TEACHERS' TIME: COLLABORATING
FOR LEARNING, TEACHING, AND LEADING

It's About Time: Organizing Schools for Teacher Collaboration and Learning

By Soung Bae

scope
Stanford Center for
Opportunity Policy in Education

About the Author:

Soung Bae, Ph.D.
Senior Research and Policy Analyst
Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education

Suggested Citation:

Bae, S. (2017). It's About Time: Organizing Schools for Teacher Collaboration and Learning. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education.

scope
Stanford | Center for
Opportunity Policy in Education

Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education
http://edpolicy.stanford.edu
@scope_stanford

Table of Contents

Introduction

Dan Lortie, in his seminal book on teachers' work (1975), characterized teaching as a profession in which each teacher "spends his teaching day isolated from other adults; the initial pattern of school distribution represented… the 'egg crate school'" (p. 14). Lortie observed that schools were organized to separate teachers rather than to create interdependence among them, and it is this focus on individualism that renders the experience of teachers to a be private rather than shared one, which can impede school improvement efforts. In fact, Rosenholtz (1989) argued that isolation in the classroom was the greatest impediment to learning to teach or to improving instructional practice. Research has shown that teacher isolation or individualism can be effectively combated through teacher collaboration (Hargreaves, 1994; Lieberman, 1990; Newmann, King, & Youngs, 2000) and professional learning communities (Louis & Kruse, 1995; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001; Newmann & Wehlage, 1995).

Teacher collaboration can break down the walls of the egg crate school and promote the meaningful exchange of ideas, experiences, and knowledge among teachers to improve student learning (Ronfeldt, Owens Farmer, McQueen, & Grissom, 2015), improve teachers' sense of self-efficacy (Shachar & Shmuelevitz, 1997; Smylie, 1988), and promote higher levels of trust among teachers (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Not all schools, however, facilitate teacher collaboration or make it a priority by creating time for it. The organization of teacher time and work are often fixed by factors outside of the control of teachers, such as school bus schedules, teacher contract regulations, and resource constraints. Thus, collaboration among colleagues is often viewed as *nice to have, but not necessary* (i.e., if only there were more time in the day) or becomes dependent on energetic teachers who give their own time to meet before or after school. Yet, this way of structuring teacher time and work does not have to be the norm.

The present case study is designed to help both practitioners and policymakers understand the teaching and learning implications of structuring time differently in schools. Specifically, it provides a detailed account of how time can be organized and used within budget and schedule constraints so that schools that organize time more traditionally may learn from these innovative practices. Moreover, the case study examines how these uses of time relate to a range of educational outcomes from engaging students in authentic learning experiences and developing more successful curricula to supporting teacher retention and improvement.

Methods

The data for this case study were gathered as part of a larger study of four public schools across the United States that organized teacher time and work in innovative ways. Data collection took place in September of 2016, when researchers spent three consecutive days at the school. During the school visit, researchers interviewed the administrators, teachers across a mix of grade levels and academic disciplines (e.g., math, science, English, humanities), and the school counselor who is directly involved in creating the master schedule. In total, 13 semi-structured interviews were conducted. In addition, observational data of teacher collaborative meetings, classroom teaching, and school-wide professional development sessions were collected. In all, researchers spent over 8 hours across the three days, observing teachers' work at the school. The observational data triangulated, disconfirmed, or further illuminated the practices and policies described by the school staff members in their interviews. Moreover, a document review was conducted to compile and examine school artifacts including student and teacher schedules, district and school policy documents, and prior research.

All the interviews were audio recorded and transcribed. Field notes of classroom and meeting observations were also typed. Data analysis was conducted using NVivo (Version 11.4.0, 2016) a software program for qualitative data analysis, to code the interview and field notes data via multiple passes. The data were coded using an inductive approach to discover and determine how teachers' time and work are organized at the school, how the organization of time supports teachers' ongoing learning and development, what teachers and administrators perceive to be the benefits and challenges of teacher collaboration, and how teacher learning interacts with student learning. A second coding pass revealed what teachers and administrators perceived to be the organizational policies, practices, and resources that allow for the innovative use of teacher time.

The case study was guided by the following research questions:

- How is teachers' work organized? How are core activities scheduled and structured? What are the enabling conditions (or organizational policies, practices, resources) that allow for innovative use of teacher time?

- How is teacher learning structured and organized? What learning resources and opportunities are afforded to teachers and how? How does this use of teacher time support the development of teachers' knowledge, skills, and dispositions?

- How does teacher learning interact with student learning? How does this use of teacher time support the growth and development of the students?

This case study describes how teacher time and work is organized at Hillsdale High School, with particular attention paid towards the factors that influence and enable the creation of the master schedule; how the allocation of time facilitates teacher learning and development, including the benefits and constraints associated with teacher collaboration; and how the organization of time in school can support deeper learning for students.

Hillsdale High School Background

Hillsdale is a large, comprehensive high school located in San Mateo, California, a high-tech enclave of Silicon Valley, nestled 23 miles south of San Francisco and 32 miles north of San Jose. The San Francisco peninsula is famous for high housing costs and serving families with high educational attainment, given its close proximity to Silicon Valley. The students at Hillsdale come from the surrounding neighborhoods of San Mateo and Foster City and reflect the full socioeconomic and cultural diversity of San Mateo County. In the 2015–2016 school year, Hillsdale enrolled 1,375 students in 9th through 12th grades (California Department of Education, 2016). The school draws an ethnically diverse group of students, with the majority of students (60%) being people of color. Specifically, in the 2015–2016 school year, 26 percent of students identified as Hispanic, 15 percent as Asian, 6 percent as Filipino, 1 percent as African American, 1 percent as Pacific Islander, and 9 percent as being of two or more races. The school is less diverse socioeconomically and linguistically than it is ethnically. A small percentage of the student population is identified as socioeconomically disadvantaged or as English Language Learners (14% and 8%, respectively). These statistics mirror the larger regional context in which the school is situated.

To fully appreciate the context of Hillsdale, one must know its history. The school's reputation in the 1980s and 1990s was one that was less than desired. A teacher recalled Hillsdale's former nickname, "Hillsjail," because back then, the school was a closed campus and was known for serving "tough to handle" students. As a result, the more affluent families took advantage of the San Mateo Union High School District's open enrollment policy and sent their children to other high schools in the district. As student enrollment at Hillsdale steadily declined, the district and the school staff realized that something had to be done. Thus, in 2000, the school began the journey of transformation into Smaller Learning Communities (SLCs) as a means to raise student achievement and ensure that all students would graduate from Hillsdale having met the requirements to attend a 4-year college. SLCs are defined as a "smaller cross-disciplinary organization of teachers and students [which] use available resources to intensify teacher-student-parent relationships, teacher collaboration, and focus on academic study" (Oxley & Kassissieh, 2008, p. 202).

In 2003, Hillsdale initiated a 3-year process of converting the large, comprehensive high school into relatively autonomous, vertically aligned SLCs (see Lance & Vasudeva, 2006 for a detailed account of the school's transformation process). The SLCs were designed to be individual small schools serving 200–280 students each. In the SLC model, all incoming freshmen are assigned randomly to one of

three lower division houses: Florence, Kyoto, and Marrakech.[1] Within each house, students take four academic core classes (English, history, math, and science) in a cohort from a team of four teachers who share the same students and act as advisors to those students.

Teachers who act as advisors teach an advisory class (typically enrolling 28–33 students) with a curriculum focused on developing study skills, social-emotional skills, academic and test literacy, and college and career readiness. In addition, advisors monitor their students' individual progress and ensure that their academic and social-emotional needs are being met. Thus, advisors follow up with a student's core teachers to check in on the student's progress, communicate frequently with the student's parents or guardians and address their concerns, and coordinate with other service providers such as social services and mental health workers if the need arises. The advisory program grew out of the belief that relationships matter and that every student needs to develop close relationships with an adult at the school as an essential component to improving student learning and development.

As a core tenet of SLCs—smaller learning environment—freshmen stay in their assigned houses and advisories for 2 years, and then at the end of their sophomore year, they get reassigned randomly to one of three upper division SLCs or houses: Cusco, Jakarta, and Timbuktu. This arrangement allows students to develop strong, trusting relationships with their core teachers and their peers, which promotes their social-emotional development and facilitates academic learning. As in the lower division houses, students in the upper division houses form a cohort, taking their core classes from a team of two to four teachers (English, social studies, math, and physics) who share the same students and serve as advisors. To the extent possible, the advisors and core teachers stay with the juniors through their senior year. Through electives, physical education, foreign language, and visual and performing arts classes, students take courses outside of the SLC structure and interact with students from other houses.

In both the lower and upper divisions, the SLC model provides academic core teachers with a common collaboration period, in addition to their individual preparation periods, to allow teachers to discuss student progress and to design and implement innovative curricula and assessments. Since the 2005–2006 school year, the SLCs have been implemented schoolwide, and the school has seen dramatic improvements in student achievement as measured by the state's Academic Performance Index (API).[2] As noted on the Hillsdale's website, the achievement

---

[1] Each lower division SLC or house is named after an important medieval town in honor of the school's mascot, the Knight. The upper division SLCs or houses are named after cities that have made major contributions to culture and society (Hillsdale High School, n.d.-a).

[2] In 2012, Hillsdale's overall API score had increased 135 points since 2002–2003, their Latino subgroup had improved by 187 points, and their socioeconomically disadvantaged students had improved by 231 points (Hillsdale High School, n.d.-b).

gains are attributed to the transformation from a single, comprehensive high school to SLCs.

In addition to the school's conversion to SLCs, Hillsdale teachers and administrators have developed a guidance document called the Cornerstones (Hillsdale High School, n.d.-c), which are commitments to equity, personalization, rigor, and shared decision-making. The Cornerstones provide a set of common goals for the SLCs and focus the school's efforts and the allocation of resources toward realizing the goals. As will be seen later, the SLC model and the school's commitment to the Cornerstones are integral to how teachers' work and time are organized at Hillsdale.

