



Win-Win Labor-Management Collaboration in Education

Breakthrough
Practices to Benefit
Students, Teachers,
and Administrators

BY LINDA KABOOLIAN
WITH PAUL SUTHERLAND

The Rennie Center For Education Research & Policy

Introduction

This “best practices” handbook provides a catalogue of innovative labor-management practices in public education for educational practitioners who are engaged in labor-management relations and collective bargaining.

Our primary focus is to identify practices that promote student-centered decision-making, thus enabling educational leaders to overcome obstacles to improved student achievement and performance of the system. This desk reference offers a national review of pathbreaking collective-bargaining agreements and related contract provisions that have led to promising new professional practices and a sharpened adult focus on student achievement. By communicating best practices in an accessible and understandable manner, we seek to respond to the field’s demand for information and guidance. This handbook has relevance and value for a wide audience, including: school board members, superintendents, union leaders, these groups’ lawyers, as well as other individuals who may be engaged in negotiations or otherwise seeking to improve labor relations.

We hope that the innovations described here will raise the field’s expectations for what can be accomplished and educational leaders’ understanding about ways of working together to improve student achievement. Innovative practices

catalogued in this handbook are not prescriptions for change, but rather, possible models for simultaneously satisfying the institutional needs of negotiating parties and for improving student achievement. While the descriptions and contract language cited in this handbook will not tell us what is happening on the ground as a result of these provisions, we hope that, in combination with the descriptions, discussions and resources offered at the end of each section, these examples could inspire educational leaders, open dialogue and stimulate the thinking of teachers, their unions, and school district leaders.

REFORM AS A COLLABORATIVE PROCESS

Adversarial relationships between teachers and school management significantly impede change efforts required to improve student achievement. Adversity is expensive and hinders a clear focus on students, using up resources—money, time, energy, and leadership attention—which could be put to better use.

Research supports the premise that collaborative work is essential to education reform. While policymakers and managers can adopt standards of practice, they cannot mandate actions in classrooms where instruction takes place.¹ In order to change instructional procedure, teachers must be active participants in the design and implementation of new practices.² For example, a study of Maryland school districts that compared low-performing schools against successful schools found that:

Student achievement is likely to be greatest

where teachers and administrators work together, in small groups and school-wide, to identify sources of student success and then struggle collectively to implement school improvement.³

Research done in conjunction with whole-school-reform models also demonstrates the connection between collaboration and improved outcomes.⁴ Links between increased student achievement and collaborative, adult problem-solving may be strongest in schools with high concentrations of poor students⁵—a finding with important implications for closing the achievement gap.

Distributed leadership—the leadership of multiple individuals, rather than one person—strengthens an organization by increasing its capacity to engage in, respond to and institutionalize constructive change.⁶ Indeed, research shows that student achievement is more likely to improve when leadership focused on educational quality is distributed across the school community and among stakeholder groups.⁷

As demonstrated by examples within this handbook, the union plays an important role as an institutional actor in promoting distributed leadership. Employee participation in problem solving is most likely to result in improved organizational performance, if the union is supportive of the effort and involved in the design and governance of the participation mechanism.⁸ Changes in practices require the consent of all parties. As a result, where there is a collective-bargaining agreement, only the most superficial types of participation would be possible, if the union were not a partner.

A NEW VISION OF REFORM

Public education is in a period of dynamic change and is under intense scrutiny due to the increased focus on accountability. The exclusive franchise that school districts once had is facing competitive challenge by charters and vouchers. With this increased emphasis on student performance and the competitive pressure of

choice, the current education delivery system as we know it is at risk. Teachers, administrators, school board members, parents, and many community members feel they have a stake in the success of their public schools. These stakeholders, with a common interest in preserving public education, can work together to devise new strategies for success.⁹

More than threats to the system make this work possible. Teachers, administrators, and school boards share a genuine concern about children and closing the achievement gap between high and lower-performing student groups. However, not surprisingly, changes required to address these problems breed conflict. This conflict between adults in public school systems must be overcome and replaced with a more constructive way of working together to better serve students.

