The Change Puzzle

CHANGE IS COMPLEX

The Pathways Problem

What is Change?
- New materials
- New behavior / practices
- New beliefs / understanding

The Implementation Dip
Leading in a Culture of Change

The Complexity of Change
1. You can’t mandate what matters.
2. Change is a journey, not a blueprint.
3. Problems are our friends.
4. Vision and strategic planning come later.
5. Individualism and collectivism must have equal power.
6. Neither centralization nor decentralization works.
7. Connection with the wider environment is critical for success.
8. Every person is a change agent.

— Fullan, Change Forces, 1993

Eight Change Lessons from Change Forces With A Vengeance
1. Give up the idea that the pace of change will slow down.
2. Coherence making is a never-ending proposition and is everyone’s responsibility.
3. Changing context is the focus.
4. Premature clarity is a dangerous thing.
5. The public’s thirst for transparency is irreversible.
6. You can’t get large-scale reform through bottom-up strategies — but beware of the trap.
7. Mobilize the social attractors — moral purpose, quality relationships, quality knowledge.
8. Charismatic leadership is negatively associated with sustainability.

— Fullan, Change Forces, 2003

Brain Barriers
BB #1: Failure to see
BB #2: Failure to move
BB #3: Failure to finish

— Black & Gregersen, 2002

BB #1: Failure to See
- The comprehensiveness mistake.
- The ‘I get it’ mistake.
- Illuminate the right thing.

— Black & Gregersen, 2002

BB #2: Failure to Move
The clearer the new vision the more immobilized people become! Why?

— Black & Gregersen, 2002
Right Thing Poorly

The clearer the new vision, the easier it is for people to see all the specific ways in which they will be incompetent and look stupid. Many prefer to be *competent at the wrong thing than incompetent at the right thing.*

— Black & Gregersen, 2002

BB #3: Failure to Finish

People get tired.
People get lost.

— Black & Gregersen, 2002

Breaking Through Barriers

- Conceive
- Believe
- Achieve

— Black & Gregersen, 2002

At the beginning of the Change Process:

- The losses are tangible and specific
- The gains are theoretical and distant

Innovativeness not Innovation

The goal is not to manage innovations, but to become innovative.

— D. Green

Overload

Overload & Fragmentation = Incoherence & Confusion

Loss and Change

No one can resolve the crisis of reintegration on behalf of another. Every attempt to pre-empt conflict, argument or protest by rational planning, can only be abortive: however reasonable the proposed changes, the process of implementing them must still allow the impulse of rejection to play itself out. When those who have power to manipulate changes act as if they have only to explain, and when their explanations are not at once accepted, shrug off opposition as ignorance or prejudice, they express a profound contempt for the meaning of lives other than their own. For the reformers have already assimilated these changes to their purposes, and worked out a reformulation which makes sense to them, perhaps through months or years of analysis and debate. If they deny others the chance to do the same, they treat them as puppets dangling by the threads of their own conceptions.

— Peter Marris, 1975
LEADING IN A CULTURE OF CHANGE

Framework for Leadership

Leaders:

- Enthusiasm
- Moral Purpose
- Understanding Change
- Coherence Making
- Relationship Building
- Knowledge

Members:

Commitment
External / Internal

Results:

More good things happen, fewer bad things happen

— Fullan, Leading in a Culture of Change, 2001

Collins’ Hierarchy of Leadership

Level 5 □ Executive
(built enduring greatness)

Level 4 □ Effective Leader
(catalyzes commitment to vision and standards)

Level 3 □ Competent Manager
(organizes people toward objective)

Level 2 □ Contributing Team Member
(individual contribution to group objectives)

Level 1 □ Highly Capable Individual
(makes productive contributions)

— Collins, 2002
Collins’ Flywheel

Charismatic Leadership … is negatively associated with sustainability.

Sustaining Leaders Have … deep personal humility and intensive professional will.

— Collins, 2002
“When we face resistance to our ideas, most of us react with an assortment of ineffective approaches. These are our default positions.”

