SCALING UP SUCCESS FOR ALL:
The First 16 Years

Robert E. Slavin
Johns Hopkins University

Nancy A. Madden
Success for All Foundation

This paper was written under funding from the Institute of Education Sciences, U. S. Department of Education (R-117-D40005). However, any opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of IES, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Abstract

Success for All, a comprehensive schoolwide reform program for elementary schools serving many children placed at risk of school failure, was first piloted in one Baltimore elementary school in the 1987-88 school year. Since then, the program has expanded rapidly; in 2003-04, it is used in about 1500 schools throughout the United States.

Success for All requires substantial change in many aspects of curriculum and instruction and extensive professional development to help schools start children with success and build on that foundation through the elementary grades. It takes time for teachers to learn and perfect new forms of instruction, and for other school personnel to learn new roles. Therefore, the program requires a great deal of professional development done over an extended period of time.

This report describes our experience — the strategies pursued, the relative success of various dissemination routes, and the implications of those experiences for public policies. This experience has led us to conclude that successful dissemination requires a combination of talented, dedicated trainers and a local and national network of schools willing and able to provide technical and emotional support. Employing full-time, regionally-based trainers recruited from outstanding Success for All schools is the most effective way of building our staff. In contrast, strategies depending on involvement of other organizations or on part-time certified trainers have not generally been successful.

In recent years, Success for All is increasingly learning to work in whole districts or subdistricts, and this strategy has led to improved implementations and outcomes.

Never in the history of American education has the potential for fundamental reform been as great. The bipartisan embrace of ambitious national goals, the restructuring of Title I in the No Child Left Behind legislation, the availability of new comprehensive school reform (CSR) designs for school change, and the growing capacity of many school reform networks, are all developments that create unprecedented possibilities for change. Federal legislation that provides competitive funding to schools to adopt proven, comprehensive reform designs adds both resources and attention to the movement toward school-by-school, standards-based reform. No Child Left Behind, with its strong emphasis on scientifically-based research and adoption of well-evaluated programs, adds further resources for school reform based on rigorous research.

However, it is by no means certain that the potential for reform will be realized. Changes will take place, but will these changes actually make a difference in the school success of large numbers of children? For this to happen, the nearly three million teachers in America's schools will have to learn and regularly apply very different and far more effective instructional methods than those they use now. School organization, assessment, grouping, and many other aspects of schooling will have to change. The systemic changes happening at many levels of government are creating a fast-rising demand for high quality, sustained professional development, particularly the professional development needed for schools to adopt proven models of school change. Yet the national infrastructure for professional development of this kind is quite limited.

If reform is to produce results, major changes in the structure of professional development are needed. This chapter is intended to shed light on the question of how a national approach to professional development might enable professional development networks to bring proven school change models to scale by describing the lessons we have learned in disseminating Success for All, a comprehensive reform program designed primarily for high-poverty elementary schools. In the course of disseminating Success for All we have learned a great deal about the process of change, about factors that support and inhibit school-level reform, and about ways of enlisting others in support of our efforts. This report describes our experience with dissemination, the strategies we are pursuing, the relative success of various dissemination routes, and the implications of our experiences for public policies.

Success for All

Success for All (Slavin & Madden, 2001) is a program designed to comprehensively restructure elementary schools serving many children placed at risk of school failure. It emphasizes prevention, early intervention, use of innovative reading, writing and language arts curricula (and is some schools, math, science, and social studies materials as well), and extensive professional development to help schools start children with success and then build on that foundation throughout the elementary grades. The box below summarizes the main elements of the program.

Major Elements of Success for All

Success for All is a schoolwide program for students in grades pre-K to six which organizes resources to attempt to ensure that virtually every student will reach the third grade on time with adequate basic skills and build on this basis throughout the elementary grades, that no student will be allowed to "fall between the cracks." The main elements of the program are as follows:

***A Schoolwide Curriculum*.** During reading periods, students are regrouped across age lines so that each reading class contains students all at one reading level. Use of tutors as reading teachers during reading time reduces the size of most reading classes to about 20. The reading program in grades K-1 emphasizes language and comprehension skills, phonics, sound blending, and use of shared stories that students read to one another in pairs. The shared stories combine teacher-read material with phonetically regular student material to teach decoding and comprehension in the context of meaningful, engaging stories. In grades 2-6, students use novels or basals but not workbooks. This program emphasizes cooperative learning activities built around partner reading, identification of characters, settings, problems, and problem solutions in narratives, story summarization, writing, and direct instruction in reading comprehension skills. At all levels, students are required to read books of their own choice for twenty minutes at home each evening. Classroom libraries of trade books are provided for this purpose. Beginning in the second year of implementation, cooperative learning programs in writing/language arts are introduced in grades K-6.

***Tutors*.** In grades 1-3, specially trained certified teachers and paraprofessionals work one-to-one with any students who are failing to keep up with their classmates in reading. Tutorial instruction is closely coordinated with regular classroom instruction. It takes place 20 minutes daily during times other than reading periods.

***Preschool and Kindergarten*.** The preschool and kindergarten programs in Success for All emphasize language development, readiness, and self-concept. Preschools and kindergartens use thematic units, a language development program, and a program called Story Telling and Retelling (STaR).

***Eight-Week Assessments*.** Students in grades 1-6 are assessed every eight weeks to determine whether they are making adequate progress in reading. This information is used to suggest alternate teaching strategies in the regular classroom, changes in reading group placement, provision of tutoring services, or other means of meeting students' needs.

***Family Support Team*.** A family support team works in each school to help support parents in ensuring the success of their children, focusing on parent education, parent involvement, attendance, and student behavior. This team is composed of existing or additional staff such as parent liaisons, social workers, counselors, and vice principals.

***Facilitator*.** A program facilitator works with teachers to help them implement the reading program, manages the eight-week assessments, assists the family support team, makes sure that all staff are communicating with each other, and helps the staff as a whole make certain that every child is making adequate progress.

Research comparing Success for All to control schools in eleven districts has consistently shown that Success for All has substantial positive effects on student reading achievement throughout the elementary grades (Slavin et al., 1994, 1996; Slavin & Madden, 2000, 2001; Madden et al., 1993) as well as reducing special education placements and retentions and improving attendance (Slavin et al., 1992, 1996; Slavin & Madden, 1999a). A long-term followup study found that eighth graders who formerly attended Success for All schools were both reading significantly better than former control students and were far less likely to have been retained or assigned to special education (Borman & Hewes, 2001).

Studies comparing gains on state accountability measures for Success for All and other schools have also found that the Success for All schools usually gain more than the state or city in which the schools are located. Large-scale evaluations in Texas (Hurley, Chamberlain, Slavin, & Madden, 1999) and California (Slavin, Madden, Cheung, & Liang, 2001) have found significantly greater gains for SFA than for other state schools, and comparisons in almost all states with 10 or more Success for All schools find similar patterns (these state-by-state evaluations are listed on the Success for All web site, www.successforall.net/resourcepub.htm.

In all, more than 47 experimental-control comparisons, done by researchers all over the U.S., have evaluated the achievement effects of Success for All and Roots & Wings. Reviews of this research have concluded that Success for All is among the most rigorously and successfully evaluated of all comprehensive reform models (Borman, Hewes, Overman, & Brown, 2003; Herman, 1999; Traub, 1999), and among the most rigorously and successfully evaluated among innovative reading programs (Pearson & Stahl, 2002). These evaluations are of great importance in themselves, of course, but also have a significant importance for scale-up, as the findings make Success for All eligible for funding in funding programs that demand scientifically-based evidence of effectiveness.

