutic model and CSRD program goals. Additional consultants were brought into the school to “fill in the gaps” based on staff assessments and needs of students. Office of Indian Education Programs (BIA) sponsors annual conferences that support comprehensive school reform in Tribal schools.

Another school sent four or five staff and administrator to week-long institutes that involved child developmental issues, literacy programs such as Accelerated Reader, and character education

methodology. One school sent teachers and students to week-long ELOB institutes that developed team building, problem solving, and personal growth and leadership skills. ELOB also sponsors numerous leadership and skills building conferences and institutes throughout the year. SFA also participate in additional off-site regional conferences and workshops, especially for newly hired staff at schools that have already implemented the programs. CFL sponsors several external workshops for facilitators and conducts staff and administrator training on-site at the school. Lightspan trainers generally conduct onsite training with new staff as needed by individual schools. In addition, Lightspan, along with the other model developers, also participate in state and regional conferences sponsored by regional educational centers, research laboratories, and state departments of education.

Effective Teaching and Instructional Leadership. Across all the schools, there were a number of teachers and school leaders who demonstrated effective instructional practices and instructional leadership. Common factors were: enthusiasm for the CSRD program, belief that changing instructional practices could improve student outcomes; considerable value given to examining and assessing teaching practices and individual learning practices; a collective vision and combined efforts concerning school reform; and little or no resistance to change. Still, challenges existed in all schools, and the varied quality of teachers and professional staff in each school affected reform outcomes. Within the three years of the initial CSRD program implementation, model developers reported they expect to see effective teaching and learning practices pervasive in these schools.

Cohesive Culture Influenced Reform. School reform research shows that a cohesive school culture is generally more receptive to change. Issues of trust are critical in creating commitment for and active participation in the reform program. While some schools were able to change resisters into believers, in other schools this resistance initially created barriers and slowed the overall implementation process. One ELOB School had developed a cohesive culture that characterized a collective vision, trust, shared leadership, ownership in the decisions and belief that ongoing improvement was an important and worthwhile process. These teachers supported one another, had developed collegiality, team teaching, mentoring and instructional leadership previous to the ELOB program. Other schools continue to struggle with these issues which require ongoing professional development and technical support to sustain school reform efforts.

Developing and Maintaining A Focus. Among these schools, a variety of school improvement plans were developed to align with district and state requirements including standards and accountability. Generally, these schools revised and refined goals, strategic plans and moved around resources to support those plans several times over the course of this study. One school was under considerable pressure, going through state accreditation process, new district leadership, and revised its plan three times to meet state and district goals and requirements. Other schools set out to align goals and objectives of all current reform and Title programs, departments (school wide plan) and newly proposed reform programs (21st Century) to make them more cohesive and systematic and

consistent overall. A CFL School also received assistance from the model developers to align curriculum with state benchmarks with standards. In many of these schools, CSRD program implementation coincided with the “heavy load” of incorporating new state accountability systems and the ongoing alignment of curriculum, standards and benchmarks. In addition, several schools were in the process of revising Goals 2000 plans to match school improvement plans and reform programs. Basically, all these activities were mutually beneficial because states required the revisions and also linked funding resources to these plans so schools were motivated to comply. One school struggled with these issues because of a top leadership change and the grant writer moved on to a Tribal College position.

Sustaining that focus was difficult for schools, especially with the amount of work involved in the CSRD implementation. Across all the schools, with CSRD and reform plans in general, more things were added to existing workloads and nothing was dropped. This created some problems in all the schools simply because it was a struggle for many teachers to fit all these objectives into each day. In addition, school leaders were loaded down with the situational issues that continued to absorb much of their time like problem behavior, low attendance, and shortage of staff in some of these schools. Maintaining the high profile instructional leadership required to sustain the reform focus in those classrooms and throughout the school was difficult for some schools.

Combination of Reform Programs. In all the schools, leaders pointed to the comprehensive nature of their strategic plan to improve schools. Whereas CSRD programs targeted academic performance, parent involvement, developmental needs, school climate, and instructional practices, additional reform programs and numerous school community resources were vital to effectively meet student’s special needs. Combining multiple reform programs and methodologies enabled schools to provide more comprehensive services to at-risk student populations. According to several school leaders, the school’s success in improving student outcomes was not due solely to one reform program. Although one school placed tremendous value on the therapeutic model and another on the Great Expectations methodology, school leaders also pointed out that CSRD programs were perceived as ongoing reform initiatives that focused on the classroom and student performance, a goal which encompasses the needs of the whole child.