- use power
- manipulate those who oppose
- apply force of reason
- ignore resistance
- play off relationships
- make deals
- kill the messenger
- give in too soon

…and may often escalate and strengthen opposition to your goals

- they increase resistance
- the win might not be worth the cost
- they fail to create synergy
- they create fear and suspicion
- they separate us from others

Five Fundamental Touchstones

1. Maintain clear focus
   - keep both long and short view
   - persevere
2. Embrace resistance
   - counterintuitive response
   - understand voice of resistance
3. Respect those who resist
   - listen with interest
   - tell the truth
4. Relax
   - stay calm and stay engaged
   - know their intentions
5. Join with the resistance
   - begin together
   - change the game
   - find themes and possibilities

Consider strategies that incorporate most (or all) of the touchstones!
## Building Professional Learning Communities

### Forms of Teacher Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragmented Individualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Isolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ceiling to improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Protection from outside interference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Balkanization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>- City states</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Inconsistencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Loyalties and identities tied to a particular group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Whole is less than the sum of its parts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Collaborative Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>- Sharing, trust, support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Center to daily work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘Family’ structure may involve paternalistic or materialistic leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Joint work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continuous improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contrived Collegiality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>- Strategy for creating collegiality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Also strategy for containing and controlling it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Administrative procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Safe simulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Influences on School Capacity and School Student Achievement

**Student Achievement**

↑

**Instructional Quality**

Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment

↑

**School Capacity**

- Teachers' Knowledge, Skills, Dispositions
- Professional Community
- Program Coherence
- Technical Resources
- Principal Leadership

↑

**Policies & Programs on Professional Development**

— Newmann, King & Youngs, 2000

**School Capacity**
The collective power of the full staff to improve student achievement.

School capacity includes and requires:
- Knowledge, skills, dispositions of individuals
- Professional community
- Program coherence
- Technical resources
- Principal leadership

**Pedagogical and Assessment Literacy**

**Traditional Views**

Traditional views of assessment are rapidly changing …
Assessment Literacy

**Definition**

1. The ability to gather dependable student data.
2. Capacity to examine student data and make sense of it.
3. Ability to make changes in teaching and schools derived from those data.
4. Commitment to communicate effectively and engage in external assessment discussions.

Effective Schools

Effective schools are ones in which principals and teachers focus on student learning outcomes and link this information to improvements in teaching and learning strategies.

Three Patterns of Teaching Practice

1. Enacting traditions of practice
2. Lowering expectations and standards
3. Innovating to engage learners

--- McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001

Communities of Practice and the Work of High School Teachers

--- McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001

Creating Collaborative Cultures Helps Teachers

1. Build on existing expertise
2. Pool resources
3. Provide moral support
4. Create a climate of trust
5. Confront problems and celebrate successes
6. Deal with complex and unanticipated problems
7. Become empowered and assertive
8. Incorporate lateral accountability
Leading in a Culture of Change

Four Dimensions of Trust
1. Respect
2. Competence
3. Personal regard for others
4. Integrity

Organizational Consequences
1. Enables risk and effort
2. Facilitates problem-solving
3. Coordinates clear collective action
4. Sustains ethical and moral imperative

The 3 R’s of School Improvement

ROLE OF THE DISTRICT

School District Reform
Recreating a School System.
Letter off A, B, C, and the read the following:
• A B C - The District Context
• A - Instruction/Multistage Process (Lessons 1-2)
• B - Shared Expertise/Systemwide Improvement/Working Together (Lessons 3-5)
• C - Expectations/Collegiality (Lessons 6-7)

Explain your section to your partners.

Re-Creating a School System: Lessons 1-7
1. It is about instruction, and only instruction.
2. Instructional change is a long, multistage process.
3. Shared expertise is the driver of instructional change.
4. Focus on systemwide improvement.
5. Good ideas come from talented people working together.
6. Set clear expectations, then decentralize.
7. Collegiality, caring, respect.