We have also developed and evaluated programs in mathematics (MathWings) and in social studies/science (WorldLab). In general, schools implement Success for All first, and then add MathWings and/or WorldLab in subsequent years. Research also shows positive effects of MathWings (Madden, Slavin, & Simons, 2001) and WorldLab (Slavin & Madden, 1999b). Schools that use both reading and math (and/or WorldLab) are often called Roots & Wings schools.

Success for All was first piloted in one Baltimore elementary school in the 1987-1988 school year. In 1988-89 it was expanded to a total of five schools in Baltimore and one in Philadelphia. Since then the number of schools has grown substantially each year. By the 2002-03 school year, Success for All is used in about 1500 schools in 600 districts in 48 states. The pace of dissemination has slowed from its extraordinary levels in the 1990's, but each year since 1996, more than 100 schools have adopted the Success for All reading program; in the peak expansion year of 1999-2000, about 400 schools joined the program. Approximately 170 of these schools also use the MathWings program, and 20 use WorldLab.

Program Characteristics Affecting Dissemination

There are several unique characteristics of Success for All that have an important bearing on the strategies we use in disseminating the program. First, while Success for All is always adapted to the needs and resources of each school using it, there are definite elements common to all. A fully functional Success for All school will always implement our kindergarten program and reading program in grades 1-5 or 1-6, will have at least one tutor for first-graders, and will have a full-time facilitator and a family support team. Other elements, such as preschool and full-day kindergarten, are optional, and schools vary in the number of tutors, the staff time devoted to family support, and other features. Yet despite this variation, we believe that the integrity of the program must be maintained if schools are to produce the results we have found so consistently in our research. The whole school must make a free and informed choice to adopt Success for All; in most schools we require a vote by secret ballot of at least 80%. If this is impossible, as in district-wide adoptions, we involve teachers in making the district-wide decision. But when schools or districts make this choice they are choosing a particular model of reading instruction, a particular use of Title I and special education resources, a particular within-school support structure, and so on. Unlike many alternative schoolwide change models, Success for All is not reinvented for each school staff. The rationale for this focus on consistency in key elements relates to the program's emphasis on research; we want to be sure that schools are implementing a form of the program that is true to the model that has been evaluated and found to be effective. Further, in the high-poverty schools with which we mainly work, we feel it is essential to have a program that is implemented and making a difference on a broad scale quickly, while the school staff is still willing to give the program a fair trial. A long co-development process risks losing the initial enthusiasm and readiness for change that is necessary for a staff to fully embrace a new schoolwide program.

Success for All requires substantial change in many aspects of curriculum and instruction. It takes time for teachers to learn and perfect new forms of instruction, and for facilitators, tutors, family support team members, and principals to learn new roles. Therefore, the program requires a great deal of professional development done over an extended period of time. While the initial training period is only three days for classroom teachers, many follow-up visits from Success for All trainers take place each year. Schools usually budget for 26 person-days of training in the first implementation year, 15 in the second, 12 in the third, and 5-8 in each subsequent year.

Success for All requires that schools invest in tutors, a facilitator, materials, and extensive professional development. Because of the focus of the program and its cost, the program is primarily used in high-poverty schools with substantial Title I resources. As of 2002-2003, the cost of the program for a school of 500 students averages $75,000 in the first year for materials and training, plus salaries for a facilitator, tutors, and other staff (usually reallocated from other functions). Most Success for All schools never have received funds beyond their usual Title I allocations, so in one sense the program has no incremental costs, but there are many schools that could not afford a credible version of the model. While the cost of the program does restrict its use, it also has an important benefit: it increases the likelihood that the school and district will take it seriously and work to see that their investment pays off.

The comprehensiveness, complexity, and cost of Success for All have important consequences for dissemination. First, they mean that the commitment to the program must be long-term, and we must be prepared to be engaged with schools for many years. Second, they mean that we must maintain a large, very highly skilled staff of trainers to work with schools. While we do occasionally use principals, teachers, and facilitators from successful schools in our training programs, the program does not lend itself to an easy "trainer-of-trainers" strategy in which a small staff trains local trainers to work with schools.

Dissemination Staff

Until July, 1998, the dissemination of Success for All was primarily carried out by our staff at the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk, Johns Hopkins University. Since that time, our dissemination has been moved to a separate not-for-profit organization, the Success for All Foundation, or SFAF (see below). In spring, 2003, our training staff consists of approximately 200 full-time trainers. Almost all of our trainers are teachers; almost all have been building facilitators or teachers in Success for All schools. The only trainers who are not former teachers are those who focus on family support. Their backgrounds are often in social work or counseling.

The trainers who work for SFAF are organized in 20 regions of the U.S., each with a very experienced trainer as a regional manager. They are supervised by four area directors. In addition, we have a small number of part-time trainers (some of whom have formerly worked for us) located in various parts of the country, and we will often ask an especially talented teacher or facilitator to help us with training and follow-up in their own area.

In addition to SFAF staff, there is a regional training program for Success for All at the University of Memphis. This group, led by Steven Ross and Lana Smith, conducted research on Success for All in districts around the United States. The University of Memphis group has taken responsibility for implementing Success for All in Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Missouri.

Formerly, WestEd, a federally-funded educational laboratory, maintained a regional training program for Success for All in most of California, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada. However, problems with this arrangement led to its cancellation in April, 1998. Most of the SFA trainers working for WestEd moved to the Success for All Foundation, which now serves schools in the former WestEd region. Similarly, a for-profit company in San Francisco, Education Partners, formerly provided training in several Western states, but this arrangement was ended by arbitration in August, 2000 (see below).

Dissemination Strategies

Schools first become aware of Success for All in a variety of ways. Many articles have been written about the program in educational journals, and our staff has made many presentations at conferences. We have an awareness video and materials, including a book

describing the program and its outcomes (Slavin & Madden, 2001). Educators may write for information, call members of our dissemination staff, or otherwise make contact with us. School or district staff may then invite our staff to make awareness presentations. These often take place as part of "effective methods fairs" in which large districts or states invite principals or school teams to learn about many promising models. We encourage schools to send delegations to visit other Success for All schools in their region if at all possible. If there is interest in schools after these awareness presentations, school staff will send us a "Preliminary Data Form," which enables us to calculate a price for training and materials. We will negotiate a contract specifying what we and the school and the district promise to do. The contract makes our intentions and requirements clear. At some point a presentation will be made to the whole staff of each interested school. Following opportunities to examine materials, visit other schools, and discuss among themselves, school staffs vote by secret ballot. As noted earlier, we require a positive vote of at least 80% of the professional staff. It is rare that we would go through the entire process and then have a vote of less than 80%; more often votes are closer to 100% positive. However, the exercise is essential in that it assures teachers that they had a free choice and that the program is supported by the great majority of their colleagues. There are some exceptions, however. In situations in which all teachers apply to work in a given school, there is no vote, but instead teachers are told about the program and understand that by accepting a position they are agreeing to implement SFA. Also, districts adopting SFA district-wide may use alternate means to ensure buy-in, described later on in this paper.

As soon as a school has decided to adopt the program, planning for implementation begins. A member of the SFAF staff or one of our regional training sites is appointed to serve as the school's lead contact.

