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ABSTRACT

My paper details a Change Leadership Plan (CLP) for a school with the fictitious name of Bimmer Elementary School (BME). My study's purpose is to enhance student learning by collaborating with staff to explore ways to maximize time-on-task (TOT) for all subjects. Currently BME has a reading achievement problem and is using pull-out programs for 4th and 5th grade students that take needed instructional time from core academic programs. I used Wagner's As-Is and To-Be charts (see Appendix A) for BME to identify and present the current status and future desired state of the school's culture, context, conditions, and competencies. Finally, through my research I examined alternative strategies to the pull-out approach and developed planning steps to achieve the desired changes.
PREFACE

Having completed this study in change leadership, I have learned two significant leadership lessons. First, this study allowed me to work with others in establishing a better way to meet the needs of students who are in need of remediation. I based this change leadership plan on my previous program evaluation, which showed that students who were receiving remediation were missing valuable time-on-task (TOT) in core academic subjects. I also believe that I have increased my capacity as an instructional leader. Throughout this journey, I have been able to work with teachers to develop different ways to remediate students in need. My data analysis indicated that the current programs that were in place at my school were not working. Teachers did not feel pulling out students was helping students increase reading proficiency. As a leader, I have learned that educating students is a top priority that comes with many challenges. The education world changes and we, as educators, must acknowledge and be able to look for ways to help all our students become proficient readers and succeed in any learning endeavor.
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SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

My school, Bimmer Elementary School (pseudonym), is using a pull-out program for reading instruction to meet the special reading needs of some of our students in third through fifth grades. With common core fast approaching and more challenging tests by subject areas being planned, elementary teachers need to become more knowledgeable and skillful to prepare students for these higher expectations. At my school we implemented a departmentalization strategy for our fifth grade team called collaborative specialization to help address this need. However, whatever we do will have less than the needed impact if many of our students are pulled from core classes like math, science, and social studies for 30 minutes of reading intervention three to four days a week. Change is needed, but such a change must include the support of the administrative team and teaching staff. The focus of my study is on potential alternative strategies to the pull-out approach and a related collaborative change process.

During the 2012-2013 school year, students in third through fifth grade took the FCAT. In order for students to meet high standards, they had to score a level three, four, or five. Sixty-one percent of students in third through fifth grade met high standards in reading. This number is a decrease of 7% from the previous year. Math had 58% of the students scoring at a level three, four, or five. Math also had a decline of 7% of students meeting high standards. In the 2011-2012 school year, the percentage of students making learning gains in reading was 73 and increased by 1% the following school year. Math on the other hand decreased by 19%, dropping from 84% in 2012 to 65% in 2013.
Rationale

Students entering fifth grade have shown over the past 3 years a decline in mathematics skills. Sad to say, it is becoming common to see students who are at a kindergarten or first grade math achievement level in a fifth grade classroom trying to learn how to rename fractions with unlike denominators when they cannot even borrow. For instance in 2012, I had about four students out of 21 who did not know how to subtract, borrow, multiply, divide, or estimate. During the 2011-12 school year, I had nine students who lacked prerequisite skills required to master fifth grade concepts. This current year, that number of students who are deficient in math skills has more than doubled.

In addition, science benchmark results over the past 3 years indicate that students at the beginning of the year (as a grade level) scored 0% on target. The science FCAT assesses student knowledge of benchmarks covered not only in fifth grade, but those in third and fourth grade. However, students are not recalling past skills that were taught and therefore, fifth grade teachers must review and reteach those benchmark skills so the students learn the required skills assessed on the state science test.

Bimmer Elementary (BME) has had a real concern for reading and has made important efforts to address the problem. However, there has been an adverse effect on other subject areas because students are being pulled to receive reading instruction. The students are missing time on task (TOT) in the areas of math, science, and social studies.

As a current fifth grade math and science teacher, I see how the current schedule is not meeting the needs of our students. For example, I have a total of four students in the morning and three students in the afternoon who are being pulled to receive reading instruction and consequently miss TOT in the subjects of math and science. More
importantly, they are unable to sit with me and receive small group instruction. Those students being pulled for reading services received a level one or two on the FCAT the previous year. Sadly, the same students who are getting pulled for reading services are also the ones who are scoring at level 1 and 2” on FCAT math. Additionally, I have eight students who get pulled eight times a month for prime time math class (math enrichment) and miss science class. Every fifth grade class has a scenario similar to the one I described. As a result, students are missing valuable instructional TOT with grade level content and are failing to stay abreast with their grade level benchmarks.

**Goals**

The purpose of my study is to enhance student learning in all areas by collaborating with staff in exploring ways to maximize TOT for all subjects taught at the 4th and 5th grade levels. My school has recognized a real concern for reading achievement and therefore, they have built pull-out programs based on student needs. Although, state and district requirements also influenced this pull-out strategy, the state demands the districts to provide more time to teach reading and math for students who are showing deficiencies. However, the current pull-out strategy has taken time from math, science, and social studies for some students and our FCAT scores in science and math indicate a decrease in student performance.

I believe we need to look at options, including the possible restructuring of the current pull-out program for addressing the reading issue while providing sufficient time to meet students’ instructional needs in all other subject areas. Having students stay in math, science, and social studies will increase their chances of mastering content since they will have more TOT in those subject areas. The current schedule reduces their chances to master
the new content being presented in the other subjects since students are not present for 30 minutes of the lessons.

**Research Questions**

My primary research questions are:

1. What change plan can I establish to address higher common core learning expectations for 4th and 5th grade students when competing for TOT to address required reading needs and the learning needs in all their other academic areas?

2. What are the attitudes of the 4th and 5th grade teachers at my school toward change?

3. Would they be willing to become a pilot learning community to study the pullout program for meeting critical reading learning needs and explore alternative program solutions to such students' loss of TOT in other important academic areas?

My secondary questions are:

1. What are the attitudes of the 4th and 5th grade teachers about the impact of the reading pull-out program regarding the loss TOT by these students in other academic areas?

2. What are their attitudes regarding the reading pull-out program from special areas (art, music, math lab, science lab) regarding their TOT in other academic areas?

3. What other alternative strategies or programs might they recommend to teach students in need of reading instruction while maximizing their TOT for all other academic subjects?
Demographics

BME is a Title I school located in the southwest learning community of Orange County near an amusement park. Currently, BME serves kindergarten to fifth grade with a voluntary pre-kindergarten program starting next school year. BME has a population of over 1,000 students. Of those 1,000 plus students, 167 of them are fifth grade students. About 34% of these students receive services that require them to be pulled from their core academic classes. BME has a high poverty rate with over 78% of our students receiving free or reduced priced lunch. Moreover, the school is very racially diverse with a high number of English language learners (ELL). To be more specific, 75 students in fifth grade are ELL. Therefore, 45% of the students in fifth grade are learning English as their second language. The fifth grade is comprised of 42% girls and 58% boys. Exceptional student education (ESE) population for the fifth grade is at 24%. The fifth grade’s demographics are as follows: 25% Caucasian, 51% Hispanic, 14% African-American, 1% Asian, and 9% is comprised of other ethnic groups.

Analyzing the 4 year history of fifth grade students at BME was revealing. The past 3 years of data revealed that meeting high standards for reading had been declining until this past year. During the 2009-2010 school year, 69% of BME fifth grade students were meeting state high standards. Meeting high standards on the state FCAT is defined as receiving a score of a three, four, or five. The following school year, 2010- 2011, the percent of students meeting high standards fell six percentage points to 63. The following school year, 2011-2012, that number once again fell to 60% of fifth grade students meeting high standards in reading. Last year, the number of students meeting high standards rose 10 percentage points, from 60 to 70%. During that school year, I conducted a study (Program
Evaluation Project) of the implementation of a collaborative specialization model of instruction along with two pull-out programs for reading to help find some alternative to the latter.

The data for math on the other hand, tells a different story. During the 2009-2010 school year, 58% of fifth graders were meeting high standards. The following school year, that number rose by seven percentage points to 65% of fifth graders meeting high standards. During the 2011-2012 school year, the percent of students meeting high standards went up again by two percentage points. However, last year our students meeting high standards in math declined by five percentage points to 63 students receiving a level three, four, or five on the FCAT.

