Higher Education and School Reform

Shirley M. Clark

The Review of Higher Education, Volume 17, Number 1, Fall 1993, pp. 1-20 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press
DOI: *https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.1993.0000*

The Review of Higher Education
Fall 1993, Volume 17, No. 1, pp. 1–20
 (ISSN 0162-5748)

Higher Education and School Reform

Shirley M. Clark

In recent years, and in particular over this past year, friends and detractors have asserted that the public's trust in higher education has been eroding and that something should be done. The reasons for this state of affairs include tuition increases, athletic scandals, inappropriate use of indirect costs, research fraud, faculty workload imbalance, inattention to undergraduates, and failure to connect the institution to important issues of the "outside world" such as the changing roles of schools. Derek Bok (1992) talked of this lack of connection at the 1992 National Conference of the AAHE when he claimed that only 22 percent of the universities and colleges of this country help the schools and their communities with school-based reform, in spite of perceptions that the level of entering students has deteriorated and that retention has seriously slipped. At the same conference, an exasperated Louis Harris said, "If we don't wake up and realize education is the heart of our society; and if educators don't take that case to the public and say, 'We represent the salvation of this society, and we have the guts to do what it takes to fix it,' then you deserve every fate that comes to you!" (1992, 5)

Shirley M. Clark is Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the Oregon State System of Higher Education and served as President of the Association for the Study of Higher Education during 1991–92. This essay was presented as her presidential address at the annual meeting of ASHE, October 1992, in Minneapolis. She thanks Holly Zanville, David Conley, Dale Hess, and Karin Hilgerson, all of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, and Edward Hines of Illinois State University, for ideas contributed to this essay.

Strong emotions and serious claims. How closely is the school related to the university? Why doesn't higher education play a more substantial and central role in educational reform? We are, after all, part of the same enterprise. These are questions that have intrigued me for a long time, first, as a sociologist of education and an admirer of the writings of Burton Clark, and second, as a system administrator who is trying to relate and mesh the responses of eight public higher education institutions with a specific reform movement in Oregon that is well into the formalization stage.

My remarks will be broken into three parts. Part 1 will focus on conditions triggering reforms, what the recent pattern of education reforms has been, and why reforms fail, only to return again and again. Part 2 will feature a case description of the current school reform movement in Oregon and higher education's response to it. In the third part I will review the inescapable relationship of exchange between the schools and higher education and suggest why education reform poses such a difficult challenge to our values and institutions.

SCHOOL REFORM: CYCLES, WAVES, AND SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Social historians of education allege that educational reformers have often had "cheerful amnesia and lack of balance" (Tyack, Kirst, and Hansot 1983, 476). Periodically and in cycles, people rediscover problems that are enduring and intractable over centuries: poverty, delinquency, inadequate preparation for work, and unresponsive, unchanging schools. Specific enthusiastic solutions are proposed with the zeal of television car salesmen; yet some of the solutions (in Oregon, work-based or career education) are recycled versions of earlier panaceas. But, as every reformer learns, change is very difficult. It truly is done school by school, classroom by classroom. Some accretive residue of change is left when disillusion sets in and interest diminishes; however, fundamental change of a more radical nature seldom results.

Reform movements in the United States may be divided into overlapping periods: the common school movement of the mid-1900s, the progressive era after the turn of the century, the reforms generated when the Soviets led the race into space, the relevancy reforms of the 1960s, and the successive waves of standards-raising efforts of the 1980s. Just as modern generations seem to be shorter (consisting of a decade or less), so also do reforms seem to be coming in shorter cycles or series of waves. By the way, this isn't an American exclusive; since the mid-1970s, nearly every region of the world has experienced educational reform in nations

of varying governance structures and development statuses (Ginsberg 1991).

The recent period of school reform has been generously described and analyzed (Bacharach 1990; Cuban 1990; Holtz et al. 1989; Kirst 1987; J. Murphy 1990; Sarason 1990; Schlechty 1990; Toch 1991). Only the past few years have provided sufficient perspective to let us make sense of what has been happening since 1983. In that year the National Commission on Excellence in Education released *A Nation at Risk* with its dramatic, cataclysmic language, connecting national economic impotence with the poor performance of our educational system. Report after report, and initiative upon initiative have used indices of school failure (declining or comparatively low achievement test scores) to explain declining United States productivity (see the index developed by Joseph Murphy 1990, 11–18).

This causal linkage between macro-level societal conditions and school outcomes continues to serve as the basic premise of reform in the most contemporary of reports. Two examples illustrate the point. The just-published 1992 report of the National Education Goals Panel states: "The nation's strength is rooted in its ability to compete economically, and its ability to perform economically is rooted in its educational system" (1992, xi). *America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages!* the basic blueprint for Oregon's school restructuring legislation, warns, "America is heading toward an economic cliff. We will no longer be able to put a higher proportion of our people to work to generate economic growth. If basic changes are not made, real wages will continue to fall, especially for the majority who do not graduate from four-year colleges. The gap between economic 'haves' and 'have nots' will widen still further and social tensions will deepen" (National Center 1990, 91).