SFA programs incorporated cooperative learning groups, teamwork, and other model components, which also addressed the developmental needs of youth. One elementary school implemented a SFA component that involved conflict resolution methodology and strategies to improve disciplinary issues and teach student’s problem solving skills, Peace Path and Getting Along. Another school implemented the Great Expectations’ weekly Rise and Shine Assembly that builds a cohesive school culture, self esteem, leadership and strong school ownership among teachers and students. ELOB model incorporates an extensive number of components that when combined and effectively implemented, provide an in-depth comprehensive reform program that fosters developmental and academic needs. However, in one ELOB School, leaders maintained that SFA was

also essential for elementary students to improve extremely low reading scores. Although the ELOB program served only the secondary students, the SFA was implemented in grades K-8.

Implementing the character education methodology (Great Expectations) and therapeutic model also positively impacted the school culture. Improvements in student conduct were noted by an elementary school since the implementation of Peace Path, its conflict resolution program. ELOB enhanced the school culture at one school and challenged students to participate in leadership roles like the student assembly and the student charter board. Another school also established a student council that structured youth participation in decision-making roles. At one elementary school, students began to engage in more open class discussions as a result of the cooperative and teamwork learning practices through the SFA program. Initially, students were shy, but teachers worked diligently to create a safe environment for the children and to support large group discussions and presentations in the classrooms.

Increased Expectations. CSRD models served to raise expectations for student performance and for teaching and learning practices in general across all these schools. The models provided a structure and format that improved teacher effectiveness when implemented correctly. Reform programs were designed to challenge students to learn differently and in a variety of situations and settings. ELOB model provided teachers and students with a myriad of teaching and learning tools that enhanced personal and academic experiences in and out of the classrooms and schools. CFL teachers in secondary grades also linked academic work with community and career oriented activities that supported older students' needs and interests. SFA Schools especially created more challenging reading and math activities because these programs were structured as fast paced activities that incorporated a variety of communication, writing, reading and interaction between and among students and teachers. Lightspan initially challenged the students with a variety of math and reading software games that were fun and interesting. Teachers implementing the program effectively also increased their expectations of students because they wanted students to utilize an additional learning tool perceived as fun and interesting to students that would improve reading and math skills.

Prioritizing Relationships. Building relationships between students and teachers was prioritized by CSRD models in a variety of ways that improved the climate of the school and classrooms. The BEST School's Therapeutic model emphasized relationships between adults and children and especially in the residential program staff roles were parental and mentoring. Classroom teachers also supported this relationship building by meeting the children for breakfast every morning and sitting as a "family before classes began." Teachers in the upper grades also met with youth each morning as a family to share before students went to other classes like music, art or PE. An ELOB school formed Critical Friends groups that meet each day with an adult mentor to discuss numerous issues related to personal, academic and school based issues. Students learn leadership, communication, and conflict resolution skills within this structure. Cooperative learning and teamwork built relationships among students and between teachers and students. These skills were particularly

important for youth and children to learn, especially in schools with more ethnic diversity where social differences are more pronounced.

Reform Programs Decreased Discipline Problems. In all the schools, high numbers of discipline incidents and behavior problems were pervasive previous to reform initiatives implemented by newly hired school leaders. Two elementary schools reported fewer behavior problems in the classrooms due to the SFA program. The fact that several of the school leaders provided more consistency in disciplinary policy and practices was also noted. In four schools, superintendents and principals reported high incidents of numerous disciplinary problems that existed at the schools when they first arrived. One of the schools hired professional staff and trained other staff to provide additional and effective services for students with severe behavior and emotional development problems. Two other schools hired truancy and security staff to handle youth skipping out on class and leaving school.

Character education programs helped schools decrease negative behavior patterns, especially in classrooms. One school documented the variety of discipline problems that significantly dropped when they implemented the Beautification program and the therapeutic model. Another school had worked considerably with its youth to understand that with freedom comes responsibility and consequences. Developing that sense of ownership and pride in their school was accomplished through school wide assemblies that were student-led in two schools.

Family Involvement

Improvement Strategies. Across all the schools, CSRD programs incorporated a number of strategies that improved family involvement in schools. In Tribal communities where parent involvement is historically low, engaging more parents was quite an accomplishment. In the Lightspan School, almost two-thirds of all families were represented at the initial program orientation for parents, and the second year also brought similar numbers of families into the school to learn about the Lightspan program. That was the first time in 20 years that many parents attended a school event directly related to improving student performance. ELOB Gallery Day brings parents into the school to observe and listen to their students present relevant information about their learning progress. More parents and Tribal leaders are attending Gallery Days in one ELOB school.

Great Expectations also involved parents in a variety of ways. In all the schools, parents “sit up and take notice” when their children display good behavior, manners, and self-confidence. CSRD programs and other reform programs targeted these human development characteristics. In addition, parents also noticed the improved reading abilities of their children in the SFA programs. Generally, families supported their children’s 20 minutes of reading daily in the home. Parents also loved the fact that their children’s reading progress had visibly improved. Another popular feature of SFA is that

kids get to keep the basal readers and take them home. Both parents and children like having the reading materials at home because in many homes there are few of these reading resources available.