A facilitator is then chosen, usually an experienced and respected teacher from within the school's own staff. The facilitator position may be new, but increasingly, high-poverty schools have a reading coach or comparable position, and this person becomes the SFA facilitator. The facilitator and the principal attend a week-long training session in one of a few central locations in different parts of the U.S. held well in advance of training for the school staff. For example, we hold our main facilitator/principal "new sites" trainings in May, June, and July for schools planning their training for teachers in August. This gives the facilitators and principals time to work out issues of staffing, space, finances, ordering and storing materials, and so on. Facilitators may also visit other schools to see the program in action and to get a first-hand view of what facilitators are expected to do.

If a school is planning to begin Success for All in September, training will generally take place over a three-day period in August. Additional training is provided later for tutors and for family support staff.

The initial training is typically done by the school's "point trainer," other staff from SFAF or regional training organizations, and (occasionally) adjunct trainers who are facilitators or teachers in existing Success for All schools. After initial training, follow-up visits will be conducted by these same staff. A first-year school will typically receive 12 person-days of followup, three two-day, two-person visits.

Our main objective during follow-up visits is to strengthen the skills of the building facilitators and principals. We cannot hope to adequately monitor and refine implementations from a distance; instead, we must rely on the facilitator, who is the change agent within the school, as well as the principal and teachers. Our staff members jointly conduct an implementation review, visiting classes, interviewing teachers, family support members, tutors, and others, and looking together at the data on student performance, pacing, attendance, special education placements, and so on. Our trainers model ways of giving feedback to teachers, give the building facilitators advice on solving their problems, share perspectives on strengths and weaknesses of the program, and plan with the building facilitator and principal the goals for individual teachers and for general program implementation that the facilitator will follow up on. Trainers meet with teachers to provide additional training on such issues as writing, pacing, or classroom management. They respond to questions and discuss issues needing further attention. Later, trainers complete implementation check forms and write up site reports summarizing what they have seen, noting promises made, issues to be followed up on, and ratings of the quality of implementation of each program element.

In general, we are satisfied with the dissemination model we are using. In regular implementation checks that are part of our follow-up visits, we find more than 90% of teachers to be doing an adequate job of implementing the programs, and many teachers are doing inspired teaching, using our materials and methods as a jumping-off point for innovative and exciting instruction. The relative prescriptiveness of the model and the training and follow-up that support it are sometimes perceived to be problematic before implementation begins, but are rarely a long-term problem, as teachers and other staff come to see the flexibility within the program and to see the outcomes for children. In fact, for teachers used to inadequate professional development without the material or human supports necessary to change their teaching on a day-to-day basis, the completeness of Success for All, from materials to training to follow-up, is a major plus. The consistent positive findings in evaluations of Success for All in its dissemination sites tell us that our model of dissemination is working.

However, while we are confident that the Success for All program can be successfully adapted to local circumstances and replicated nationally using the model of dissemination we have evolved, we face continuing challenges in providing such an intensive level of service on a broad scale. We have had to continually restructure ourselves to accommodate this growth without compromising on quality, and will need to continue to do so for the foreseeable future. We still have a long way to go.

Obey-Porter Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD)

In 1997, the U.S. Congress allocated $150 million for a new program designed to assist schools in adopting "proven, comprehensive" reform designs. These are programs that provide external assistance to schools to upgrade their curricula, parent involvement approaches, assessments, professional development approaches, and other features. Success for All and Roots & Wings were named in the legislation among 17 examples of such comprehensive designs. Schools can apply for three-year grants of at least $50,000 per year to pay for the start-up costs of adopting comprehensive designs. Funds were also allocated for labs and state

departments of education to help in the awareness and review process (see Slavin, 1998).

The CSRD program, now simply called Comprehensive School Reform, or CSR, has now increased to $310 million annually. CSR is having an important impact on scaling up of Success for All. Obviously, it provides funding for schools that might not have been able to afford adequate implementations. More importantly, perhaps, it raises the profile of programs like SFA at the policy level. State departments of education, laboratories, and districts are all engaged in disseminating information about comprehensive reform models, and this may have an impact on their own involvement in and knowledge about whole-school reform.

Among CSR grants made to date, the largest number have been made to schools to implement SFA/R&W. However, the surprise in the CSR process is that grants are being made to support an enormous array of programs that are neither well-researched nor even comprehensive. Schools have adopted 739 different models. Collectively, the programs rated in the influential American Institutes for Research review (Herman, 1999) as having "strong evidence of positive effects on student achievement" (including Success for All) have received only 17.3% of CSR grants; adding in programs rated as "promising," the total is still only 25.2% of CSR grants. This means that almost three quarters of CSR grants are going to schools adopting programs with limited or no evidence of effectiveness.

Extending Our Reach

As Success for All has become a national program, we have had to confront the problem of providing adequate training and follow-up in many widely dispersed locations with very different needs, resources, and circumstances. Early on, we began searching for ways of engaging regionally based educators in training or support roles, to extend our training capacity, to reduce travel costs for schools, and to provide schools with trainers who are more familiar with the local scene. For a program as complex as Success for All, with such extensive requirements for training and follow-up, it is not a simple matter to train trainers to work in their own areas. As we disseminate Success for All we do not want to compromise on the quality or integrity of the model we have developed and researched. It is difficult to train educators who have not been teachers or facilitators in Success for All schools, and the need for lengthy follow-up makes it difficult to have part-time trainers with other jobs play a major role in training. With these concerns in mind, however, we have pursued a variety of strategies for building a local and regional capacity for training, follow-up, and support. The following sections discuss our experiences with each.

Regional Training Sites

As noted earlier, we have had three regional training sites for Success for All managed by other organizations. Only one of these, is at the University of Memphis, is still in operation. The stories of how these sites were established and how other attempts to create regional training

sites in other organizations have failed provide an interesting perspective on the possibilities and difficulties of regional training strategies.

Universities

One obvious candidate for regional training sites is universities. This is the route taken by several other national school reform networks, such as Reading Recovery (Pinnell, DeFord, & Lyons, 1988) and Accelerated Schools (Levin, 1987). However, Success for All does not lend itself as easily to dissemination from universities. Reading Recovery is a tutoring program for at-risk first graders that provides its training as courses with graduate credit. It therefore fits easily into established structures. Accelerated Schools emphasizes an organizational development consulting approach that is also familiar to university faculty members (see McCarthy, 1991). In contrast, working with whole schools over extended time periods is an unusual activity for university faculty, who are typically too involved with courses, committees, and research to put much time into such activities. With the sole exception of the University of Memphis, no university has attempted to establish a regional training program for Success for All.

The success of the University of Memphis regional training site depends on several relatively unique characteristics. One is the existence of a research center at the university. Another is the unusual motivation and skill of the researchers, and their close relationships with our research center. However, it is important to note that the University of Memphis training site came into being through a traditional university activity, research, and not training per se. In fact, the emphasis of this center is still much more on research than on training. Other attempts to recruit universities to house regional-training programs have not worked out.