Science test results from the past four years showed a steady increase in students meeting high standards. During the 2009-2010 school year, 36% of the students met high standards. The next school year, that number rose to 31%. In 2011-2012, science scores once again increased. Our results indicated an 11% increase, resulting in 50% of our fifth grade students meeting high standards in science. Last school year, the results were by far the best we have seen in 4 years, 64% of our students meeting high standards.

Although the data above show improvements for FCAT reading and science, if you assess just the students who were receiving interventions and missing instruction in math, science, and social studies, the data appears vastly different. When examining the 56 students who received reading interventions, the number of students meeting high standards in reading who previously scored at a level one or two went from 0 to 34%. These students were receiving the required 90 minute reading block with an additional 30 to 45 minute block of a reading pull-out program a day. Although the pull-out program was able to raise
achievement (FCAT scores) for 34% of the students, 66% of the students once again received a level one or two on the standardized test.

When examining math and science scores carefully, out of the 11 students who were pulled from science instruction for reading intervention, only one student passed the science portion of the FCAT with a level three (9%). Of the 45 students who were being pulled during math instruction, only 40% of the students scored a three or higher on the math portion of the FCAT. Furthermore, of those same 45 students who were being pulled during math instruction, 15 students went down one level or more on their exam. Therefore, the pull-out program did have an adverse effect on the students who were missing TOT in science and math.

**Conclusion**

In order to solve this problem, I believe that students need to be provided with the opportunity to have sufficient TOT for all subjects in order to make academic gains. Part of my change process would be to work with others in identifying optional solutions that start with what is being done now and exploring new strategies. One possibility is to pull students from special area classes (art, music, math lab, and science lab) and explore the impact for all students. This is the same concept that is being used in the district’s middle schools. When students receive a level one or two on the FCAT, they receive remediation courses. Middle school schedules are different from the elementary schools since they are fully departmentalized. Students have a total of six classes, two of which are elective courses. When students score at a level one or two on the FCAT reading or math, students are required to take a remedial course for that subject. As a result, some students may have two reading blocks and/or two math blocks and do not have the option to take an elective. This
same concept could be implemented in the elementary school. However, keeping with state mandates, students are required to go to physical education classes to meet the minimum number of minutes per week required. This presents a scheduling challenge. Another time scheduling problem is trying to minimize instructional interruptions for other academic classes.
SECTION TWO: ASSESSING THE 4 CS (AS-IS)

Using Wagner et al. (2006), I created As-Is and To-Be charts (see Appendix A) for my school. Wagner’s 4 Cs change model for organizational renewal has helped me see the greatest challenge the fifth grade team is facing when trying to improve student achievement. The 4 Cs in Wagner’s change model refers to: (a) conditions, (b) competencies, (c) culture, and (d) context. By exploring the 4 Cs individually, I was able to pinpoint individual areas of my school’s practices that must be altered to meet better the needs of all students at BME. Applying the 4 Cs framework described in Wagner’s (2006) text has helped guide my examination of all areas of my school’s practice.

Context

Context as defined by Wagner et al. (2006) refers to the skill demands all students must meet to succeed and related concerns of the family and community the school serves. Additionally, context refers to the larger organizational system within work, informal and formal (Wagner et al., 2006). The context at BME includes a high poverty rate with a racially diverse group of students as noted earlier. The school has been classified as Title I for the past 3 school years. During the 2012-2013 school year, all students were eligible to receive free breakfast due to our high number of students who were classified to receive free or reduced price lunches. If the school would have had 80% or higher of its students eligible for the program, the students not only would have been eligible for free breakfast, but also free lunch. Additionally, our students have low proficiency levels when entering the next grade level. More specifically, we have a total of 55 of our 5th grade students getting corrective reading services during the day. As a result of the pull-out and scheduling issues,
students are missing an average of 150 minutes of instruction time in their core classes during the week.

Many of the parents of those students being pulled out have multiple jobs and many are unable to support their children’s educational needs. In addition, parents work schedules are barriers because they are unable to attend parent nights or conferences since they must work. Many parents do not have the knowledge or the education needed to help their children. The traditional two-parent home is not considered the norm. The home environment of our students at BME has changed within the past few years from a two parent home to a single parent raising the children. According to a study on American adolescents, youth spend about 5% of their time with their parents (Wagner et al., 2006). BME also is a bilingual center for Spanish speakers. As a result, students who arrive at BME often lack parental support at home due to language barriers. The mobility rate at BME is extremely high compared to neighboring schools. Within a month, I could see two or more students withdraw and about the same number enter.

Culture

Wagner et al. (2006) defined culture as the shared values, beliefs, assumptions, behaviors, and the quality of relationships within and beyond the school. The culture within BME is very unsettling. The scheduling structure of my school lends itself to isolation within grade levels as well as inadequate relationships between grade levels and throughout the building. My school, like others facing all of today’s higher learning expectations, has placed a greater emphasis on accountability, which has resulted in unclear priorities since everything is considered important. There is no impactful communication or collaboration within grade levels. More specifically, the fifth grade team itself also is divided greatly due
to differences of interests and opinions that need to be addressed in a professional, collaborative way. During the fifth grade professional learning community (PLC), the team does not discuss student data or desegregate data to see how students are improving. Instead, the 45 minutes is used for technical items that could be accomplished via e-mail.

Throughout the school teachers compete to see who has the best test scores and data results, which I believe stems, in part, from the performance appraisal and compensation policies. Teachers generally share ideas and activities with the same persons over time and have limited time to collaborate with others, including parents, for the benefit of all students. There is a lack of group thinking where teachers share student needs and solutions with all other teachers on their teams (not just a select one or two) and to accept personal responsibility to do their part to contribute to the success of students. In my opinion this lack of collaboration and group thinking as has led to blame shifting.

The administrator turnover also has increased teacher anxiousness since each new administrator has new ideas and priorities. The turnover and related circumstances even has contributed to teacher distrust in the administration to develop. Lastly, while administrators have an open door policy where they are always willing to listen to frustrations and solutions, they are often diverted by other priorities they cannot ignore resulting in limited or no follow-through.

Conditions

The conditions among the different grade levels at BME are very similar to other schools. Conditions are defined as “the external architecture surrounding student learning, the tangible arrangements of time, space, and resources” (Wagner et al., 2006, p. 101). Currently, collaboration among all teachers within each grade level is minimal on lessons
being taught, which in part, is a structural and scheduling condition. Students are pulled continuously for reading tutoring; ESE for needs, such as occupational therapy, speech, vision; English Language Learners and enrichment (prime time). In all cases these students are missing core academic instruction. As a result, when the students return to the classroom, they are completely lost and unable to catch up. Moreover, students’ needs are not being paired with teacher competencies. Instead, students are being placed in classrooms according to how many students are in a particular class and by gender.

Given the heavy priority placed on reading, more time and other resources are being allocated for it. Currently, there are limited resources in math for underperforming students. Additionally, some teachers resist change, rising from a lack of confidence in new approaches. There are problems sometimes when teachers are not open to new ideas or when team members think too much alike. Furthermore, teachers’ planning time often is used to address important non-instructional issues, leaving insufficient time for teachers to collaborate and plan regarding student learning. Insufficient time for implementing the numerous initiatives is another reality at BME. Also, there are some team members with different levels and types of knowledge of subject areas and limited, if any, interest in teaching all assigned subjects.

**Competencies**

The last of the 4 Cs is competencies. Wagner et al. (2006) described competencies as “the repertoire of skills and knowledge that influences student learning” (p. 99). The staff and administration at BME, as in many other schools, have insufficient collaboration skills. However, my school is very fortunate to have teachers who are well educated and very passionate about their profession. As previously mentioned, however, teachers are not
allotted enough time to reflect, grow, identify needs, and develop and implement solutions. This in part is due to the numerous initiatives that are being implemented at once, which leave teachers unfocused and uncertain of what the priorities truly are. Additionally, some teachers lack planning and problem solving skills, particularly with respect to integrating data in order to identify student needs. The data need to be deconstructed into skills, not benchmarks, so the teachers are capable of gaining a clearer vision of the students’ needs.