Most analysts relate the start of the 1980s reforms not to professional educators, the professoriate, or the general public, but rather to spokespeople in the business community, the government (at national and state levels) and the media. The numerous reports and studies themselves have served as principal catalysts for educational change.

States have emerged as important actors in the reforms launched in the eighties, even though many of the reports have been sponsored by national commissions or nonstate organizations. "Now state government officials create education policies, and local groups react to them. Educators lost control of the state agenda quite a while ago," points out Michael Kirst (1987, 161). Reform mandates come from state legislatures acting as superschool boards telling the locals how to manage the schools (Underwood 1989). The federal interest in directing reforms seems to have receded in the Reagan era of decentralization and withdrawal of

interest from Congress and the courts. At the same time, as the states' share of funding of education increased from the 1970s forward, their interest in policy making, control, and accountability also increased. States, too, are associating their own economic viability and visions of their futures with the outcomes performance of their educational systems.

Three Waves of School Reform

The metaphoric language used by analysts to describe educational reform is rich in its imagery. Several analysts (Cuban 1990; Kirst 1990; J. Murphy 1990; Passow 1990) write about "waves" of reform in the 1980s, with Joseph Murphy dividing the reforms of the 1980s into three waves. He mixes the metaphor of waves with the metaphor of transportation (1990, 22). Wave 1 is captured in the phrase "fix the old clunker" (repair); Wave 2 is "get a new car" (restructure); Wave 3 is "rethink view of transportation" (redesign). The effect of the approach taken during Wave 1 was to generate widespread state-led initiatives to shore up the bureaucratic organization of the school and increase the supervision and evaluation of students and teachers. More testing, supervision, and evaluation of teachers, increased graduation requirements, and slightly lengthened time commitments for students resulted.

Wave 2 arose about three years after the first tidal wave had crashed in 1983, and lasted about three more years. By 1986, disillusionment and disenchantment with the effects of the first wave of reform were widespread. Myron Lieberman pronounced reform "dead on arrival" (1986, 20). Reformers argued that repairs to the system, although considerable in quantity, had been incremental and had left an outmoded structure in place. Optimism had been replaced with pessimism, and then again with optimism, as the new diagnosis of the problem focused on the redistribution and decentralization of power and on restructuring schools to emphasize professional rather than bureaucratic management. Specific initiatives were related to the professionalization of teaching, improvements in the work environment of teachers, experiments in school-based management, school choice proposals, and some equity-based programs for students.

Wave 2 probably ended about 1988 or 1989 and the third wave, that of rethinking and redesigning the system, is underway. SCANS, the Secretary of Labor's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills, established in 1990, has issued two reports, *What Work Requires of Schools* (1991) and *Learning a Living: A Blueprint for High Performance* (1992). The SCANS reports, quite predictably, are oriented toward preparing young people to succeed in a high-performance economy. They urge that specific workplace competencies become explicit objectives of instruc-

tion at all levels of schooling. Elementary and secondary education should be reinvented to facilitate student achievement of the goals established and monitored for the second year by President George Bush and the governors of the states. The SCANS reports propose that new techniques of educational assessment tied to learning goals, SCANS competencies, and more challenging curriculum content, should be devised. The structure of elementary and secondary education should be reordered around an internationally benchmarked Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) program to be achieved by age sixteen. A comprehensive system of technical and professional certificates and associates degrees should follow for the majority of students who do not pursue the baccalaureate degree (National Center 1990).

This current change model is more revolutionary and more comprehensive than those of the earlier 1980s. It also includes attention to major redesign of coordinated services for children and their families, through an integrated interorganizational, interprofessional service model.

Explaining the Recurring Nature of Reforms

How do we explain the recurring cycles or waves of educational reform in the schools? Analysts have paid more attention to explaining why reforms fail or even why some actually succeed than to explaining the recurring hydraulics of reform. Larry Cuban's (1990b) work is an exception. He begins with an explanation anchored in the rational model of organizational behavior and then offers two alternatives to broaden the analysis in areas where the rational explanation seems to come up short. Rational bases for change rely on determining what the problems are, devising correct solutions, and evaluating effectiveness. Rationalistic models of schooling and its management have been with us for a long time. They assume that policy makers who have both the knowledge and the technical expertise to solve problems are in control. Reforms return when this process fails.

Within the rational explanation, two images or metaphors are frequently used: the pendulum and the cycle. The two are closely related. The swing of a pendulum is started by an external force (the Soviets launching Sputnik, for example, or the recession of the early 1980s). There is ample evidence that liberal or conservative ideologies hold sway for about a decade and a half, and then change places (Schlesinger 1986). Applying the pendulum or two-cycle explanation to schooling is very common; to oversimplify, when conservative values are politically dominant in the larger society, school reforms are concerned with "excellence," high academic standards, orderliness, efficiency, productivity, and competitiveness. When liberal values dominate, school reforms advance

"equity," equal opportunities for minority, economically disadvantaged, and handicapped students and other groups, and the preparation of youth for work. However, this isn't exactly the way reforms have split in the recent waves. For different but convergent reasons, both liberals and conservatives have endorsed the effective schools movement and have advocated new programs for at-risk students.