Education Partners

Education Partners (EP), a for-profit company, was once the largest regional training program for Success for All housed in a different organization. Headquartered in San Francisco, EP served approximately 180 schools in the San Francisco Bay Area, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Colorado, and New Mexico. In 1996, EP's President approached us about taking on a training role. At the time, EP was very small, and had only been in operation for less than two years. EP proposed to carry out dissemination of SFA in a defined region under a stringent set of performance standards, to be monitored by us, that required them to maintain a high quality of training and implementation at each school they served. They agreed to pay JHU (currently SFAF) a set fee on all revenues. We agreed to EP's proposal as an experiment, to see if a for-profit organization could do a better job than we could as a not-for-profit. Later, when a contract with the Xerox Corporation to do our printing and distribution fell apart in fall, 1998, EP bid for and won a contract to broker our printing and fulfillment services as well.

Because EP started out so small, it was able to design itself solely for the purpose of serving as a training program for SFA. With a few exceptions (such as a more proactive marketing plan), EP operated much the same way as SFAF does. However, while there was an initial plan to gradually expand EP's training territory, this did not occur. The problem was in

the for-profit nature of EP. While any operating surpluses in SFAF go into further development and research, those in EP went to investors. By 1999, it was clear that EP was adding little value to our training or printing efforts, and was costing us far more than what it would have cost to provide these services directly. SFAF invoked its performance standards under a compulsory arbitration provision of our contract with EP, and in August, 2000, the training contract was terminated. In November, 2000, the printing agreement was ended by settlement. Clearly, our experience does not support the idea of subcontracting to for-profit organizations for training services or print brokering.

Educational Laboratories

The regional laboratories would appear to be ideal organizations to become regional training sites for Success for All. They are responsible for helping districts in their regions learn about and implement effective programs. In fact, when they were first established in the 1960s, labs were meant to complement the work of national research centers, such as the one at Johns Hopkins, in which Success for All was developed and researched. We attempted to engage labs in support of Success for All dissemination. We spoke to lab directors and lab communication directors, and had various communications with individual labs. However, WestEd, in California, was the only lab to establish a regional training program for Success for All. This arrangement was initially successful, but it ultimately did not work out. Part of the problem was in maintaining consistency between JHU/SFAF and WestEd; in many cases, WestEd reinterpreted SFA policies, failed to implement various program elements, or otherwise insisted on its own approaches. These and other problems led to a schism within the WestEd SFA staff, with more than half resigning or threatening to resign during the 1997-98 school year. SFAF took back the region in April, 1998.

While our experiences with WestEd and with labs in general does not support the idea of having labs establish their own training programs, labs can be helpful in an awareness and brokering role. In particular, the Obey-Porter Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration, described earlier, provided grants to each lab to help schools and districts in their regions learn about and adopt effective whole-school reform designs. Early on, labs helped states set up awareness activities, such as effective methods fairs, to help schools and districts apply for funding to implement proven designs, including Success for All and Roots & Wings.

School Districts

School districts themselves are logical sources of training and follow-up for Success for All and other reform models. Many school districts with several schools implementing Success for All designate a district coordinator for the program. The district coordinator is intended to serve as a liaison between our staff, the schools, and the central administration. In some districts this person is expected to learn the program and provide direct support to teachers, facilitators, and other staff, much like that which our staff gives to schools in follow-up visits.

Our experience with district coordinators is that they can be very useful in their liaison

function, but are less consistently effective in training or follow-up with schools. The need for a liaison is great, especially in large districts. District coordinators can and do help make sure that schools get the resources they need and that district policies are interpreted for the Success for All schools. For example, if the district adopts a new reading curriculum, the liaison can help figure out whether Success for All schools should simply be exempted from it, or whether some attempt should be made to adapt the Success for All curriculum to the new guidelines. The district coordinator can advocate for the program within the central office and see that it remains on the district's broader agenda. He or she can provide a single point of contact for our program staff on all issues that go beyond individual schools, from arranging for ordering, duplication, and delivery of materials, to helping with assessments, to keeping our staff aware of changes in district policies.

As important as the liaison role is, our experiences with district coordinators have been mixed. In some districts, district coordinators have been people who already have many other responsibilities, and Success for All is added to their list with nothing else being removed. Further, assigning a program to a relatively low ranking central office official can be one way to ensure that a project remains at the periphery of the district's operations (even if it was no one's intention that this take place). We have found that it is important to maintain close relationships with someone in the district who has line authority (such as the superintendent, assistant superintendent for instruction, or Title I director) and not to let the project be seen as "belonging" to a lower-level district coordinator.

Regionally-Based Project Staff

As the Success for All network has expanded and matured, another means of establishing regional training sites has become dominant. This is the establishment of regional training programs staffed by trainers who are full-time employees of SFAF but remain in their home areas. This arrangement solves several problems. First, we often find staff (usually facilitators) in Success for All schools who are outstanding educators, excellent trainers, willing to leave the security of their school district jobs, eager to travel and work with schools all over the country, but not willing or able to move to Baltimore. In our early years we did require most new trainers to relocate to Baltimore, but found that a requirement that such unusually able and exceptional people also must be willing to move to Baltimore put a severe constraint on our hiring qualified staff. Having regionally-based full-time staff allows us to hire the very best experienced trainers regardless of where they happen to be located.

Second, hiring trainers to serve a region gives us far more control and assurance of fidelity to our program's goals than does engaging regional training sites in universities or other existing agencies, which may have their own agendas and constraints. Otherwise, regionally-based SFAF trainers have the same advantages as institutionally-based regional training sites. They reduce travel costs to local districts and increase the probability that our training staff will know about and be able to adapt to local circumstances and needs.

On the other hand, regionally-based SFAF trainers also have several drawbacks. One is

that they are often isolated, working from their own homes without the informal collegial supports that might be possible in a more centralized organization. Operating far from our center, these trainers cannot routinely attend meetings or keep up easily with the latest information or developments. To deal with this, we hold regular regional and national staff retreats, plus meetings around other functions, to keep everyone on the same wavelength. These meetings have major costs, but are essential in a widely distributed organization. Monitoring the performance of regionally-based trainers is also problematic. To improve management of the entire system of regional managers and regionally-based trainers, we instituted (in 1999) four area offices staffed by experienced trainers who also have management and financial management expertise.

Despite the problems of coordination, in the future we expect to see a continuing increase in regionally-based SFAF trainers. In fact, this is the only dissemination model we expect to expand in the coming years.

Networking

Building a national network of Success for All schools is one of the most important things we're trying to do (Cooper, Slavin, & Madden, 1998). An isolated school out on the frontier of innovation can sometimes hang on for a few years, but systemic and lasting change is far more likely when schools work together as part of a network in which school staff share a common vision and a common language, share ideas and technical assistance, and create an emotional connection and support system. This is the main reason we have an annual conference for experienced sites. At the annual conference we provide valuable information on new developments and new ideas (most of which we have gotten directly from the schools we work with). We are also trying to build connections between the experienced schools, so that they can share ideas on issues of common interest and build significant relationships with other schools pursuing similar objectives. We are also trying to create an esprit de corps, a pride in what we are all trying to do together, an understanding and acceptance of the struggle needed to achieve the goal of success for every child. We have "t-shirt days" and team-building activities that can be as important as the formal sessions. The breaks, when staff from different schools get to know each other and exchange information and telephone numbers, may be even more important.

In addition to the national conferences, there are many other things we try to do to build an effective support network. Our newsletter, *Success Story*, is one example. Our training sessions and the manuals and materials we produce invariably use contributions from experienced Success for All schools and reflect them back to all schools. In particular, our family support and facilitator's manuals are primarily composed of ideas we've gotten from extraordinary Success for All schools, and we keep revising these and other materials as we learn more from the schools. For example, school staff often modify various materials, forms, and assessments for their own use. We pay attention to these modifications and if they seem broadly applicable, we use them to revise our materials. Further, in our conversations with schools we are constantly putting schools in touch with other schools to help them with specific issues, such as bilingual education, year-round schedules, use of Title I funds in non-schoolwide circumstances, use of special education funds to support tutoring, and so on.

Local Meetings. One of the most common activities of local support networks for Success for All is regular meetings among key staff. Most often it is facilitators or facilitators and principals together who meet about once a month to discuss common problems and explore ways to help each other. In 1999, we began to introduce a leadership academy program in most areas with a concentration of SFA schools. This is a training course in leadership, but it also serves as a local networking opportunity for principals and facilitators. The benefits of these meetings are like the benefits of mentoring, discussed earlier. Principals, facilitators, and family support team members can learn a great deal from others who are facing similar problems in similar environments under similar circumstances. Further, regular meetings among the leaders of Success for All schools provide routine opportunities for these staff to build positive relationships and to establish opportunities for other types of mutual assistance.

Some local support networks schedule some sort of demonstration at the host school for the visiting staff from other schools. For example, the host school may have developed a new computer system to help with regrouping, a new thematic unit for preschool or kindergarten, or a family involvement or parent volunteer program they want to show off. The demonstration might take place before or after the meeting.

Local Conferences. One of the problems with our national Success for All conferences is that since most school staff must travel great distances to attend, few schools send more than one or two people, usually the facilitator and/or the principal. Because of funding limitations, some schools cannot send anyone. Yet a similar purpose is sometimes served by holding local conferences. These can be scheduled on designated staff development days so that all staff can attend. The activities are like those of the national conference, with various inservices, updates, and other sessions, and with opportunities for schools to show off their accomplishments in a variety of ways. SFAF staff participate, but center stage is reserved for the schools themselves. This provides a basis for local networking among the whole staffs of the schools that has remained long after the conference itself.

Organization and Capital

Scaling up a successful school reform model is not only a question of building a strong training corps capable of working nationally. It also involves creating an organization capable of supporting trainers, developing materials and strategies, carrying out research and awareness activities, and so on. This, in turn, requires capital. Any reform organization needs to spend large amounts of money each year on recruiting and training new trainers, developing and printing materials, and other activities, many months before school districts pay their bills. This means that a line of credit is needed indefinitely, over and above whatever funding was necessary to develop and evaluate the program in the first place. These issues, both creating an efficient organization and securing operating capital, having consumed enormous amounts of our energies in recent years.

For ten years, Success for All existed as part of Johns Hopkins University. When the program was small, this worked very well. Johns Hopkins took care of most routine business

functions, such as payroll, benefits, insurance, and some legal services. It allowed us to run a deficit each spring as long as we had accounts receivable to cover the deficit when schools paid us in the fall.

Separation from Johns Hopkins. However, by summer of 1997, it became apparent that this arrangement could no longer work. On our side, the university's salary scales, policies, and practices were constant impediments to growth. We could not hire trainers in the Northeast, for example, because Johns Hopkins salary scales were much lower than those of Northeastern school districts. Similarly, we had difficulty hiring business-related staff, such as accountants, human resources staff, and a finance director, because the University's rates for such staff were half of what commercial businesses were paying. On the University's side, the size and complexity of our operation were very difficult and time-consuming to manage, and the University was understandably uncomfortable advancing us ever-larger amounts of capital each spring.

As a result, we decided to separate from the University. We reached agreement with University officials by February, 1998, and completed the separation by July 1, 1998, establishing the Success for All Foundation as a not-for-profit entity to be responsible for the development and dissemination of Success for All and Roots & Wings.

For Profit or Not For Profit? One of the key issues we had to resolve early on was whether to remain as a not-for-profit organization. This was a difficult decision. On one hand, it was clear that as a for-profit we would have no problem raising capital; many venture capital firms and individuals courted us heavily. However, there were several factors that led us to strongly favor staying in the not-for-profit world if we could. One was a desire to maintain an institutional ethos that focused on what is best for children, not what is best for profits or investors. Our staff is deeply committed to children and to school reform, and we did not want to undermine this spirit in any way. Another factor related to the public perception of our efforts. Watching the hostile reception in many quarters to the Edison Project and other for-profit education reform groups, we wanted to be sure that our program was seen as having unmixed motivations. The American Federation of Teachers and, to a lesser extent, the National Education Association, have strongly supported us (and opposed Edison). We did not want to endanger support of that kind. Finally, as a practical matter, we wanted to be certain that any operating profits would go back into development, research, and quality control, not into investors or taxes.

The decision to remain as a not-for-profit organization did have serious costs, however. We found that banks were unwilling to make loans to us unless we had substantial assets. We were able to secure approximately $5 million in grants and loans from two family foundations, the MacArthur and Ford Foundations, the New Schools Venture Fund, and New American Schools; on the basis of these assets, we obtained a line of credit from a commercial bank. Even with this we remain seriously undercapitalized for an organization of our size and rate of growth. For example, we have an annual printing bill of about $15 million, which we must pay many months before school districts begin to pay us. Had we had investors rather than loans, these problems would not have existed. On balance, we are sure we made the right decision, and that, in the long run, we will be much stronger as a not-for-profit organization.

In addition to capital needs, we have had to recruit a large corps of people to duplicate all

of the functions the University had previously fulfilled: finance, accounting, payroll, benefits, insurance, legal services, information technology, space, and so on. All of these new people had to be recruited and trained at the same time that we were increasing our number of schools by about 50% and our total institutional budget by almost double. As these people have settled in, it has become apparent that we can do a much better job outside of the University, creating an organization completely tailored to our needs.

District-Level Failures

In working with high-poverty schools in 600 school districts, it is inevitable that we would encounter failures as well as successes. On a school-by-school basis, not every school achieves the success we work to attain. Not surprisingly, the key factor in success or failure at the school level is the quality and completeness of implementation (Nunnery et al, 1996). Further, we have occasionally experienced failures on a larger scale, which bear more directly on our scale-up strategies. We try to learn from our failures as well as our successes, and adjust our scale-up strategies to take into account what we have learned.

Two of our most widely publicized failures were almost purely political failures, rather than implementation failures. In Baltimore, our original home, a change of superintendents in 1989 put in place a superintendent who was openly hostile to outside involvement in the district, most particularly from Johns Hopkins University. Despite substantial and consistent evidence of effectiveness in well-controlled experiments (e.g., Madden et al., 1993), the program was phased out of Baltimore in the mid-1990's. Much later, a change of superintendents in Memphis brought in a superintendent intent of stamping out the accomplishments of his predecessor, Gerry House, who had been named Superintendent of the Year primarily on the basis of her bringing into Memphis a variety of reform models, including a large number of Success for All schools. As in Baltimore, evaluations had consistently found positive effects of Success for All on achievement tests (e.g., Sanders et al., 1999), but this did not matter.

A key failure in Dade County (Miami), Florida, was partly political, but also involved a decision on our part that we later regretted. We had begun in Dade County on a small scale in 1994. Our initial schools did very well, and an internal evaluation found that Success for All schools were making outstanding gains on state assessments, in comparison to other Miami schools.