Conclusion

In my earlier PEP study, I discovered some problems with the implementation of collaborative specialization in the fifth grade department during the 2012-2013 school year at BME. First and foremost, there was a lack of a sense of urgency about the structural issue of scheduling classes to ensure sufficient time for math, science, and other subjects because of the understandable emphasis on reading. Out of a sense of concern for students with special needs at BME, some students pulled out of core subjects for reading instruction lacked sufficient TOT in the other areas. Those students were missing about 30 minutes of instructional time due to being pulled for reading and in other instances for ESE and ELL instruction as well. The subject areas that are impacted most are math and science since students are pulled from them in most instances to attend reading intervention. All students are required by law to have a 90 minute reading block, which cannot be interrupted and therefore have to be pulled during the other subject areas.
SECTION THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

My year-two change plan research focused on student placement and scheduling. Additionally, I also took a deeper look into teacher collaboration and its role in and impact on student achievement and student behavior. I used qualitative data in order to collect the necessary information on how BME scheduled and placed students and what level of team collaborating was being done. The purpose of my study was to enhance student learning by collaborating with staff in exploring ways to maximize TOT for all subjects taught at the 4th and 5th grade levels. To meet this purpose, I used a collaborative approach to determine a sustainable strategy or optional strategies.

Participants

I selected students, teachers, and administrators to survey. The student sample included all incoming fourth and fifth graders who were attending BME during the 2013-2014 school year. The teachers who participated in the study were eight fifth grade teachers and eight fourth grade teachers. I also asked resource teachers associated with the pull-out or push-in model of instruction to participate in this study. Furthermore, there were three school administrators overseeing the pull-out interventions.

Data Gathering Techniques

This study involved the utilization of various types of data. Each of the data types in this study was essential to determine the results. I thought it was vital that I collect and analyze the data in a manner that would allow for a more meaningful interpretation of the results gathered. I used the results to determine the staff’s attitudes regarding the loss of instructional time resulting from the reading pull-out program. I explored the current
achievement results for reading, math, and science, alternatives to the pull-out strategy for teaching reading, and staff readiness for change.

**Surveys**

I conducted surveys using a Likert scale and open-ended questions to seek specific responses to teachers’ views on change, possible alternatives to the pull-out and push-in programs, and ideas on how to develop a change plan to implement these improvement strategies. Teachers responded to two surveys during the school year, one at the beginning of the year and the other at the end (see Appendix D). I surveyed the principal and assistant principals twice during the school year (see Appendix E). I conducted teacher and administrator surveys through printed surveys.

**Data Analysis Techniques**

I analyzed the data using different techniques. I coded the surveys as well as tallied the surveys according to the responses for each question. I organized the surveys by theme in order to analyze responses by participants.

**Ethical Considerations**

I treated all of the participants in accordance with the ethical guidelines of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), the American Psychological Association (APA), and National-Louis University’s (NLU) Instructional Review Research Board (IRRB). Although there were no identifiable risks involved for participating in this research study, I acknowledged a couple of considerations when dealing with all participants. First, I surveyed the teachers about their experiences with the pull-out program. Therefore, all participants communicated about their experiences with it. Secondly, I realized the possibility that teachers might feel hesitant to share their personal
perceptions and true feelings about structure changes, thus I assured them of their anonymity. Thirdly, I thought teachers might feel uncomfortable and reluctant to change and I was honest with them in sharing my change goal.

All participants completed the participation consent forms as required (see Appendices G and H). Participation was strictly voluntary and participants could withdraw at any time. I took the necessary steps to ensure confidentiality at all times. I have kept the results of my study in a secure file in my home as well as in a password protected file on my personal laptop. I kept all information and data collected in strict confidentiality in order to protect the identity of all participants.

I was faithful to all of these considerations during the study. I took every caution to ensure that all participants were safe, comfortable, and had the freedom to participate or withdraw. I adhered to all the ethical standards of the AERA during the conduction of this research study.

**Conclusion**

It was critical that I conduct my change leadership plan using the above procedures to ensure I reached the end results ethically and appropriately. This study required significant input from all the stakeholders involved. Therefore, it was important that I allow all stakeholders the opportunity to voice their opinions and comments. The purpose of the data collection process was to receive feedback on the positive and negative impact of the pull-out and push-in programs in relation to teacher instructional time and student achievement.
SECTION FOUR: RELEVANT LITERATURE

Introduction

How can teachers support struggling readers to meet the challenges they face on a daily basis within a regular education classroom? Across the United States, school districts have been exploring how to meet efficiently and effectively the needs of their at-risk readers (Bower, 2008). The outcomes of their decisions in many cases revolve around implementing a pull-out reading intervention program (Bower, 2008). Pull-out programs are interventions that remove students from their mainstream classroom in order to assist them toward reaching their expected level of proficiency.

Response to Intervention/Multi-Tiered Systems of Support

With the recent revision of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 2004, there has been a move toward the Response to Intervention (RtI) model or as it is now being called, the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS). IDEA is a law that ensures specific services for children with disabilities throughout our country. IDEA determines how states and public agencies provide early intervention, special education, and other related services to individuals with disabilities. The RtI model has become a customary organizational design for schools across my school district. This model is being used currently for screening, identifying, and placement of students for intervention (see Figure 1). As Kame'enui (2007) stated, RtI schools will limit the over-labeling of students as well as problems associated with the over placement of students into the special education system. Experts believe the RtI design will help lessen the load on the ESE classrooms that currently serve struggling readers who have no learning disability (Montgomery, 2006).
Figure 1. Multi-Level Prevention System. Adapted from “Essential Components of RTI - A Closer Look at Response to Intervention” by the National Center on Response to Intervention, 2013.

According to the National Center on Response to Intervention (2013), RtI is a multi-level prevention system that includes three levels of intensity or prevention for students (see Figure 2). The primary prevention level includes “high quality core instruction. [The secondary level includes] evidence-based intervention(s) of moderate intensity. [The tertiary prevention level includes] individualized intervention(s) of increased intensity for students who show minimal response to secondary prevention” (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2013, “RTI Employs a Multi-Level Prevention System”).
The RtI model combines progress monitoring that is individualized to meet student needs with a research-based intervention program provided within the classroom (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2013). The goal of RtI is to reduce the number of students who are being labeled as having a learning disability, when in actuality the student may be just simply struggling with no actual disability (Richards, Leafstedt, & Gerber, 2006). Early identification and prevention programs offered through RtI are designed to reduce reading problems by 70% in the primary grades. These findings are a support for reading instruction of students in the general education classroom (Montgomery, 2006).

RtI is a three-tiered approach to instruction and classification of students (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2013). Tier one is a representation of all general education students who receive core classroom instruction. Instruction is differentiated and
strategies and materials are utilized that are scientifically research-based to meet all student needs. Assessment, monitoring, and interventions are all facilitated through the general education teacher. If students are in need of interventions at the tier one level, the general education teacher is expected to assist students through small group instruction, differentiated instruction, or one-on-one assistance (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2013).

Tier two is represented by students in the classroom who need modifications and accommodations (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2013). Therefore, the classroom teacher uses supplemental materials to further assist students with content. At this level, interventions may occur in or outside of the general education classroom. Progress monitoring of these students occurs more frequently (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2013).

The last tier, tier three, is described as students needing instruction that is intense and continuous (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2013). According to the RtI model, this can occur within the classroom by having another teacher “push-in” to give instruction or outside of the classroom where a group of students who are at the same level receive specialized help. During tier three interventions, students are to receive targeted instruction for a minimum of two 30-minute sessions every week for 9 to twelve weeks. Tier two and three are very similar, the only major difference is that during tier three interventions, the lessons are intensified, focused, frequent, and longer in length (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2013).

**Pull-Out vs. Push-In Intervention Program**

The pull-out and push-in models of instruction are seen as tier two and tier three levels of support for students who are struggling. In a pull-out program model, students
receive additional support in reading outside of their classroom. During the 2012 school year at BME, there were two reading pull-out teachers, who served the fifth grade students. These teachers used two different programs for interventions. One program that is used currently at BME is *Tucker Signing Strategies for Reading*. Tucker Signing provides students with mental models to decode words easily, accurately, and fast. The students are required to learn 44 hand signs that prompt associations between letters or word chunks and their sounds. As a result, when a student comes across a letter or a combination of letters, he or she will make a sign, and say the sound at the same time.