Hillsdale's transformation from a large comprehensive high school to SLCs set the stage for the school to organize teacher time and work in nontraditional ways. Through the SLC structure, Hillsdale allocates time in service of very specific and intentional goals: 1) to personalize learning for students, 2) to support collaboration among teachers, and 3) to develop rigorous, cross-disciplinary units of study for students. Thus, time, at Hillsdale, is used to foster learning and development for both students and teachers.

Organizing Teacher Time and Work
at Hillsdale High School

Eleven out of 13 (85%) of the staff members interviewed talked about the challenges of building the master schedule that supported the work of the SLCs and the school's commitment to the Cornerstones. As one teacher observed, "With our model, there are just so many moving pieces. I do not envy the person who has to make that happen." Despite the challenges, staff members attest that teachers' time and work can be organized in ways that support teacher collaboration and ongoing learning and development for both students and teachers.

Three versions of the bell schedule are used at Hillsdale. The "regular" bell schedule, which is in place on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Fridays, consists of seven 50-minute periods, a 10-minute "brunch" break between periods 2 and 3, a 25-minute advisory period, and a 30-minute lunch break during the middle of the day (see Tables 1 and 2, next page). On Wednesdays and Thursdays, the school implements a block schedule, wherein the odd periods (1, 3, 5, 7) are held on Wednesdays and the even periods are held on Thursdays. The block schedule allows for longer 88-minute classes and facilitates the implementation of integrated projects among the academic core team members. In addition, the longer block periods are coupled with a 38-minute advisory class and brunch and lunch breaks. On Thursdays, the students have a 45-minute tutorial class and are dismissed at 1:49pm rather than at 3:15pm to allow for weekly, schoolwide professional development sessions.

Priorities

At Hillsdale, the master schedule is designed to facilitate the school's collective mission and goals. Specifically, it is laid out so that teachers have a common collaboration period with their colleagues, students can take classes from a team of four subject area teachers within their SLCs, and demands of the teacher contract are adhered to. The school counselors and an administrator work together to build the master schedule or the schedule board. The teachers may state their preferred teaching periods, but those preferences take a back seat to the priorities embodied in Hillsdale's transition to SLCs and commitment to the Cornerstones. Eleven out of 13 (85%) staff members expressed that the way teacher time and work is organized at the school is driven by the desire to support specific priorities and goals. Thus, the master schedule is not created simply to divide time within the day but to realize Hillsdale's vision of a student-centered school by breaking down the walls of the egg crate school and promoting teacher collaboration.

● Direct Contact with Students   ● Collaboration Time   ● Individual Teacher Time

TABLE 1: HILLSDALE HIGH SCHOOL, 9TH-GRADE SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHER SCHEDULE, MONDAY/TUESDAY/FRIDAY

PERIOD	TIME	MONDAY	TUESDAY	FRIDAY
1	7:45 – 8:35	World History Intro.	World History Intro.	World History Intro.
2	8:40 – 9:30	Individual Prep	Individual Prep	Individual Prep
–	9:30 – 9:40	Brunch	Brunch	Brunch
–	9:45 – 10:10	Advisory	Advisory	Advisory
3	10:15 – 11:05	Marrakech House Meeting	Marrakech House Meeting	Marrakech House Meeting
4	11:10 – 12:00	World History Intro.	World History Intro.	World History Intro.
–	12:00 – 12:30	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
5	12:35 – 1:25	World History Intro.	World History Intro.	World History Intro.
6	1:30 – 2:20	World History Intro.	World History Intro.	World History Intro.
7	2:25 – 3:15	Individual Prep	Individual Prep	Individual Prep

TABLE 2: HILLSDALE HIGH SCHOOL, 9TH-GRADE SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHER SCHEDULE, WEDNESDAY/THURSDAY

PERIOD	TIME	WEDNESDAY	PERIOD	TIME	THURSDAY
1	7:45 – 9:13	World History Intro.	2	7:45 – 9:13	Leadership Team Meeting
_	9:13 – 9:23	Brunch	_	9:13 – 9:23	Brunch
_	9:28 – 10:06	Advisory	_	9:28 – 10:13	Tutorial
3	10:11 – 11:39	Marrakech House Meeting	4	10:18 – 11:46	World History Intro.
_	11:39 – 12:09	Lunch	_	11:46 – 12:16	Lunch
5	12:14 – 1:42	World History Intro.	6	12:21 – 1:49	World History Intro.
7	1:47 – 3:15	Individual Prep	_	2:00 – 3:15	Whole Staff Professional Development

Collaboration Drives the Schedule. "I think the desire to collaborate is what drove the rescheduling," recalls a teacher. At Hillsdale, a key component in building the master schedule is facilitating teacher collaboration in various forms: in content, house, and advisory teams. The schedule creators begin by looking for periods when each house team can get together, and then they find a common period for each content team to meet. A teacher reflected, "One of the great things we've done here is to institutionalize collaboration and given time for it." An administrator echoed, "There's no flexibility with saying, 'Oh, the whole English 9 team has this collaboration except we couldn't get it for you, so you just…' That won't work here. It's been ingrained in the culture that those collaboration periods are prioritized and honored." Another teacher described her frustration when she did not get a collaboration period with her colleagues as expected:

> When you don't get a collaboration period with your teaching team, people that are teaching the same courses as you, when you don't get a collaboration period with them, a fuss is raised. People are like, "Ahhhhh. No!" The fact that I didn't get one in pre-calculus this year, I was put out. It was an expectation. When I looked at the schedule I understood why it happened, so the hurt feelings didn't last for very long, but I had expected it because this is how Hillsdale makes their master schedule.

As this quote illustrates, teachers at Hillsdale expect that time to collaborate with their colleagues will be built into their daily schedules. That time is sacred to them. Another teacher shared:

> Ever since then we transitioned [to SLCs], now that collaborative time is built into the day. The fact that I know that every seventh period block, I'm going to have my whole team there all in one room, and none of us had been planning to do anything else. That is how we're spending that time, means everybody is not only there, but sort of, like, fully present.

An administrator explained that building collaboration time into the master schedule was a very deliberate act. Rather than restructure the day to simply create more time, the schedulers created the master schedule to foster collaboration for the type of teaching and learning the staff wanted for their students. He noted:

> It was just the priority. I think we knew. I guess if you go all the way back, we wanted to do certain things in the classroom. We wanted to do projects. We wanted to team English and social studies. One of the teachers, who has the most seniority, he was doing really amazing, creative stuff 25 years ago. As we tried to expand a lot of his work, it just became too hard to do. You wanted to share teaching between English

and social studies, but if you don't share students and you don't have time to talk about the students and the curriculum, then even the most well-meaning individuals weren't going to do the work… It was very conscious, very early that what was driving the structural changes and the development of collaboration time was a desire to do something in terms of teaching in classrooms.

At Hillsdale, the conscious desire to facilitate and support collaborative work among teachers is a key driver in how the master schedule is organized. Therefore, teachers have come to expect collaboration time with their colleagues, and it is prioritized when making time allocation decisions.

Students Stay in Houses. SLCs break large schools into smaller, more intimate learning environments for students and teachers and emphasize the Cornerstone of personalization. An administrator described how the rules for creating student schedules were sometimes bent at another school that she had worked in prior to moving to Hillsdale:

> There's been a lot more soft edges around, "Oh, well, this kid… I'll just put this kid in that house for math because it works better," or, "I'll put this kid in this situation because it works better for the schedule." Here, we really make sure that if you are in a Florence 9 house, those are your classes.

At Hillsdale, the priority of keeping students in a cohort to personalize their learning environment so that they know their fellow classmates and teachers well is strictly adhered to, even if this means that a snag in a student's schedule could dismantle the schedule and require that the creators start the process over again. The administrator went on to say, "I started by saying, like, the Florence 9th-graders, those kids are not willing. Those are their classes, their advisor. They can't swap and switch. The master scheduler would have to know where the flex is and where it isn't."

Teacher Contract Regulations. Another factor that is prioritized when creating the master schedule is honoring the regulations within the teacher contract. For instance, according to the agreement with the teachers association, the teacher workday at Hillsdale is 7½ hours long. On a typical day, the bell schedule for students begins at 7:45am with period 1 and ends at 3:15pm with period 7. Teachers, however, need to be at the school 15 minutes before the start of their first class. So if a teacher teaches period 1, her day begins at 7:30am and ends at 3:00pm. If she does not teach period 1, then her day begins at 7:45am and goes until 3:15pm. Thus, given the confines of a 7½ workday, a teacher is not permitted to teach periods 1 and 7 or else she would be in violation of her contract. The schedule builders take this contractual limitation into account when building the master schedule. As a counselor said, "We just never build a board that has somebody teaching 1 and 7."

Time with Students

The way schools organize the master schedule has a significant effect on how much time teachers spend interacting directly with students and how much time they spend on other responsibilities such as collaborating with colleagues, planning curriculum, and assessing student work. At Hillsdale, teachers work with five classes daily, which generally translates into four academic core classes and one advisory class.[3] Because of Hillsdale's commitment to personalization, the staff added an advisory class in the school schedule, which meant increasing the typical seven-period day into an eight-period day. One administrator reflected, "You add advisory, and I don't think we really thought about it, but in effect, that creates an eight-period day. Where other schools are teaching five out of seven, we've created eight-period days, so our teachers are teaching five out of eight." Interestingly, even though the number of periods increased, the teachers at Hillsdale spend fewer hours interacting directly with students in a class than a typical teacher in the United States does. According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) 2013, international lower secondary school[4] teachers spend an average of 19 hours per week teaching students, while U.S. teachers have been found to spend an average of 27 hours per week (OECD, 2014). Notably, teachers at Hillsdale spend an average of 18.5 hours per week teaching students, similar to the international average.[5] The restructuring of teachers' time with students to prioritize teacher collaboration permits Hillsdale teachers to have both a common preparation and a collaboration period each day. Moreover, on the regular bell schedule days (3 out of 5 days), teachers have an additional period for preparation and collaboration (the way this time is used will be discussed in detail in a later section). Therefore, at Hillsdale, more time is not simply "added" to the schedule, but rather existing time is organized differently.