In 1996, the Dade County Superintendent, Octavio Visiedo, asked us to substantially expand our program in Miami. He created a program for about 40 of the district's highest-poverty elementary schools that included Success for All and an integrated learning system, either CCC or Jostens. The nature of the program precluded the voting process that we had long advocated. We resisted this, but were finally convinced that the district would do a good job of obtaining buy-in from teachers by treating them as professionals, providing plentiful services and support, and so on. In fact, the district did start off this way, but just a few months into the school year the superintendent unexpectedly resigned. The new superintendent reneged on the promises to the teachers and to us, and provided low levels of training, inadequate tutors, and

ambiguous support. As a result, implementation quality, which began at an adequate level, began to erode. An internal evaluation several years into the implementation (Urdegar, 1998) looked at one-year gains (controlling out all the achievement gains from the earlier years) found that neither Success for All nor the CCC or Jostens interventions were making any difference. This evaluation further eroded support for the model. Over a period of years, schools in Miami have gradually dropped out of the program, and the Miami debacle still haunts us throughout Florida and nationally.

The Baltimore, Memphis, and Miami experiences taught us some hard lessons. First, they reminded us that we play in a rough neighborhood. As long as we remained a small "pilot," we could stay below the radar and continue despite district-level turmoil, but as we became a large presence, our fates could be tied to those of a particular superintendent or other political actors. However, they also influenced us in maintaining a focus on the principal and school staff, not the district, as the unit of change in school reform.

District-Level Implementations

While our early experiences led us to focus on schools rather than districts, events in recent years have caused us to rethink this strategy and to develop means of working with districts. This has come about primarily through experiences in a few districts that have adopted Success for All as their main literacy approach.

Hartford, Connecticut. Perhaps the most interesting district-wide application of Success for All is under way in Hartford, Connecticut. In 1998, a new superintendent, Tony Amato, came to Hartford promising to get Hartford off of the bottom rank among Connecticut districts. In collaboration with the Hartford Federation of Teachers, he adopted SFA in all but one of the district's 26 elementary schools, and instituted many other reforms directed at enhancing teachers' skills and students' achievement.

Because there was one reading reform program in the district, the district could support it in ways that other districts could not. Amato himself attended the teacher training and then publicly taught an upper elementary and a first grade class, communicating "if I can do it, you can do it" to skeptical teachers. He asked his principals to also attend the training and then teach a class from time to time. He aligned many district policies around the requirements of Success for All and carefully monitored the eight-week assessments used in the program to assess the progress of all schools and teachers, as a means of obtaining curriculum-based indicators long before the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) scores were available. In combination, these and other interventions led to substantial gains in district-wide performance on the CMT's, moving Hartford from last to second among Connecticut's seven urban districts.

In fall, 2002, Amato left Hartford, but his successor, Robert Henry, has maintained the model at high quality.

Chancellor's District, New York City. Another districtwide adoption of Success for All has also affected our thinking about possibilities of districts as the unit of change. In 1998, New York City Chancellor Rudy Crew created a separate district within the city for schools performing at the very lowest levels. These schools were removed from their community

districts, given substantially new staffs, and given significant resources to move their schools forward. All elementary schools received Success for All as part of the initiative; in lieu of a vote, teachers individually applied for their jobs with the understanding that SFA would be used. As in Hartford, schools in the Chancellor's District made remarkable gains in test scores, and most of the schools have improved enough to escape from the state's list of Schools Under Registration Review (SURR).

As in Hartford, the Chancellor's District was able to build its professional development and other strategies around the requirements of SFA. The Chancellor's District was very well-regarded within New York City and in other urban districts, yet it was disbanded in 2003 as a move toward a consistent districtwide whole language model, introduced by superintendent Joel Klein and his deputy, Diana Lam.

Project GRAD. A third model for subdistrict reform is Project GRAD, a national program begun in Houston by a former Tenneco CEO, James Ketelsen (see McAdoo, 1998). Begun as a scholarship program for disadvantaged high school students, Project GRAD began in 1999 to work with entire feeder systems of schools leading into its chosen high schools. All elementary schools (and many middle schools) in these feeder systems use Success for All. Local Project GRAD staff supplement the training and followup provided by SFAF, and collaborate with district staff in making each feeder system a district within a district, with its own policies, curricula, and professional development plans. Project GRAD implementations in Houston, Columbus (Ohio), Atlanta, and Los Angeles have all shown substantial gains on state tests. Again, Project GRAD demonstrates the positive effect of subdistrict coherence in ensuring implementation quality, adaptation to local needs, and enhanced outcomes.

The Hartford, Chancellor's District, and Project GRAD experiences, as well as smaller district-wide implementations in Long Branch, NJ; Lawrence, MA; and Galveston, TX, have given us a vision of how the district can become the unit of change, with appropriate supportive structures. District-level implementations do not generate the level of initial teacher- and principal buy-in as school-by-school implementations, and we must work to build this commitment over time. However, having a consistent district focus on Success for All appears to have advantages that outweigh their disadvantages. In the current environment, which is emphasizing district coherence and control (in contrast to site-based management), we must learn how to take advantage of district coherence in introducing school and classroom change (see Slavin, 2003, for more on this).

Reconciling District Successes and Failures

The previous sections present a paradox. Larger-scale implementations within urban districts have been both major successes and major failures. Of course, the successes are still under way, and could become tomorrow's failures.

One possible lesson from our experience with districts or large subdistricts as the focus of reform is simply that for these arrangements to work, the district has to follow through on the opportunity presented by large-scale implementation of SFA. If districts align professional development, curriculum, assessment, and other policies around the requirements of Success for All, and use the tools that SFA provides (including eight-week assessment data), then district coherence can be a strength. This might have happened in Miami if Visiedo had remained in the

superintendency. Memphis did a fairly good job of supporting Success for All, but at the end it had nineteen different comprehensive reform models, too many to support adequately (although the reforms would almost certainly have been swept away anyway for purely political reasons when Gerry House resigned).

District reform is the next frontier in the scaling up of Success for All. We have learned a great deal about how to help district leaders create coherence around research-based practices. However, working with whole districts or major subunits of districts also raises the profile of SFA and makes the reform more vulnerable to the shifting tides of district politics that are the bane of school reform, especially in large urban districts.

Lessons Learned

Our experience with the national dissemination of Success for All has led us to several conclusions. These are as follows.

- Successful dissemination of a program as comprehensive and complex as Success for All requires a combination of two types of assistance to schools. One is a core of talented, dedicated trainers operating from the project's home and/or regional training sites closely coordinated with the project headquarters. The second is a local and national network of schools willing and able to provide technical and emotional support to schools entering the network.

- While other institutions can be helpful in dissemination, we are finding greater success in employing staff from outstanding Success for All schools to be full- or part-time trainers. Regional laboratories, other universities, and state departments of education have been helpful in our dissemination efforts, but with the exception of the University of Memphis they have not taken major responsibility for disseminating Success for All in their regions. District coordinators are very helpful as liaisons between our project, Success for All schools, and their central offices. Regionally-based trainers on our payroll and staff in Success for All schools who are willing to do some training and follow-up for us are usually much more effective.

- Quality control is a constant concern. Whatever dissemination strategy we use, constantly checking on the quality of training, implementation, and outcomes is essential. Without it, all programs fade into nothingness.

- To maintain over a long period of time, schools implementing innovations must be part of a national network of like-minded schools. To survive the inevitable changes of superintendents, principals, teachers, and district policies, school staffs need to feel that there is a valued and important group beyond the confines of their district that cares about and supports what they are doing.