Superintendents and school boards are beginning to see the wisdom in working with other stakeholders, particularly unions, on education reform. Superintendents have a lot at stake and are often the first affected by accountability.

Former urban superintendents gave their peers the following advice at a recent colloquium regarding working with unions on education reform:

- Encourage collaboration around the ‘main thing’—student achievement. Ideally, the contract becomes a living document that adjusts and changes continually as understanding of student achievement evolves.
- Make the contract the instrument for advancing student learning. If it isn’t in the contract, it’s not really the main thing.
- Think of negotiating as a problem-solving mechanism, not a source of conflict. Ideally it should be a perpetual tool for problem-solving.
- Unions have an interest in good schools, too.
- Keep up to speed on what’s happening with union reform. Some of the most progressive ideas about how to advance the learning are coming from union leaders themselves.¹⁰

Unions, too, recognize the significant institutional challenges they face and the consequent need to adopt new ways of working with school leaders.¹¹ Increasingly, unions must respond to a changing membership with different demands. The generation whose loyalty was won in the fight for professional wage scales is retiring out of the system. New teachers want a more professional and issues-linked relationship with their union, and research suggests that they rank salary considerably lower in preference to other professional concerns, including: engaging with supportive administrators, collaborating with highly motivated and effective professional colleagues, and working in mission-driven schools that share their teaching philosophies.¹² As a result, unions are now called on to provide help with instructional practice, continuous professional education, and meeting requirements of an increasingly regulated profession.

Contrary to a traditional view of unions as “reform blockers,” teachers’ unions have proven to be important institutional education reform partners in many locations and have increasingly engaged in “value-added unionism”—a practice of using institutional capacity to further the success of their districts, while protecting their members’ interests.

We believe that both union leaders and school managers must adopt a new vision of labor relations that puts student achievement at the center of the collective-bargaining process. In so doing, negotiating parties must acknowledge that working together in different ways will entail changes in behavior on both sides. Both school managers and teachers’ unions have a vested interest in seeing their enterprises succeed and in ensuring that public education does not erode. The practices and contract language in this handbook document the positive contribution that unions and school managers, through collaboration, can provide to education reform efforts.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING: A TOOL FOR PROGRESS

This handbook focuses on identifying innovative working relationships that place student learning at the center of the educational enterprise. While this book is not about collective bargaining specifically, we recognize collective bargaining as a tool—an instrument that structures relationships, describes roles, protects rights, sets expectations and limits, while creating the possibility for change. The end product of collective bargaining—the district contract—defines teachers’ work practices and, through codification, often institutionalizes innovative ways of working together. The collective-bargaining process reflects the tone of labor-management relations and parties’ attitudes toward student-centered decision-making. To quote one former urban superintendent,

“...The contract is the union’s ‘sacred text.’ If it isn’t in the contract, it isn’t important.”¹³

Too often, collective-bargaining agreements embody the cumulative scar tissue of brutal battles between negotiating parties in their pursuit of autonomy and control. Contracts resulting from adversarial relationships are thick with restrictive work rules, detailed descriptions of when they apply, and numerous exceptions. The focus is on the needs of adults rather than the improvement of student learning. In most contracts, labor and school management have established a narrow relationship in which student achievement is largely irrelevant, severely limiting their capacity to reorganize for expanded productivity.

The contract serves as the framework around which collaboration is possible and from which new ways of working together can be institutionalized. In some instances, negotiating parties are able to “work things out” because positive, trusting relationships develop at the leadership level. However, these

positive relationships between leaders do not always carry over to the school level, where further implementation challenges may arise. The innovative practices cited in this handbook are notable because they represent a departure from the traditional goals and strategies embodied in collective bargaining. Explicitly student-focused, these practices represent a transformation in the structure of relationship between the parties, institutionalizing new ways of working together at the district and school levels. In these examples, leaders' strong relationships may have been the catalyst initiating collaboration, but the resulting collective-bargaining agreement (as embodied in contract language) reflects the leaders' collaborative spirit and seeks to actively transform the structural relationships between school-level participants.