One school conducted a holiday program which was attended by 100% of families and a science fair led by students brought many families into the school. Another school took students on an ELOB Expedition that was widely attended by families, the 5K walk, departure ceremony, and basically, assembling their children and necessary supplies needed for the five-day trip. About 35 family members joined the expedition; some of these were support staff from the school and students from the Teacher Cadre Program. These parents spoke highly of the school leaders and staff who made the expedition possible for all participants.

Another school contributed resources for families to attend their children's graduation ceremony. Whereas families lived in other states, many had no resources to travel to the school and participate in this grand event. Teachers and staff from this school also travel to the children's home each summer to bring basic supplies and food to assist these families.

A common factor among schools reporting increased parent involvement was a school environment more "receptive" to families. Some school leaders suggested the change occurred because they spent time developing relationships with families, others believed the combination of CSRD and character education programs built awareness for how parents can contribute to their student's academic and developmental progress. One school provides parenting and child rearing resources in a special "parent section" in its library (Love and Logic books and video tapes).

Challenges with Parent Involvement. Across schools, teachers generally perceived parent involvement as this formidable goal that is never quite achieved. However, a few teachers had succeeded in effectively engaging parents in educative behavior and discussions that focused solely on the student. Although the majority of school leaders seemed optimistic about increasing family involvement, they wrestled with the solutions to this pervasive problem.

In one school, SFA implemented a Family Support Team to encourage and support particularly serious situations involving student attendance, behavior, and low performance. However, school participants perceived the nature of that involvement as inadequate, largely because the activities with families focused on negatives rather than positives of the student. The Family Support Team in one school visits the families in their homes to establish relationships away from the school in what may be perceived as a safer and definitely more familiar environment than the school. Once the families understand the nature and purpose of the Family Support Team, and through the counselor's support, they feel more comfortable visiting the school and with staff.

A common perception among staff in all the schools was the belief that parents do not value education and that is why parent involvement is so low. The most frequent reason school leaders and

staff gave for low parent involvement was the negative experiences that many Native Americans parents and grandparents had in mission and boarding schools. This was a common struggle for teachers and school leaders alike.

Parents also considered education a separate entity from the Tribal community. This pattern of not participating in schools has long been a problem in Tribal school communities. Schools generally reported this situation changing, somewhat slowly, however it would seem these perceptions are changing. In several schools with SFA and Lightspeed programs, more parents were attending functions and beginning to participate in more literacy driven activities in the home. Three schools with older students continued to have challenges getting parents to participate in school functions. ELOB schools designed student-led presentations that drew both parents and community members into the schools. SFA schools had more students presenting individually and in groups at family and community events. The Great Expectations school also engaged students in performances that captured both family and community attention.

Community Involvement

One of the surprising findings in this study was the varied response to comprehensive reform efforts in schools by the different Tribes. Improving education for the overall community was a prominent goal in all the Tribal Mission Statements; however, there were some stark differences in the resources used to support that goal among these school communities. Schools generally provided updates and generated feedback from Tribes about new initiatives that were being implemented. A series of community surveys were administered to solicit relevant information utilized in school reform programs by most of these schools. CSRD orientation meetings were held in the school for parents and community members. A common resource was the Tribe's financial ability to provide funds to support educational and developmental programs in schools that serve Tribal populations. Generally, the Tribes that had viable enterprises like Casinos would contribute some funding when approached by schools with a proposal. Another factor was if the Tribe had an established Educational Department or Office with whom the school had developed a mutually beneficial partnership.

Two Tribal communities provided a considerable amount of resources for the school's reform efforts either in funding, tutors, language and culture specialists, family and community liaison staff. One Tribe has an education office with staff and resources that partnered in a variety of ways with all the district schools serving their Tribal members. The Tribe provided substantial resources to the school to fund an alternative education program and also hired language specialists to teach classes in the program. Both the school and the Tribe recognized the importance of this partnership especially because it provided educational options to disenfranchised youth that normally failed in the conventional schools.

Another school had developed many community partnerships that would be supported through a 21st Century program that targets adults, youth and children in the community for additional educational, social, and recreational services. Approximately 600 children and community members will be served with that program.

In one community, Tribal leaders formed a Task Force and then a Culture Center Foundation partnering with the school district, developing a strategic plan for improving language and culture resources in the school and to improve success rates of their students in school. A grant writer worked within the Advisory Board governing the Culture Center Foundation to access federal monies that directly impacted the efforts of this partnership. Funding resources were awarded to the Culture Center Foundation to develop numerous resources for families and children. A Child Care Center, Early Childhood and Head Start programs, a Teacher Cadre Program (teacher education program for community member to become certified classroom teachers), Even Start program, and a Culture Center in the school. This school hired nine language and culture consultants (Elders) who would contribute valuable information to assist the Center in documenting the language and developing resource materials for classroom purposes. A 21st Century program was recently funded that will boost the services for youth, children, families and the general population.