— Elmore & Burney, 1999

— Bryk, 2002
The District Context

District 2 is one of thirty-two community school districts in New York City that have primary responsibility for elementary and middle schools. District 2 has twenty-four elementary schools, seven junior high or intermediate schools, and seventeen so-called Option Schools, which are alternative schools organized around themes with a variety of different grade configurations. District 2 has one of the most diverse student populations of any community district in the city. It includes some of the highest-priced residential and commercial real estate in the world, on the Upper East Side of Manhattan, and some of the most densely populated poorer communities in the city, in Chinatown in Lower Manhattan and in Hell’s Kitchen on the West Side. The student population of the district is twenty-two thousand, of whom about 29 percent are white, 14 percent black, about 22 percent Hispanic, about 34 percent Asian, and less than 1 percent Native American. About 20 percent of students use English as a second language, and recent immigrants have come from about one hundred different countries. About 50 percent of students come from families whose incomes are officially classified as below the poverty level; a slightly higher proportion of students in elementary schools are classified as poorer than in junior high schools. About two hundred students reside in temporary shelters, and about two thousand students receive special education services.

The proportion of students living in poverty is between 70 percent and 100 percent in fourteen of the district’s schools, with five of those schools having proportions of poor children between 95 percent and 100 percent. At the other extreme, nine schools have proportions of poverty at 25 percent or below. District 2 has a thriving, diverse, middle-class population of families who take public education seriously, but who are also willing to make financial sacrifices to send their children to readily available private schools if they find the quality of public schools lacking. Principals speak consistently of having to win the loyalty and allegiance of middle-class parents through providing high-quality education. The schools and classrooms of District 2 are a virtual United Nations of diversity (the UN is actually in the district); every school has substantial racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity, even when the student population is predominantly of one race or ethnicity. Most schools have substantial diversity of social class.

Anthony Alvarado became Superintendent of District 2 in 1987, after spending ten years as community superintendent in District 4, in Spanish Harlem, immediately adjacent to District 2 above Ninety-Sixth Street on the north, and after an eighteen-month stint as chancellor of the New York City public school system. Among Alvarado’s earliest initiatives in District 2 was to exercise a strong hand in personnel decisions. In his first year, he recruited and hired a deputy superintendent, Elaine Fink, whose experience and job description emphasized direct work with schools rather than central office administration. Later he hired Bea Johnstone, whose credentials were also primarily in work with schools, to oversee staff development. Alvarado communicated to principals early in his tenure that he expected them to play a strong role in instructional improvement in their schools.
“We expected principals to have a clear vision of what they wanted to have happen in teaching and learning in their schools and to be willing to question themselves and their capacity to deliver,”

Alvarado said. Some principals found Alvarado’s expectations congenial; others did not. Over the first four years of Alvarado’s tenure, he replaced twenty of the district’s thirty or so principals; most were “counseled out” and found jobs in other districts; three retired. At the same time he was exercising influence over the appointment of principals, Alvarado created seventeen Option Schools, small alternative programs with distinctive themes, and staffed them with “directors,” a title he had invented earlier in District 4, whose role is a hybrid of senior teacher and principal.

At the same time he was changing the leadership of District 2 schools, Alvarado was working on the transformation of the teaching force. District staff estimate that they have replaced about 50 percent of the district’s teachers in the eight years of Alvarado’s tenure. He communicated the expectation that principals and school directors were to take an active role evaluating teachers in their buildings, establishing networks with other principals and with higher education institutions to recruit student teachers and new teachers, and working with district personnel to ease the transition of ineffective teachers out of the district and prevent the transfer of ineffective teachers into the district.

Alvarado’s early personnel decisions at the level of the central office, school leadership, and the teaching force sent a strong signal that his priorities were focused on instructional improvement. These decisions also communicated that instructional improvement depends heavily on people’s talents and motivations. These combined efforts seem to have worked.

In 1987 Community School District 2 ranked tenth in the city in reading and fourth in mathematics out of thirty-two districts. In 1996, it ranked second in reading and second in mathematics. These gains occurred during a time in which the number of immigrant students in the district increased and the student population grew more linguistically diverse and economically poor. Many of the immigrants entering school came with less education and linguistic development than had previously been the case. Yet improvements in the quality of teaching have proved more powerful than these challenges to the achievement of students.

Over the eight years of Alvarado’s tenure in District 2, the district has evolved a strategy for the use of professional development to improve teaching and learning in schools. This strategy consists of a set of organizing principles about the process of systemic change and the role of professional development in that process; and a set of specific activities, or models of staff development, that focus on systemwide improvement of instruction.