Many issues that reappear in the guise of reforms are value conflicts, societal dilemmas, and sometimes national problems that prompt Americans to turn to their schools for help, e.g., inequitable income distribution, racism, drug addiction, environmental destruction, and economic losses to foreign markets. A national problem is announced and spread instantly by the media; schools are expected to come to the rescue. As Cuban puts it, waves of school reform keep reappearing because dominant social groups get public schools to work on national ills, rather than risking major dislocations in the society by addressing major social problems directly: "Policy makers turn religiously to school-based solutions for national problems," he says (1990b, 9).

An additional and, to a certain extent, alternative explanation is institutional. The public expects school organizations to be organized predictably and act according to expectations, functions, traditions, and rules that are widely understood (Meyer and Rowan 1978). The district has tightly coupled linkages to assure that teachers are properly credentialed, business practices follow rules of procedure, and graduates have earned the requisites to be admissible to the next level of schooling. However, classroom instruction (school life in the broader sense) is not tightly coupled to administration and policy making in the organization. Teachers have a great deal of discretion in curricular content and methods, and they can effectively stop reforms at the classroom door if they do not buy into them.

The genesis and path of reform movements, if not their recurring nature, have interested social philosophers and social change theorists since the 1800s. A social movement can be defined as a collective effort or enterprise seeking to bring about social change and establish a new order of thought and action, or to resist a change in the society or group of which it is a part (Blumer 1939; Turner and Killian 1972). They emerge during periods of unrest and dissatisfaction with some aspect of society and are motivated by hopes for change. As they develop, they evolve from an amorphous, unorganized state to acquire organization and form, customs and traditions, leadership, a division of labor, and a new way of thinking about things. Ultimately, this process of institutionalization leads to development of formal organizations and, potentially, to new social systems. They include the common school movement, the labor

movement, the civil rights movement, the women's movement, the peace and ecology movement, etc. They move forward on the basis of what Herbert Blumer (1939) calls "cultural drifts" that signify new values and entitlements. They elicit dissatisfactions where perhaps people had none except in vague and indefinite ways. (The women's movement is a good example of this kind of social movement.) There is also a growth in literature of the movement with expressions of protest or frustration and projections of a more utopian situation.

Stages of Social Movements. Successful social movements pass through four stages: social unrest or an unfocused restlessness, popular excitement, formalization, and institutionalization. In the first stage, people have a sense that something is wrong; and agitators (individuals, groups, or even "blue ribbon" study commissions) foster the contagion of excitement about a set of issues. With the second stage, unrest expands; people whose concerns are similar begin to establish rapport with each other and openly express those concerns. They form groups, acquire a collective identity, share a set of convictions about the rightness and importance of their purpose, and articulate a faith that the movement's goals can ultimately be attained. A philosophy develops along with emotional symbols, metaphors, and images for ready consumption. In its third stage, formalization, the movement organizes, creating rules, policies, and tactics; it works to influence centers of power. The organization and the establishment of programs, committees, and task forces keep members involved after the initial urgency has passed. Leadership changes perceptibly, from agitators, reformers, and prophets to statespeople, intellectual leaders, and strategists. Each has work to do. The statespeople and intellectual leaders keep the movement alive by attending to ideology, symbols, and slogans. The strategists work on procedures, tactics, and organization. The possibilities for movement breakdown are myriad since differences about how the movement should proceed and how fast, how radical its tactics should be, and what accommodations can be made are serious matters of consideration.

Followers, as well as leaders, must be attracted and committed to keep the movement going. Followers come in many categories: converts, passive adherents, fanatical "true believers," and adventurers who see opportunities to advance their own goals (Hoffer 1951). More recently, resource mobilization theory suggests that successful movements depend upon those who are already organized (e.g., state and federal agencies, the media, political leaders, and voluntary associations) and are often interconnected among themselves and their environment (Gamson 1975; Oberschall 1973; Rosenthal et al. 1985).

If adequate resources have been mobilized to assure survival, social movements reach their final stage, institutionalization. Integration is complete, goals have been secured. Some movements do not reach this stage; they dissipate or are quashed, go underground, or become dormant for a time. At the institutionalization stage, excitement fades while organization and structure endure. Of course, even failed movements may contribute to social change by forcing existing social structures to come to terms with their values, incorporating some of their features into existing programs and institutions. Third-party movements in American history have exemplified this phenomenon, and so have the educational reforms of earlier decades.

Parenthetically, I should interject here that reform movements are related to revolutionary movements but differ in the scope of their objectives. The reform movement accepts the basic tenets and moral aims of the social order and, in fact, uses them to criticize the very defects it is attacking. In contrast, the revolutionary movement seeks to reconstruct the social order and must operate outside the fold. The reform movement thereby has a claim on such social institutions as schools, churches, the press, government, voluntary associations, and the middle class to pursue desired changes that affirm the ideal values of the society.