The second program that BME uses is called Corrective Reading. Corrective Reading is a program designed for students in third or higher who are reading below grade level. This program promotes reading accuracy in decoding, fluency, and comprehension. The program is comprised of four levels of instruction that address students' decoding skills. Additionally, there are six levels that address students' comprehension skills. The program lessons are compiled sequential and scripted for the teacher. At my current school, the Corrective Reading program is implemented in a whole group format since students are ability grouped. Students meet with their corrective reading teacher for 45 minute lessons four times a week. Before starting the interventions, the reading intervention teachers will test students who scored a level one or two on the FCAT reading portion of the test in order to know where students should be placed.

All students who are being pulled for reading intervention are classified as being at a tier two or three in the RtI process. Therefore, students are being pulled vertically and horizontally in order to be placed in one of these intervention groups. However, students who are being pulled are away daily from their general education teacher for approximately
30 to 45 minutes four to five times a week. Those students who receive services are grouped with students who are classified in the same tier and reading level. The scheduled time for pull-out reading instruction must be consecutive and without interruption. Therefore, students usually are pulled for reading intervention during their math and or science class.

The push-in intervention program is the opposite of the pull-out. Students in this model receive additional assistance from another teacher who will come into the regular classroom to work with a student or small group. At my school, the push-in model of instruction was implemented within the first couple of weeks of school. However, students were distracted with what the whole class was doing and therefore, the push-in teacher decided it was best to have students meet in her room.

The focus of my project is change – a change to continue to meet the reading needs of students who need it, but minimize the impact on the TOT in the core subjects of science, math, and social studies. Kotter (2002) described eight critical steps in the change process. I decided to focus on the first four steps through this study by (1) increasing the sense of staff urgency by focusing on student results in losing TOT in selected academic areas and developing staff interest in change to enhance instruction, (2) building a team of teachers to explore the pull-out program through this study and beyond, (3) creating a joint compelling vision of a pull-out program alternative, and (4) developing a clear message of the needs and alternatives to all staff and beyond.

Wagner et al. (2006) stated that a successful leadership transformation requires sharpening capacities within individuals and the organization. Leaders need to see more clearly why it is so hard for organizations and individuals to change. “Leaders must learn how to take action effectively to help our organizations actually become what they need and
want to be” (Wagner et al., 2006, p. xvi). Leaders need to take action to help individuals become the persons we want them to be in order to serve our communities effectively.

Wagner created a 4Cs diagnostic tool to help instructional leaders identify and diagnose some of the key factors that influence the problems within a school or district (Wagner et al., 2006, pp. 107-109). I also used Wagner’s 4Cs, as a way to communicate important issues the school must consider in this study -- the context (what students need to learn), culture (the attitudes and expectations of staff toward the importance of TOT for all subjects and student learning needs), conditions (the student learning schedule and the reading pull-out program’s impact on TOT in other academic areas, and needing sufficient learning time in all subjects), and competencies (the capacity to create new strategies for creating needed TOT through alternative scheduling strategies to better use the capabilities of all staff to enhance learning for all students).

Heifetz, Linskey, and Grawshow (2009) stated, “The most common cause of failure in leadership is produced by treating adaptive challenges as if they were technical problems” (p. 19). Changing schedules to better meet the needs of students is a technical problem. However, changing attitudes about change and culture are adaptive. In order to make changes, it is important to ‘step on the balcony’ (Heifetz et al., 2009) and see how the organization would respond before trying to make changes. Therefore, as part of my change process, I made sure that all stakeholders realized the urgency for the change in order for true change to take place within the organization by securing the staff’s attention to the need and identifying their potential responses.

Adaptation takes time. “To practice adaptive leadership, you have to take time to think through your interpretation of what you observe, before jumping into action” (Heifetz
et al., 2009, p. 34). According to Heifetz et al. (2009), one of the most common failures is to ignore human complexities when trying to lead an adaptive change. “By identifying your stakeholders’ strongest values, the things they care most about, you may be able to find another way for the resisters among them to serve those values than opposing your proposed change” (Heifetz et al., 2009, p. 92).

Since the subject of my change was lost time from the pull-out program, it is important to examine it in more detail. In a 1992 study, Gelzheiser, Meyers, and Pruzek compared the pull-in and pull-out approaches to delivering reading services to elementary special education and remedial students. Six elementary schools were selected for this study: two urban, two suburban, and two rural. All schools were located in the Greater Capital District of New York. A total of 47 students were observed and followed. Pull-in and pull-out programs were implemented in all schools in grades two through five (Gelzheiser et al., 1992).

The authors concluded that students in pull-in programs did not differ from students in pull-out programs in gains in reading comprehension (Gelzheiser et al., 1992). Pull-in and pull-out approaches did not differ in total time devoted to reading instruction each week, but there were differences in time spent on non-reading activities. Time spent on reading and non-reading activities did not predict reading achievement (Gelzheiser et al., 1992). While there is little research on the impact of these approaches on reading, I know from personal experience that time spent on other subjects is lost. My concern is the latter and its impact on student learning.
Conclusion

Not enough research has been conducted on the benefits or problems of having intervention pull-out programs for students. However, it is easy to see there is a negative impact on student achievement when students are missing core academic classes. In fact, my previous PEP study found students missing up to 150 minutes per week from their core academic subjects and losing ground in math and science achievement as measured by state testing results. Therefore, having students pulled-out of other subject areas to get intensive reading instruction is not the answer in closing the achievement gaps that low performing students are facing.

Dole (2004) found limited success in Title 1 schools where reading specialist worked with remedial readers primarily in a pull-out setting. As I noted previously, the focus of my study was on the models for change of Kotter (2002) and Wagner et al. (2006). I focused on Kotter’s building a sense of urgency, establishing a change team, creating a vision, and developing a clear message and alternative strategies. I also used Wagner et al.’s seven practices for system change and how it forces individuals to look at their whole organization in order to locate the areas of needs, create a sense of urgency, and engage others to join the cause. In other words, both Kotter and Wagner et al. stated very similar ideas – without a compelling, urgent need, staff engagement, a clear vision, and some choices of direction, adaptive and meaningful change is not possible.
SECTION FIVE: DATA ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION

Findings

The purpose of my study was to enhance student learning in all subjects by collaborating with the staff to explore ways to maximize TOT for all subjects taught at the 4th and 5th grade levels. BME recognized the concern for reading achievement and therefore chose to implement pull-out programs based on student needs. However, the current pull-out strategy has taken time from math, science, and social studies for some students. As a result, the FCAT scores over the past 2 years have shown a decrease in student performance in science and math.

I strongly believe we need to look at options, including the possible restructuring of the current pull-out program, for addressing the reading issue, while providing sufficient time to meet students’ instructional needs in all other subject areas. Providing students with the time needed on task in math, science, and social studies will increase students’ chances of mastering content in those subjects since they will have the opportunity to receive the full time allotted in those areas without getting pulled. The current schedule does not work in our students’ best learning interests. It reduces their chances to master the new content being presented in these other subjects since students are being removed for 30 to 45 minutes per day of the lessons being taught.

I used a combination of instruments to collect and analyze the research questions presented in this study. I compiled qualitative and quantitative data in order to review the effectiveness of the pull-out program. I used my findings of the study to answer the following research questions:
Primary Questions:

1. What change plan can I establish to address higher common core learning expectations for 4th and 5th grade students when competing for time on task (TOT) to address required reading needs and the learning needs in all their other academic areas?

2. What are the attitudes of the 4th and 5th grade teachers at my school toward change?

3. Would they be willing to become a pilot learning community to study the pullout program for meeting critical reading learning needs and explore alternative program solutions to such students’ loss of TOT in other important academic areas?

Secondary Questions:

1. What are the attitudes of the 4th and 5th grade teachers about the impact of the reading pull-out program regarding the loss TOT by these students in other academic areas?

2. What are their attitudes regarding the reading pull-out program from special areas (art, music, math lab, science lab) regarding their TOT in other academic areas?

3. What other alternative strategies or programs might they recommend to teach students in need of reading instruction while maximizing their TOT for all other academic subjects?
Surveys

I distributed two surveys throughout the school year to fourth and fifth grade teachers as well as to resource teachers at BME. I used the surveys to see the impact of the pull-out and push-in program. Although I asked 17 teachers to participate in this study as well as eight fourth grade teachers, eight fifth grade teachers, and one resource teacher, only 10 teachers actually responded to the survey 1: one resource teacher, five fourth grade teachers and four fifth grade teachers, for a response rate of 59%. For survey 2, of the 10 participants originally surveyed, only six were returned to me for a response rate of 60%. The other teachers opted not to participate for personal reasons not associated with the research project.