Organizing Principles: Mobilizing People in the Service of Instructional Improvement

Central to Alvarado’s strategy in District 2 is the creation of a strong belief system, or a culture, of shared values around instructional improvement that binds the work of teachers and administrators into a coherent set of actions and programs. Like most other belief systems, this one is not written down, but it is expressed in the words and actions of people in the system. I have reduced this complex set of ideas to seven organizing principles that emerge from the ideas and actions of people in the district.
Lesson 1: It is about instruction, and only about instruction.
The central idea in District 2’s strategy is that the work of everyone in the system, from central office administrators to building principals, to teachers and support staff in schools, is about providing high-quality instruction to children. This principle permeates the language that the district leaders use to describe the purposes of their work, the way district staff manage their relationships with school staff, the way principals and school directors plan their own work, the way they interact with district staff, and the way professional development is organized and delivered. Most school systems purport to organize themselves to support good instruction; few carry this principle as far as does District 2.

Alvarado describes the district’s commitment to instruction in this way:

Our time is precious when we visit schools and when we work with people in schools. We try to communicate clearly to principals and school directors that we’re not interested in talking to them about getting their broken windows fixed or getting the custodians to clean the bathroom more often. Not that those things aren’t important, but there are ways of dealing with them that don’t involve our spending precious time that could be focused more productively on instruction. So when principals and school directors raise those issues with us, we say quite firmly that we’re there to talk about what they are doing specifically to help a given teacher to do a better job of teaching reading. We try to model with our words and behavior a consuming interest in teaching and learning, almost to the exclusion of everything else. And we expect principals to model the same behavior with the teachers in their schools.

Alvarado describes the genesis of this idea from his previous experience as community superintendent in District 4.

My strategy there was to make it possible for gifted and energetic people to create schools that represented their best ideas about teaching and learning and to let parents choose the schools that best matched their children’s interest. We generated a lot of interest and a lot of good programs. But the main flaw with that strategy was that it never reached every teacher in every classroom; it focused on those who showed energy and commitment to change. So after a while, improvement slowed as we ran out of energetic and committed people. Many of the programs became inward looking instead of trying to find new ways to do things. And it focused people’s attention on this or that “program” rather than on the broader problem of how to improve teaching and learning across the board. So when I moved to District 2, I was determined to push beyond the District 4 strategy and to focus more broadly on instructional improvement across the board, not just on the creation of alternative programs.
Lesson 2: Instructional change is a long, multistage process.

Teachers do not respond to simple exhortations to change their teaching, according to District 2 staff. Bea Johnstone, director of educational initiatives and coordinator of the district’s professional development activities, describes the process of instructional change as involving at least four distinct stages:

1. Awareness, which consists of providing teachers with access to books, outside experts, or example of practice in other settings as a way of demonstrating that it is possible to do things differently.

2. Planning, which consists of working with teachers to design curriculum and create a classroom environment supportive of that curriculum.

3. Implementation, which consists of trying out new approaches to teaching in a setting where teachers can be observed and can receive feedback.

4. Reflection, which consists of opportunities for teachers to reflect with other teachers and with outside experts on what worked and what did not when they tried new practices and to use that reflection to influence their practice.

At any given time, Johnstone says, groups of teachers are involved in different activities at different stages of development. They may be immersed in implementation and reflection in reading and literacy while they are in the early stages of awareness in math. Johnstone describes the process as a gradual softening up of the teachers’ preconceptions about what is possible, introducing new ideas in settings and from people who have credibility as practitioners, adapting new ideas to teachers’ existing practice under the watchful eye of someone who is a more accomplished practitioner, and reflecting on the problems posed by new practices with peers and experts. Hence the district’s strategy is to engage teachers and principals in a variety of instructional practices that move them through the stages of the process in different domains of practice.

Lesson 3: Shared expertise is the driver of instructional change.