Social Movements and School Reform. When these ideas about reform movements as social movements are applied to the first wave of the current reform series, they seem to make sense. The social unrest that launched *A Nation at Risk* in the early 1980s was fueled by reports of a long downward slide of achievement test scores, teacher competency issues, concerns about changing authority relations between adults and children/youth, and the rising costs of maintaining school systems, not to mention public unease about the economic ascendancy of other countries. As individuals, groups, and committees interested in initiating reforms of many kinds began to coalesce, they collected data, developed position statements in support of certain sets of recommendations, and disseminated their reports widely. With a few exceptions of reports expressing equity themes, the majority of the reports were similar in focus and change recommendations. Much more than in earlier education reform cycles, reformers used a literature consisting of elaborate, widely publicized, and broadly disseminated reports to build support for taking actions. Emotional symbols, metaphors, and images were used. The ominous, apocalyptic language in *A Nation at Risk* is a case in point.

The movement also showed considerable evidence of formalization and institutionalization. Most state legislatures approved reform packages and implemented them at least in the form of model, if not universal, programs. These enactments included testing programs, mandates raising

secondary school standards, and new strategies to professionalize teaching by moving to post-baccalaureate training programs and entry-level mentoring relationships. Established groups such as governors, legislatures, teachers' unions, citizens' leagues, business partnerships, philanthropic organizations, and, of course, higher education were among the resources mobilized on behalf of reform. The role played by higher education is illustrated by the founding and success of the Holmes Group Consortium of thirty-nine deans of education from some of the nation's leading universities and the on-going differences over approaches to teacher education. The dissenting position taken early by some member deans regarding "the demand for orthodoxy that seems to be expected of the Holmes Group" (Rodman 1986, 10) illustrates the variations among reform movement followers who are uncomfortable with specific ideologies.

As we all know, the first wave of reform in the 1980s crashed about three to four years after it crested. However, it left an important residue of legislative enactments at the state level and began changes in the teaching profession that are still in process. This wave particularly thrust governors forward in key reform leader roles, and it begged the question—yet to be answered—about the role of the U.S. government in establishing a national educational policy. Continued reform efforts have been slowed by the intractability of organizational structures and our limited ability to understand them, lack of public consensus on needed changes and how to achieve them, slow economic growth or recession, competing states' interests in other public services, and initiatives that limit the states' abilities to tax and spend.

THIRD-WAVE REFORMS: THE CASE OF OREGON

In July 1991 just days before adjourning, the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill 3565, the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century, otherwise known as the Katz bill, a bold, comprehensive redesign of K-12 education. One newspaper editorialized: "It was introduced, sponsored and bulldozed through by former House Speaker Vera Katz, D-Portland, whose current political ambition is to become mayor of Portland" ("Katz" 1991). In a legislative session heavily preoccupied with managing the first phase of effects of Measure 5, the voter-approved referendum of 1990 that limited property taxes and drew school support from the state's general fund (thereby diminishing resources for government services and higher education), HB 3565 passed quickly with an overwhelming majority vote. It was supported by the governor, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and speakers of both houses of the legislature. The dominant teachers' union neither supported nor opposed

it. It is not an exaggeration to say that under the agitating leadership of a strong advocate and her relatively small group of highly committed followers in and outside of the Oregon Department of Education who worked on successive drafts of the bill, the reform moved quickly from the first two stages of social unrest and popular excitement to formalization. In fact, there was neither much unrest nor excitement. The process occurred with such astonishing speed and comparative lack of conflict that, when the enactment became fait accompli, Oregonians asked themselves what happened.

HB 3565 had been preceded by some second-wave school restructuring legislation in the late 1980s, but none of those provisions led inevitably to HB 3565. Katz was in her tenth term in the Oregon House, a long-time power in the legislature while the Democrats held sway. She also had had a decade of leadership participation on national education commissions. This participation stimulated her strong support for changes in extending teacher education from four-year to post-baccalaureate programs in the Oregon State System of Higher Education, support that was translated into statutory requirements. She also proposed alternative certification programs. Katz's ideas meshed closely with those of the *American 2000* strategy (1991) and particularly with those of the National Center on Education and the Economy whose leaders were invited to address Oregon legislators on ideas set forth in *America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages!* (1990) in the course of legislative deliberations on HB 3565.

The *America 2000* strategy has four parts, envisioned as four giant trains moving swiftly along parallel tracks on the long journey toward educational excellence (1991, 2–3). The tracks are better and more accountable schools; the invention of a new generation of schools (535 by 1996 and thousands more by the year 2000); a nation of lifelong students replacing a nation at risk; and school-supporting communities. The six goals to be achieved by the year 2000 include: (1) all children will start school ready to learn; (2) the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent; (3) students will leave grades four, eight and twelve having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history, and geography; (4) United States students will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement; (5) every adult American will be a literate and competent citizen and worker; and (6) all schools will be free of drugs and violence and will offer an environment conducive to learning.