I distributed the first survey (Appendix D) to the teachers on February 19, 2013 along with a consent form. This survey consisted of six questions. I coded the teachers’ responses to reveal themes and patterns within each question. According to Table 1, all participants in the study stated they were not satisfied with the pull-out program (survey question #1). Sixty percent disagreed with the statement that they were satisfied with the pull-out program. Furthermore, 40% felt neutral about the pull-out program.

Table 1

Participants' Response Pattern Regarding Satisfaction with Pull-Out Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Number</th>
<th>Code Description</th>
<th>Number of participants who reported this</th>
<th>Which participants reported this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>B, C, D, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6 (60%)</td>
<td>A, E, G, H, I, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement two of the survey was used to ask participants if they believed the pull-out program had improved their students’ academic work, meaning the reading instruction from the pull-out program had helped improve their work in math, science, and social studies.

Table 2 below shows how the participants ranked the success of their students due to the pull-out program. One participant (10%) agreed that she believed that the pull-out program had improved the students’ grades, scores on tests, and general academic performance. Fifty percent of the participants were neutral as to whether their students had improved because of the pull-out program. Furthermore, 40% of the teachers surveyed disagreed or strongly disagreed that the pull-out program made a positive impact on their students’ academic success in their class.

Table 2

*Participants' Response Pattern Whether Pull-Out Improved Student's Academic Work*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants' Response Pattern</th>
<th>Code Number</th>
<th>Code Description</th>
<th>Number of participants who reported this</th>
<th>Which participants reported this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>A, D, C, E, F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>G, J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>H, I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 indicates how participants felt about the pull-out program supporting their instruction in science, math, and social studies (survey question #3). Three participants (30%) stated they agree that the pull-out program does indeed support what they are doing in their classroom. One participant (10%) felt neutral about the statement, while 60% had a negative opinion. When delving deeply into each participant’s response, it was interesting to note that all fifth grade teachers who participated *strongly disagreed or disagreed* with the
pull-out program supporting their instruction in math, science, and social studies.

Meanwhile, almost all fourth grade teachers had the opposite opinion.

Table 3

Participants' Response Pattern Whether Pull-Out Supports Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants' Response Pattern</th>
<th>Code Number</th>
<th>Code Description</th>
<th>Number of participants who reported this</th>
<th>Which participants reported this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>B, C, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>B, C, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>A, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>F, G, I, J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement four of the survey had participants rank using the Likert scale their attitude on the following statement: My students used the reading strategies they have learned from the pull-out/push-in programs in my class. Of the 10 teachers surveyed, 40% disagreed with the statement and another 40% had a neutral opinion on the statement. However, 20% agreed that they used the strategies from the pull-out and push-in programs in their classroom (see Table 4).

Table 4

Participants' Response Pattern Whether Students used Pull-Out/Push-In Strategies Learned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants' Response Pattern</th>
<th>Code Number</th>
<th>Code Description</th>
<th>Number of participants who reported this</th>
<th>Which participants reported this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>B, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>A, C, E, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>G, H, I, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>G, H, I, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement five of the survey was “I feel confident that my students get the assistance they need during the pull-out program.” Again the majority of participants’ views on the
pull-out program were negative (see Table 5). Fifty percent of the participants selected that they disagreed with the statement that they felt confident that their students were getting their needs met with the pull-out program. On the other hand, 30% of those surveyed stated they agree that the pull-out program was providing their students with the assistance they needed while they were pulled out. Twenty percent of the participants were neutral about the statement.

Table 5

Participants' Response Pattern Whether StudentsReceived Needed Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Number</th>
<th>Code Description</th>
<th>Number of participants who reported this</th>
<th>Which participants reported this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>E, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>D, F, G, H, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows participants’ responses to being asked to rank their opinion of the push-in program (survey question #6). Two participants (20%) agreed with the statement that they were satisfied with how the push-in program was implemented at the school. Forty percent of the teachers had a neutral view, while another 40% disagreed with the implementation of the push-in program at BME.

Table 6

Participants' Response Pattern Regarding Satisfaction with Push-In Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Number</th>
<th>Code Description</th>
<th>Number of participants who reported this</th>
<th>Which participants reported this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>B, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>C, D, G, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>A, E, F, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I distributed the second survey (Appendix E,) on June 2, 2014. Of the 10 participants originally surveyed, only six were returned it to me for a response rate of 60%. The second survey consisted of five open-ended questions regarding the push-out and push-in programs, alternatives to those programs, and teachers’ feelings about change. The data collected were coded, analyzed, and displayed in Tables 7-11.

Survey question #1 asked participants’ views of the current pull-out program in regards to loss of TOT by those students in other subject areas such as math, science, and social studies. The questions on this survey were all free response, so there were typically several themes that emerged from each response. As you can see in Table 7, all of the teachers who responded stated there was an impact on students missing core instruction when they were being pulled. Additionally, three (50%) of the teachers surveyed stated they had seen no academic growth in those subject areas students were pulled out of for remediation purposes. Two of the participants (33%) also noted there was no added benefit or value for students who were being pulled. One teacher (17%) reported that they pull-out program causes stress on the teacher and the student.

Table 7
Participants' Response Pattern Regarding View of Pull-Out Program and Loss of TOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Number</th>
<th>Code Description</th>
<th>Number of participants who reported this</th>
<th>Which participants reported this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stress on teacher and student</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Miss core instruction</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
<td>D, E, F, G, I, J,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No growth from pull-out</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>D, J, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not beneficial/valueble to students</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>F, J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The participants could choose to respond to more than one issue, ergo the reason for the table showing more than 100% total overall.
Question two of the survey involved teachers expressing their view on the pull-out program if students would be pulled during their special areas (music, art, science lab) instead of during the time scheduled for science, math, and social studies. Four participants (67%) of the teachers stated the pull-out program should be taught during the students’ special areas time (see Table 8). Additionally, they recommended the reading support program be provided with fidelity and consistently in order for students to benefit. Although over 60% believed that the pull-outs should be done during this time, 3 participants (50%) of these same teachers had mixed feelings about pulling their students from their special areas because they believed the students need to be exposed to the arts.

Table 8

*Participants' Response Pattern Regarding Pull-Out during Specials*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants' Response Pattern</th>
<th>Number of participants who reported this</th>
<th>Which participants reported this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Should be done</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>E, G, I, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mixed feelings</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>D, F, I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Teacher could and did express both opinions, ergo the reason for more than 100%.

Table 9 has the results of question three which regarded alternative strategies or programs the teachers would recommend for teaching students in need of reading support, while maximizing the TOT for other academic areas. Interestingly enough, all fourth grade teachers, 3 participants, stated that students should be required to attend a before or after school program, while 3 of teachers (33%) of the other teachers surveyed believed that having a push-in program in place during the reading block would be more beneficial for both teachers and students. One participant stated there should be fewer resource teachers. Placing students with the certified resource teachers would reduce class size, providing
teachers with more time to work with their students in all areas, including providing the required reading instruction.

Table 9

*Participants' Response Pattern Responses for Strategy Recommendations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants' Response Pattern</th>
<th>Number of participants who reported this</th>
<th>Which participants reported this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Push-in support (reading)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>G, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Before and/or after school tutoring</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>D, F, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Have no resource teachers= All teachers have students less moving for students</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4 involved participants thinking about what the barriers are to change the current structure of the reading program at BME and what the school would have to do to eliminate them or minimize their impact. One participant stated that the focus on grading needed to change; the focus must be on the standards and whether or not a student has mastered them. Time constraints and the willingness of staff to change were of course two of the biggest concerns 4 out of 6 participants saw for the school to make changes. Furthermore, two teachers mentioned that the school must look at the lack of knowledge and experience within our staff. According to two teachers, BME has had a high turnover rate of teachers as well as administrators that can be considered an instability barrier. As a result, there are people in certain areas with little experience. The administration was identified as a key barrier with 2 (33%) of the participants stating it as a concern (see Table 10). Participants stated that administration needs to listen to teacher concerns and be willing to look into the issue of lost TOT in core subjects. Additionally, teachers stated that in order for change to be possible, administrators should be trained in transforming a school’s reading program and culture.
Table 10

Participants' Response Pattern to Key Barriers of Reading Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants' Response Pattern</th>
<th>Code Number</th>
<th>Code Description</th>
<th>Number of Participants who reported this</th>
<th>Which participants reported this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grading structure</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge and experience (staff)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>G, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Willingness to change/ stuck</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>D, E, G, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Time constraints</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>F, G, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>G, J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last question I asked participants (question #5) was whether they would be willing to take part in a pilot professional learning community to study the pull-out program for meeting the critical reading learning needs and explore alternative program solutions to address students’ loss of TOT in other important academic areas. Of the six participants, only one stated that she would like to participate. Three participants stated they would, but they were not returning to the school or they were changing grade levels and as a result it would not impact them. Two participants declined to participate in a pilot program (see Table 11).