The enemy of instructional improvement, according to District 2 staff, is isolation. Alvarado describes the problem this way:

There is a tendency for teachers and principals to get pulled down into all the reasons why it is impossible to do things differently in their particular setting – and there are lots of reasons why it is difficult. What we try to do is to get a pair of outside eyes, not involved in the maelstrom, to bring a fresh perspective to what’s going on in a given setting.
Shared expertise takes a number of forms in District 2. District staff regularly visit principals and teachers in schools and classrooms, as part of a formal evaluation process and an informal process of observation and advice. Within schools principals and teachers routinely engage in grade-level and cross-grade conferences on curriculum and teaching. Across schools principals and teachers regularly visit other schools and classrooms. At the district level staff development consultants regularly work with teachers in their classrooms. Teachers regularly work with teachers in other schools for extended periods of supervised practice. Teams of principals and teachers regularly work on districtwide curriculum and staff development issues. Principals regularly meet in each other’s schools and observe practice in those schools. Principals and teachers regularly visit schools and classrooms within and outside the district. And principals regularly work in pairs on common issues of instructional improvement in their schools. The underlying idea behind all these forms of interaction is that shared expertise is more likely to produce change in individuals working in isolation.

**Lesson 4: Focus on systemwide improvement.**

The enemy of systemic change, according to District 2 staff, is the “project.” Whether projects take the form of special programs for selected teachers and students or categorical activities focused on students with specific needs, they tend to isolate and balkanize new ideas. Systemic change in District 2 means operationally that every principal and every teacher is responsible for continuous instructional improvement in some key element of his or her work. Instructional improvement is not the responsibility of a select few who operate in isolation from others, but rather a joint, collegial responsibility of everyone in the system, working together in a variety of ways across all schools.

At the same time, District 2 staff recognize that change cannot occur in all dimensions of a person’s work simultaneously. So although they create the expectation that instructional improvement is everyone’s responsibility, they also focus improvement efforts on specific parts of the curriculum and specific dimensions of teaching practice.

District 2 staff do not say exactly what they regard as the ideal end state of systemic instructional improvement, but presumably it is not a stable condition in which everyone is doing some version of “best practice” in every content area in every classroom. Rather, the goal is probably something like a process of continuous improvement in every school, eventually reaching every classroom, in which principals and teachers routinely open up parts of their practice to observation by experts and colleagues, in which they see change in practice as a routine event, and where colleagues participate routinely in various forms of collaboration with other practitioners to examine and develop their practice. This is clearly not an end state in any static sense, but rather a process of continuous instructional improvement unfolding indefinitely over time.
Lesson 5: Good ideas come from talented people working together.

Alvarado says,

Eighty percent of what is going on now in the district I could never have conceived of when we started this effort. Our initial idea was to focus on getting good leadership into schools, so we recruited people as principals who we knew had a strong record of involvement in instruction, and we tried to create a lot of reinforcement for that by the way we organized around their work. Then we wanted to get an instructional sense to permeate the whole organization, so we said, “Let’s pick something we can all work on that has obvious relevance to our community and our kids.” So we settled on literacy. Since then, we’ve built out from that model largely by capitalizing on the initiative and energy of the people we’ve brought in. They produce a constant supply of new ideas that we try to support.

A focus on people working together to generate new ideas permeates the managerial language of District 2 staff. Alvarado’s descriptions of his and his staff’s work are peppered with examples of specific principals or schools that are either exceptional or in need of improvement in some respect, and the efforts district staff make to put the former together with the latter. He speaks with pride about gradually increasing control at the district and school levels over recruitment and assignment of teachers and deflecting the reassignment of teachers to District 2 who have been released from other districts. The district staff organizes its time around work with specific schools, based on its assessment of their unique problems, and often asks principals pointed questions about the progress of specific teachers within their schools. This emphasis on attracting, selecting, and managing talented people in relation to one another is the central tenet of District 2’s view of how improvement occurs.

Lesson 6: Set clear expectations, then decentralize.

District 2’s strategy emphasizes the creation of lateral networks among teachers and principals and the selection of people with a strong interest in instructional improvement. A corollary of these principles is the idea of setting clear expectations and then decentralizing responsibility. Each principal or school director prepared an annual statement of supervisory goals and objectives according to a plan set out by the district, and in the ensuing year each principal is usually visited formally twice by the deputy superintendent, Elaine Fink, and often by Alvarado himself. The conversation in these reviews turns on the school’s progress toward the objectives outlined in the principal’s or director’s plan. Over time schools have gained increasing authority over the district’s professional development budget, to the point where most of the funds now reside in the budgets of the schools.