Two data-based reports, in 1991 and 1992, have been released on aggregate and state-by-state progress in building a nation of learners (National Education 1991, 1992). A variety of programs including "A+ for

Breaking the Mold" awards to be given frequently by Secretary Lamar Alexander to innovative schools that are working toward achievement of the six goals, and an America 2000 Library Partnership to support the goal of becoming a "nation of students" has been established ("Alexander" 1992).

America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages!, prepared by the National Center on Education and the Economy (1990, 4), asserts that America is making a choice for low wages. Unlike European and Asian countries, America does not insist that virtually all students stay in school and reach a high educational standard, provide "professionalized" education to noncollege bound students to prepare them for the trades and manage their school-to-work transition, operate comprehensive labor market systems, support company-based training through general revenue or payroll tax funding, or have a national consensus on moving to high productivity work organizations and high wage economies. The thesis of *America's Choice* is buttressed by Bureau of Labor Statistics data showing the majority of American families losing ground economically. Estimates of a skills shortage in the noncollege job sector stand at about 70 percent of the workforce, even though employers surveyed seem not to have grasped the situation (26).

Key to understanding the provisions of HB 3565 is the program structure that overlays and, in fundamental ways, changes elementary and secondary education. It subsumes education to about age sixteen and the completion of the traditional tenth grade into a Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) curriculum. As proposed, the CIM would be established nationally and benchmarked internationally. Completion of the CIM, intended for all students, would certify labor market readiness and mastery of the basic skills necessary for high productivity employment. It would have a new assessment system consisting of performance-based examinations to be taken at a student's own pace and spread over an extended time period. For students unable to achieve a CIM in the regular program, alternative youth centers of many models run by new local employment and training boards, would provide additional help toward the CIM, social services, counseling and job placement.

Beyond the CIM, the curriculum would split into two tracks (my term—the authors of *America's Choice* do not engage in philosophic discussion of curricular tracking but use *routes* or *sequences*). One track is called college preparatory and is little discussed in the report; the other is Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM) programs to be offered across the range of service and manufacturing occupations. The CAM could extend into associate degree programs offered by community colleges, proprietary schools, and other training institutions. These technical and

professional programs, open to students as soon as they finish the CIM and to adult workers, would meet standards established by industry and trade-based committees. A cohesive system pulling the combined work and study programs together under the new standards, taking responsibility for school and youth center-to-work transition, managing labor market information and counseling services, and coordinating placement and other existing programs would be under the purview of local employment and training boards. Parallel coordinative structures would be established at state and national levels. Altogether, the proposed seamless system would aim to make skills upgrading for the majority of workers a central thrust of public policy.

The Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century follows the *America 2000* and *America's Choice* models very closely toward the goal of producing a restructured educational system. It includes provisions for early childhood education and services to young children and their families, nongraded primary school programs, an extended school year, integrated health and social services at the school site, modification of the structure of the school day and methods of instruction, school choice plans, school site committees, performance-based assessment strategies, development of applied academics, establishment of the CIM and the CAM program structures, alternative learning centers, and new employment-related roles for school counselors. The projected time frame for the restructuring began with the 1991–93 biennium and the initiation of planning processes. By the 1997–98 school year the last of the major curricular innovations (the CAMs) are to be in place. Over the six-year period, a variety of programs will be phased in. The lengthened school year, to 220 days in 2010, is the last in the sequence of mandated innovations to be implemented.

To put flesh on the statutory framework, ten citizen task forces established and led by the State Board of Education have been at work since the fall of 1991 under the guidance of a 21st Century Schools Council. This council presented draft reports to the Board of Education in August 1992 and another to the legislature in January 1993. Each report, consisting of process, proposals, and recommendations, is more or less controversial. Among the most controversial is the report of the task force on the CAM. I'll suggest why later. But first it is important to consider the legislatively expected role of higher education in the reform.

The Role of Higher Education in HB 3565

In the formal sense with few exceptions, higher education's role is implicit rather than explicit. Explicitly, there is inclusion of higher education (one seat) on the 21st Century Schools Council, the steering

mechanism. Higher education faculty are among other groups to be consulted about developmentally appropriate models for nongraded primary programs. The State Board of Higher Education is among other groups to be consulted about rules governing the education of minors who have not obtained the CIM and the CAM and who wish to be employed during the school year. The Chancellor of the Oregon State System of Higher Education (OSSHE) has a seat on the Workforce Quality Council, established separately from HB 3565 to coordinate employment-related training, education, and placement services. The OSSHE, along with the other two public education sectors, is charged with developing education and training programs for two-year to five-year academic professional technical endorsements and associate degrees. Importantly, the State Board of Higher Education must be consulted about requirements established by the State Board of Education for the college preparatory endorsement. And the State Board of Higher Education, in consultation with other agencies, is required to develop programs of research, teacher and administrator preparation, and continuing professional development that are responsive to the needs of the educational system and related to the goals of the act.