Table 11

Participants' Response Pattern to Willingness to Pilot Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants' Response Pattern</th>
<th>Code Number</th>
<th>Code Description</th>
<th>Number of Participants who reported this</th>
<th>Which participants reported this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>F, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes- but not returning</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>D, E, G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpretation

After carefully analyzing the data collected, it is clear that teachers are not happy with the current way BME is scheduling students who have shown a significant gap in reading. Teachers stated they would be willing to accept an alternative solution to include pulling students during their special area classes of physical education, science lab, music, and art class. Furthermore, teachers for the most part do not see the benefit in having students miss core academics to receive additional reading support. Participants reported they were not happy with either the current pull-out and or the push-in programs.

When asked if they would like to participate in a professional learning community to study the pull-out program, only one teacher stated she would want to join. The urgency to address this problem for change apparently is not yet recognized by teachers and administrators to the extent needed to change the current push-out or pull-in strategies. I believe my study can be an important step to address this problem by first sharing it with BME’s current school leaders. I then can seek their approval to move forward with a planning group to develop a clear vision for the future. It also could explore alternative solutions that would benefit both students and teachers. Administrators have tried different solutions, but nothing has worked. The problem, in my opinion and based on analyzing the above data, is one that causes the most failures in change leadership efforts. Heifetz et al. (2009) explained, “The most common cause of failure in leadership is produced by treating adaptive challenges as if they were technical problems” (p. 19). I believe our school leadership understands the complexity of the problem, but may feel pushed by important managerial issues of a technical nature and are hard pressed to find the time and will to deal
with an adaptive one like my issue. I am hoping my study will inspire them to let me move forward with a change process dealing with the pull-out, TOT problem.
SECTION SIX: A VISION OF SUCCESS (TO-BE)

Given what I have learned through my research, it is important to communicate my vision of success for my change plan. To this end, I will share what Wagner et al. (2006) referred to as the To Be vision of what I would like to see happen – process and results. This involves a description of the desired state of my school’s context, culture, conditions, and competencies.

Context

As described in Section Two, BME has a high poverty rate with a racially and ethnically diverse group of students. There is an achievement gap between all groups that must be understood and addressed with effective instructional strategies for each. The school has been classified as Title I for the past 3 school years. Due to the high number of students on free or reduced price lunches, all students have been eligible to receive free breakfast. Having students get free breakfast has encouraged students to want to come early to school and have a healthy meal. Having students eat in the morning can increase their ability to stay focused in class.

My To-Be context for learning includes three key elements. First, a high percentage of our students would be receiving the quality of service needed to be able to read, write, and compute at expected levels of proficiency. Scheduling would be accomplished with the best intentions for student growth and success and would include options to the pull out program and for more TOT for all subjects. A significant reduction in the need for remediation, particularly in reading, may take considerable time, but it would lessen the need for a pull-out program and provide more flexibility for the school and district to choose less disruptive options for remediation that would be in the best interests of students. Such options could
then lead to less traveling between intervention classes and missing core instruction because the students would be proficient in reading and math. Greater success in school should lead to higher student morale and an improved desire to attend school.

**Culture**

The culture within BME has been very unsettling and has the greatest potential for growth. There is isolation within grade levels and throughout the building. Priorities are unclear since everything is important. There is very limited professional real communication or collaboration within grade levels. Throughout the school, teachers compete to see who has the best test scores and data results, which I believe stems in part from the performance appraisal and compensation policies. Teachers generally share ideas and activities with the same persons over time and have limited time to collaborate with others for the benefit of all students. Lastly, the frequent turnover rate of the administration team has not allowed the administrators’ time to develop trusting relationships with staff members.

The To-Be I seek through my change leadership plan is a school culture that is collaborative and priorities regarding curriculum and instruction are clear and understood by all. Communication is open and effective throughout the school and the district. Teachers help one another with the analysis of data and choosing instructional strategies and not competing to keep their jobs and earn more pay but focusing on learners and their needs. In my To-Be plan, teachers planning time would allow them the opportunity to reflect, grow, and make connections. Moreover, teachers would have strong collaborative and data analysis skills. Additionally, administrators would have the time to listen, collaborate, and problem solve with the teachers. The positive attitudes and actions of school leaders would lead to teachers embracing them in the development of strong working relationships based on
trust. Rigor, relevance, and relationships would be the foundation values supporting our vision.

**Conditions**

In section two I explained the conditions that are present at BME. Currently, collaboration among all teachers within each grade level is minimal on lessons being taught. Students are constantly pulled for numerous services and are missing core academic instruction as a result. Students’ needs are not being paired enough with teacher competencies when assigned to teachers. Additionally, a majority of the resources at BME are allocated for reading and therefore, there are limited amounts of resources for math, science, and socials studies. Finally, teachers have insufficient time to plan and implement the numerous initiatives that are being presented.

My To-Be condition would be that all students in all subjects would have sufficient TOT to master required course or program content and competencies. There would be before or after school tutoring and or other non-disruptive provisions (i.e., non-core academic classes) of whatever remediation or special program assistance may be required. Students also would be placed according to the teacher’s competencies in terms of their academic needs. In addition, the school would have additional resources in math, science, and social studies to help struggling students through the use of Title I funds or other sources of financial support. Teachers would be given the materials they need to teach with rigor. Professional development would be provided to help alleviate tension when working towards new school and district initiatives, thereby encouraging teachers to be more open to change. Lastly, teachers would be guaranteed sufficient and adequate planning time.
Competencies

As described in Section Two BME, as in many other schools, has a well-educated staff that is eager to help students achieve success. However, teachers do not have sufficient collaboration skills. As previously mentioned, teachers are not allotted enough time to reflect, grow, and improve their performance before things get changed. This in part is due to the numerous initiatives that are being implemented at once, which in part leaves teachers unfocused and uncertain of the priorities. School leaders need to engage teachers more in the planning process and when necessary communicate clear initiatives and explain their priorities to teachers.

With the implementation of my recommended policy, teachers would have developed high level communication and data analysis skills stemming from professional development. Administrative priorities would reflect clearly the staff’s and students’ interests and needs. School leaders would be attending professional development regarding the engendering of collaboration skills. In my To-Be school, school leaders would be spending more time in the classrooms. They would know their teachers’ strengths and weaknesses as a result, teachers would be provided time to reflect, grow, and make connections. Walkthroughs would be used to identify staff development needs in order to add more rigor and relevance to lessons.

Conclusion

Much needs to be done to go from the As-Is to my To-Be desired state, but that state is attainable. This includes a context that is filled with eager students that want to come to school to learn, have low levels of retention, and a high proficiency rate. It also includes a culture that is full of staff members that want to work together, have clear goals and priorities, and school leaders that are willing to collaborate with teachers. It includes a
condition that has an abundance of resources, teachers have sufficient planning time, and students are not being pulled out of core academic classes and all subjects have the necessary time to meet student proficiency standards. Finally, it requires some critical competencies, including collaboration and communication skills, data analysis, and allowing teachers’ time to reflect, grow, and make corrections.
SECTION SEVEN: STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS FOR CHANGE

To date, I have done a program evaluation project regarding a special form of departmentalization and identified it as a collaborative specialization. In the process, I was using the research to determine its effectiveness for improving learning, providing more planning time for staff to work together on lessons and other matters of instructional importance, and provide students more hands on learning and rigor. It worked. However, it also brought to my attention the concern teachers have about the pull-out programs for reading because of the time requirement as driven by law and student needs. What was obvious to me is I was doing the kind of action research required in any change process. In my second project, this change leadership plan, I again carried out an action research plan to try to address the pull-out issue and the loss of TOT in core subject areas and focused on the 5th grade. I am still working on a change process.