Another example of community participation in schools was the Chapter Houses that had members who served on site based management teams in schools. These community members, many of them parents, represented their children and the Tribal community. They presented a critical presence in these decision-making groups in schools. Board of Education members in Tribal communities also function as a policy making group that serves the interests of Tribal members, the children. In most of these schools, the Board members effectively made decisions that supported school leaders in their reform efforts.

Community Image of Schools is Changing. A common local factor was that the community perception was generally negative about students and the school. School leaders and teachers worked diligently in some of the schools to change the negative image to a positive one. The Great Expectations public performances drew a lot of publicity, statewide and locally. The BEST School established a Beautification program and Therapeutic model that changed the perceptions of students which positively impacted behavior problems that included youth leaving the dorms at night and vandalizing the local community. Negative images are changing because the schools have developed systematic ways to build self-esteem and pride in children and youth. Several schools have additional reform programs and methodologies to create cohesive school cultures that foster child developmental needs and which have led to positive student behavior and improved the school image in the larger community.

Culture and Language Resources

Developing Language Resources. Language and culture resources were provided in varying degrees in all the schools. Three schools had expended tremendous efforts and funding toward developing resources to effectively teach the children their native languages. The majority of schools relied on language specialists, generally Elders from the community, who were fluent speakers. Language and culture curriculum was developed or was in the process of being developed in four schools in this study. In all these schools, language specialists had participated in this process. Only two schools were assessing language acquisition. Two school communities had language and culture components in Day Care centers, Early Childhood and Head Start programs.

Effectively teaching native languages to these student populations was a focus in four schools that was also supported through professional development. Four schools had developed language and culture programs that consistently taught Tribal languages. Two schools hired linguists to develop essential resources like dictionaries and reading materials for teachers and students. One school reported the Tribe had requested its district to not teach language and culture in schools. Another school had applied for federal funding for a bilingual education program and was not awarded the grant, however, the application will be revised and resubmitted this year. While two schools had no language and culture programs, both sponsored school community wide events, held annually, that generally included a Pow Wow and traditional activities like dancing, drums, songs, foods, and artwork.

Two schools engaged in considerable efforts to fund and develop culture and language materials to contribute to the school and community. Both schools hired a linguist to write materials for teachers, students, and the community to access. One school hired a consultant to assist them in the development of a hyper studio computer language program that students could use to learn languages. This school later hired a linguist who expanded the program to include all five of the Tribal languages represented by the children in that school. Language and culture are integrated into the classrooms in that the language teacher who also speaks ten different Tribal languages assesses school and students.

Essential Resources. A common factor in the schools with effective language and culture programs was financial and community support. Schools with funding resources were able to develop language and culture resources with the assistance of community Elders, consultants, and linguists. Additional funding has allowed these schools to incorporate technology language and culture programs, assessments, and conduct professional development and training that would not otherwise have been possible.

Clearly, CSRD models did not provide the essential Tribal language and cultural resources that these student populations require. Generally, model developers did not perceive this level of support as part of their function. Notwithstanding, ELOB, BEST and CFL models do support

integration of culturally appropriate materials and all the CSRD models in these schools incorporated essential instructional practices recognized as enhancing learning among these populations.

Challenges in Meeting Language and Culture Needs in Schools. A number of Tribes did not have language resources for schools serving their children. In some cases, the language is oral, not written, making it particularly difficult for schools to provide language support and assistance, especially for LEP students. One school district was advised by the Tribes not to teach culture or language because “it was the family’s place to teach” it. School leaders were willing to collaborate with the Tribal leaders and community to integrate more cultural and language materials into the curriculum, however, were apprehensive in taking that initial step. The language was not documented so it remains a struggle to maintain Tribal language for this population. Language is taught in the Tribal Schools and in the Early Childhood and Head Start programs in this community.

Whereas language specialists have been certified through the state or Tribal Office to teach language in these schools, they generally do not have instructional methodology training. This is problematic because teaching language in formal classroom settings requires teaching and learning methodology. Professional development was offered to language specialists, but in some schools CSRD training was not available.