A relatively modest appropriation of state funds was made in support of this extremely ambitious set of reforms. In addition, the Department of Education assigned twenty staff members to spend a significant portion of their time on the planning effort. Grants of $5,000 to $10,000 were awarded to nine schools to develop nongraded primary pilot programs. Eighteen grants (from Perkins Act funds)[1] were made to professional technical consortia to enhance and implement tech/prep associate degree programs that had begun after 1986 with earlier Perkins allocations. A statewide professional development center for school improvement, to be set up by two educational service districts, has been funded for one year; and an assessment network of seven schools has been established to develop models appropriate to the CIM. Statewide broadcasts over Oregon ED-NET, the new educational telecommunications system, began in the fall of 1992, describing components of the reform strategy to school communities throughout the state.

Higher education, which received no appropriation in support of the legislation, has received support from Department of Education-directed

[1]The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act of 1990 (P.L. 101–392) is a federal funding program that allocates money to the states in support of the integration of academic and vocational education, the development of tech-prep programs and other linkages between secondary and postsecondary programs, and the development of program performance measures.

funds to develop and conduct inservice training programs for professional technical instructors and counselors. Although the OSSHE was required to plan for a budget reduction of about 10.5 percent for the 1991–93 biennium and has planned another 20 percent budget reduction for 1993–95 (the second of three phases of the unmitigated impact of Measure 5 on public higher education), all major state actors including the governor and key legislative committees have expected higher education to be responsive to the reform agenda, make and implement plans in cooperation with the Department of Education, and undertake adjustments as needed internally to support the new goals.

There were, and continue to be, widely divergent opinions within higher education about major aspects of the reform design. Differences concern the strong emphasis on students' need to make early career decisions related to program choices within the CAM, the emphasis on preparation for work rather than on other goals of education, and the bifurcated structure of the CAM programs. Still, OSSHE officially supported the reform legislation before and after its enactment based on a primary concern with higher student performance.

Public higher education is contributing in a number of ways. These include the application of about $1 million dollars obtained through campus program closures, administrative reorganizations and other budget reductions during the first phase of Measure 5 planning, to programs and projects related directly to the school reform agenda. Programs include the reinstatement of revised vocational teacher education and school counseling programs at one institution. Projects include nine campus-based but collaboratively structured partnerships with schools and/or community colleges to advance different aspects of the reform agenda, from applied academics to accelerated college entry to articulated 2 + 2 professional technical programs, as examples. We have established a committee to study applied academics, devised a process to bring discipline-based faculty together from across sectors to evaluate the appropriateness of new applied academics courses in meeting college entrance requirements, and obtained approval from the Board of Higher Education to take a flexible approach to admissions requirements as Oregon high schools implement new curricula.

With the assistance of the Department of Education and the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, OSSHE recently completed four large-sample studies of teacher and counselor staffing trends, the job-seeking experiences of recently licensed educators, and the nature of the reserve pool of educators with active licenses. The reference point for each survey is the state of preparedness of Oregon's professional educators to meet the demands of restructured schools. State System officers

meet regularly with the six deans and directors of OSSHE's schools of education to align teacher, counselor, and administrator preparation programs with the reform agenda via a new coordinated plan of preparation programs approved by the Board of Higher Education in July 1992. We are also exploring new ways to relate strengths of schools of education to reform needs such as a new vision of the school as a lead social agency in the community.

The reform legislation and the stringent resource constraints, politics, and financing that follow in the wake of Measure 5, have brought many key actors to a convergent conclusion: that curricula and student flow must be better articulated from level to level and across sectors. This is the "seamless" educational system goal heard repeatedly in the rhetoric of reform. The Chancellor of the State System, the Commissioner of the Community Colleges, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the governor have fostered this perspective.

In April 1991, by executive order, the governor directed the two boards of education to meet more frequently, more substantively, and less ceremonially on issues that overlap their separate board authorizations. This vehicle, known as the Joint Boards of Education, has become a primary arena for coordinating staff work on cross-sector issues related to the reform agenda. The Joint Boards established a Joint Articulation Commission that has taken up the work of two previous cross-sector committees with a new mandate and a new set of actors. The primary focus of the commission is on issues that cross the boundaries of the community colleges and the four-year institutions, e.g., preparation requirements, transfer, common course numbering, curricular sequencing, and faculty interactions.

Prospects for Sustaining This Reform Movement

Where are we now? What are some of the fault lines? And what are the prospects for sustaining this reform movement? Clearly, the state of Oregon has made a major investment in support of the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century, not so much in funds but in the commitment of influential stakeholders to plan and implement lasting change. However, the Measure 5 environment seriously threatens the ability of schools to overhaul curricula at all levels, to establish early childhood and alternative programs, to hire more counselors and teachers, to develop whole new modes of assessment, to significantly lengthen the school year, and to support other innovations. Experience with past reform efforts suggests that significant curriculum redevelopment requires substantial resources, testing, and research programs to support it. Relatedly,

resources for professional development of staff will be essential to support lasting change.

Skeptics' concerns about nature of this reform, whether it amounts to tracking or not, have not been resolved or even adequately addressed. If reforms do indeed proceed by stages, then this reform probably moved to the stage of formalization too quickly; unresolved criticisms in the background may now threaten the basic design. The dominant teachers' union, the Oregon Education Association, may introduce legislation in the 1993 session to greatly alter the present reform design.[2] This reform is much more a top-down than a grass-roots initiated movement in Oregon. It will be necessary for the movement to gather more converts, adherents, true believers, and resource mobilizers if it is to go beyond the planning and pilot site phases to broad-based implementation. Higher education faculty and administrators are concerned about the decidedly vocational emphasis of the proposed CAM. In the CAM, college preparation appears to be a by-product of early preparation for work, and occupationally specific work at that. Whether families and communities support reform directions is difficult to determine, since little of the reform has emerged at local school and classroom levels.

Conversely, if one weighs other indicators, the chances of success for the reform seem promising. It is closely patterned after national proposals that are inspiring similar designs across the country in states such as Colorado, South Carolina, and Maine. There is strong legislative and gubernatorial support for the general goals of the reform. Expectations for its success are high. Key education sector leaders back the reform goals, advocate publicly for change, and have organized lean resources to support the process.

Only time will tell whether this reform movement will complete its mission and realize its dream, or whether the "frustration [that] is the fate of all social movements" (Wilson 1973, 360) will also be its epitaph.

SCHOOL REFORM MOVEMENTS: THE CHALLENGE OF RESPONSE

Why is it so difficult for higher education to respond to school reform movements when, increasingly, it would seem in our best interests

[2]The Oregon Education Association prepared proposed legislation that would have modified the reform framework and threatened the CAM programs structure in particular; however, the OEA did not vigorously advocate for its amending legislation. The Oregon legislature continued to support the goals of school reform during the 1993 session, even though it ultimately allocated only modest funds for further development of the reform designs and cut state support of schools by 10 percent.

to be responsive? This is a question for which I have no answers, only thoughts to move the discussion along.

Public schools and higher education are inextricably linked; each is highly dependent upon and affected by the other. To use Burton Clark's metaphor, the relationship is a two-way street (1985, 1, 290). An upward flow of students who are prepared, oriented, and certified enters the college or university. The school shapes the human resources that enter higher education—either well or poorly. The traffic flowing the other way, from the university to the school, consists of two major vehicles of influence. One is professional personnel who are selected, trained, socialized, and certified as teachers, counselors, administrators, or other specialists. The other vehicle is curricular: the university sets preparation requirements for admission which in turn influence what teachers teach and what schools offer. Each of these social institutions thus has tremendous power over the other. Inadequately prepared teachers cannot meet the challenges of increasingly diverse student bodies and international achievement benchmarks. Inadequately prepared students force the university curriculum to begin at subcollegiate levels, waste scarce resources, and extend time to graduation.

One response to school-university mismatches is shared responsibility for problems and collaborative approaches to solving them. Old ways of solving mismatch problems don't seem to work very well. Because of pressures on access and lack of curricular tracks or streams in United States schools (at least until the *America's Choice* designs are implemented), higher education finds it difficult to exclude poorly prepared students, although community colleges play an important remedial and filtering role in the management of access. And higher education in the United States is not as tightly coupled to secondary education philosophically and organizationally as is the case in many other countries. Rather, the tight coupling here is downward between secondary and elementary schools. So one reason for higher education's tempered response to school reform lies in the recognition that there are real limits to the influence higher education can bring to bear because of structural cut-offs between sectors. There seems to be strong anticipation that business/industry will play a larger role in educational reform in the future because the "third wave" of reform in the 1980s and early 1990s is clearly worker-preparation related. If so, business/industry might play a brokering role among the educational sectors and levels.

Collaborative reform activities initiated by schools, by state departments of education, or by colleges and universities are one mechanism for bridging the chasms among sectors and levels. They appear to be on the rise and flourishing to the point where national networks have been

formed to bring partnerships into communication with each other (Goodlad 1990). They exist in a great variety of forms, often have philanthropic or legislative support, and have tremendous potential for overcoming a legacy of mistrust (Greenberg 1991). Even with all the good press surrounding the explosion of school/college collaborations, higher education is often viewed as the prickly partner, given more to rhetoric than action, making a marginal commitment, and not rewarding faculty for participation (Hawthorne and Zusman 1992).

In addition to structural separation and obstacles to easy partnerships with schools on reform activities, it may be that higher education's general disinterest in or disdain of sweeping social movements precludes full participation in school reform. Faculty are socialized to be skeptical of utopian solutions to complex problems; they do not make good "true believers." Further, they saw some key reforms of the 1980s as essentially political and even contrary to research and theory, e.g., attributing the economic woes of the country to the educational system (House 1991). When reforms are not based on research or theory but on preferred solutions of people in power, faculty are left in the uncomfortable position of doing reactive research to support the solutions chosen.

We must remember, however, that performance in schools is extremely important to the performance of higher education, and both are important to society in ways that include preparation for work and extend far beyond it. As members of an organization in decline (Cameron and Tschirhart 1992) we in higher education need to pursue offensive and creative strategies to maintain the integrity of our enterprise in an increasingly difficult environment of diminished resources, competition, and shaky public confidence. A more proactive approach to school reform reflects enlightened self-interest. It enables higher education to have voice and credibility as it rides the inevitably recurring waves of public concern about school reform.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Alexander Announces New 'A+ for Breaking the Mold' Award." *America 2000 Newsletter* 36 (7 September 1992): 1.