---

[3] This is the "typical" class load because not all teachers at the school teach an advisory class—the arts teachers, some upper division science teachers, and some language teachers do not. Teachers who do not have an advisory class teach five academic classes.

[4] Lower secondary school refers to the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED-97) and equates to middle school or junior high school in the United States.

[5] The OECD TALIS 2013 also surveyed international upper secondary school teachers, equivalent to U.S. high school teachers, and found that, on average, international teachers spend 17.9 hours per week on teaching. A sample of U.S. teachers did not participate in this portion of the survey, so a comparable average for how much time U.S. secondary teachers spend on teaching is unknown. However, the OECD research shows that, in general, teaching time decreases as the level of education increases. Thus, it is likely that U.S. secondary teachers, on average, spend less than 27 hours teaching per week, but it is unlikely to be as low as the OECD average.

Organizing Teacher Time to Facilitate Teacher Learning and Development

Teacher time and work at Hillsdale is organized to prioritize the school's commitment to personalization and teacher collaboration. Thus, the school's master schedule differs from a traditional high school schedule by including an advisory period for students and common preparation and planning times for teachers. Embedding common planning periods into the daily schedule influences how teachers collaborate and learn with and from each other. This section details how Hillsdale structures ongoing learning and development for teachers by providing weekly professional development time and daily collaboration time. The benefits to teachers as well as the challenges they experience are also explored.

Professional Development

Every Thursday, Hillsdale staff engages in an hour-long professional development (PD) experience after students are dismissed early. The school has a teacher on special assignment[6] who coordinates and plans PD sessions in collaboration with the administration and a PD committee. In previous years, the PD focus has centered on the development of a graduate profile (i.e., what students should know and be able to do to graduate) and the types of questioning that teachers should use to engage students' metacognitive processes and push critical thinking in their senior defenses. The PD sessions, this year, are focused on equity and "what it means to be, often, a white teacher in a diverse classroom," shared an administrator. This has led teachers to read material in common to gain a better understanding of what equity means and then engage in conversations about implicit bias, how teachers talk to students, and how students "read" teachers. The PD Coordinator described how the staff role-played dialogues with students and wrote reflections on uncovering the implicit biases in their verbal and nonverbal interactions with students. At the time of data collection for the study, the PD sessions were moving from a whole-staff orientation to professional learning communities (PLCs). The PLCs are organized around subject matter departments, and each PLC is tasked with designing a project for students that will be examined with an equity lens. The PD Coordinator explained:

> Some of them are designing a new lesson plan. Some of them are revising something that is already in place but that they feel like could be improved. Some of them are working on a portfolio piece for the senior portfolios. There's some freedom around what to choose, but we ask that it had some characteristics, it had a

---

[6] The teacher on special assignment position started with one-time funds from the state to support Common Core implementation. The district has kept the position out of general funding but may reduce the support next year.

technology component, it had a tie to the graduate profile, that it had opportunities or issues that they could foresee around the equity, that it tied to the senior defense questions for the content area.

For example, the upper division social studies teachers were observed spending their PLC time brainstorming ideas for a new unit that they were developing for their students. Teachers shared what they thought had worked previously with other classes and brainstormed ideas for project topics that would be both relevant and interesting to students (e.g., election issues, supreme court nominations). As teachers offered their ideas, colleagues asked clarifying questions and built off one another's ideas.

After the projects are collaboratively designed in the PLCs, teachers are expected to implement the unit with their classes. The goal, according to the PD Coordinator, is for teams to "have students work from it to use in the last cycle where they're going to do an analysis of student work and look at actually how the students did on it and think about how it ties to the grading piece." Thus, the PD that Hillsdale teachers experience embodies the critical components of high-quality PD that research has shown to improve teacher practice: it is ongoing and connected to practice; it focuses on student learning and addresses the teaching of specific curriculum content; it is aligned with the school's goals and priorities; and it provides time for teachers to collaborate and work together (King & Bouchard, 2011; Newmann King, & Youngs, 2000; Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009). Later in the year, the PD sessions will also delve into the use of technology. In the mind of the PD Coordinator, the learning goal for teachers is clear:

> The overall goal is that if you take this one unit and you examine it through different lenses, that you have one really good thing that you're taking to the classes where you've been really thoughtful about academic discourse and student interactions and you'd been really thoughtful about what equity issues could come up. You'd been really thoughtful about how you're incorporating technology. It's not just like a Kahootz[7] click button, but you're actually doing something that's changing or transforming the learning.

Teacher Collaboration Time

As shown, teacher collaboration is prioritized at Hillsdale, and opportunities for teachers to learn with and from each other help drive the building of the master schedule. As such, teachers are afforded three common preparation periods per day, and teachers use that time to meet in various team configurations. The team

---

[7] Kahootz is a cloud-based collaboration tool that facilitates real-time communication, data collection, and information sharing. See http://www.kahootz.com.

configuration that was talked about the most was the content team, which typically involves disciplinary collaboration across houses. Thus, a math teacher who teaches 9th-graders in the Marrakech house will meet with the two other math teachers who also teach 9th-graders in the Florence and Kyoto houses. During this time, the teachers engage in curriculum planning whereby they discuss and align the curriculum across the houses so that all 9th-graders are afforded similar opportunities for learning. A math teacher elaborated:

> We can say, "What lesson is coming up?" and "Oh yeah, that's the one that doesn't work very well. How do we change that?" or "Our next test, who's doing that?" "Do we have a good test? No, we don't." "[Teacher A], why don't you do that one? I'll do the next unit." It gives you, as a teacher, an opportunity to serve your kids but also to develop yourself professionally around your curriculum.

In addition to disciplinary teams, teachers described how they used the common planning time to meet in cross-disciplinary teams. These planning meetings typically involve collaborations between social studies and English within the same house. Thus, the 11th-grade English teacher in Cusco house would collaboratively plan, with his 11th-grade social studies partner, to develop integrated curricular projects and units. An example of a cross-disciplinary project is a humanities project called the American Journeys Immigration Narrative. Students interview an immigrant to the United States and then write a story about the person's immigration journey. Through this project, the students learn about narrative techniques such as flashbacks and incorporating details to convey the immigrant's story as well as the history of immigration, push and pull factors, and nativism. A history teacher recalled, "That was co-planned basically with all of the English teachers and all the U.S. history teachers. That's something that is done across all classes. It's in the junior year, so that project has been developed over a couple years." The cross-disciplinary collaboration between history teachers and English teachers is a long-standing tradition at Hillsdale. Integrated projects that were developed 25 years ago as a result of a strong collaboration between history and English teachers, such as the Trial of Human Nature and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Hearing, are still being implemented today. In fact, it was the innovative cross-disciplinary work in the humanities that instigated the restructuring process and paved the way for embedded teacher collaboration time that the current staff enjoys today (Lance & Vasudeva, 2006).

Teacher collaboration time is also used to facilitate collaborative work among house members. For example, Marrakech house, which consists of four freshmen and four sophomore teachers who teach the core subjects—math, science, English, and social studies—at each grade level, organized themselves so that they meet as a large group once a week. One Marrakech teacher noted, "The way that we have worked, and we decided to meet, was that we did like to meet as a whole eight and do some work

around professional development type activities… I think different houses have done that differently." In the Florence house, the teachers meet as a group once a month. When all the teachers in a house meet, they often discuss and address issues that affect all the students in the house. As an example, when a Marrakech house team meeting was observed, all eight teachers and the house administrator were present. The teachers discussed how their house would implement standards-based grading, focusing on how to evaluate students' abilities to do self-assessments. One teacher pointed out that self-assessment has a different focus in 9th and 10th grade—in 9th grade, it is about students respecting themselves, and in 10th grade, it is about showing up for their community. Another teacher stated that she wanted to have something tangible to give to students. A different teacher suggested that self-reflection was a way to develop students' ability to respect themselves and their community. Thus, they should assess students' ability to self-reflect. Another teacher proposed that students should reflect across different categories across the 4 years of high school, but their self-reflections should not count against them in their portfolio of work. The discussion ended with teachers using a one to five rating system to show their preferences for the different proposals, and a decision was made to revisit the ideas after getting more clarity from the standards committee. This house meeting shows the teachers' desire to build coherence within the house. Since students stay in a house for 2 years, it is critical that all members of the house are clear about their expectations for students and how to best nurture student learning and growth from year to year.

In the house team meetings, teachers also set aside time to engage in "kid talk." Kid talk is when grade-level teams of teachers meet to discuss their shared students. As one administrator described, kid talk is when teachers "thoughtfully have conversations about students, students' needs, student progress, student success and have time to share best practices about what is working for our students." A teacher observed, "We will talk about students and interventions and that kind of thing, share strategies for how to work with certain kids." Teachers also mentioned that they try not to focus only on kids who are having difficulties. "Normally, we would go through two or three kids per advisor, and we try to pick a range of kids. Some kids are doing really well. Some kids are doing just fine, but not super great, and some kids who are struggling. We try to have a mix of kids. We cycle through them and talk about them, and figure out what's going on with them and follow up with the family if necessary," explained a teacher. The Hillsdale teachers value the time they have to discuss students with their colleagues. Engaging in kid talk ensures that all the teachers who work with a student know how the student is doing in class as well as at home. These conversations allow teachers to better address their students' strengths, interests, and needs both in academic and social-emotional terms. A teacher reflected, "In terms of the personalization for students, having that time to do kid talk, time to discuss what the students are needing is just so important to everything we're doing."

Finally, Hillsdale teachers make time to meet in advisory teams, which are made up of teachers in the same grade level who teach an advisory class and serve as an advisor to students. In advisory team meetings, teachers plan the advisory curriculum together. A teacher explained,

> I think the collaboration time with my advisory team is the piece in between the PD and the students because we are learning and talking in Thursday PD. We come to our advisory meeting where we plan what we're going to do in advisory class, which we then do in advisory class… In advisory collaboration, it's "Well, what are we doing on Monday? What are we doing on Tuesday?" We want to do this thing where we get the kids talking to each other. What do we need to put before that to make sure that that conversation will work?