Culturally Appropriate Teaching. One of the greatest challenges in these schools was the low comfort level of non-Indian teachers to teach language, culture and history. Regular classroom teachers often reported a lack of knowledge about the Tribes represented in the schools. They also perceived Tribal information of any kind to be taught by the language specialists who were Tribal members. Another perception was that academic content areas were the school priority while language and culture and history were secondary to “real educative” activities. The ELOB schools changed this perception among teachers and language specialists and especially among the families and students as well. This went a long way in making education a collaborative process between the Culture Center and the regular classroom teachers in one school. Likewise, with the Tribal Education Office and the school, teachers collaborated with language specialists. The difference was centered primarily on the level of respect and the fact that their roles and vision for students were both collective and generally a mutually beneficial process. The major focus often gets placed on one or the other language rather than maintaining a child centered focus on the comprehensive language needs of these populations, a situation that impedes gaining proficiency in both languages. A few schools are taking that high road to develop effective and systematic programs that support collaboration among key player in schools and communities and that are mutually beneficial.

Collaboration Essential. Schools struggled with meeting the critical language needs of these populations, yet few had bridged the classroom and culture. Language and culture are treated in an isolated fashion when standards and goals target integration as the ideal and appropriate approach. Language specialists and classroom teachers collaborated in a variety of ways in the schools, but only two schools consistently built language and culture activities into lesson plans. One ELOB School

effectively integrated culture and language into instructional practices in and out of the classrooms. Another ELOB school collaborated extensively with the Tribe to incorporate language and culture specifically for the Safety Net students in the Tribal community. In addition, classes that integrated Tribal member's expertise about cultural traditions, history, geography, science knowledge of Native Americans was offered school wide in this ELOB School.

The BEST School's linguist/language teacher partnered with Culture Center staff in another ELOB School to share language resources and ideas to support the literacy and language preservation needs of these student populations. The BEST language teacher also collaborated extensively with teachers to integrate language and culture into classrooms daily and link these activities to lesson plans. In addition, this school assessed language progress of all its students. Culture Center staff continued to struggle with issues of regular classroom teachers not integrating language and culture into instructional activities. The principal advocates the idea that it is "not solely" the role of language specialists to teach language and culture, and suggests "all teachers" need to support this standard.

Challenges still exist in these populations to effectively learn both their Tribal and English languages. Based on the low literacy skills across all grades, regular classroom teachers struggled with accountability issues directly related to reading and math, which require English. Another issue that weighs heavy for everyone is that students need English to get a job, go to college, to participate in meaningful ways in the larger society and to support their families. The primary issue for Tribal members is that schools teach language and culture skills that enable students to function in "both worlds" and not constrain one or the other language. A major part of attaining that outcome is substantial resources and systematic support in schools and communities. In several of these communities both Tribes and schools are supporting these objectives with Day Care Centers, Even Start, Early Childhood and Head Start, comprehensive language and culture programs and 21st Century programs that teach and preserve Tribal languages.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Six closely related sets of issues arise as comprehensive school reform is implemented in schools serving Tribal communities.

Leadership. As these findings indicated, strong leadership to support comprehensive school reform continues to be a major key to effective reform. Principals must participate in strong instructional leadership to facilitate effective reform outcomes in classrooms and schools. Professional development for principals and superintendents should be coordinated with school's comprehensive reform plans for teacher professional development. Strong leaders need to forge a collective vision, collaborative teams for creating a cohesive school culture, methods for assessing and documenting progress, and sustaining the momentum for comprehensive school reform.

One of the issues confronting many schools is the “readiness” for change. School leaders need to approach reform differently when the school culture is not conducive to change. Reform models rest on the assumption that *schools are in fact ready* for radical change, but in fact many schools are stuck in conventional approaches to educating at-risk populations. To create the urgency to change among staff remains a challenge for school leaders. Effective leaders facilitate shared leadership among staff and initiate leadership teams to drive comprehensive school reform. Building the momentum to take that initial step to reform is difficult for many schools. Leadership provides information and assistance to key players to make good decisions about the best reform model for the school. Too often schools get stuck in a comfort zone instead of forging ahead with ongoing change. School leaders need to provide systemic support for teachers that builds trust, confidence and collegiality among staff.

Instructional leadership is essential for teachers to learn to examine teaching and learning practices and to pinpoint strengths and improvement needs. A supportive and trusting atmosphere enables collaboration and reflection on instructional practices that improve student learning goals. School leaders must actively participate in a systematic way to maintain support for comprehensive reform. Establishing collegiality and shared leadership that develops an unwavering commitment to students' learning is important to school reform. Providing the guidance that enables teachers to build collegial relationships and to reflect on their instruction and the change process. Few schools had substantial instructional leadership in classrooms and this impeded school reform. Even those teachers who were inclined to readily embrace change also needed support in classrooms to assure program components were being implemented accurately.

Change in leadership tends to impede reform, especially if the new leader is not progressive and moves the school backwards rather than forward in the reform process. School leaders must understand and support school reform or staff and parents may not perceive the new leader as a strong

supporter of reform. As we saw in one school in this study, a smooth transition to new leadership is critical and professional development is needed to secure the preservation of reform efforts attained during the previous administrator's tenure.