Although Alvarado and the district staff generally favor decentralization, they are pragmatists. “If the teachers really own teaching and learning,” Alvarado says, “how will they really need or want to be involved in governance decisions? Our instincts are to push responsibility all the way down, but they may not want it, and it may get in the way of our broader goals of instructional improvement.”
Lesson 7: Collegiality, caring, and respect.

“Our vision of instruction improvement,” Alvarado says, “depends heavily on people being willing to take the initiative, to take risks, and to take responsibility for themselves, for students, and for each other. You get this kind of result only when people cultivate a deep personal and professional respect and caring for each other. We have set about finding and hiring like-minded people who are interested in making education work for kids. We care about and value each other, even when we disagree. Without collegiality on this level you can’t generate the level of enthusiasm, energy, and commitment we have.” According to Alvarado, “The worse part of bureaucracy is the dehumanization it brings. We try to communicate that professionalism, and working in a school system, is not a narrowed version of life; it is life itself, and it should take into account the full range of personal values and feelings that people have.”

Alvarado, Fink, and Johnstone articulate this broad conception of collegiality with extraordinary fervor. In their view, improvements in practice require exceptional personal commitment on the part of every person in the organization, not just to good instruction but also to meeting the basic needs of the human beings involved in creating good instruction – their need for personal identification with a common enterprise, their need for help and support in meshing their personal lives with the life of the organization in which they work, and their need to feel that they play a part in shaping the common purposes of the organization.

Alvarado worries that District 2’s approach to instructional improvement will be seen by outsiders as a collection of management principles rather than as a culture based on norms of commitment, mutual care, and concern. Implementing the principles without the culture, he argues, will not work because management alone cannot affect peoples’ deeply held values. He also worries that emphasizing managerial principles at the expense of organizational culture makes it appear that district administrators can change practice, when in fact the process of changing practice has to originate with teachers, students, administrators, and parents as they work out difficult problems together in a web of shared expectations. The effectiveness of district-level management, he argues, is determined by the level of commitment and mutual support among those responsible for instruction.
ROLE OF THE STATE

England - Literacy: Percentage Level 4 or Above

England - Numeracy: Percentage Level 4 or Above

— DfEE, England, 2002
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Michael Fullan

England: Distribution of LEA Results

Knowledge Rich/Poor


— Barber, 2002
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Instructional Continuum
- Transfer knowledge
- Imposed requirement
- Results driven
- False certainty
- Standardized scripts
- Deference to authority
- Intensive training
- Sects of performance

Performance Training Sects
- Transform knowledge
- Shared inquiry
- Evidence informed
- Situated certainty
- Local solutions
- Joint responsibility
- Continuous learning
- Communities of practice

Professional Learning Communities

Three Policy Sets

Three Policy Sets for Educational Transformation

Moral Purpose and Knowledge
- Policies re:
  - Curriculum
  - Student Assessment
  - Teacher Learning
- Policies re:
  - Individual Development of Teachers and Administrators
- Policies re:
  - Improving the Conditions of Work

Teacher Passion, Purpose & Capacity
-------------------------
Student Engagement & Learning

Ever increasing political and public commitment and investment

— Hargreaves, 2003

— Fullan, 2003
THE MORAL IMPERATIVE

Purpose: The Inner Core of Teaching

Write a personal statement trying to express what is at the heart of your life as a teacher. Consider the following questions (choose one or more in your freewrite). Verbally share your statement with a partner and discuss.

1. Why did I become a teacher?
2. What do I stand for as an educator?
3. What are the “gifts” that I bring to my work?
4. What do I want my legacy as an educator to be?
5. What can I do to “keep track of myself” — to remember my own heart


WORKSHEET — PURPOSE: FREEWRITE

<p>| | |</p>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Moral Imperative of School Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Making a Difference in Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Making a Difference Beyond the School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Making a Difference in the School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Making a Difference to Individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

— Fullan, 2003

### Hope

Hope is definitely not the same thing as optimism. It is not the conviction that something will turn out well, but the certainty that something makes sense, regardless of how it turns out. It is hope, above all, that gives us strength to live and to continually try new things, even in conditions that seem hopeless.

— Vaclav Havel
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Notes: