Spring 2002

Comparing Administrators' and Teachers' Experiences and Attitudes toward "Success For All"

Bridget Dullea
Trinity College

Trinity College
HARTFORD CONNECTICUT

Comparing Administrators' and Teachers' Work Experiences and Attitudes Towards *Success For All*

Bridget Dullea
Ed 400
Prof. Dougherty
Final Project

Today, one of the most prominent educational reform programs is *Success For All* (commonly referred to as SFA). This program was developed in order to provide an answer to the educational problems that exist in American schools. It has been implemented into an estimated 1,550 schools nationwide. The majority of these schools deem the program a success. The Hartford, CT, school district has just recently (as of two years) adopted SFA. In the past years, the program has been linked to the success of the Connecticut Mastery Test (a standardize state test) scores. Thus, the program appears to be an "effective" solution to Hartford's educational crisis. After closely working within the program at a local Hartford elementary school, I often wondered about the experiences and opinions of the people directly involved with SFA, such as administrators and teachers. I designed a research question that states, how has a Hartford school's administrators' work experiences of *Success For All* differ from those of teachers with the school? Furthermore, how do each of their experiences shape their group attitude towards SFA? In hopes to answer my question, I investigated the work experiences and opinions of these two distinct groups of people within one particular Hartford elementary school. From my research, I was able to disclose two conclusions. First, I found that although both the Hartford school's administrators' and teachers' work have become more difficult and less enjoyable, they have different attitudes towards *Success For All*. Their attitudes appear to have been determined by their different work experiences with the program such as time investment, restriction of work, and opinion on school relationships.

SFA Background

The *Success For All* reform program was developed in 1986 by educational researcher Robert Slavin and his associates at the Center of Research on Elementary and Middle Schools (CREMS), located at Johns Hopkins University. The program is a school wide research-based reform model designed for disadvantaged pre-kindergarten through fifth grade students. It is primarily based on the three principles: every child can learn, success in early grades is critical for future success in school, and learning deficits can be prevented through intervention in preschool and early grades. Essentially, its main goal is to "ensure that virtually every student in a high-poverty school will finish the third grade with grade-level reading skills."[1] There are several key components to the program. These components consist of a restructured curriculum, a 90-minute reading program, one-on-one tutoring, eight-week assessments, teacher professional development, a family support team, and an advisory committee. Slavin believes the *Success For All* will lead to great success within poverty-stricken school systems such as in the Hartford school district.

The program was adapted by the Hartford school system in the spring of 1999, under the control of Superintendent Anthony Amato. At the time, Hartford was "an urban system where more than four out of five children live in poverty, Hartford in 1998 had managed to get only 13 percent of its 4th graders to meet the state goal on Connecticut's reading test (the Connecticut Mastery Test)."[2] Thus, Amato believed SFA was the best solution to the problem. In order for the program to be implemented, it

---

[1] Weiler, Jeane. "Success For All: Summary of Evaluations." ERIC Clearinghouse .
1996.<http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed425250.html

[2] Archer, Jeff. "Under Amato, Hartford Schools Show Progress." Education Week. 1 Mar. 2000.

requires that at least eighty percent of Hartford's teachers approve its adaptation. In Hartford, the program was rejected by just one of the twenty-eight elementary schools. SFA has remained in the Hartford school district for two consecutive years.

Significance

From my prior investigation on the *Success For All* reform program, I noticed that there is an absence of research on administrators within the program. Much of the literature published on the topic concentrates on the structure of the SFA program. Furthermore, the SFA designer himself, Robert Slavin, writes most of this literature. Some research does focus on teachers' experiences and attitudes about the program; however, researchers have neglected to include administrators in their study. For example, Amanda Datnow and Marisa Castello's article[3] on *Success For All* measures the support of teachers and how their teaching experience influenced the program's implementation. They found that the majority of teachers' work experience had significantly changed, and most were in strong support of the program. Another example is Steven Ross' article[4] on the effects of *Success For All*. He focused on teacher's adjustment. His findings paralleled that of Datnow and Castello. As it is apparent, both of these articles completely ignore administrators and their experiences and opinions about SFA.

---

[3] Datnow, Amanda and Marisa Castellano. "Teachers' Response to Success For All: How Beliefs, Experiences, and Adaptations Shape Implementation." American Educational Research Journal. Fall 2000.

[4] Ross, Steven. "Effects of the Success For All model on kindergarten through second-grade reading achievement, teachers' adjustment, and classroom-school climate at an inner-city school." The Elementary School Journal. Nov. 1994.