In addition, developing the advisory curriculum in collaboration with other teachers ensures that a teacher is not left alone to figure out what to do. As one teacher expressed, "[It's] nice to never really have to worry about independently planning advisory because we did it as a team. It was taken care of. I didn't have to worry about if I was doing the right thing in advisory because we were all doing the same thing."

Benefits of Teacher Collaboration

As Hillsdale teachers engage in weekly PD sessions and the multitude of teacher collaboration meetings embedded into the master schedule, how does this use of time support the development of teachers' knowledge, skills, and dispositions? All 13 educators talked about the benefits to teacher learning and development derived from teachers' opportunities to collaborate. Specifically, 12 out of 13 (92%) staff members stated that common planning with colleagues improved their teaching practice; 10 out of 13 (77%) staff members indicated that they were better able to support their students as a result of the collaboration time; 12 out of 13 (92%) staff members identified building collegial relationships as a key benefit of collaboration time; and 8 out of 13 (62%) staff members viewed opportunities to collaborate with colleagues as a factor in teacher retention and achieving a healthy work-life balance.

Improvements in Teaching Practice. Nearly unanimously, Hillsdale teachers viewed their collaboration time as having a positive effect on their teaching practices. One teacher stated, "It's improved [my teaching] tremendously, because two or three brains are better than one. Oh yeah, my lessons are that much better by being able to have a built in time every week that I can collaborate with other people." Another teacher shared a similar sentiment:

> More ideas make more interesting perspectives, right? I've got my perspective, you've got your perspective, together we can make a lesson

or a unit that will engage more students because I'm going to have a really good reading and you're going to have a really good kinesthetic thing. Together we can hit more people. Hit more kids with our big idea or our learning.

She goes on to say that many minds enrich each learning opportunity. So when teachers collaborate, they make a richer lesson or a richer assignment because one person's strengths complement another person's strengths. As an example, she shared how her colleague has "great ideas for questions, asks really good questions to the students. My questions maybe aren't so strong. So, I can take her questions, put them onto our worksheet and now my worksheet is better."

As another example, a teacher talked about her coaching work with a team of world language teachers. The language teachers had set a goal of having students engage in unsupported, sustained meaningful conversations. The teachers worked collaboratively to identify the scaffolds the students would need to make that goal a reality. Over the year, the teacher coaching the language teachers saw how they were building classroom practices that really supported student learning. She observed:

> I don't really think that people can do that by themselves. Probably an excellent teacher could do that, but to really have the support of their peers doing similar work, and being able to go in there and discuss, "Hey what was an activity that worked,?" and "I tried this and it quite didn't go," and "I'm trying to get here. What are you guys doing?" I think that that's the strength of some of that collaboration time that they have.

Moreover, a teacher shared how collaborating with colleagues allows teachers to be more creative:

> You can be more innovative because you don't have to invent every little bit of this new, innovative thing you're trying. My pre-calc teacher and I, we wanted to restructure chapter 1. The idea of restructuring chapter 1 is daunting unless someone else goes, "Well, why don't I take the 1st day and you can take the 2nd day and then we'll talk again? And then I'll do the 3rd and you'll do the 4th." It becomes manageable when you've got a team that can help you lift this very large burden of something that's new and different.

Supporting Students Better. An integral part of the Hillsdale model is the focus on personalization and really knowing students well. Thus, teachers, spend time in their collaborative meetings, talking about students' learning and development and strategizing ideas for how to support them. An administrator described the kid talk as a way "to understand the students better or the sociology of the class." Within those

conversations, teachers communicate with each other about what they are seeing from students and strategize ideas for how to provide support to them. He continued, "There's communication about, 'so-and-so, he's not handling his business. You, advisor, you're also the English teacher. Can you help take care of this, help this kid? Urge this kid to come to office hours or get to the after-school program?'"

A teacher talked about how the teacher collaborative time at Hillsdale allows him to quickly and more effectively respond to students' needs than he would be able to in a traditional, comprehensive high school:

> What's different here and what [the teachers] get out of the [collaboration time]…is we get structured time to plan for advisory and talk about how our kids are doing… I teach the same group of kids that [the other core teachers in my house] teaches... What we get out of this is more focused, targeted time around our kids in advisory, which means that we can get after kids who are struggling more rapidly and support kids who are not doing well more rapidly and more effectively. Other high schools don't work that way. If I have a kid in my math class in a traditional high school, I got to find time to call you, his English teacher, and you, his social sciences or biology teacher. If this kid over here has a problem or that kid might not have you as the teacher, it means I have to figure out who do you have and by the way, do I even know you? Do I know the other teachers? Because in a big school, you might not know everybody, or you might not have a really good, strong personal relationship, whereas [the other core teachers in the house] and I teach together. We're friends. We can get right at a kid extremely fast. We know what's going on right away, and there's just no screwing around.

This teacher prizes the fact that the collaboration time with his colleagues is an opportunity to share information about students so that the team can intervene quickly when problems arise. Time is not wasted on trying to figure out which other teachers are working with a student and whether he has developed the working relationship with the other teachers to devise a coordinated response to the issue. Another teacher valued that the collaboration time created a collective understanding of students' strengths, interests, and needs within the team of teachers who "also understand the different dimensions of the kids and their issues." This common understanding can be extremely helpful in relieving stress and creating a sense of teacher efficacy, which refers to teachers' confidence in their abilities to affect student learning. In fact, research has shown that teacher efficacy is strongly associated with teacher-to-teacher relationships as well as the frequency of engagement in teacher collaboration activities (OECD, 2014). Specifically, research has shown that collaborating with colleagues around instructional matters has a positive indirect effect on teachers' sense of personal efficacy because it creates a certainty of practice (Smylie, 1988).

Collegial Relationships. The Hillsdale staff prioritizes building relationships with colleagues as an essential precondition for teacher learning and development resulting from collaboration time. One teacher described how she and her colleagues make it a point to eat lunch together:

> There's usually four or five of us in my room... We sit and we talk about our lives and some days we close the door and it's about kids, sometimes about school politics. It's good. It's fun. I know my colleague's children's names and how his wife is. That is an important piece of, I think, collaboration. You don't have to know each other, know the nitty-gritty details, but if you are able to know someone's values, I think it helps you see the full person as well. Like with our students, when you know more it only helps.

This teacher suggests that knowing about her colleagues' lives beyond school helps her grasp their values and understand the full person. Many teachers talked about how "tight knit" they were with the other teachers in their houses. In addition to working together constantly, they go out together socially. A counselor remarked:

> [I]t's a very tight-knit group, so once a month they plan a social, and a lot of times it is after one of the house meetings. Maybe we'll meet at somebody's house and cook dinner. Maybe we'll go bowling, play bocce ball, go somewhere.

Another teacher observed, "I think that part of it is that we really want to like each other here. We really like to be together and you get that with the collaboration, right? You get this kind of, 'You're on my team. We're together.' I think it's a little bit emotional and a little bit practical."

More importantly, teaching can be a lonely profession where the norm in schools can be "every man for himself." At Hillsdale, however, the teacher collaboration time helps teachers feel less isolated. When asked if he thought a lot of teachers' time was spent in meetings, an administrator replied, "Yes, it is. But I think that teachers are typically lonely." Another administrator observed about working at Hillsdale, "I think it's a good place for new teachers to come in because I don't think that new teachers feel isolated. Teachers are naturally part of two teams, their house and their content team. There's less space for somebody to feel isolated." Other teachers expressed the same sentiment. "I think the hardest thing at my first school early in my career was I would feel, I'm an island and without support or any notion of what I'm doing is good or bad. I was just in a vacuum," reflected a teacher. The way that teacher collaboration time is structured at Hillsdale, however, breaks teachers out of the isolation that working in large schools can create. One administrator contended that by giving teachers time to collaborate during the school day, they can connect with others and feel energized by each other. He shared:

By keeping them in conversation we are also reinforcing the sense of community and what it is to work here… We have to keep that conversation going internally and keep the expectations so that nobody gets real lazy, everybody gets the energy injection of having interaction with their peers… I guess at the bottom of it all you have to make the time to make the relationships with people.

Thus, it would not be a stretch to suggest that building collegial relationships strengthens teachers' ability to work collaboratively and to learn from and with each other. However, these teachers could not nurture the relationships that enable them to work together to support student and teacher learning without the careful attention towards how time is organized at the school.

Teacher Retention. It is not surprising to learn that most teachers believe there is not enough time in the day to finish all the work they *must* do, let alone all the work they would like to do. In schools where innovative reforms make many demands on the staff, issues of sustainability and teacher burnout become paramount. Therefore, what is remarkable about how Hillsdale organizes teacher time and work is that it intentionally focuses on achieving a work-life balance so that teachers will stay in the field. For one, the school staff recognizes that expecting teachers to find time either before or after school or on their own time to plan and collaborate is an unrealistic and unfair expectation. People have family commitments outside of work that may make coming in early or staying after school impossible. When asked if teachers typically stayed after school to plan together, one teacher replied:

After school here, it's not so much in the culture, which I think is a good thing given that it's hard to work here. I don't mean that in a negative way. It's hard to work here because we make that emotional investment, and so it's really important for all of us to have something outside of school that, like, fills our bucket so we can bring it the next day. We are very guarded of 3:30. 4:00, that's getting into the time I need to recharge, to be able to come here and do the work I do. We don't really meet after school.

According to a teacher, part of the Hillsdale mission was to create a sustainable model of schooling. "We looked at what was going on in charter schools and some other places where it was burn and churn, where they'd even say, 'You're thoroughbreds. We're going to run you for 3 years and then you're out.' We wanted this to be a place where people could make it a lifelong career; people with families could exist and could thrive." This teacher went on to say:

The idea that your whole life and your whole career, your whole world, is for your kids here, I just don't think that's sustainable longterm as a model for education. One way to avoid that and allow for

the collaboration, allow for the personalization is to embed the time in the school day. It's also closer to European and other models where they're there to teach and then there's time to collaborate during the day. I think that's why we've tried really hard to do that.

The intentional act of embedding time for collaboration within teachers' contract hours brings structure and limits to an already overloaded day. Another teacher reflected:

> [Collaboration] has to be built into the bell schedule. I'm thinking now, I remember being on some committee, and we met at 7:00 am, and they were like "don't worry, we'll meet at this diner." It shouldn't be out of the goodness of hearts, we're doing all this stuff, because you can't sustain that. We were totally pumped to do that, and we felt like "oh, we're going to bring in all these innovative things," whatever it is. It's like that's fun a couple times to meet at the diner at 7:00 am, it definitely couldn't ever be a weekly thing. We couldn't even sustain it monthly.

The need to protect teachers from burnout by creating a work environment that honors teachers' lives outside of the school is a challenge that is often overlooked by school administrators and other educators. As time becomes a more limited resource, the fallback tends to be to assume that teachers will make up the difference by giving more of their personal time (e.g., coming in early or staying late to plan lessons and to meet with colleagues). At Hillsdale, however, the staff engages in discussions about the inverse relationship between time and sustainability. A teacher expressed:

> We've had a lot of conversations around here. I don't know that we've solved anything but it's something that people are very aware of just in terms of maintaining that these people have families and people have little kids. Juggling the roles of being a full-time teacher and a parent is something that people have to grapple with.

Along with acknowledging the potentially conflicting demands of work and family, allocating time within the confines of the school day for teachers to work collaboratively and learn with and from each other can alleviate some of the stress and may be critical for sustainability.

Challenges to Teacher Collaboration

While many administrators and organizational theorists extoll the virtues of collaboration, those who engage in the collaborations agree that good ones require hard work. Research has shown that developing communities of practice is difficult, especially when the aim of the teacher community is to go beyond contrived collegiality and actually influence classroom practice (Hargreaves, 1991; Little, 1990).

All 13 educators identified challenges associated with organizing teacher time and work to prioritize collaboration. Therefore, schools that value teacher collaboration and would like to allocate time for collaboration into the master schedule should be cognizant of the potential challenges to collaboration and the need to continually balance and rebalance their use of time. In their experience, Hillsdale staff members identified meeting fatigue, group dynamics, and loss of individual time as challenges to teacher collaboration.

Meeting Fatigue. While thought of as valuable and integral to the work of the school, some staff members (4 out of 13, 31%) stated that collaboration time can be a slippery slope and staff can get "meeting-ed out" as one administrator put it. The various opportunities to collaborate in different teams and take on leadership activities, such as teachers at Hillsdale are afforded, can pull staff in conflicting directions. "You do hear people talk about another meeting, 'I got another meeting today,' and it sort of piles up sometimes. You know, some meetings are more effectively run than others and more efficient and there's sort of a trade-off between your meeting and… protecting your time," related a teacher. Another teacher observed how having too many collaboration teams could potentially be counterproductive. He explained:

> There are periods where you look at my calendar and you're meeting all the time. Another problem with meeting all the time is you get fatigued. There's also, I think, a limited capacity for being able to acclimate to different collaborative groups. There's just a certain load that goes beyond what people can do. A good collaborative group is a bit of a mystery. There's a little bit of a mystical element about it. You can have norms and you can do all that stuff, but it doesn't mean the group's going to work. Having too many different webs of collaboration, I think, is actually counterproductive. Having too many meetings is counterproductive.

This teacher acknowledged that good collaborations take time to develop and can be elusive. In addition, he pointed out that there may be a threshold for a team member's ability to engage in different working groups and contribute to each one productively. He questioned what a "proper load" of collaborative meetings was. He reflected:

> What's possible? What can people manage? How many different work teams can really be productive and really be useful? How much time can be devoted to collaboration? How much downtime is needed?... I'm proud of what we've done here to create this structure, but there's human limits and human needs within all of those structures.

The balancing act between group responsibility and individual autonomy can be a difficult one to achieve.

Group Dynamics. The mix of teachers that make up a collaborative team can have powerful effects on how the team works together. Members of the Hillsdale faculty (5 out of 13, 38%) identified group dynamics as a challenging aspect of collaboration. As one teacher explained:

> The teaming is tough, too. I think we've had good people with really pretty extraordinary social skills. That can be a problem there if the teams aren't thinking about that team process. I think there's been occasional conflicts with teams… so that's probably going to be a byproduct of any kind of collaborative experience.

Another teacher identified personalities as a potential source of conflict in teams. She related, "Some people just prefer to be as an island. I think it's having a strong set of team norms that people follow and aren't afraid to call others out on, if they're not abiding by them." She believed that teams should develop norms for collaboration and enforce them when necessary. One teacher suggested that what can make collaborative teaming difficult is the challenge of building the work relationships that allow the team to focus on the work rather than the people. He described:

> Because a lot of what you're doing is trying to make sure that the people around you are feeling okay. I go into meetings. I think half about the content. I'll be honest, I think a quarter about the content and, in the teams I'm less comfortable with or less familiar with, 75% about how everybody else is feeling because we've emphasized that, because nobody can feel bad in the meeting. If you have a good group that works well, you put most of that stuff aside and you're actually focusing on what you're doing.

Another teacher recalled a year when there were not enough advisors to teach the necessary number of advisory classes. As a result, two teachers who normally did not teach advisory were required to do so. She explained:

> They made it clear that they didn't want to. It wasn't that they were anti-advisory, they were just very uncomfortable and anti having to give up their elective… It was difficult because they didn't want to be there, and they were pretty clear about it… That's sort of the downside, of when the structure and the schedule dictates everything.

Individual Time. The challenge to collaboration that was identified the most by staff members (7 out of 13, 54%) was the loss of individual time. When teachers meet collaboratively in their content, house, or advisory teams, they cannot attend to small, but important, tasks that may take a lot of time such as making copies, answering emails, calling parents, or grading. One teacher described:

> For me, what was always the challenge was getting the grading piece done because I found that I had a hard time finding time to do the grading during my prep periods whereas, I think, if you didn't have those collaborations and you were just doing your own thing, that you would probably be able to use more of your prep periods for just the day-to-day work, the answering the emails and the grading and the stuff that's just, like, you just need to sit down and hammer through it.

Another teacher echoed, "There's sort of a trade-off between your meeting and then you've got your grading and your planning, meeting with students, copying, that kind of thing." A different teacher reflected:

> I now have a 3-year-old at home, so there are times that I just need to leave. I can't work to 11:00pm anymore like I used to for years. So I try to get as much as I can done here before I go, but that's a challenge… But grading is a nightmare. Like Wednesday, I had to take a day off. Just took a day off to just catch up on that and still got pulled into a meeting in the afternoon.

To another teacher, having too many meetings becomes counterproductive as it stunts teachers' ability to be reflective:

> I think neuroscience shows that, too. Even creativity studies show that too, is you need that reflection, that downtime, that away time as well. I've had places where I've talked to teachers and say, 'I don't know what day it is, but I know I have a meeting.' Think about it.

Thus, finding the right balance between structuring time for collaborative work and individual work is challenging, yet critical, in making the complex job of teaching manageable and rewarding for teachers. Hillsdale seems to be successful at meeting this challenge because the creation of collaborative time in the master schedule is driven by the staff's commitment to creating personalized learning environments for students and honoring the school's tradition of teachers working together to develop integrated curricular projects and portfolio assessments. As one administrator reflected:

> We have a lot of meetings but it works here because people are bought into it. People, by and large, feel that the outcomes from going to those meetings still outweigh their ability to have individual time to work on their own X, Y, or Z.

Organizing Teacher Time to Support Student Learning

Most educators would agree that the goal of education is to facilitate the growth and development of students. Although demonstrating a causal relationship between teacher learning opportunities and student learning is beyond the scope of this case study, the study suggests that Hillsdale students do derive benefits when teacher time and work is organized to allow for teachers to collaborate and work together on a regular basis. Nine out of 13 (69%) staff members reported that the collaborative work allowed teachers to integrate curricula and to design innovative learning projects as well as facilitated conversations that deepened and strengthened their knowledge of students' academic progress and social-emotional wellbeing. As a result, Hillsdale students benefit from the focus on and development of students' academic skills and knowledge as well as their social-emotional skills and dispositions.

Focus on the Development of Students' Academic Skills and Knowledge

At Hillsdale, teacher time and work is organized to support student learning. One administrator explained:

> With the amount of time we have to both collaborate on our own content and talk to one another about who our students really are as individuals and learners, we're better able to help support their learning. We can go deeper. We can ask more critical thinking questions. We can develop projects that are more interdisciplinary and allow students to have more flex in their own learning or take more ownership or to have creativity in what an outcome might look like for a particular project. That is really the core of it.

According to this administrator, students derive benefits from the interdisciplinary projects that are developed in the collaborative meetings because those projects afford students more autonomy to choose or self-initiate an action, which research has shown to enhance students' motivation and learning (Chase, Chin, Oppezzo, & Schwartz, 2009; Harter, 1978; Iyengar & Lepper, 1999).

In addition, students derive benefits when teachers meet and collaboratively develop integrated projects because then students experience more rigorous, challenging tasks that go beyond simple recall and require students to use higher order thinking skills and demonstrate their understanding. Another administrator observed:

> We want kids to take the AP tests, the classes. We want to challenge them. Whether they get a 3 or a 4 [on the AP exam], that has never

been as important as how do we get them to do an oral defense, how do we get them to practice to cite evidence and argue their point.

A teacher elaborated:

> Seniors defend their portfolios in front of a panel. Freshmen come, 10th-graders, 11th-graders also come around and see those. What that has infused the rest of the school with is a common expectation around defense of work. Knowing that you have to be able to answer questions you weren't necessarily prepared for, how to think on your feet, that there's some common focal areas that are going to be discussed; your proficiency, your growth, your challenges. Everyone's going to do that. That creates a common experience for the entire school so that it's not just isolated in one AP class that was maybe going to do that. This is the work of the school and…this is the kind of work that we believe is really authentic college preparation for 21st-century job work.

Another administrator shared a story that a parent told at a recent school board meeting. The parent's daughter had graduated from Hillsdale and was a freshman at the University of California where, in one of her classes, she was required to do an oral presentation. The board member reported that the professor singled her daughter out and said to the class: "'This is for everybody who wants to see what an oral presentation looks like, this is what you should be doing.' He took her aside, said, 'How did you develop those skills?' She's like, 'That's what you do in high school.'" The administrator added, "That's rewarding and that doesn't show up in anything, but kids do say this. They come back and say, 'We know how to interact with our professors, we know how to give presentations, we know how to cite evidence.'"

The administrator's comment that the students' skills do not "show up in anything" is not completely accurate. In fact, since 2003, when the school began the SLC restructuring process and built time in the master schedule for teacher collaboration, Hillsdale students' performance on state standardized tests has improved consistently (Hillsdale High School, n.d.-b). As measured by the state's API,[8] in 2002–2003, the school's API was 662,[9] well below the state goal of 800. However, in 2005–2006,

---

[8] California's API is the state's annual measure of test performance of schools and districts. For high schools, the API is calculated using results of the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program and the California High School Exit Exam. In 2013, the California legislature suspended the state's STAR program to prepare for the new Smarter Balanced assessments and to transition to the new state assessment system that was being developed. In 2014, the State Board of Education decided not to produce a growth API for 2 years during the transition to the state's implementation of the new Common Core standards and the Smarter Balanced assessments. (See https://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/Pages/UnderstandingTheAPI.aspx.)
[9] See http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/2002Base_Sch.asp?SchCode=4133070&DistCode=69047&AllCds=41690474133070

during the first year of full SLC implementation across Hillsdale, the school's API increased over 100 points to 768.[10] By 2012–2013, Hillsdale's API score was 818.[11] Thus, the school's performance data on standardized measures do show that Hillsdale's commitment to personalized learning and creating time for daily teacher collaboration is correlated with growth in student test scores.

Focus on the Development of Students' Social-Emotional Skills and Dispositions

Hillsdale's SLCs and advisory program were designed with the goal of personalization, so that every student knows at least one adult in the school very well. Toward that end, the school organizes teachers' work and time to allow the staff to meet and discuss each student's progress and support the development of their social-emotional skills. One administrator explained:

> We put so much energy and resources into this advisory program, which is supporting the softer skills… the social and emotional components. That's where a kid is going to end up crying to you about something that happened at home or they're going to spill this or that or they're going to ask for advice… Because they feel so safe and comfortable. In another school, they might not have shared that all with me but we've created a space to share that. We've created a space that makes them feel opening up and vulnerable enough to express that.

A counselor related how the structure allows staff to get to know kids and their families, so students request to be placed into specific houses because of those established relationships and rapport. From her perspective, this supports students to be "happier and more successful." Teachers also noted how students, now, seem to take more pride in their work and their school. One teacher described how student work is displayed in common spaces all over the school and students do not deface the work. She related:

> We hang up student work in the hallway, and on bulletin boards that aren't even right outside our classroom, that are in common spaces… I think more so it's just like this sort of respect that the kids all know, it's not that they know each other, but they just know this is the place where you don't [destroy property], and that would be such a betrayal of individuals I think, to do that… I think that there's something about how, I think that a lot of kids know that the teachers here love them to

---

[10] See http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/APIBase2006/2006GrowthSch.aspx?allcds=41690474133070
[11] See http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/Acnt2014/apiavgSch.aspx?allcds=41690474133070

pieces, and just have their back, and are so concerned about them for good reason, everything's sort of infused with that.

As a result, Hillsdale now has a reputation in the community "as the school that takes care of your kids" shared an administrator. He also added, "It's like you get this private school, small school experience for free, and you know that you have an advisor, and you have these people who are looking out for you." A teacher echoed, "There's a waiting list to get into our school. We're a very desired school to go to." Hillsdale has come a long way from its old reputation of "Hillsjail."

Enabling Conditions

Hillsdale's organization of teachers' time and work supports its vision of SLCs as well as its ongoing commitment to the Cornerstones. Specifically, the school's master schedule has been designed to prioritize deeper learning for students and teachers. The school's organization and scheduling would not be possible without support from critical organizational policies, practices, and resources. Hillsdale's innovative use of time is buoyed by enabling conditions: support from the district office, strong leadership, shared decision-making, shared values, and community support.

District Support

Twelve out of 13 (92%) staff members identified support from the district office as a key enabling condition for how the school can innovatively organize teacher time and work. The central office provides much needed financial resources to support the SLCs and scheduling. When Hillsdale began the transition to SLCs, the district backed the restructuring process by providing money to hire the extra teachers needed to staff the program at a ratio of 20 students to 1 teacher. According to an administrator, at that time, the school received funding for the full-time equivalent (FTE) of four teachers from the district, but the original staffing support for the transition to SLCs has since been phased out. Currently, the administrator estimates that Hillsdale receives "1.2 FTE of support that's on our staffing sheet," which the district provides to all schools in the district to sustain a district-wide initiative, but Hillsdale repurposes the funding to strengthen the SLCs. Therefore, Hillsdale does not receive additional funds not available to other schools in the district. Without the initial financial resources from the central office, however, the school would not have been able to implement the SLC model that drives how it organizes and supports student and teacher learning today.

In addition, the district provides support by offering the school the flexibility and autonomy to make its own decisions. When Hillsdale began the process of creating SLCs, one teacher related:

> The district, to their credit, I think they said, "Well, what's Hillsdale doing? They're doing something out there." They're like, "Okay, those guys, the dreamers." Whatever you want to call it, they were pretty supportive… I never felt like they were coming in and saying, "No, you can't do this."

An administrator added, "There was a district who was willing to help us maneuver through that to make that happen. I think sometimes we overlook how important that was, because we could have been blocked." Specifically, the district has allowed

the school to make staffing decisions that best fit its programmatic needs. An administrator explained:

> The other thing we did early on was over the first few years, we had four classified positions come over where classified people, they retired or changed jobs, and we didn't repost, so we cut our classified staff by four positions. We got rid of department chairs. The district calculated the savings on all of those things and gave us back, basically, two teachers' worth of resources, since they're not paying for classifieds, they're not paying for department head days and department head stipends.

In making its own staffing decisions, the school staff was able to re-allocate the resources from the district to fund the advisory classes that are so critical to its mission and the cornerstone of personalization. This, in turn, has paved the way for Hillsdale to organize teachers' time and work in the master schedule that prioritizes teacher and student learning.

Moreover, the district gives Hillsdale the autonomy to provide academic support classes to students in the manner that makes the most sense to students and teachers in the school. According to an administrator, the support class initiative came about when schools were missing their performance targets and the district went into program improvement under No Child Left Behind. As a result, the district provides 1.2 FTEs to all schools in the district so that schools can implement double blocks of English or Algebra support classes to students who are underperforming in those subjects. Hillsdale teachers, however, said those support classes would not work at the school because of how it organizes students into SLCs and the overall master schedule. An administrator recalled:

> We said, "We are not going to do that, because [the students have] got to be in our core." They have to be in our core, or the whole thing falls apart. The district, again, said, "Okay, you can do that. Every other school's going to do these double blocks. Hillsdale will do a single, and then certain identified students will get a second hour of English."

Whereas the other high schools were implementing the support classes as conceived by the district, Hillsdale was afforded the flexibility to put those resources into their advisories. "Where other schools are taking these support classes, we're taking them and putting them, essentially, into advisory. We just think it's a better model for kids, a better support," an administrator explained. In this manner, the district provides key support to the school by allowing the staff to make independent decisions about how best to support the learning needs of their students.

Finally, the central office provides flexibility and autonomy to the school in support of its overall mission and goals by playing a critical buffering role. As an example,

the school's SLC model is designed to support cohorts of about 110 students in each grade in small, personalized learning environments. Especially in the lower grades (9th and 10th), strict adherence to the SLC structures (i.e., students are randomly assigned to a house where they take core academic courses from a team of four teachers for 2 years) is prioritized. Yet, recently, the district has seen an increase in student enrollment numbers, which has placed pressure on the entire system to ensure that students are placed and enrolled in a school. Whereas the central office's stance could have been to equally distribute the growing number of students among the six high schools in the district, instead, the district chose to cap the number of students enrolled at Hillsdale in alignment with the SLC model and to distribute the remaining students to the other schools. An administrator observed:

> [The district] really try to make way for us. They try to support us. They try to clear the path. For example, we're expanding. The enroll-ment in the south side of the district is just booming because of all the construction, so Aragon and San Mateo High Schools both increased their freshman classes this year. We did by just a little bit, because we have to grow in these 110-student chunks. The fact that the district, when we've gotten to 336 up till now in their freshman class, which is 112 per house, we've called the district and said, "That's it. We have no more room." That's 28 to 1 in our 9th and 10th grade. The con-tractual maximum's 35 to 1. Do we have room? Yeah. They can put another seven students per class in there, but that's not our model.[12]

Thus, even though teacher contracts stipulate that class sizes can go up to 35 students, the central office administrators' decision to cap the student enrollment at Hillsdale to 112 students per house provides flexibility to the school so that Hillsdale is able to stay to true to its mission of small learning environments for students.