As BME continues to alter the ways it provides remediation to students through different programs and scheduling, there are several strategies I will follow to keep the change process going to reach my desired context, culture, conditions, and competencies for my school and district. I want to move it from “my” projects and “my” To-Be to “ours”. I have to get buy in from school leadership and staff to move forward. How do I do that?

When analyzing the situation at BME, there are several approaches that could be implemented to bring about the changes needed to improve student achievement. I would use Wagner et al.’s (2006) “Change Leadership” ideas to frame how I would make change possible within my school and district. Successful leadership transformation requires sharpening capacities within individuals and the organization (Wagner et al., 2006). My first strategy would be to share my paper with the staff and use Wagner’s book as our frame and
Leaders need to see more deeply into why it is so hard for organizations and individuals to change (Wagner et al., 2006). “Leaders must learn how to take action effectively to help their organizations actually to become what they need and want to be” (Wagner et al., 2006, p. xvi). As a leader, I need to take action to help individuals on the staff understand the urgency for change and the need (Wagner et al., 2006).

Using the 4 Cs diagnostic tool I have identified where I think my school is and the vision I see for where we want to be when it comes to the problem of time loss for teaching math, science, and social studies because of the reading pull-out strategy. I think the staff that I worked with in my program evaluation and change leadership projects and because of their involvement would agree with my diagnosis as well. One strategy I would use is to analyze carefully related data and information and build consensus around the urgency and need for the change. My two studies can be the basis of this analysis.

Heifetz et al. (2009) warned that too often leaders do not take the necessary time to diagnose the system before trying to implement change. Moreover, adaptive leadership requires understanding the group’s culture and assessing which aspects of it facilitates change and which aspects will stand in the way of making that change possible (Heifetz et al., 2009). “The most common cause of failure in leadership is produced by treating adaptive challenges as if they were technical problems” (Heifetz et al., 2009, p. 19). “Stepping on the balcony” to see how the organization would respond before trying to make changes is very important when trying to change how an organization works. All staff members need to see that the pull-out program is more than a scheduling change; it is an adaptive issue involving changing priorities and gaining more instructional time for core subjects while insuring students master the basic skills needed.
The Engagement Strategy will be the first step in my change process. I plan to seek permission from the school principal to form a committee with teachers who participated in my studies who see the urgency for change and will help me update the As-Is and To-Be (Vision). Once an updated vision is created, I will present the vision to the school principal. I will once again seek the principal’s approval to establish a broader committee with the empowerment needed to move forward with the work on addressing the pullout program problem, that is, the loss of important TOT learning in the core subject areas.

The committee should be broadened to include representative parents, the principal, a counselor and others the principal deems would be important to include. Their task would be to review the research I have done and help modify as needed for the 4 C’s – the As-Is and To-Be or Vision. As noted in Kotter (2012), it is important to get a guiding team to create a vision that is compelling. The committee also would be responsible for examining the pull-out and push in options and their advantages and disadvantages. They also would need to explore other options as well.

The second strategy I will use is Communications/Reporting. I will plan a session for the committee to explain its role and responsibilities. Then I will share with them my study, its processes and results. During this time, I also will share with them the As-Is and To-Be information. At other sessions I will lead a discussion on my hopes to develop a sense of urgency concerning the TOT issue. I will explain that there are several alternatives to the pull-out program and that together we can develop a plan that will better meet the needs of all our students. In addition, I will explain how my change process will work and how they can get engaged in it. The focus on the communication between school leaders and staff should improve as we move towards building a solution to the TOT issue at the school. I also will
work with the committee in developing and carrying out a communication process to let the
staff know the problem we are studying and how they can help and be involved. The plan
will include a periodic reporting to staff on the progress the committee is making. By
increasing communication, all staff members would know what is happening and could lead
them to adopt and support our vision and better understand the alternative solutions we are
considering. All staff members would have access to my studies. They would know what
the committee sees as the As-Is and understand the extent of the problem of lost TOT. Staff
communications can alter the culture to one of action and research and data driven activities
and therefore make change for student success a more likely possibility. Knowing that there
are options that can help alleviate the problem, and understanding the urgency for some
change could lead to a better solution and stronger support.

Heifetz and coauthors (2009) stated that leaders should use the networks already in
place within the organization to “forge alliances with people who will support your efforts
[and] integrate and defuse oppositions” (p. 133) - they call this acting politically. BME’s
leadership team, must demonstrate to the staff that they will not only listen to what the
teachers need, but also work with them in dealing with their interests and concerns. They
must be able to show that they are knowledgeable and build relationships with the faculty,
parents, students, and community members. As a leader, it is important to notice the human
complexities when trying to lead an adaptive change. Leaders need to think politically and
act politically.

By acting politically, we mean using your awareness of the limits of your own
authority, and of stakeholders’ interests, as well as power and influence networks in
your organization, to forge and defuse opposition, and to give valuable dissenting
voices a hearing as you adjust your perspective, interventions and mobilize adaptive work. (Heifetz et al., 2009, p. 131)

The change process must include effective use of such political strategies which in a way leads into the third strategy.

The third strategy is the Development Strategy. In this strategy, I will establish small study committees to review the alternative strategies to the pull-out program. This committee will need to determine what to conserve and what to discard from the past practices and work together to invent “new ways to build from the best of the past [while also considering the] human dimensions of the changes” (Heifetz et al., 2009, p. 69). In the case of the push-in and pull-out programs, all teachers surveyed in my study believed what was currently in place were not the best solutions.

The committees would develop reports on each of the alternatives and share those results with school leadership and staff for discussion. The goal of is to seek consensus on what change or changes are of most value to the staff and students. I believe this will create a better solution or solutions with less resistance from teachers as they are taking part in the decision making. Once consensus on the change is decided I will seek to pilot any alternative or alternatives to help determine the best next step for our students.

Adaptation takes time. “To practice adaptive leadership, you have to take time to think through your interpretation of what you observe, before jumping into action” (Heifetz et al., 2009, p. 34). If BME wants to make the necessary changes to increase student achievement, it needs to realize that this process does not happen instantaneously. Therefore, understanding the political relationships within the organizational system is vital. Moreover, when thinking politically, one can uncover the values that drive certain behaviors. “By
identifying your stakeholders’ strongest values, the things they care most about, you may be able to find another way for the resisters among them to serve those values than opposing your proposed change” (Heifetz et al., 2009, p. 92).

Implementation of the pilot or pilots will require training of staff. The committee will help identify the knowledge and skills needed to deliver instruction for the selected option or options. After identifying the staff’s strengths we can adjust our professional development to provide the staff any special understandings or skill sets that might be needed to plan, teach, and assess student progress in any change that might be adopted, for example, if my collaborative specialization schedule model is chosen as part of the solution, my study has identified some special needs that may require some staff development.

The fourth strategy is the Evaluation. This would include how we are carrying out the selected alternative program or programs, what teachers are experiencing and how they feel about it, and student academic progress. As I stated before, it is important to use the research design of my study and continue to conduct research on the option or options selected. Then we must continuously assess both the processes and outcomes in order to make necessary changes based on the results. It’s like Kotter (2012) explained, “Whenever you let up before the job is done, critical momentum can be lost and regression may follow” (p. 139).

**Conclusion**

I believe BME is able to use these change strategies to change the way we remediate students who are struggling by revamping the pull-out or push-in program or even to take on new changes. BME has the potential to achieve the changes it seeks to improve student achievement. However, they must be done slowly. My change plan is designed to bring
about an adaptive change not a technical one. It requires a change in the way people think about and implement change. It is about engagement and openness to progress. It represents a change in attitude. That attitude is one of being action research oriented. This requires the entire school committing itself to take on a problem like remediating students and creating something that will provide it without taking time of selected students away from TOT in their core subjects. I believe in an important way it will strengthen the schools culture and add to the school’s commitment to change. The strategies and actions I have outlined are what I believe are most important to make “my To-Be” an “our To-Be.”
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Appendix A: The 4Cs (As-Is) Analysis

As-Is 4 Cs Analysis for BME

Context
- High student remediation rate/ low proficiency when entering next grade level.
- Parent inability to support students.
- Multiple parent barriers- non English, work schedule, education, etc.
- Racially diverse population; high poverty rate.
- Lack of scheduling (pull out interfering with core classes.)

