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This monograph examines the existing role of teacher leaders while addressing many of the missed opportunities for teacher leaders to impact student achievement. The work of teacher leaders must impact teacher expectations, teacher content knowledge base, and teacher practice. In an era of teacher accountability and teacher quality schools can no longer continue to tolerate the fact that 40 percent of students in urban and rural schools never make it to high school graduation. To that end, urgency suggests that we begin to examine the potential of teacher leadership.

For decades, society touted education as America’s great equalizer. Fifty years have passed since the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision regarding Brown v. Board of Education, which should have been pivotal for educating minority students. However, equal access has not led to equal achievement levels for all students, especially minority students. A plethora of literature suggests that there is a significant correlation between a student’s level of education and socio-economic status. Fischer et al. (1996) posited that there is a symbiotic relationship between education and prosperity, both on the individual and societal levels. The quality of the education that poor and minority students receive relies heavily on their teachers’ expertise in teaching. Unfortunately, Rothman’s (2001) study of teachers of poor and minority students in California found that teachers in urban and low-income areas were less likely to have substantive content knowledge, were less experienced, and were less prepared with pedagogical skills to meet student needs.

The reality of low achievement levels in many urban schools is a result of low expectations for students. Delpit (1995) contended that research continues to reinforce the link between student failure and socio-economic status as well as student failure and cultural differences. Delpit lamented, “It is hard to believe that these children can possibly be successful after their teachers have…so much negative indoctrination…there is a tendency to assume deficits in students rather than to locate and teach to strengths” (p. 172).

While the 100 largest urban school districts comprise less than 1% of the nation’s school districts, urban schools educate approximately 30% of all students living in poverty and 40% of all nonwhite students in the United States (MDRC, 2003). The urban schools literature is replete with evidence highlighting the deleterious fact that students within urban districts typically suffer from higher poverty rate indexes, higher populations of students for whom English is not their primary language, higher populations of special education students, more complex family structures, higher incidences of violence, and fewer certified teachers in critical subject areas such as math, literacy, and science. In former United States Secretary of Education Rod Paige’s recent address to the 2004 National Urban League in Detroit, Michigan, he identified the
Achievement Gap as the “...major driver of racial inequality...” He contended that,
...the African American community is in educational crisis, a catastrophe is upon us. This is no exaggeration. For example, a new study from Northeastern University found that black male unemployment was so bad that in 2002, one out of every four African American men, 25 percent, were idle all yearlong, a rate twice as high as that of white or Hispanic males.” Paige also revealed “…African American students on average score 30 points lower than their Anglo peers, one out of every four African American men does not complete high school and of those who do finish 12 th grade and graduate, more than 60% of them are not enrolled in colleges. There is overwhelming evidence that these problems continue generation after generation, passed down from father to son like a name.

Likewise, Armandaiz (2001) concluded that public school systems have institutionalized negative biases enacted toward Mexican Americans. In the public schools studies, Armandariz found that the skills, knowledge, and self-concepts were consistently and systematically devalued coupled with low teacher expectations of these minority students. According to Leithwood and Fullan (2003),

Often times school leaders work with student populations that are increasingly diverse and may not be experiencing success in school. This includes children who are from low-income families or whose cultural backgrounds or characteristics fall outside of the mainstream (for example, native peoples or recent immigrants, children with physical handicaps, and Latinos, or African Americans). Histories of poor school performance for such students may result from neglect on behalf of the school and/or district leaders, allocation of the least able teachers and most limited resources to the most needy schools and students, low expectations, or lack of knowledge of effective strategies for working with particular kinds of students in challenging contexts. (p.13)

Effective schools research emphasizes the impact of teacher content knowledge, best practice methodology and the powerful role teacher expectations play in student achievement. Despite consistent low achievement levels of children of poverty in many of our urban schools, we pay little attention to determining how teacher expectations can be changed and sustained. Changing teacher expectations is a challenging undertaking as expectations for student achievement hinges on personal beliefs. A teacher’s beliefs ultimately influence teaching practices and behaviors (Good & Brophy, 1997). Teachers’ low expectations for student learning result in implementation of less challenging curriculum and ineffective instructional methods. Delpit (1995) described the problem succinctly, “We say that we believe that all children can learn, but few of us really believe it” (p.172). If teachers embrace the idea that there is little they can do to improve student achievement, they find little incentive to change their instructional practices.

Low income and urban schools face the challenge to make knowledge about teaching relevant to practitioners. Relevancy prevents teachers from sorting out information through their belief systems. Teachers with limited knowledge, passé practices, and low expectations need focused professional development, which allows for teacher transfer and routine use. If teachers seize the opportunity to gain new knowledge and best practices designed to increase student engagement and improve performance, they will have higher expectations. Teachers’ sense of self-efficacy increases as their teaching successes increase.

The school, as an institution, has the power to change a history of poor school performance however, the school must face what Patterson (1997) referred to as the bold realities about leadership and educational reform. The school administrator can no longer exist as the sole instructional leader in school reform. Whereas, teacher leadership presents an opportunity for teachers and leaders to grow and develop simultaneously, a parallel opportunity exists for school administrators. As the administrator embraces teacher leadership, sharing instructional leadership roles becomes critical. According to Newmann and Wehling (1995), principals play a key role in creating conditions that enable a school to improve. They further purported that effective principals involved in school improvement exhibit the following characteristics:

- Lead through shared vision and values
- Involve faculty members in decision-making
- Provide relevant staff development and training
- Model behaviors consistent with the vision and values

Changing teachers’ knowledge, practices and expectations can no longer rest in the lap of the school principal alone if the goal of the reform is to create a learning community to improve teaching and learning. Several studies revealed the importance of teacher leadership in total school reform (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 1996; Lieberman, 1988; Urbanski & Nickolaou, 1997).
Teacher leadership in urban settings requires time and attention to the challenges related to power, social class, inequity and race for improvement in student achievement levels to occur (Delpit, 1995; Lipman, 1999; Wynn, 2000). Successful schools in the United States provide support for teachers on a day-to-day basis and focus on improving learning for all students. What separates successful schools from unsuccessful schools is how educators define and utilize leadership (Glickman, 1993; Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2001). Teacher leaders who provide their colleagues with the professional development desperately needed to abolish low expectations have become pivotal to reversing the intolerable achievement gap that exists for minority students in urban schools. Today, the view of leadership is transformed to focus on scientific understandings of teaching and learning, data driven decision-making and a broader view of professional development. Dufour (2002) preferred the term learning leader versus instructional leader. The educational lens is now focused on leading learning communities The National Association of Elementary School Principals (2001), embraced six important roles of leadership: establishing high expectations for students; connecting content and instruction to standards; using multiple sources of data for assessment of learning; placing a high priority on learning for students and adults; providing ongoing professional development in a culture of learning; and embracing the community’s support in the success of the school.

This article examines the existing role of teacher leaders, addresses opportunities and potentials for teacher leaders to positively impact teacher knowledge base, and teacher practices and teacher expectations.

**Defining the Work of Teacher Leaders**

Historically, educators defined teacher leadership as support faculty such as social workers, department heads, master teachers, lead teachers, learning specialists and supervisors. Specialization of more traditional teacher leadership roles may not necessarily lead to dynamic school reform and perhaps requires a more complex definition.

Crowther, Kaagan, Ferguson and Hann (2002) stated that, “Teacher leadership facilitates principled action to achieve whole-school success. It applies the distinctive power of teaching to shape meaning for children, youth, and adults. And it contributes to long-term, enhanced quality of community life” (p. 10). Katzenmeyer and Moller (2001) defined teacher leadership as, “Teachers who are leaders lead within and beyond the classroom, identify with and contribute to a community of teacher learners and leaders, and influence others toward improved educational practice” (p. 5). The dynamic change in the way a school community works together to improve student learning as suggested here offers promise to schools struggling with limited resources. Recognizing the potential that teacher leadership affords schools is the first step toward acquiring positive results. School leaders must take the next step and determine how to identify teacher leaders and define the way in which principals and teacher leaders can work collaboratively toward common goals.

Teacher leaders are identified primarily by school administrators, other teachers, or the teacher leaders are self-proclaimed; their roles vary dramatically. There is agreement in the literature that teacher leaders take on a variety of roles but the more recent role is one which is not specialized but more generalized (York-Barr, 2004). This generalized role is global and process-oriented leading change beyond the school walls. The role emerging for teachers leaders is more than a singular contribution, but far reaching including a strong focus on the well being and achievement of all students and includes more community involvement.

According to Hargreaves (as cited in Crowther, Kaagan, Ferguson & Hann, 2002) an, “…intimate connection…exists between teaching and leading, realistically as well as rhetorically…when leadership is conceived as principalship, then really effective principals can bring about successful innovation, turn under performing schools around, and even sustain change…But typically, when top-level leaders move on, the focus shifts, the ownership of change leaves with the departing leaders. (p. xii) Conversely, distributed leadership allows the change or reform to continue. The focus is on “communities of teacher leadership” supported by teacher leaders (Crowther, Kaagan, Ferguson & Hann, 2002). Teacher leaders help colleagues achieve success for all students in the school. They accept more responsibility beyond their individual classrooms and focus on change for the entire school program. Crowther, Kaagan, Ferguson and Hann (2002) described this type of leadership as parallel leadership. Parallel leadership involves leaders working harmoniously, moving in a common direction and diminishes the role of the principal as primary decision-maker. Teacher leaders in this position engage with the school administrator in the goal of increasing the potential of the school to improve as a community. Parallel leadership, according to Crowther, Kaagan, Ferguson and Hann
(2002), “…engages processes of professional learning, culture building, and school wide pedagogy to enhance a school’s overall capacity to produce positive student outcomes” (p. 43). Although a superfluity of definitions of teacher leadership exists in the literature, there is some agreement that the leader must possess certain qualities in order for changes to emerge in the school community.

The qualities necessary for teacher leadership include interpersonal skills that build trusting, communicative and collaborative relationships with teachers. Content knowledge that involves deep understanding of subject matter and how to deliver the content knowledge through a curriculum development process is necessary for the teacher leader’s ability to gain the respect of colleagues. Additionally, pedagogical knowledge (teaching practices) that demands an understanding of how children best learn within a “thinking” curriculum as well as how to assess the learning is paramount to teachers in leadership capacities.

An important and somewhat daunting challenge for teacher leaders in urban school settings is the greater inhibitor of school reform: low expectations. Despite rhetoric related to teachers’ efforts toward increasing student achievement, teachers often don’t practice what they preach. Teacher leaders play a key role in championing the need for high expectations. However, the roadblocks of personal and professional bias regarding race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status and gender must first be removed to pave the way for high expectations for all students.

**Opportunities for Teacher Leaders to Impact Teacher Expectations**

According to Green (2002; 2003), when the professional staff begins with sincerity to believe that all students can achieve, hold high expectations for student accomplishments, and do whatever it takes to ensure that students will learn, then the school operates in a self-sustaining climate of effectiveness. Included among the responsibilities of teacher leaders is their ability to positively impact teacher expectations.

Within urban environments, several students live in a state of hopelessness and are more likely influenced negatively which often results in poorer choices and poorer academic performances. To that end, many teachers have acknowledged and accepted these factors which result in their abilities to expect a lower performance, if a performance at all. Nonetheless, many children succumb to these low expectations resulting in self-fulfilling prophecies. Harvard University Scholar, Ronald Ferguson (1998; 2003), presented evidence that suggested teachers’ perceptions, expectations, and behaviors probably help sustain, and perhaps even expand, the test score gap between White and African American students. Continuing the discussion, Swanson, Cunningham and Spencer (2003) examined African American males’ perceptions of teacher expectations for their achievement and found that negative stereotyping and tracking influenced achievement.

Seemingly, everyone knows that it is unacceptable for teachers to knowingly engage in behaviors that may stifle and hinder the performance of students. As a result, many urban school districts pride themselves on their belief and expectation that ALL students can learn, never really demonstrating that this belief alone dictates and guides every action, interaction, and reaction that the professionals within the organization display.

In order to demonstrate the expectation that ALL children can learn, teachers must explore a deep understanding of the protean use of expectations. Bamburg (1994) concentrated on three general types of teacher expectations. The first type of expectation refers to a teacher’s perception or hunch as to the student’s current academic level. While the student’s current level may not affect future performance, Bamburg (1994) continued to share that it does affect the teacher’s interaction with the students. For example, teachers who believe that they are interacting with bright students nod their heads and smile more often than teachers who believe they are interacting with slower students. Additionally, teachers also lean toward and provide more direct eye contact with smarter students more frequently.

The second type of expectation that Bamburg (1994) mentioned is teacher’s prediction. The teacher’s prediction is the teacher’s guess of how much academic progress will occur over a period of time. Coupled with teachers’ perceptions, teachers’ predictions can negatively influence students. For instance, students labeled academically challenging may receive fewer opportunities to learn new material than students labeled as bright. Now, academic rigor is factored into the equation because students labeled as slow are less likely to benefit from acceleration versus constant remediation.

The third type of expectation is the degree to which a teacher over estimates or underestimates a student’s present level of performance. Underestimating a student’s academic performance is usually as a result of test scores or other information gained about the child from a previous teacher. Any or all of the general types of expectations influence student performance. According to Bamburg (1994), they will create either a self-fulfilling prophecy or a sustaining expectation effect. Likewise, the findings of Douglass (1964) informed educators by revealing that,
...teachers’ expectations about a student’s achievement can be affected by factors having little or nothing to do with his/her ability, and yet these expectations can determine the level of achievement by confining learning opportunities to those available in one’s track. (p. 2)

Many theorists warned that expectations could become damaging if based upon inaccurate or inflexible information, and if teachers make instructional decisions on these incorrect perceptions (Babad, Bernieri, & Rosenthal, 1991; Brophy & Good, 1970; Demaray & Elliot, 1998). While the damage of inaccuracy is potentially detrimental to students, even more alarming is what Bognar (1982) shared about the lack of willingness for teachers to revise their expectations of students in response to the new information.

Attempting to positively affect the attitudes and beliefs of other teachers is a major responsibility for teacher leaders and may be the most complex, especially since it is a highly personal affective measure. Hilliard (1991) argued that deep restructuring and fundamental change occurs when we allow teachers to experience the joy of collaborative discussion, dialogue, critique, and research. An enriched academic foundation is definitely a prerequisite for an enriched pedagogical foundation, and the two provide a level of comfort for the teacher who supports professional dialogue as well as teacher-student dialogue.

While the critical conversations must begin, conversations alone are not enough to get all teachers to become reflective practitioners. Teachers must examine their belief about the expectations of students. Teacher leaders should begin to nudge teachers to shift their thinking and practices. For example, in the American educational system, most teachers are prepared to assess students based on the student’s ability instead of the student’s effort. Stevenson and Baker (1992) highlighted the advent that American society confuses the concepts of ability and effort. They compared educational practices in the United States with those in China and Japan. Their findings revealed that,

...people in the two Asian countries acknowledged differences in individuals’ innate abilities, but considered hard work to be the more important factor than ability in students’ academic achievement. In contrast, American children, teachers, and parents emphasized innate abilities as the major component of academic success. (p. 1656)

Stevenson and Baker (1992) underscored the fact that in America innate ability has resulted in a belief tantamount to educational predestination. Innate ability, rather than effort, the amount of quality instruction, and parent involvement – is believed to be the sole determinant to achievement.

Further agitation of this idea may also mean that many American students who have not performed well on standardized tests are believed by their teachers and ultimately themselves to have a much lesser ability. This inferior ability becomes fixed in the minds of teachers and students alike. Regardless of hard work, continued development, and additional professional support services, this idea remains fixed.

Contrary to the innate ability findings is the experience of math teacher Jaime Escalante at Garfield High School in Los Angeles. Escalante presented strong evidence that emphasizing effort can pay off, particularly when a teacher believes that students can succeed and provides the necessary support. Escalante’s inner city students consistently outperformed suburban and private school students on the Advanced Placement (A.P.) calculus exam for more than seven consecutive years. Prior to Escalante’s work, Marva Collins, founder and teacher of the Westside Preparatory Academy in Chicago took students from the projects of Chicago and provided them with a rigorous curriculum and the expectation that they would all attend college. From her steadfast work, her students consistently outperformed students enrolled in the surrounding local school districts and annihilated the predictive statistics of inner city youths between 1970s and 1980s as evidenced in CBS’ 60 Minutes feature entitled, Too Good to Be True.

In order for teacher leaders to impact teacher expectations, the teacher leaders must become familiar with what works in schools. Teachers within the building need the information, and, as collaborative partners, the teacher leaders must agree to support the teachers as they attempt to try new techniques and make use of the new information. Ongoing assessment of school culture and beliefs about students and student achievement must guide this process. Teacher leaders must take time to raise consciousness and create awareness about race, gender, social class, disability status, communication and speech patterns, student history, limited English proficiency, physical attractiveness, handwriting, and participation in extra-curricula activities for teachers to meet the needs of all students.

Opportunities for Teacher Leaders to Impact Teacher Knowledge

Since legislators, policymakers, and those who make funding decisions about education are now concerned with student outcomes, it has become
apparent to many that the next steps of accountability will be the link between student outcomes and teacher knowledge. Beginning in 2000, states received federal dollars in the form of Title II grants. These grants are designed to improve teacher quality using professional development. These professional development proposals were required to affect the teacher’s knowledge base through the rigors of content. The new energy surrounding this type of professional development allowed colleges of education and colleges of arts and sciences to collaborate with school districts to meet this challenge. This framework of professional development aligns with the ideas of Guskey and Sparks (1998) who postulated the linkage of quality professional development to increased student outcomes through the influence of teacher knowledge.

Ingersoll (1999) highlighted the significant disparity in content knowledge between teachers in high-poverty, urban schools and those in affluent schools. His research identifies significant comparison gaps in the areas of math, science, English, and social studies. Further, teachers in the urban schools lacked a major or a minor in their teaching field. For example, 43 percent of teachers in urban schools lacked a major or minor while only 27 percent of teachers in more affluent schools. Coupled with Ingersoll’s research, the National Center for Education Statistics (2000) reported that 20 percent of teachers in urban schools have three or fewer years of teaching experience.

Ultimately, schools assign teachers with the least credentials and least experience the toughest teaching assignments in the nation. Even teachers in urban areas with the appropriate experience and credentials are often not adequately prepared and supported to handle the increasingly difficult instructional challenges embedded within these environments. Having this insight, the teacher leader must become a master of content and be able to transmit expertise to his/her colleagues. As a master of content, the teacher leader must use his skills as a professional developer to impact teacher knowledge. Sanders’ (1998) study showed that students assigned to effective teachers’ [deep academic content] for three years in a row scored an average of 49 percentile points higher on standardized tests than those assigned to ineffective teachers three years in a row.

**Opportunities for Teacher Leaders to Impact Teacher Practice**

Standards based accountability places more demands on the teacher leaders’ knowledge of curriculum and assessment. Classroom teachers need strong support of knowledgeable leaders to produce significant results based on ambitious academic expectations. There are distinctions made in the literature regarding the definitions of pedagogical knowledge. As we consider the evolving role of teacher leaders as ‘capacity’ builders in school reform, we assume content knowledge exists. Pedagogy is a process for teachers, placing emphasis on the areas of curriculum development, assessment and best practices in methodology. Teachers invest in their own learning to this end. Subsequently, teacher leaders share newly gained skills by promoting, participating, and facilitating in a purposeful professional learning community. These teachers are “…informal leaders on the cutting edge of reform…not afraid to take risks…the ones administrators typically call on for opinions and help in effecting change” (Stronge, 2002, p. 20). In this role, the teacher leaders build capacity in their school.

Lambert (2005) defined leadership capacity as “…reciprocal, purposeful learning together in community” (p. 38). In a study of high leadership capacity schools, most of which were urban and high-poverty, the principal was responsible for building shared leadership, gradually releasing the decision making to the teachers (Lambert, 2005). There are many descriptors used to illustrate what leadership capacity ‘looks like’, however, we argue that reflective practice embodies effective teacher leadership.

When principals create a learning community, they look to teacher leaders to facilitate the process. Knowledgeable teacher leaders can assist colleagues in becoming effective teachers through reflective practice. A commitment to teaching and professional learning is critical to improve student achievement (Blair, 2000; Lambert, 2005; Mitchell, 1998). In essence, effective teachers feel responsible for the learning of all students and examine ways to meet their needs (Covino & Iwanicki, 1996; Pear & Campbell, 1999; Shellard & Protheroe, 2000). Therefore, we can reasonably conclude that teacher leaders must examine reflective practice as a tool with which to lead others to effective teaching practices.

Costa, Lipton, and Wellman (1997) discussed the need for teachers to engage in research, inquiry, reflection and revising of practices. Teachers construct knowledge when they engage in a learning process that promotes a spirit of risk-taking. The model of professional development that supports this is one which individuals, small groups, and entire faculties study classroom activities and achievement data as a means for exchanging ideas and exploring research possibilities in their own environment. In this model, teacher leaders facilitate a process that
builds a community of learners within the building centered on inquiry, experimentation and reflection.

Costa and Kallick (2000) stated that in order for teachers to maximize meaning from experience they must engage in reflection. They described the activity of reflecting especially with a group of teaching peers as:

- Amplifying the meaning of one’s work through the insights of others;
- Applying meaning beyond the situation in which it was learned;
- Making a commitment to adjustments, plans, and experimentation,
- Documenting learning and providing a rich base of shared knowledge. (p. 60)

Reflection leads to substantive conversation, collaborative inquiry into practice of teaching and developing important recommendations for transformation in methodologies. Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) stated, “professional development today means providing occasions for teachers to reflect critically on their practice and to fashion new knowledge and beliefs about content, pedagogy, and learners” (p. 597). Principals alone cannot sustain this level of learning for their teachers. However, teacher leaders who are generally in non-evaluative roles, better meet with success in this context of professional learning.

**Conclusion**

In 1954, lawmakers embedded equity into law. Today, unfortunately, many students continue to face unequal and inadequate educational opportunities because they are poor, black, Latino, or live in inner cities or rural areas. Further, many of these students do not get the education they need to thrive in today’s economy and to participate as citizens in a democracy. Assuredly, strong public education promotes a strong society.

In many cases, the reality of a weak public education system resulting in low student achievement is a result of low expectations (Delpit, 1995). Several years ago, Ron Edmonds, father of Effective Schools Research, made a commitment to find schools that were successfully educating all students. He reasoned that if he could find a single school where all children were successful, then success was indeed possible. For Edmonds, the belief that all children could learn was nonnegotiable; this was the expectation (Bamburg, 1994).

As teacher leaders equip other teachers with high-yield best practices that result in increased student achievement, teacher leaders must be prepared to support the new learnings of teachers. Teacher leaders must create conditions for teachers to refine, practice, reflect and improve their practice over time. The teacher leader must then become the promoter and facilitator of a purposeful professional learning community.

Effective schools do not tolerate failure; however, they may miss opportunities and potentials for teacher leadership. Helping teachers change their thinking and practices is a difficult task. As capacity for shared leadership or parallel leadership increases, the opportunity for leaders to support colleagues in an analysis and challenge of their beliefs about student learning occurs. Improving teacher quality is critical to low-income, urban schools. Developing a community of learners holds great promise for urban schools to improve professional practice and ultimately increase student achievement.
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