The Hillsdale staff shared that the central office has been "willing to work with us" by providing "openness and flexibility" around a variety of initiatives that Hillsdale has instituted to ensure that all students reach their academic and personal potential. Hillsdale was the first school in the district to implement a policy that eliminated the general science courses and placed all freshmen into biology so that all students could take chemistry in their sophomore year and be on track to meet the science requirements needed for eligibility in the University of California and the California State University system. Hillsdale was also the first school in the district to essen-tially assign all students to a rigorous college preparation curriculum. In fact, the district has approved an arrangement wherein students need to pass their senior

---

[12] All schools in the district have a 35:1 maximum for any given class. Therefore, other schools could choose to use their FTEs differently and reduce the class size ratio like Hillsdale does in the 9th and 10th grades, if they are willing to make other compromises such as reducing the number of electives offered or increasing class sizes in other grades.

defense to earn a diploma from the school. An administrator reflected, "It's a de facto graduation requirement. No other school does that, but that creates an incentive for students to do that project for those who are on the fence or don't see the inherent value in it." Teachers and administrators recognize the district's willingness to "negotiate expectations or work with [them] as a unique entity has been really important." It is this support from the district office that has enabled the innovative organization of teachers' time and work in the school.

Strong Leadership

Hillsdale has a history of strong leadership that has consistently championed teacher learning and innovation. It is said that the former principal, who was in place when the school transitioned into SLCs, would give teachers much leeway as long as it benefited students. One teacher recalled, "[The principal] would let you put a carnival tent in the parking lot if you could prove it was good for kids." This form of unwavering support gave the staff "a little more time and room to dream and play" so that they were emboldened to think outside of the box and create organic collaborations around curriculum and personalization. Another teacher added that the principal had a "let 1,000 flowers grow philosophy" and became an important supporter of the school's transformation once he saw that many teachers supported the change. The teacher elaborated:

> The administration's support for teacher innovation has been really key, and they've set it up right. That's been key. They always have done that schedule right, and that has been huge. Yeah, I think that's maybe the most unique thing within Hillsdale. They really make sure that you get that scheduling right, where you're able to have those periods… I know there's my other history brother or my English partner or that whole team of advisors that I can read with and…we can collaborate… That's been huge. Yeah, the administration, that's been super, super helpful. They've been supportive.

The initial small group collaborations eventually led way to the SLC model and the development of a master schedule that formally provides time for teacher collaborative work and learning. This would not have been possible without the support of the school administrators. Thus, it is not surprising that 10 out of 12 (83%) staff members identified school leadership as a critical enabling condition.

The school's strong leadership is also apparent in the ways administrators find creative solutions to fund the SLC model and related scheduling components. For example, when collaboration time is embedded into the daily schedule for teachers, they are getting paid to learn with colleagues and not solely for working directly with students. As an administrator pointed out, "That's been the ongoing challenge… It turns out that the bigger you get, there are not efficiencies. It doesn't scale

up in a way that it's cheaper, which we had hoped." Thus, the school leaders are constantly adjusting the numbers to make the model work. "[He] has done everything. He has pulled rabbits out of more hats than most people understand how to do. It's amazing what he's been able to do… what he has to manipulate in terms of dollars," explained one administrator about his colleague. School leaders talked about how it is their job to manage their funds, especially since financial support from the district is waning. To the school leaders, if the model is worth anything, it should be replicable, and any school should be able to do what Hillsdale does.

So how does school leadership manage it? For one, all three administrators in the school, as well as one counselor, are advisors to a group of students and teach an advisory class. Thus, the administrators and the counselor essentially donate their time, since serving as advisors is an additional responsibility. Doing so, they cover four sections out of the 47 that are needed to provide all students with an advisory class and save staffing dollars for the school. Moreover, the school leaders have developed a partnership with the local community college whereby the community college teachers teach 11 sections of elective courses at Hillsdale. An administrator estimates that it translates into 2.1 FTEs that come free to the school. He explained:

> The students are getting community college credit and they're getting high school credit… It's augmented our program. Where we would have carried those electives, now students are taking electives through the community college instead of through the district. Those [classes] are free. Students get community college credit. For us, it's a win-win. The community college is a great partner for us.

Thus, Hillsdale's strong leadership supports student learning by providing ongoing support to the staff and encouraging teacher learning and innovation as well as by finding creative solutions to fund the SLC model and prioritizing teacher collaborative work. As such, the school's strong leadership is an important enabling condition for organizing teacher time and work in nontraditional ways.

Shared Decision-Making

Eight out of 12 (67%) of the staff members recognized shared decision-making as a key enabling condition. Hillsdale's restructuring into SLCs began as a teacher-led movement and was not a top-down mandate. The teachers, wanting to be more collaborative and to design integrated projects between different subjects, approached the administration with a plan for transforming into SLCs. What resulted from that transformation process was a shared governance structure that relied heavily upon a standard of distributed leadership. For one, the SLC model was designed to have three administrators act as principals of the SLCs. In this manner, the principals hold nontraditional roles as they present themselves as "coequals" to the staff, parents, and the central office. This conception of co-principals tends to perplex the

district since central office administrators often hold traditional views of the leadership hierarchy in a school. An administrator recalled how at one point, when a new superintendent came into the district, the Hillsdale staff was told that it needed to have "somebody in charge." The staff resisted and said "that's not how we do it at Hillsdale, we have three co-principals." The central office responded by selecting one of the principals as the "lead principal" and considered that person to be in charge of the school. The same administrator described:

> They want to box you in. They want to say, "Okay, district meetings for principals, [one of the administrators], you go to this and [another administrator] goes to these." Sometimes that doesn't work with our model and sometimes we just go to different places, and that bothers them a little bit, but not too much.

However, he added that the district office has since softened and the current administration is "open and supportive" of Hillsdale's model of leadership. Thus, as co-principals, "We really try to ensure that the small learning communities are the schools that we serve. We try to be the leaders of those schools."

The creation of a model of distributed leadership was an intentional act, and it was conceived as a way for the teachers to have an equal voice with the administration. A teacher recalled:

> One of the unique things about Hillsdale is that we have an administration, but they serve at the behest of the faculty. The reason [one of the administrators is] such an effective administrator here is because... we chose him because he's the kind of person who's not going to be a dictator, who's going to go along with the group. We wouldn't have chosen [him] if it had been somebody who wanted to be the person who was in charge of the school.

The governance structure of the school was deliberately created as a way for teacher voices to be heard in all decisions that pertain to the running of the school, and the administrators were "chosen" by the staff with that goal in mind. The same teacher went on to say that that is what the school faculty feel exceptionally good about:

> One thing we have achieved is you don't hear a lot of people at Hillsdale complaining about the administration, "The administration is doing this to us"… You don't hear that here… You heard that at other schools, "Principal's out to get me." You don't hear that here. [One of the administrators is] a great person, but it's not because [he's] a great person. It's because of the structure and the culture that we tried to create.

The structure that this teacher is referring to is the school's commitment to shared decision-making, one of the four Cornerstones that guides the school. To begin, all members of the faculty are welcome to join any and all school committees (e.g., leadership committee, sustainability committee, governance committee, assessment committee, PD committee, equity committee, interview committee, SLC council). As an example, teachers actively participate on interview committees to select new hires with teacher representatives from the house that has the opening as well as with teachers who teach the same content. This allows teachers to get a sense of the person they may end up collaborating with very closely. "I appreciate that, being able to not only sit in on hiring a history colleague, but the English colleague you want me to be working with. I think that's really key," shared a teacher.

An administrator described how the school staff views nine specific issues as very important; those issues are clustered into three groups and are discussed every 3 years. He observed:

> This year we're talking about equity, technology, and sustainability. What does it look like 4 years out for small learning communities? What's it going to cost? How are we going to afford it? What are we going to be able to do in terms of electives, and those kind of things.

The previous year, the three committees focused on budgets, governance, and facilities. Once the staff makes decisions on the issues, they are not revisited for another 3 years.

To arrive at a decision, the staff goes through a shared decision-making process whereby the faculty must come to a consensus for a decision to move forward. As an example, an administrator detailed how the faculty decided on instituting a portfolio system that requires every senior to defend a portfolio of work before a panel of teachers, parents, community members, and their peers. Because implementing a portfolio assessment would have many ramifications on teachers' time and work (e.g., assessing the PD needed to support teachers to do this work, developing supports to help students learn how to respond to questions about their work, creating time in the schedule for students to defend their work), staff input towards that decision was critical. This decision-making process began with a committee that spent time learning about portfolios and talking with various stakeholders to come up with recommendations or a plan of action. Next, the recommendations were brought before and discussed at each house as well as the SLC council, and staff provided feedback. Based on faculty input, the committee revised its recommendations and took them back to the houses for another round of discussions and feedback. Afterward, the proposal was brought to the SLC council for debate and decision-making. The SLC council is made up of a member from each house, four at-large representatives, and the administrators. The administration only gets one vote. Thus, out of ten votes, the staff gets nine. The SLC council members cast their

votes using a one to five rating system. A five rating suggests that the member not only supports the proposal but will also actively work to make it happen. A four rating indicates that the member supports the idea. A three rating suggests that the person is neutral, neither for the proposal nor against it. A two rating indicates that the person does not like the proposal, but will not stop it from being implemented. A one rating stops the process; the proposal gets debated again and could even go back to the committee to be revised. However, once the proposal is voted on and approved by the SLC council, the decision is final. This was the case with the decision to implement a portfolio system at Hillsdale. The administrator concluded:

> We are a portfolio school now… We made that decision and that's it, and then we work to create time, or to move the resources around so that we can make it happen… If you wanted to reverse that you would have to come up with a proposal that was able to get through consensus model, and that would be really, really hard because people are invested in a portfolio.

Because of all the opportunities staff members have to voice concerns or questions about issues and proposed plans during the decision-making process, once the decision is made, "you have to live with the decision." Hillsdale's shared decision-making process ensures a high level of involvement from all faculty, which in turn increases staff buy-in and investment in implementing the decision. A teacher reflected:

> [It's] valuing, respecting, enabling the shared decision-making that we do. That's one of our Cornerstones. That's something that is very essential to all that we do, that we don't get top-down dictates… it's letting us, at the most local level, figure out how to be successful, to accomplish what we need to.

Within this structure is an added benefit of teachers being afforded multiple opportunities to take on leadership roles within the school. A teacher observed:

> If you want teachers to be decision makers, they have to collaborate and they have to work on that. I don't think it's any coincidence that Hillsdale's produced a lot of leaders of curriculum councils. We've produced some administrators at other schools and so forth because people get that experience here.