Culture
- Isolation within grade level.
- No clear priority- everything is important.
- Very little real communication or collaboration (unguided).
- Teachers compete for best data scores to receive attention.
- Teachers distrust admin.
- Blame is shifted to others.
- No clear collaboration with parents.
- Admin turnover= teacher anxiousness.
- Admin is willing to listen to frustrations/ solutions but no follow.
- Lack of relationships between grade levels.

Conditions
- No collaboration on lessons being taught.
- Students being constantly pulled for reading tutoring, ESE services (OT, Speech, Vision, etc.), enrichment (prime time) and missing core academic instruction.
- Student needs are not being paired with teacher competencies. (placed in classrooms according to class size and gender.)
- No resources in math for underperforming students.
- Teachers are “stuck” in the past. (Culture- Isolation)
- Insufficient Time (planning/ initiatives).

Competencies
- Teachers/Admin lack collaboration skills
- Well educated and motivated teachers
- Teachers are not allotted time to reflect, grow, and make correction- things get changed too quickly. (Example- DBQ’s mid-year)
- Teachers lack skills in gathering and interpreting data in order to identify student needs. Teachers get data overload but have no clear vision of what to do next.
Appendix B: A Vision of Success (To-Be)

To-Be 4 Cs Analysis for BME

**Context**
- Low student remediation rate/high proficiency.
- Students are eager to come to school to learn.
- Scheduling is done with the best intentions for student growth and success.

**Culture**
- Collaboration and real communication within grade levels, building, and across the district.
- Clear priorities.
- Teachers work together for best data scores.
- Teachers embrace administration.
- Administration is willing to listen to frustrations and solutions and are able to collaboratively come up with solutions that will be implemented.
- Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships.

**Conditions**
- Collaboration on lessons being taught.
- Students pulled for reading tutoring, ESE services (OT, Speech, Vision, etc.), enrichment (prime time) during non-core academic instruction.
- Student being paired with teacher competencies.
- Abundance of resources in math for underperforming students.
- Teachers are willing to change for student needs.
  - Teachers have sufficient planning time.

**Competencies**
- Teachers receive PD on collaboration skills.
- Administration receives PD on skills in collaborating information.
- Teachers given ample time to reflect, grow, and make correction.
- Teachers given PD on gathering and interpreting data in order to identify student needs.

Improving structure and rigor in instruction leads to improved student achievement.
## Appendix C: Strategies and Actions Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Engagement/Reporting strategy | • Get participant teachers to help me update the As-Is and To-Be (Vision)  
• Go to the school principal to get his approval.  
• Establish a school steering committee  
  ○ Include participants in the study and others to assess the situation and refine the vision  
• Kotter – build a guiding team of teachers to update the vision to be compelling and examine the pull-out situations and options and update as needed.  
• Inform staff periodically of the study process and emerging results.  
• Discuss implications for further development.  
• Kotter – reports can alter the culture to one of action and research and data driven activities – help make change for student success is a good thing. |
| Communications and Staff development strategy | • Develop and implement a staff development program on the change process  
• Share As-Is and To-Be to develop a sense of urgency concerning the TOT issue  
• Explain alternatives to pull out and how the change process will be carried out in the school  
• Inform staff on how they can get engaged in the change  
• Kotter – communicate the vision and sense of urgency |
| Development strategies        | • Form small study committees to review the alternative strategies.  
• Develop reports on each alternative  
• Share with school leadership and staff for discussion.  
• Seek consensus on what change or changes are of most value to staff and students.  
• Pilot some of the alternatives.  
• Kotter – short term wins or needed – my study had a winning ending. |
| Evaluation strategies         | • Use research design of my study and conduct research on the options selected.  
• Assess both the processes and outcomes.  
• Kotter – don’t let up – assess and move on based on the results. |
Appendix D: Teacher Survey 1

Dear teachers,

As you may be aware, I am a current graduate student at National-Louis University, completing my doctoral degree in educational leadership. As part of my dissertation, I would like to survey you using the following questions in order to assess the impact of the pull-out and push-in programs.
Thank you for taking the time out of your busy day.

Teacher Survey

Please fill in the bubble that represents how you feel about the pull-out and push-in program.

1. I am satisfied with the pull-out program.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

2. The pull-out program has improved my student’s academic work (grades, scores on tests, etc).

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

3. The pull-out program supports my instruction.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Disagree
4. My students used the strategies they have learned from the pull-out/push-in programs in my class.

- Strongly Disagree
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

5. I feel confident that my students get the assistance they need during the pull-out program.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

6. I am satisfied with the push-in program.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

I am a ____________________________ teacher. (Fourth grade or fifth grade)

Thank you for participating in my study. I truly appreciate your input. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Miss Nicole Villaverde
Appendix E: Teacher Survey 2

Dear teachers,

As you may be aware, I am a current graduate student at National-Louis University, completing my doctoral degree in educational leadership. As part of my dissertation, I would like to survey you using the following questions in order to assess views regarding the pull-out and push-in programs, followed by your ideas concerning alternatives to its use, and your feelings about change.
Thank you for taking the time out of your busy day.

Teacher Survey

1. What is your view on the pull-out program regarding the loss of time on task by these students in other subject areas (Math, Science, Social Science, etc.)?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

2. What would be your view on the pull-out program if all level 1 and 2 students would be pulled during their special areas (Music, Art, and Science Lab) for 30 to 45 minutes instead of during academics?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________
3. What other alternative strategies or programs would you recommend to teach students in need of reading support, while maximizing their time on task for all other academic areas? How about math support?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

4. What do you think are the key barriers to changing the current structure of the reading program in our school and what would we have to do to make such a change possible? How about the Math program?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

5. Would you be willing to pilot a professional learning community to study the pull-out program for meeting the critical reading learning needs and explore alternative program solutions to address students’ loss of time on task in other important academic areas? ________________

I am a _____________________________ teacher. (Fourth grade, fifth grade, or resource)

Thank you for participating in my study. I truly appreciate your input. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Miss Nicole Villaverde
Appendix F: Informed Consent - Teachers

Informed Consent - Teacher

You are being asked to participate in a research study conducted by Nicole Villaverde, student at National-Louis University (NLU), Tampa, Florida. The study is entitled A Change Leadership Plan for Bimmer Elementary School. The purpose of this study is to enhance student learning by finding ways to maximize time on task for all subjects taught at the 4th and 5th grade levels. Bimmer has recognized a real concern for reading and has made important efforts to address the problem. However, there has been an adverse effect on other subject areas because students are being pulled out to receive reading instruction. Unintended reduction of time on task (TOT) has occurred in the areas of math, science, and social studies in this process.

Participants will be participating in a minimum of two surveys that will be completed at the beginning and end of the research study. The survey will consist of five questions, but may be expanded depending on responses. They will be directly related to the pull-out model and how this organizational structure has impacted your teaching as well as your students’ achievement.

Your participation is voluntary and you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty. Your identity will be kept confidential by the researcher and will not be attached to the data. Your participation in this study does not involve any physical or emotional risk to you beyond that of everyday life. While you are likely not to have any direct benefit from being in this study, your taking part in this study may contribute to our better understanding of the effects of the planning process in addressing important school needs.

While the results of this study may be published or otherwise reported to scientific bodies, your identity will in no way be revealed. Results also will be made available to you and others upon request. In addition, the study results will be kept in a secure file in my home.

In the event you may have questions or require additional information you may contact the researcher: Nicole Villaverde, National-Louis University doctoral student, phone, 321-297-3496; email, nvillaverde@my.nl.edu; 5110 Eisenhower Blvd., Suite 102, Tampa, FL 33634. If you have any concerns or questions before or during participation that you feel have not been addressed by the researcher, you may contact my Dissertation Chair. Dr. Jim Schott, Distinguished Professor of Practice, EDL Florida Program-Department of Educational Leadership, Department of Educational Leadership, National Louis University, 1207 Home Office, Waterwitch Cove Circle, Orlando, FL 32806, Email address: jschott@nl.edu or jimua@aol.com, or NLU’s Institutional Research Review Board: Dr. Generosa Lopez-Molina, National Louis University, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, IL 60603, (312)-261-3135; email: glopezmolina@nl.edu.

Participant Name (Print) ________________________________
Participant Signature ________________________________ Date _________
Researcher Name (Print) ________________________________
Researcher Signature ________________________________ Date _________