Examples of innovative collective-bargaining practices and contract language in this handbook suggest something more than relationship building is occurring. In particular — student achievement is recognized as important to both parties, as well as to students, parents, and taxpayers. As a result, negotiating parties express a growing willingness to look beyond the current ways of doing things and to experiment with new working relationships. Innovations embody openness to the possibility that the other side has good ideas and flexibility, rather than positional rigidity, about how one's interests are served.

CATALYSTS & IMPEDIMENTS TO COLLABORATION & INNOVATION

The districts cited in this handbook are not so unique that replicating their collaborative work would be impossible. Districts represent a range of sizes, including the largest urban districts, suburban counties, and small towns. Their populations are diverse and often impoverished but not always so. No one element characterizes these districts except that some stakeholder, internal or external to the system, wanted and believed that by working together the parties could

produce better student outcomes.

Catalysts driving collaboration differ. In some cases, a superintendent and union leader build on a strong personal working relationship. In other instances, one leader reaches out to an adversary. External stakeholders also play a role in leading the transformation of labor-management relations. For instance, in Boston, the business community intervened at a moment of impasse. In other districts, foundations work with individual school systems to support their tentative steps, or they become involved at a more systemic level by supporting leadership-training programs aimed at fostering collaboration on student achievement. District networks like the Teacher Union Reform Network have also helped to spark and support innovation.¹⁴ National unions can support locals with technical assistance and resources if they express interest in collaborating with administrators; however, national bodies cannot require this involvement since locals are permitted to retain autonomy from the national union and pursue divergent courses. These different impetuses demonstrate that innovation can occur in a range of environs and under diverse circumstances.

Innovation requires that the leaders of each stakeholder group be willing and able to bring their own constituents along the politically treacherous path of change. Each party must invest in the development of its constituency's technical, political, and educational capacities because new skills may be required within a collaborative environment. Even in districts where the desire for collaboration and innovation exists, the "work of change" requires political skills to gain stakeholder support. Unions and school boards are political organizations, and differences will exist between leaders' and members' perceptions about the need for and value of change. As one superintendent put it:

"Leaders and members are different constituencies. Often the leader is out ahead of members on key educational issues."¹⁵

Union leaders and school district managers are more likely to be open to collaboration than their constituents. The reform environment looks different to leaders who travel to national conventions or who participate in professional networks outside their home districts. These leaders will hear the early warnings that change is necessary. They will learn about pilot projects and experiments in other districts. Their repertoire of strategies will expand as they meet and learn from peers, and they will encounter resources to cope with the new challenges that they face. Constituents who rarely experience horizon-broadening opportunities will need convincing that new ways of doing business will be worth the effort and pain.

Despite their broader exposure to the benefits of collaboration, both school district managers and union leaders face additional disincentives to work together. The following issues have been cited as possible impediments to overcome:

- **Perceived violation of fair representation.** Unions may have a more difficult time with collaboration if working with management appears to violate legal standards for union action. In exchange for the right to exclusively represent their members, unions are required to fulfill their obligations to represent and advocate for *all* members, even the bad actors.¹⁶
- **Traditional conceptions of unions' function.** Members may have traditional notions about a union's function, which is limited to a narrow focus on wages, hours, and working conditions. As teachers' unions have begun to expand their repertoire and engage management around issues of professional practice, governance, and education reform, many of their members worry that they abandon economic and representational issues. The fallacy in this thinking is the assumption that advocacy over economic and representational issues is incompatible with collaborative work relating to education reform.
- **History of poor labor-management relations.** The union and district's relationship history may also be an obstacle to effective collaboration. Strikes that occurred years in the past and under the leadership of long retired superintendents and school board members may still influence members of the teachers' union. It may be difficult for a superintendent with 18 months tenure in a district to realize that his or her interaction with different constituents may be impacted by distrust sown years ago.¹⁷ Trust between people is more easily restored than trust between institutions.
- **Tension caused by budgetary constraints.** External factors such as fiscal tightening may pose additional obstacles to collaboration if conditions threaten parties' interests. Many people see layoffs, or even the threat of layoffs, to be "the third rail" of collaboration, causing significant stress in stakeholder relationships. Trends in many states toward late budget resolution exacerbate these challenges and function to alienate even the most faithful educators who might be engaged in collaboration.
- **Opposition to change and innovation.** All stakeholder groups—unions, school managers, school boards, and community members—have individual leaders and members who are resistant to new ways of doing things or working together. These individuals may be more comfortable with the existing status than risking an unknown scenario. Additionally, in many instances, there may be little incentive to change working arrangements that are beneficial to adult professionals.
- **Managerial accountability pressures.** Management faces greater accountability pressures, and thus may be less willing to engage in reforms that limit central office prerogatives. The expectation of many school boards is that a superintendent, as a district's chief executive

officer, is expected to be decisive and to make things happen.

- **Anti-union sentiment.** Superintendents may also have to deal with their constituents' negative reaction to collaboration with the teachers' union. School board members, mayors, and the news media might be anti-union, seeing little value in the parties working together. Rather than involving unions in reform efforts, these players may prefer that unions are further constrained or that their existence is eliminated altogether. Collaborative work may be seen as an undesirable "soft" technique, if stakeholders believe that hard choices and decisive action are required. In this environment, administrators who advocate for collaboration may be criticized or marginalized.
- **Difficulty reversing trend of union exclusion.** When hiring new superintendents, school board members rarely discuss if or how teachers' unions will be involved in reform efforts. While unions may have their supporters on school boards, the important issue of union inclusion often remains unaddressed. Even in districts with a history of successful collaboration, this course can be negatively impacted if a new superintendent is hired who is either unaware or inimical to existing working relationships.

In spite of these impediments, many leaders have found ways to "break through" conventional barriers. Their efforts are documented in this book.

FORMS OF COLLABORATION AND INNOVATION

Collaborative work between teachers' unions and administrators takes a variety of forms. The specific context of a situation will influence the process, scope, and direction of innovative developments. Not every innovative practice is well suited to every district. State laws governing unionization, collective bargaining, and education

reform vary considerably—in some cases, impeding innovation and in other instances facilitating it.

The form of innovative working relationships can vary. Some relationships are formalized in contracts, while others are established through Memoranda of Understanding or side agreements. Others exist for years without being formally codified in writing. There are advantages and disadvantages to each form. The existence of contract language creates enforceable rights and responsibilities, which can continue even if party leadership changes. However, contract language requires ratification, which may be too high a hurdle for an experimental practice. Productive collaborative relationships may also continue with no formal agreement, incorporating new ways of working together in everyday interactions and delegating problem-solving and innovation to joint committees at the school levels.

The innovations listed here exist on a continuum of complexity and may take a number of different forms. For example, innovations involving pay for performance may require a different type of collaboration than contract overrides. Similarly, peer assistance practices may differ depending upon the circumstances of their implementation—in some instances involving occasional interaction between a mentor and new teacher, while in other cases, entailing elaborate programs governed by a joint labor-management committee. Not all innovations can be equated in terms of the amount of work required for implementation or their possible effect on student achievement. Also, it is worth noting that in several cases, districts have adopted multiple innovations that are mutually reinforcing when they occur in a cluster.¹⁸ The range in scope and complexity of innovative practices is reflected within this handbook's discussion.

IMPACT ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

This handbook does not evaluate the effect that specific innovative practices have had on student

achievement; such analysis is beyond the scope of this work. However, if a specific district's practice has been evaluated, we cite this research, as well as evidence justifying the value of these innovations to student achievement. Collaboration and the transformation of working relations often affect intermediary processes—such as collaboration among educators, district culture, and teacher practice—rather than impacting student learning in a directly quantifiable way. For this reason, there is not a large amount of research documenting the clear link between strengthened labor relations and improved student achievement. Intuitively, the connection is clear — collaborative, student-centered decision-making is more likely to result in student gains than adherence to a set of confrontational, adult-focused interactions.

The union's involvement is both directly and indirectly connected to the success of a school or district. Directly, union-management relations determine the way organizational resources will be used in pursuit of organizational goals. Because teacher salaries comprise the bulk of education spending, collective-bargaining agreements outline a large percentage of a district's budget. Less directly, the tenor of labor management relationships will play a large role in determining the value that can be created by available resources and the extent to which more satisfying professional jobs can be created. High-trust, participatory relationships have been shown to enhance organizational effectiveness. Low-trust, conflict-ridden relationships experience attendant costs associated with conflict mediation, absenteeism, and high turnover.¹⁹

CHALLENGES OF IDENTIFYING INNOVATION

Knowledgeable observers can cite examples where a discrepancy exists between contract language and practice on the ground. These discrepancies may run in both directions—in some

cases, innovative contract language does not translate into innovative practice, and, in other instances, innovative practice is not codified within the contract. There are a number of reasons why a discrepancy may occur. Good intentions expressed during contract negotiations may not translate into action, if those responsible for implementation lack requisite skills, resources and/or good will. In other cases, district-wide policy decisions may not represent appropriate strategies for all schools. Alternatively, innovations may arise indigenously at the school level, but may not be sufficiently developed or supported to be institutionalized on a district-wide level. In other instances, parties resist codifying new practices and relationships because informality preserves each side's ability to withdraw unilaterally from the practice. Sometimes, leaders choose not to formally change a contract, so that they can work toward implementing an innovation without need to seek formal authorization from their constituents.

Innovations contained within this text have been verified through discussions with both labor and management representatives and scrutinized in regards to whether innovative agreements have actually been implemented. However, observers may vary in their perceptions of these innovations and the extent to which they have been actualized. We value these differences in perception as they represent important insights that can contribute to creative problem-solving.

CLASSIFICATION OF INNOVATIVE PRACTICES

Arguably, there were many ways to classify each innovation, and the boundaries between many innovations are judgment calls. While some of the topics covered here seem traditional, both the process of negotiating them and the substance of new provisions challenge conventional roles and relationships between the contracting parties. In addition, these innovations address important

INTRODUCTION

problems, clustered into five areas of activity, which are described below:

BARGAINING METHODS AND NEW FORMS OF AGREEMENTS.

The negotiations process, as well as the content and form of the agreements, have changed. Student achievement is explicitly addressed as the parties' purpose. Procedures for altering contract components are more flexible and less cumbersome. Contracts are shrinking from encyclopedia volumes filled with regulations and innumerable exceptions to "thin" contracts that set some district-wide standards but allow most conditions, particularly work rules, to be negotiated at the school site level. Parties attempt to find terms that provide the maximum value for each side rather than assuming "winner takes all" postures. In this section, we describe:

- Interest-based bargaining
- Salary benchmarking
- Thin contracts
- Waivers and override procedures
- Living contracts
- Language on student achievement

IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF TEACHING AND TEACHERS.

Student achievement is premised on: hiring good teachers, assigning these teachers where they are needed, providing them with the necessary skills and support, assuring that their time is used in sufficient quantity on teaching, competently assessing teaching performance, intervening when teachers falter, efficiently removing those who should not be teaching, and rewarding effective efforts.

Professional development represents a constellation of practices, which not only include preparing new teachers and upgrading the skill set of the existing teaching force, but also

encompasses the creation of internal professional job ladders for teachers thus recognizing teaching prowess and working to increase teacher retention. In this section, we describe:

- Teacher hiring, assignment, and transfer policies
- Professional development of new and continuing teachers
- Peer review and assistance
- Pay for performance
- Evaluations by families and students

DEVOLVING AND DEREGULATING SCHOOLS.

The process of devolving and deregulating schools is premised on the theory that the people closest to students—teachers, building administrators, and parents—will make decisions that are more responsive to student needs than those made by central office bureaucrats. The goal of these innovations is to shift administrative control from the district level to the building level. Often this entails breaking large schools into smaller units with special foci or services. Additionally, there is reduced emphasis on district-wide standardization of schools and increased variation in whole school design, possibly including the establishment of charters. In this section, we describe:

- Site-based management
- High-autonomy schools
- Small learning communities

IMPROVING LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOLS.

This set of innovations involves multi-stakeholder intervention in low-performing schools. Prior to *No Child Left Behind Act* authorizations, federal regulations already required a multi-stakeholder process to devise

School Improvement Plans (SIP) for schools performing poorly on state assessment tests. Innovations noted in this section formalize SIP processes, explicitly stating the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder group. More importantly, they recognize low performance as an urgent issue and liberalize or waive existing contract terms in order to focus on student achievement. In this section, we describe:

- Special districts
- School intervention processes
- Extending the school day and year

PARTNERING.

Recognizing that student achievement is a shared endeavor, these innovations engage stakeholders both inside and outside of the school system in order to expand resources, capture good ideas, and develop support and shared ownership over change processes and outcomes. Innovations exist on a continuum of formality. In some instances, they include informal, undocumented relationships between individual labor and administrative leaders, who are working together on mutually defined problems to find mutually satisfactory solutions. In other instances, partnerships involve very formal, institutionalized structures for stakeholder power sharing. In this section, we describe:

- Strategic partnerships
- Joint problem-solving
- External partnerships
- Cross-district consultation

ORGANIZATION OF THIS HANDBOOK

Innovative practices contained within this handbook were identified through a national scan and via contact with a variety of professional

networks. Our search was aided by the two national teachers' unions, as well as organizations representing school boards, labor attorneys, and superintendents. During the course of our review, we found that a great deal of collaborative innovation exists and has been ongoing for many years. Because of the wide breadth of positive work being accomplished around the nation, we were unable to include all identified innovations in this handbook. To provide readers with a manageable foundation from which to draw inspiration and ideas, we selected a sampling of practices that best exemplified new ways of working together.

Readers are able to reference this handbook to read selectively about innovative practices. As described in the prior section, innovative practices have been organized and presented thematically under umbrella headers. Innovative practices are briefly defined, and their usefulness to improving student learning is noted. Problems that each innovative practice addresses are also clarified. For readers interested in learning more about how specific innovative practices evolved and were implemented, short district scenarios are reviewed. Pertinent information about each scenario's history, special circumstances, and participants is included. Additionally, so that readers can contact district leaders to learn more, contact information for relevant individuals is provided at the end of each section.

Many districts that have pursued innovative practices have documented these new working relations in their contract language, some of which we reference in this book. Contract language cited in this handbook is taken from current contracts, though there may have been different provisions in previous contracts. Some of these innovations have evolved over time and through experimentation. If readers are curious to learn more about the context behind an innovative practice and its related contract language, we encourage them to contact the district's union and administrative leaders.

INTRODUCTION

CONCLUSION

We believe that the reshaping of working relationships in education is absolutely essential to student success and the success of reform. Across the nation, educators, school leaders, and policymakers cite the need to improve relationships among professionals in public education. There is widespread interest in the issue, but there is little documentation of strategies for addressing it. We have confidence that local leaders, if given the proper opportunity, facilitation, expertise, and support, will be able to make significant headway in redefining their professional relationships in ways that place student achievement at the center of adults' work in education. We hope that this reference guide contributes to a process of engendering, in the field, a vision of new, more flexible, and effective relationships that focus on improving student learning while providing educators with more gratifying, successful professional jobs.

FOOTNOTES

1. Elmore, R. (2002). "Hard Questions About Practice." *Beyond Instructional Leadership*. (5)22-25.
2. Stringfield, S. and Ross, S. (1997). "A Reflection at Mile Three of a Marathon." *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*. (March). 8(1)
3. Schafer, W.D.; Hultgren, F.; Hawley, W.D.; Abrams, A.L.; Seubert, C.C.; and Mazzoni, S. (No publication date). *Study of Higher Success and Lower Success Elementary Schools*. Available on the Maryland Assessment Archive at www.marces.org/mdarch/shell.asp?wtest=MSPAP.
4. Datnow, A. and Stringfield, S. (2000). Working Together for Reliable School Reform. *Journal of Education of Students Placed at Risk*. Vol.5(1&2).
5. Schafer, W.D.; Hultgren, F.; Hawley, W.D.; Abrams, A.L.; Seubert, C.C.; and Mazzoni, S. (No publication date). *Study of Higher Success and Lower Success Elementary Schools*. www.mdk12.org/process/benchmark/improve/
6. Spillane, J.P.; Halverson, R.; Diamond, J.B. (2001). Investigating School Leadership Practice: A Distributed Perspective. *Educational Researcher*. 30(3):23-28. Newmann, F., Wehlage, G. (1995). *Successful School Restructuring: A Report to the Public and Educators*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Education Center.
7. Ibid.
8. Research on participatory schemes distinguishes between employee involvement programs where individual employees (or work teams) have the opportunity to make suggestions to improve productivity, quality and service and programs and programs where employees and their union representatives participate in strategic choices. Findings from research of these different types of programs make clear that the positive effects of participation are greater and longer lasting when unions as well as individual employees are involved and when the domain of discretion is expanded to include strategic issues.
9. See Sherif, M., et al. (1954). *Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation: The Robbers Cave Experiment*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press. This book is also available at: www.psychclassics.yorku.ca/Sherif/
10. Harvey, J. (2003). *The Urban Superintendent: Creating Great Schools While Surviving on the Job*. Council of Great City Schools. Page 27.
11. Kerchner, C.T.; Koppich, J.E.; and Weeres, J.G. (1997). *United Mind Workers: Unions and Teaching in the Knowledge Society*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
12. Farkas, S.; Johnson, J.; Foleno, T. (2000) *A Sense of Calling: Who Teaches and Why*. Public Agenda.
13. Harvey, J. (2003). *The Urban Superintendent: Creating Great Schools While Surviving on the Job*. Council of Great City Schools. Page 27.
14. The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) established the Redesigning Schools to Raise Student Achievement network to support collaborative reform efforts at the local level. A group of local unions affiliated with both the AFT and the National Education Association founded the Teacher Union Reform Network (TURN).
15. Harvey, J. (2003). *The Urban Superintendent: Creating Great Schools While Surviving on the Job*. Council of Great City Schools. Page 27.
16. The Duty to Fair Representation requirement protects members who may not be in political favor with the union leadership, and it protects all members from union leaders colluding with management against the members. While unions do not strictly need to put their full weight behind every member, the penalties for failure to fairly represent a member are heavy. At the same time, union officers know that vigorous representation of members who do not carry their weight in the workplace can be a political liability. As much as members want their union to represent them, should they need it, they also resent doing the work of non-performing employees and do not want their union to spend financial and political resources protecting bad actors. As a result, union officers must exercise political savvy in working with administrators to improve student achievement.
17. This point is best illustrated by the experience of one urban district that sent its union and administrative leadership on a retreat. When asked to draw a time line of the relationship, the union leaders came back with details stretching back 25 years. The administrators described only the last two years.
18. The effects of clustered innovations in comparison to stand-alone innovations have been studied in detail by economists. Researchers have found that adopting work practice innovations in isolation has little or no effect on organizational outcomes. See, for example: Ichniowski, C., et al. 1997. The Effects of Human Resource Management Practices on Productivity. *American Economic Review*. 86 (6):291-313.
19. Norsworthy, J.R. and Zabala, C. (1985). Worker Attitudes, Worker Behavior and Productivity in the American Automobile Industry, 1959-1976. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 38:556.