Another teacher talked about the many leadership opportunities she has taken on since she began working at Hillsdale and the ability to bring her perspective to the table: "I like having my voice heard and I'm bringing a different perspective, I think than a lot of teachers here." To her and to many others, the affordance of leadership opportunities to teachers is about "making sure those voices are heard and valued." Teacher leadership is a byproduct of Hillsdale's use of shared decision-making pro-

cesses, which enables the organization of teacher time and work that honors collaboration and cross-disciplinary work in support of student learning.

Shared Values

Another enabling condition present at Hillsdale is the staff's shared values and beliefs about what constitutes high-quality learning experiences for students and what the staff must do to help students realize their potential and be successful learners. All the staff members that were interviewed talked about the importance of the school's vision and values and how their shared values drive the work that they do. One teacher observed:

> I think most schools spend nearly all of their time figuring out the bell schedule and the arrangement of collaboration time or the staffing ratios, and all that's important. But if they haven't done the work of, like, clarifying what they're about and how teachers will work, it's like our cornerstones, then it's going to be short lived when they try to carry that out.

The staff's commitment to the school's shared beliefs or Cornerstones guides the SLCs, the master schedule, teachers' collaborative time, and the integrated projects. As an example, many teachers spoke of the staff's shared beliefs about collaboration. When asked why Hillsdale's master schedule embeds common planning time for teachers, a teacher responded:

> One reason is a firm belief in collaboration… People working together, entrepreneurial, finding success and excitement and enrichment and meaning and friendship working with others. Doing that and doing things we felt were good for kids. I think that that was one of the catalysts, and so I think it's a big part of our culture.

Another teacher elaborated:

> We decided as a school what we value, and realized that the traditional bell schedule, and other sort of structures, not only didn't promote that but were an obstacle to that. If everybody agreed that all of our lessons are better when we co-plan, then why is it that we have to give up our lunch or after school to co-plan, and then penalize somebody who can't stay after school because they coach, or they have child care?… If we value collaboration, then let's build it into the schedule.

Similar sentiments were expressed about the staff's shared beliefs about personalization. One teacher noted, "I think a lot of the advisors have been advisors for a really

long time... I think people really appreciate advisory. It's a very anchoring sense of our model and of our structure." Another teacher explained:

> We firmly believe that this model serves kids more effectively... We have these Cornerstones. The one that always comes up first, when people talk about it here, is personalization. Personalization really is... What it means is we know you personally... We're structured in the way we're structured with advisory because we believe in personalization.

As one teacher said:

> Those kinds of principles have guided how the teams were constructed of teachers in order to support students... What it requires is a lot. I think that this school believes that what it yields is also a lot. It's worth the trouble. It's worth what it takes to put it together, to maintain it, to keep it working.

Organizing teacher time and work in nontraditional ways necessitates a clear conception of why it is being done. Without the guidepost of shared values, the school that supports student and teacher learning, which is complex and challenging, will likely fail to produce the intended effects.

Community Support

Schools do not organize teacher time and work in a bubble. The contexts in which schools exist are nested within larger settings that influence the school's organizational structures. As shown earlier, support from the school district, which sits outside of the school, had enabling effects on how teacher time is structured at Hillsdale. Similarly, community support was found to be an enabling condition. Five out of 13 (38%) staff members described how support from parents and the community has been critical to the ongoing success of the school. One administrator reflected:

> I think that our community of support, our really strong parental community support has come from them seeing the benefits of our model over the course of time... If I call you as a parent, you're really going to get a sense that I know who your [child] is because I know them from my class, I've talked about your [child] with our team, I know their strengths and weaknesses. That's really reassuring to a family.

Another administrator described how over the years, he has seen a noticeable shift in the way people in the community talk about the school and that they've "won enough converts." A teacher echoed this point:

When I first started here 8 years ago, we were going out into the community trying to persuade people about this model, about what we were trying to do, and that has totally dissipated to a point now where we have waiting lists of kids and families trying to get into Hillsdale, and even to the point where I've been really surprised in the last few years to hear of families selling their houses and moving into our attendance area so they don't have to put in a transfer request because they're less likely to be allowed to come to the school… I think the district hears about that, about the waiting lists created from families wanting to come to Hillsdale. To me, that speaks a little bit about the model is having some take up in the community.

Parents share within their social networks how their children go to Hillsdale and are thriving. Thus, the community support acts as a "political firewall." The administrator added, "I think there's a lot of people who would rally if there was ever a significant threat to the model."

Moreover, the community support is expressed through a financial commitment to the school. According to an administrator, the Hillsdale High School Foundation was started about 10 years ago. It is a parent- and alumni-run organization with a part-time executive director, paid for with funds raised by the foundation. Currently, the foundation subsidizes three sections of classes and provides funds for release time or paid time for teaching teams to work together. The administrated commented:

That's a big deal. Most teams, I would say, meet together for 2 days during the summer where they might do an advisory day, and then the biology teachers get together for a day, or 2 days, or a day and a half, and work on curriculum. That's something that's easy to overlook, but that's a lot of time.

Knowing how hard it is to find 8 hours together during the school year, both teachers and administrators appreciate the community support for teacher collaboration and learning.

Conclusion

As one teacher aptly summarized, "There's never enough time. Teaching's never done." Yet, schools can allocate limited resources and make key staffing and programmatic decisions to organize teacher time and work in ways that serve the learning and development needs of both the students they serve and teachers and staff. Hillsdale takes such steps by being very purposeful and clear about the priorities that drive how time is structured. That is, the master schedule is designed to realize the school's goals of creating smaller, personalized learning environments for its students and prioritizing opportunities for teachers to learn with and from one another to develop rigorous, cross-disciplinary curricula for students. This is exemplified through the staff's commitment to the Cornerstones, which provides a foundation by which decisions regarding how time is allocated are made. Moreover, the realization of the school's priorities is enabled by essential support from the district office, the community, and the school leadership as well as the staff's collective agreements around shared values and the practice of shared decision-making. As Hillsdale's story shows, it is possible to move beyond the traditional bell schedule and to intentionally allocate time in ways that support the learning and development of teachers and students.

References

California Department of Education. (2016). *2015–16 enrollment by grade: Hillsdale High School report*. Retrieved December 13, 2016, from http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/dqcensus/EnrGrdLevels.aspx?cds=41690474133070&agglevel=School&year=2015-16

Chase, C. C., Chin, D. B., Oppezzo, M. A., & Schwartz, D. L. (2009). Teachable agents and the protégé effect: Increasing the effort towards learning. *Journal of Science Education and Technology, 18*(4), 334–352.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R. C., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession*. Washington, DC: National Staff Development Council.

Hargreaves, A. (1991). Contrived collegiality: The micropolitics of teacher collaboration. In J. Blasé (Ed.), *The politics of life in schools* (pp. 46–72). New York, NY: Sage.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Harter, S. (1978). Pleasure derived from optimal challenge and the effects of extrinsic rewards on children's difficulty level choices. *Child Development, 49*(3), 788–799.

Hillsdale High School. (n.d.-a). About SLCs. Retrieved December 13, 2016, from https://hhs.schoolloop.com/aboutslcs

Hillsdale High School. (n.d.-b). WASC 2012: Full report. Retrieved August 21, 2017, from https://hhs.schoolloop.com/wasc

Hillsdale High School. (n.d.-c) Mission Statement & Cornerstones. Retrieved December 14, 2016, from https://hhs.schoolloop.com/mission_cornerstones

Iyengar, S. S., & Lepper, M. R. (1999). Rethinking the value of choice: A cultural perspective on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*(3), 349–366.

King, M. B., & Bouchard, K. (2011). The capacity to build organizational capacity in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 49*(6), 653–669.

Lance, G., & Vasudeva, A. (2006). *Windows on conversion: Stories of comprehensive high school redesign – Hillsdale High School*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Redesign Network.

Lieberman. A. (1990). *Building collaborative cultures in schools*. Lewes, UK: Taylor-Francis.

Little, J. W. (1990). The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. *Teachers College Record, 91*(4), 509–536.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Louis, K. S., & Kruse, S. D. (1995). *Professionalism and community: Perspectives on reforming urban schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

McLaughlin, M., & Talbert, J. (2001). *Professional communities and the work of high school teaching*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Newmann, F. M., King, M. B., & Youngs, P. (2000). Professional development that addresses school capacity: Lessons from urban elementary schools. *American Journal of Education, 108*(4), 259–299.

Newmann, F. M., & Wehlage, G. (1995). *Successful school restructuring*. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

NVivo (Version 11.4.0) [Software]. (2016). Retrieved from http://www.qsrinternational. com

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2014). *TALIS 2013 results: An international perspective on teaching and learning*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing. Retrieved June 29, 2017, from http://www.oecd-ilibrary. org/docserver/download/8714021e.pdf?expires=1498776760&id=id&accna me=ocid194777&checksum=4D7F237B2142D213F770DD9AC661FE72

Oxley, D., & Kassissieh, J. (2008) From comprehensive high schools to small learning communities: Accomplishments and challenges. *FORUM, 50*(2), 199–206.

Ronfeldt, M., Owens Farmer, S., McQueen, K., & Grissom, J. A. (2015). Teacher collaboration in instructional teams and student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 52*(3), 475–514.

Rosenholtz, S. (1989). *Teachers' workplace*. New York, NY: Longman.

Shachar, H., & Shmuelevitz, H. (1997). Implementing cooperative learning, teacher collaboration, and teachers' sense of efficacy in heterogeneous junior high schools. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 22*(1), 53–72.

Smylie, M. A. (1988). The enhancement function of staff development: Organizational and psychological antecedents to individual teacher change. *American Educational Research Journal, 25*(1), 1–30.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration, 39*(4), 308–331.

Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education
http://edpolicy.stanford.edu
@scope_stanford

scope
Stanford Center for
Opportunity Policy in Education