America 2000: An Education Strategy. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1991.

Bacharach, Samuel B., ed. *Education Reform: Making Sense of It All*. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1990. His essay, with the same title as the book, is on pp. 1–6; his second essay is "Putting It All Together," 415–30.

Blumer, Herbert. "Social Movements." In *Principles of Sociology*, edited by Alfred McClung Lee. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1939.

Bok, Derek. "Reclaiming the Public Trust." *Change* (July/August 1992): 13–19.

Cameron, Kim S., and Mary Tschirhart. "Postindustrial Environments and Organizational Effectiveness in Colleges and Universities." *Journal of Higher Education* 63 (January-February 1992): 87–108.

Clark, Burton R., ed. *The School and the University.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.

Cuban, Larry. "Cycles of History: Equity versus Excellence." In Bacharach, 1990a, 135–40.

———. "Reforming Again, Again, and Again." *Educational Researcher* 19 (January-February 1990b): 3–13.

Gamson, William. *The Strategy of Social Protest.* Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1975.

Ginsburg, Mark B., ed. *Understanding Educational Reform in Global Context: Economy, Ideology, and the State.* New York: Garland Publishing Company, 1991.

Goodlad, John T. "School-University Partnerships: Fundamental Concepts." *Educational Perspectives* 27 (Summer 1990): 2–6.

Greenberg, Arthur R. *High School-College Partnerships: Models, Programs, and Issues.* 1991 ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, No. 5. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University/School of Education and Human Development, 1991.

Harris, Louis. "Seeing Ourselves As Others See Us." *AAHE Bulletin* 44 (June 1992): 3–7.

Hawthorne, Elizabeth M., and Ami Zusman. "The Role of State Departments of Education in School/College Collaborations." *Journal of Higher Education* 63 (July/August 1992): 418–40.

Hoffer, Eric. *The True Believer.* New York: Mentor Books, 1951.

Holtz, Harvey, Irvin Marcus, Jim Dougherty, Judy Michaels, and Rick Peduzzi, eds. *Education and the American Dream: Conservatives, Liberals, and Radicals Debate the Future of Education.* Granby, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey Publishers, 1989.

House, Ernest. "Big Policy, Little Policy." *Educational Researcher* 20 (June-July 1991): 21–26.

"Katz Bill Finale." Editorial, *Register-Guard* (Eugene, Oregon), 6 July 1991.

Kirst, Michael W. "The Crash of the First Wave." In Bacharach 1985, 20–29.

———. *Evaluating State Education Reforms: A Special Legislative Report.* Denver, Colo.: National Conference of State Legislatures, 1987.

Lieberman, Myron. "Why Reform Was 'Dead on Arrival.' " *Education Week* 5, no. 20 (29 January, 1986): 20.

Meyer, John, and Brian Rowan. "The Structure of Educational Organizations." In *Environments and Organizations,* edited by John Meyer and W. Richard Scott. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Murphy, Joseph, ed. *The Educational Reform Movement of the 1980s.* Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1990.

National Center on Education and the Economy. *America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages!* Rochester, N.Y.: National Center on Education and the Economy, 1990.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative of Educational Reform.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.

National Education Goals Panel. *The National Education Goals Report 1991: Building a Nation of Learners.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Goals Panel, 1992.

Oberschall, Anthony. *Social Conflict and Social Movements.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Passow, A. Harry. "How It Happened, Wave by Wave." In Bacharach 1985, 10–19.

Rodman, Blake. "Dissent Emerges Within Holmes Group." *Education Week* 5, no. 19 (January 22, 1986): 10.

Rosenthal, Naomi, Meryl Fingrudt, Michelle Ethier, Roberta Kurant, and David McDonald. "Social Movements and Network Analysis: A Case Study of Nineteenth-Century Women's Reform in New York State." *American Journal of Sociology* 90 (March 1985): 1022–54.

Sarason, Seymour B. *The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990.

Schlechty, Phillip C. *Schools for the Twenty-First Century.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990.

Schlesinger, Arthur M. *The Cycles of American History.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1986.

Secretary of Labor's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS). *What Work Requires of Schools.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, July 1991.

Secretary of Labor's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS). *Learning a Living: A Blueprint for High Performance.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, April 1992.

Toch, Thomas. *In the Name of Excellence.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Turner, Ralph, and Lewis Killian. *Collective Behavior.* 2d ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Tyack, David, Michael Kirst, and Elisabeth Hansot. "Educational Reform: Retrospect and Prospect." In *The Dynamics of Organizational Change in Education,* edited by J. Victor Baldridge and Terrence Deal, 473–90. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1983.

Underwood, J. "State Legislative Responses to Educational Reform Literature." In *Recent Advances in Educational Administration,* edited by Linda S. Lotto and Paul W. Thurston. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 1989.

Wilson, John. *Introduction to Social Movements.* New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973.