Superintendents, Boards of Education and advisory boards can provide critical support for comprehensive school reform. Sound policy making for schools to operate with children as the main focus remains a particularly important key to reform issues. Sticking to the thoughtfully constructed reform plan for three to five years is essential for schools because too often change means dropping one program for another after one year. Effective comprehensive school reform means targeting academic and personal growth development areas that provide support for teachers, students and families to improve student achievement. Collaboration and collegial relationships among these key stakeholders are essential to improve schools.

Cohesive school cultures were more receptive to change and enabled schools to creatively resolve reform challenges. Collaborative oriented teams of teachers embraced change rather than resisted it. Teachers maintained a strong focus on students that created a momentum for improving performance throughout the school. Schools struggled with building collegial relationships that supported a collective voice and a strategic reform plan that strengthened the focus toward changing instructional practices to improve student learning.

Curriculum and Instruction. Changing instructional practices constitutes much of the reform program emphasis in classrooms. That is why it is so critical that schools have an effective professional development program closely linked to examining instructional practices and to maintain a constant focus for raising student performance. Schools must establish strong instructional leadership among CSRD program facilitators to effectively incorporate the tools and strategies of the reform models into the classrooms. Model trainers conduct training and individually coach teachers, however, on-site experts will provide ongoing support that is embedded in a systematic way that sustains school reform.

Decision making about curriculum and instruction that is shared by staff and administrators develops a sense of ownership for school reform critical to the change process. Teachers often resist change because they have no decision making role in those changes that directly affect them. Sometimes teachers fear change. It is difficult to embrace reform programs without first building trust and collegiality among staff and administrators.

Planning time is critically important for effective implementation of CSRD programs. Substantial planning time is required for teachers to develop lesson plans, share ideas, participate in professional development and apply newly acquired knowledge in their classrooms. Too often, not enough time is set aside for understanding and relating reform model correlates to curriculum, lesson plans and assessments. Teachers should not have to trade off effective teaching for less challenging

learning situations because they lack the time to develop good lesson plans and the skills to apply these. Many teachers spent personal time developing effective lessons and learning centers.

The findings showed that teachers shared more than before especially when given planning time. Leadership teams conducted self-assessments used to reflect and examine strong areas and weaknesses in content and/or instruction. Individual teachers also began to understand better how they could examine their own teaching and learning practices. Connecting the dots that explained how student learning was linked to instruction was empowering to some teachers while others resisted the change process.

Creating a systematic consistency in teaching and learning practices provided these teachers with a collective task if not a collective vision. Building collegiality and trust is important for teachers and the overall reform process. Whereas some schools struggled more with implementing new teaching strategies and structured, sequential tasks, most succeeded in establishing higher expectations for both students and teachers alike.

Reform programs provided a structure and format to academic programs across classrooms that schools previously lacked. A systematic method for monitoring and assessing student progress was directly linked to instructional practices, and this was new in most of these schools. Teachers and students need to clearly see progress that is based on shorter tasks and understand the connectivity between content areas and standards. Ongoing assessments and evaluations were critical to improving instructional practices and student performance.

Model developers provided substantial training and professional development to schools to support reform efforts. Schools were generally satisfied with training and technical support to assist them in the change process.

Student Outcomes. Systematic reform programs effectively implemented generally improved academic scores in schools. Reading and math scores increased in most of these schools especially in CSRD programs based on the prescriptive models. Consistency is still a concern among schools that have traditionally had problems maintaining improved scores across grades as students transition into the higher grades. In addition, high teacher turnover rates remain a problem in several schools. Schools struggle with consistent instructional practices and maintaining in the classroom reform efforts because new teachers have to be trained each year.

Students generally responded positively to school reform efforts. Schools implemented a variety of strategies to make learning more fun and interesting. Students liked to know what teachers expected them to know and were interested in monitoring their own progress.

Expanding learning and teaching beyond the classroom was embraced by students. Making content and instruction more relevant to students was emphasized by schools implementing the

process oriented and the curriculum based models. CSRD program instruction taught students to be better readers and to participate in teamwork and cooperative learning groups. More student-directed learning is needed in schools to actively engage students. Models targeted students taking more responsibility for their learning; however, teachers need more time to incorporate strategies and develop lessons that link content areas and standards.

Supporting child development needs are as critical to student academic performance as the quality of instructional practices designed to improve test scores. Schools must have additional services that match the comprehensive needs of student populations. While most CSRD models support social skills like cooperative learning and teamwork among peers, fewer models have established components that focus on the whole child including the spiritual, emotional, social, intellectual and physical needs of children.