- District or subdistrict adoptions of Success for All can produce outstanding outcomes on a substantial scale if district leaders align their policies and professional development efforts around the model's requirements, but large-scale implementations in urban districts also exposes the program to greater political risks.

Success for All is the largest comprehensive reform network, but it is only one of many national models of school reform, and it has unique characteristics that may make some dissemination strategies effective and others difficult or ineffective. Other types of programs may find very different strategies to be more effective. However, to the extent that other programs emphasize a strong research base, a well-specified set of materials and procedures, and a comprehensive approach to reform, we believe that our experiences will be a useful guide and will inform policies regarding technical assistance and reform at the local, state, and federal levels.

Policy Implications

Our experiences with the dissemination of Success for All have given us some degree of insight into the ways that systemic issues, such as federal, state, and local policies, can promote or inhibit school-by-school reform, and have given us some ideas about how these policies might change to support what we and other school change networks are trying to do.

Substantial positive change in student learning can only come about on a broad scale when major changes take place in the daily interactions of teachers and students. Ideally, we would have a variety of curricula, instructional methods, professional development methods, and school organizational forms for each subject and grade level, each of which has been rigorously researched and evaluated in comparison to traditional practices and found to be effective on valid measures of student achievement. School staffs would be made aware of these effective alternatives and would have the time and resources to learn about them, visit schools using them, see video tapes on them, and ultimately make an informed choice among them. Their exploration of alternatives might be assisted by local "brokers" who are knowledgeable about effective programs, organizational development, and the change process, and are aware of local needs, circumstances, and resources (see Slavin, 1997, 1999).

School staffs would control significant resources for materials and professional development and would be able to invest them in the exploration process and in well developed models supported by national training staffs and local support networks. These national programs would themselves be primarily supported by revenues from schools, but would also have seed money for developing materials and awareness and training materials, establishing national networks and regional training sites, and building qualified staffs of trainers and support personnel. Federal and state policies would support the process of school-by-school change by developing and promulgating standards, assessments, and accountability mechanisms likely to encourage school staffs to explore alternative models for change and to invest in professional development. They would push existing resources (such as Title I funds) to the school level, with a clearly stated expectation that these funds are intended for whole-school reform, not for

maintaining current operations or patching around the edges. Some portion of school change funds would be provided on a competitive basis to schools, based on their willingness to engage in whole-school reform and allocate their own resources (especially Title I) to this purpose. Further, funds would be allocated to outstanding exemplars of school reform methods to compensate them for the costs of serving as demonstration sites, mentoring other schools in their local networks, and participating in local training and follow-up.

The remainder of this papter discusses the current state of policy support for school-by-school changes and the policy reforms needed to provide this support on a broad scale.

1. Increase support for research and development of school change models.

One of the most important deficiencies in the current structure of professional development is a shortage of whole school reform programs proven in rigorous research to be markedly more effective than traditional instruction, and thus ready for national dissemination (see Slavin & Fashola, 1998). Besides Success for All, only a few, such as the Comer project (see Cook et al., 1999), Direct Instruction (Adams & Engelmann, 1997), and America's Choice (Supovitz, Pologinco, & Snyder, 2001) have conducted and reported comparisons with traditional methods. There is progress on the development of new school change models; the New American Schools (NAS) funded seven design teams to develop such models, and the U.S. Department of Education has funded the development of six secondary models, including a Success for All Middle School design. Only recently has OERI begun to fund projects to formally evaluate the outcomes of some of these new designs in comparison to traditional methods.

It is interesting to note that the federal involvement in the development, evaluation, and dissemination of these models was minimal until fairly recently. Private foundation and corporate funding was almost entirely responsible for the development and dissemination of all of the current CSR models in wide use. Success for All benefited from federal funding (its development and evaluation have been part of the work of the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk at Johns Hopkins University), but it could not have been successfully developed and evaluated at first without funding from private foundations, especially the Carnegie and Pew Foundations and New American Schools.

There is a need for federal investment in the development of schoolwide change models, in evaluation of these models by their developers, and in third-party evaluations that compare the effects of the models to the effects of traditional methods (see Slavin, 1997; Herman, 1999). Only when we have many successful models with clear and widely accepted evidence of effectiveness will we be able to confidently offer schools an array of choices, each of which may be quite different in philosophy or main elements but each of which is known to be effective under well-specified and replicable conditions of implementation.

2. Help proven professional development networks build capacity.

The most important limitation on the broad dissemination of Success for All is our own capacity to provide high-quality professional development services to a very large number of schools. Our model requires a great deal of training and follow-up, and any equally ambitious restructuring program that intends to change the daily instructional practices of all teachers would require equally intense training. We can only add so many schools each year without overtaxing our staff's considerable energies, hiring more trainers than we can train and mentor, or seeing the quality of professional development decline.

Our professional development organization is self-funding; our trainers' salaries are supported by fees we charge schools for their time. However, rapid scale-up has costs. While we are training new trainers, we must pay their salaries, fly them to observe schools or training sessions, and so on. Costs for establishing trainers in sites other than the project's home site may be particularly great, as these trainers must travel frequently to the home site. There is no source of funding for these costs. By the time a trainer is fully operative and bringing in enough revenue to cover his or her salary, we may have spent more than $50,000. As noted earlier, an even larger problem of scale-up is obtaining a line of credit to cover printing and other cyclical costs.

There is a need to provide training organizations like ours with funds to scale up their operations. Ultimately such organizations must be self-funding, but they need capitalization as they begin their work and as they engage in significant expansion of their national capacity. As noted earlier, private foundations have largely fulfilled this capitalization function for some projects, including Success for All, but if training organizations are to remain in the not-for-profit sector and to operate at significant scale, there must be much larger sources of capital for this purpose from government or donors. Recently, OERI has begun to provide capacity-building funding, and this is starting to have a substantial impact on the total availability of reform models.

3. Provide resources to schools earmarked for adoption of effective programs.

Serious reform at the school level takes serious funding at the school level. School staffs must have control of resources they can spend only on professional development, especially on adoption of demonstrably effective programs.

School staffs should control professional development funds so that they can choose the development that they feel will meet their needs. When they freely select a given program or service provider, they will feel a commitment to that choice, in contrast to the more common case in which teachers resist inservice presentations that they feel do not respond to their needs. A school should be able to purchase services from any provider, including universities, regional laboratories, federal, state, or local technical assistance centers, professional development networks (such as the National Writing Project), or even their own district's staff development office.

The Obey-Porter Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration is making an excellent start in this area, at least as far as whole-school, comprehensive designs are concerned. This initiative is providing modest funding on a competitive basis both to help schools adopt research-based programs and to give them an incentive to use their existing resources (especially Title I) on programs likely to make a difference in all aspects of school functioning and in student achievement (see Slavin, 1998).

4. Provide awareness and brokering services to schools so they can choose professional development services wisely.

Individual school staffs are poorly placed to select promising or effective programs, as they may not be aware of what is available or how to go about obtaining the programs and materials they need.

Providing awareness (and some brokering) of promising programs is one area in which the federal government has played a significant role. The developers of programs that met an evaluation standard. NDN state facilitators organized awareness conferences and helped schools adopt these "validated" programs. However, the evaluation standards were low, and NDN funding was never adequate to provide much more than a clearinghouse, informational function (although, even with its limitations, NDN efforts led to thousands of successful adoptions of research-based programs in every state). In 1996, funding for the NDN was eliminated.