Many journalists have also written articles on the issue of SFA. These articles have been published in such newspapers as the *Hartford Courant,* as well as the magazine *Education Week.* These articles include Robert Frahm's "School Bets On Strict 'Success' Story," Rick Green's "Teachers Want to Alter Script," and Jeffrey Archer's "Under Amato, Hartford Schools Show Progress." Each article does touch upon the topic of administrators. In all of these articles, the general opinion is that teachers find the SFA program limits their teaching, and its only objective is to teach to the test. However, administrators view SFA as a success and believe teachers do in fact have flexibility around the program. At first glance, it appears that journalists have already answered part of my research question. However, my study focuses on the administrator and teacher gap more systematically than journalists, since they typically do not follow any research methods. Much of their information is based on random interviews of teachers and administrators from all areas of the Hartford district. Furthermore, my study centers on one particular Hartford school as opposed to the entire district. I feel it is necessary to analyze administrators, in comparison to teachers, in order to gain a better understanding of the people controlling and practicing the *Success For All* reform program.

Methodology

I collected all of my data for my research through in-depth interviews with SFA administrators and teachers. I selected three administrators and three teachers at one particular Hartford elementary school. I had some limitations on my interview pool. I was able to select my participants through a contact at the Hartford elementary school in

which I have an internship. Thus, my participants were not selected at random, nor did all of them have pre-SFA experience at the school. My contact also selected these participants on the basis of their reputation at the school, as well as their experience with the SFA program. The participants in my study were very much handpicked rather than randomly selected from a sample pool.

For ethical and confidentiality reasons, I will not reveal the name of the school nor will I disclose the names of the participants in my study. I have assigned a pseudonym for each of the teacher participants (Ms. S, Ms. N, and Ms. C). Each of the teachers I selected teaches a different grade level. I interviewed two 1st grade teachers and one 2nd grade teacher. One of the 2nd grade teachers (Ms. C) was a first year teacher at the school; therefore, she did not have pre-SFA experience. This teacher had difficulty answering some of my questions on past work experience. Furthermore, her opinions were debatable because of her lack of experience within the school.

The selection for administrators was quite different. There are only two administrative positions within the school that pertain to the *Success For All* program. These positions include the Principal of the school and the SFA Facilitator. I also selected to interview an administrative participant outside the school, an SFA evaluator. However, the SFA Evaluator is in constant contact with the school and periodically visits to evaluate the program. Although each of these administrative positions entails a different task, I chose to interview them because they represent the three highest SFA administrative positions within the school.

In my interviews, the questions I asked both administrators and teachers paralleled one another; although, there were a couple variations do to the difference in

work. In my interview guide, I included different variables. For instance, the first part of my research question about work experience contains the variables: work schedule, work enjoyment, and school relationships. For the second part of my research question pertaining to attitudes towards SFA, the variables included: affects of SFA on student learning, test scores, and teacher/student interaction. Each of these variables allowed me to measure and determine a significant difference between the two groups (administrators and teachers).

Evidence

Work Experience:

From my research, I was able to notice a significant difference between administrators and teachers in the areas of work experience and attitude towards SFA. In terms of work experience, both administrators and teachers experienced difficult work than prior to the implementation of SFA. They also found their jobs to be less enjoyable because of the difficulties they face with *Success For All*. However, I found that the aspects of their work experience that have changed are quite different from one another.

Although teachers appear to devote extra time to the SFA program, administrators seem to dedicate a significantly larger amount of time. Their time investment in the SFA program is where the majority of their difficulty and lack of enjoyment lies within their work experience. For example, the Facilitator explains that her job, as well as her life, revolves around the SFA program. When asked about her devotion to the program she states, "I spend practically my whole life. I literally don't have time to breathe. I put in about 25 to 35 extra hours a week. In addition to everything I do throughout the day. It's

a very difficult job. I've cut out exercising. I've cut out seeing my family. It's not a job you can do for many years."[5] The difficulties she experiences within her work revolve around her restrictions of time due to SFA. In prior years, the Facilitator had worked as a teacher and a curriculum specialist. Although these jobs were both challenging, they did not require the same amount of time commitment as *Success For All*. The Evaluator's work experience is quite similar to the Facilitator.