Attendance, behavior, and truancy problems require a considerable amount of time and energy from staff and school leaders and eventually negatively impact student performance, school culture, and parent relations with schools. Disciplinary treatment emphasizes punishment rather than prevention that teaches appropriate ways of responding to emotions and feelings especially anger, sadness, and grief. Large numbers of children and adults suffer the consequences of alcoholism, drug abuse, domestic violence and abuse, yet schools and communities do not have sufficient resources and experts to provide services that match these needs.

LEP students continue to struggle with language skills in disconcerting numbers. Teaching expertise is required to effectively integrate language throughout instructional practices and across all content areas. Professional development and training for classroom teachers to become certified bilingual education or ESL is particularly important to improving student performance. Low language skills are pervasive in these schools and have created patterns of low performance, interests and motivation.

Language and Culture. Language and culture programs can effectively preserve language and culture when there are substantial and effective resources. Teaching Tribal languages requires substantial resources like language specialists and materials that can be utilized by regular classroom teachers, students, parents, and community members. Methodology training and professional development is particularly important to build a solid teaching staff that effectively teaches language skills school wide.

Tribal language and culture issues were resolved by collaborative teams of teachers and language specialists and Tribal members who established a collective vision, participated in extensive professional development and combined reform programs that enhanced one another and improved the process of learning for students. More collaboration among teachers in regular classrooms and

language specialists would enhance infusion of language and culture into the curriculum and standards.

Substantially trained language teachers that can teach content areas were prioritized in a few schools. Training community members to become certified teachers is key to infusing and preserving Tribal languages. Regular classroom teachers also need professional development to facilitate understanding and knowledge about the student populations they teach. Process oriented and curriculum based models provided support and resources for teachers to integrate language and culture into classrooms and also extended learning outside the school and in the community. Without Tribal resources, it would be extremely difficult for schools to participate in language and culture classes. A few schools developed curriculum and standards for language and culture. Only a couple of schools assessed student learning for language and culture.

Language must be connected to relevant culture, social, economic, political and family contexts for students to excel in literacy, communication, and knowledge building tasks. Teachers struggled with adapting model materials and teaching styles to enhance students' diverse backgrounds and create relevancy between what they were learning and why it was important for them to learn it. Models were not easily adapted to these student populations and communities. The process oriented and curriculum based models targeted and embraced diverse populations and supported infusion of Tribal culture and language. The prescriptive models basically were receptive to utilizing a variety of resource materials to teach literacy and language skills, however, only a few teachers drew on culturally appropriate materials.

Combinations of reform programs, additional child development programs and services were essential to comprehensive improvement envisioned by schools and communities. Early childhood programs facilitated language preservation in schools. Several Tribal communities had established and some partnered with schools to provide social and academic programs that extended services in schools and Tribal agencies. Teen parenting services supported youth staying in school and going on to postsecondary institutions. Two schools provided substantial language and culture services through a 21st Century program.

Family and Community. Parent and community involvement is increasing in these communities in a variety of ways. Tribal members increasingly participated in leadership roles in schools. Teacher Education Program adult/students led ceremonial activities sponsored by schools. Schools effectively partnered with community and Tribal organizations to improve education. While all the models supported partnerships with parents and somewhat with the community and business, the process oriented and curriculum based models targeted partnerships supporting comprehensive reform efforts. Family and community members participated in numerous events that streamed across powwows, graduation banquets, learning expeditions, curriculum resource materials, language development and traditional culture. Many parents work as support staff in schools in the food service, transportation, tutors, custodial, teaching assistant, language specialist, truancy or security officers;

fewer were in administrative positions in schools. Community and family members were students in the teacher education program. Some parents were on the Board of Education and other advisory boards or task force committees.

School leaders, staff, students and families need to form strong unified groups to improve schools. Effective reform often requires more than one reform program. A combination of reform programs, additional child developmental programs and services were essential to the nature of comprehensive school reform.

Tribal communities responded positively and with resources when the partnership was mutually beneficial and when resources were available. Numerous outside agencies and organizations joined forces with schools to promote student achievement.

Schools effectively partnered with community and Tribal organizations and agencies to improve education. Child care centers, Head Start, Even Start, Early Childhood programs were essential to language preservation, language skills building in both English and Tribal languages, and providing critical services to children and families.

Schools continue to face challenges in this area largely because tensions still exist between teachers and parents. Parents are beginning to feel more comfortable in some schools. Some teachers were successful in bridging communication and collaboration issues with parents. Family Support Teams targeted attendance and behavior issues and parents actively participating in schools; yet parents were not particularly receptive to this strategy because it focused on problems stemming from families that negatively impacted behavior and attendance.