There is a need for far more ambitious outreach to school and district staffs to help them assess their needs and make them aware of a range of alternative programs and services available to them. State or federal support might be important in helping establish brokering agencies or individuals, but in a system in which professional development resources are focused at the school level, agencies or individuals providing any professional development services to schools would ultimately have to support themselves on fees from schools. Existing agencies, such as the regional laboratories and regional comprehensive assistance centers, could also play an important role in helping schools make wise choices of professional development services and programs. A process of this kind has been set in motion by the Obey-Porter Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration, which provides funds to labs and state departments to increase awareness of proven, comprehensive models.

5. Provide funds to successful exemplars of proven programs to serve as demonstration/ training sites.

One thing we have learned in the dissemination of Success for All is how important it is to have schools successfully implementing the program whose staffs are willing to receive visitors and assist neighboring schools in the process of adopting the program. Many of our outstanding schools have put hundreds or thousands of person-hours into helping other schools start and maintain the program.

However, all this help comes at a price. Many schools can provide only minimal

assistance to other schools without overly taxing their own staff resources. Some principals are concerned that if they let their best staff members work to help other schools, they will be hired away. More often, school staffs find that while their efforts to help other schools bring them recognition and satisfaction, they must put a limit on this activity.

It is unfair and unrealistic to expect that outstanding exemplars of proven programs will work indefinitely as demonstration and training sites without any outside compensation. There is a need to provide resources to these schools for the real costs of serving as demonstration sites (such as hiring substitutes when staff are elsewhere helping other schools) and to help them see aiding other schools as a part of their responsibilities.

Conclusion

Our experience in the national dissemination of Success for All is instructive in many ways. We have discovered that there are far more schools eager to make thoroughgoing changes in their instructional programs than we or other national training networks can possibly serve. Policy changes, such as those contained in No Child Left Behind, the Obey-Porter Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration, and state and local systemic reforms, are further motivating schools to seek high-quality, intensive, and extensive professional development services to fundamentally transform themselves. The key limitation in making this change take place is the limited national capacity to provide schools with well-researched models backed by networks of trainers, demonstration schools, materials, and other requirements.

The focus of this paper is on the ways we have tried to expand the capacity of our Success for All program to serve a rapidly expanding network of schools across the United States, and on the policy changes that would be needed to support our network and others in building our nation's capacity for quality professional development. In brief, we have found that our network of schools and our own dedicated staff are the bedrock of a national dissemination strategy, and that building on the strengths of this network is the most promising approach to scale-up. Federal, state, and other support to help establish and maintain professional development networks like ours, along with providing money to schools earmarked for professional development, are most likely to create conditions in which schools throughout the United States will focus their energy on exploring alternatives, seeking professional development appropriate to their needs, and then engaging in a long-term, thoughtful process of change that results in measurably improved achievement for all children.

References

Adams, G., & Engelmann, S. (1997). *Research on Direct Instruction: 25 years beyond DISTAR*. Seattle, WA: Educational Achievement Systems.

Borman, G., & Hewes, G. (2001*). Long-term effects and cost effectiveness of Success for All.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on the Education of Students placed

at Risk.

Borman, G.D., Hewes, G.M., Overman, L.T., & Brown, S. (2003) Comprehensive school reform and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 73* (2), 125-230.

Commission on Title I (1992). *Making schools work for children in poverty*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Cook, T.D., Habib, F.-N., Phillips, M., Setterstein, R.A., Shagle, S.L., & Degirmencioglu, S.M. (1999). Comer's School Development Program in Prince George's County, Maryland: A theory-based evaluation. *American Educational Research Journal, 36* (3), 543-597.

Cooper, R., Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (1998). Success for All: Improving the quality of implementation of whole-school change through the use of a national reform network. *Education and Urban Society, 30* (3), 385-408.

Dianda, M. & Flaherty, J. (1994). *Annual report on promising practices and program adaptations and successes*. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory.

Haynes, N.M. (Ed.) (1994). *School development program: Research monograph*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.

Herman, R. (1999). *An educator's guide to schoolwide reform.* Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Hurley, E.A., Chamberlain, A., Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (2001). Effects of Success for All on TAAS Reading: A Texas statewide evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82* (10), 750-756.

Levin, H.M. (1987). Accelerated schools for disadvantaged students. *Educational Leadership, 44*(6), 19-21.

Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L.J., & Wasik, B.A. (1993). Success for All: Longitudinal effects of a restructuring program for inner-city elementary schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 30,* 123-148.

Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., & Simons, K. (2001). *MathWings: Effects on student mathematics performance*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.

McCarthy, J. (1991, April). *Accelerated schools — The Satellite Center Project*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Nunnery, J., Ross, S., Smith, L., Slavin, R., Hunter, P., & Stubbs, J. (1996, April). *An assessment of Success for All program configuration effects on the reading achievement of at-risk first grade students*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Pinnell, G.S., Lyons, C.A., DeFord, D.E., & Seltzer, M. (1994). Comparing instructional models for the literacy education of high risk first graders. *Reading Research Quarterly, 29*, 8-38.

Pinnell, G.S., DeFord, D.E., & Lyons, C.A. (1988). *Reading Recovery: Early intervention for at-risk first graders*. Arlington, VA; Educational Research Service.

Sanders, W.L., Wright, S.P., Ross, S.M., & Wang, L.W. (2000). *Value-added achievement results for three cohorts of Roots & Wings schools in Memphis: 1995-1999 outcomes*. Memphis: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Slavin, R.E. (1995). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Slavin, R.E. (1996). Neverstreaming: Preventing learning disabilities. *Educational Leadership, 53* (5), 4-7.

Slavin, R.E. (1997). Design competitions: A proposal for a new federal role in educational research and development. *Educational Researcher, 26* (1), 22-28.

Slavin, R.E. (1998). Far and wide: Developing and disseminating research-based programs. *American Educator, 22,* (3), 8-11, 45.

Slavin, R.E. (2003, March 5). Converging reforms: Change schools? Change districts? How the two approaches can work together. *Education Week*, 44-46.

Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (2000). Roots & Wings: Effects of whole-school reform on student achievement. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 5* (1 & 2), 109-136.

Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (2000). Research on achievement outcomes of Success for All: A summary and response to critics. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82* (1), 38-40, 59-66.

Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (Eds.) (2001). *One million children: Success for All*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (1999). *Roots & Wings: Effects of whole-school reform on student achievement.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Cheung, A. & Liang, C. (2002). *Effects of Success for All on SAT-9 reading: A California statewide evaluation.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Dolan, L.J., & Wasik, B.A. (1996). *Every child, every school: Success for All*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Dolan, L.J., Wasik, B.A., Ross, S.M., & Smith, L.J. (1994). "Whenever and wherever we choose...": The replication of Success for All. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *75*(8), 639-647.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B.A. (1992). *Success for All: A relentless approach to prevention and early intervention in elementary schools*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Supovitz, J.A., Poglinco, S.M., & Snyder, B.A. (2001). *Moving mountains: Successes and challenges of the America's Choice comprehensive school reform design*. Philadephia: University of Pennsylvania, Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Traub, J. (1999). *Better by design? A consumer's guide to schoolwide reform*. Washington, DC: Thomas Fordham Foundation.

Urdegar, S.M. (1998). *Evaluation of the Success for All program, 1997-98*. Miami: Miami-Dade Public Schools.