Parents generally were pleased with school reform efforts. Many more parents than were expected participated in a technology driven program. Parents liked the literacy focus in the CSRD programs because they see their students struggle and fail too often. Now, parents watch and participate in reading and math programs because they see the children's successes.

Effective comprehensive reform takes time, resources, and ongoing dedication, commitment and enthusiasm. Parents, community and schools can unite to provide important services and to improve student performance. Tribal communities need strong schools that can facilitate learning that meets the critical issues facing many reservations.

References

- Bureau of Indian Affairs Report*. (1997). BIA 1998 budget supports local tribal programs and education. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.doi.gov/bia/press/budget98.html/>
- Colorado State Statistical Data*. (2000). [On-line]. Available: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdedistrict/dist2035.htm/>
- Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Eisner, E.W. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. New York: Macmillan.
- Howe, K., & Eisenhart, M. (1990). Standards for qualitative (and quantitative) research: A prolegomenon. *Educational Researcher*, 19(4), 2–9.
- LeCompte, M.D., & Goertz, J.P. (1982). Problems of reliability and validity in ethnographic research. *Review of Educational Research*, 51, 31–60.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1996). *1995–96 Common core of data*. [On-line]. Available: <http://nces.ed.gov/>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1998). *1997–98 Common core of data*. [On-line]. Available: <http://nces.ed.gov/>
- North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission. (1999). *1993–97 Statistical report*. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.health.state.nd.us/ndiac/>
- North Dakota Department of Education. (2000). *Statistical data reports for Fort Totten School District profiles (1996–2000)*. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/dpi/index.htm/>
- OESE. (1998). *CSRD program description*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wolcott, H.F. (1994b). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Appendix

Case Study Survey Instruments

Native American Case Study School Background Information

Name of School: _____ Date: _____

Address: _____ Nearest urban center: _____
miles

Telephone #: _____ Fax #: _____ Email: _____

Principal: _____ Superintendent: _____

School Board Members: _____

Percentage of tribal members on school board _____%

Reform Model Data (Data Source): _____

School CSRD Coordinator: _____ State CSRD Coordinator: _____

School Reform Model: _____ Implementation of reform began in 19 ____

Number of teacher trainings to date: _____ Reform plan developed in 19 ____

Strategic Plan w/ timeline developed: 19 ____ Benchmarks developed in 19 ____

Number of new teachers since reform model implementation: _____ Grade level/s: _____

Number of new staff or resource personnel since reform model implementation: _____
Position/s: _____

Number of new administrators since reform model implementation: _____
Positions: _____

List any changes in school board membership since reform model implementation: _____

List any district resources applied to CSRD model implementation (i.e., professional development): _____

School Related Data (Data Source): _____

Total School Enrollment: _____ Enrollment by grades and number of classrooms by grade ():

PreKdG: ____ () Grade 4: ____ () Grade 9: ____ ()

Kdg: _____ () Grade 5: _____ () Grade 10: _____ ()
Grade 1: _____ () Grade 6: _____ () Grade 11: _____ ()
Grade 2: _____ () Grade 7: _____ () Grade 12: _____ ()
Grade 3: _____ () Grade 8: _____ () Special Ed: _____ ()

Percentage of pupils eligible for free and reduced lunch: _____ %

Ethnic representation of non-Indian students: _____ % _____ % _____ %

Average class size: _____ Average daily attendance percentage rate: _____ %

Per pupil expenditure: _____ Average pupil/teacher ratio: _____

Percentage of school budget supported by state aid: _____ %

Age of school building: _____ yrs.

Upgrading of facilities since reform plan implementation? Yes ____ No ____ Year: 19____

Feeder schools: _____

Mobility rate of students/families: _____ %

School completion rate (based on students beginning 9th grade, how many complete school): _____ %

List partnership programs or activities with feeder school teachers and administrators

Teacher Related Data (Data Source): _____

Number of professional staff: _____ Number of unlicensed support staff: _____

Average teacher salary: _____ Average years of teaching experience: _____

Average number of years teaching in tribal school communities: _____

Teacher turnover per year: _____ Number of Native American teachers: _____

District Related Data (Data Source): _____

Number of student enrollment: _____

Community Related Data (Data Source): _____

Population of community: _____ Percentage of non-Indian population: _____ %

Principal source(s) of employment income for general community (i.e., what jobs are available in their immediate community/or if they have to commute to other communities for employment):

Community services/resources: (i.e., library/health/college/safety/education/employment): _____

Urban relocation sites: _____

Tribal Related Data (Data Source): _____

Tribal affiliations represented by students: _____ Tribal enrollment: _____%

Tribal Council Members:

Tribal Offices/Departments:

Principal source(s) of revenue for Tribe (i.e., casino; natural resources):

Federally (state) recognized tribal status: Yes ____ No ____

Other sources of data available for this study: _____