Although the Evaluator is not stationed in the school at all times, she still experienced a change in time investment to the program as well as the school since the implementation of SFA. Much of her work has become more difficult and less enjoyable because of her time commitment to the program. Before SFA, the Evaluator was working as a teacher within a Florida elementary school. This was typically a nine-to-five job. The *Success For All* program has led to a significant increase in time investment within the Evaluator's work. Today, she travels all around the United States evaluating different schools' SFA programs. She explains her work experience by stating,

> "Most of my time is devoted to SFA. I sometimes say I think, eat, sleep, and work SFA all day long, including weekends when I often have reports to complete. It's definitely more than a 40-hour workweek and I make myself available as needed. I could spend 24 hours a day, either doing SFA office responsibilities, or preparing for trainings...Traveling in my job has become more difficult and stressful and I often spend many hours waiting in airports or driving from site to site. The long work days are often difficult, especially when I have spent eight to ten hours working in a school and then travel five to six hours at night."[6]

The Evaluator's work difficulty is very much a result of her traveling and time investment. She dedicates a majority of work time as well as her free time to the program. Although the Principal is not directly affiliated with the program, she

---

[5] Interview #1. Personal Interview. 3 Nov. 2001.
[6] Interview #6. Personal Interview. 25 Nov. 2001.

experienced a considerable amount of time investment change as well since the program was adopted into her school.

The Principal's work has changed in terms of the time commitment to SFA "component" meetings, assessments of teachers, and meetings with SFA administrators.

She finds that her job has become more difficult because she has to schedule time around her daily work schedule for the SFA program. Prior to SFA, even though the school had adopted a 90-minute reading program, the Principal explains that it did not require the same amount of time investment as SFA. Furthermore, she feels that the program has taken a significant "chunk" of her time. She describes her daily work schedule with SFA by stating; "There's one time in a month where I meet up with the Facilitator to discuss the component of SFA, the success of our teachers. And then there's also time when we meet on a weekly basis to discuss the program and things that we need to look at regarding what things are working or whether there should be any changes made to the program. I also have to do teacher observations on top of the reading components. Sometimes, I have to do more than two teachers a day for an entire block."[7] All of the administrators have found that time investment has effected their work experience the most. It has made their jobs both more difficult and less enjoyable than prior to SFA. Teachers, on the other hand, have experienced a different aspect of change in their work.

Teachers find their jobs to be more difficult and less enjoyable due to the change in the structure of their work, rather than time commitment. They believe that *Success For All* limits them from doing things in certain areas of their work. For instance, they suggest that SFA has limited their freedom and creativity as teachers. Ms. N thinks the

rigid structure of the program has restricted her from conducting her own ways of

teaching. She says,

> "Well, the program itself is very scripted. It is very structured. The degree to
> which I design lessons, plan them, or have my own input into the materials is
> quite limited. The schedule is set. There's a daily schedule you need to follow.
> Depending on the day, or the cycle, you do different activities according to the
> sequence of activities. SO, everything is pretty much determined for you. This has
> made my job less enjoyable."[8]

Ms. C also agrees with Ms. N's argument. Although this is her first year as a teacher, she

has had past experience as an assistant teacher. She believes that the program does in

fact limit a teacher's creativity. When asked a question about creativity she answered,

"Some of the stories we read in SFA are wonderful, but you do not have time to go into

them. You can't incorporate them into other areas of learning because you don't have

your own kids in your room for SFA."[9] Ms. S, although in agreement, believes there is

another area in which SFA has changed the structure of their work.

Ms. S feels that SFA has made the interaction with students and teachers more

difficult. She believes that the 90-minute restricted block of time limits her time with

individual students as well as communication with teachers. She argues, "There is too

little time in the program. We have no time to concentrate on individual students. I have

to rush through things all the time because I'm on a schedule...It affects my relationships

with teachers. We have barely any time to even talk with one another, to share ideas."[10]

All of the teachers agree that the SFA program has notably changed the structure of their

work. Another area that the teachers believe has been significantly affected by SFA is

school relationships.

---

[7] Interview #5. Personal Interview. 17 Nov. 2001.
[8] Interview #2. Personal Interview. 3 Nov. 2001.
[9] Interview #4. Personal Interview. 17 Nov. 2001.

The topic of school relationships is a subject where I found a contrasting difference between administrators and teachers. For the most part, the teachers find that SFA has negatively affected the relationships within the school (such as teacher/teacher and teacher/administrator). Two out of the three teachers suggest that the program has contributed to controversy amongst teachers. For example, Ms. N argues that there is less partnership, even though the program promotes teamwork. She explains how "teachers are fighting for different levels and some people tend to get the best levels while others seem to get the more challenging ones."[8] They proposes that SFA is initializing arguments amongst the teachers because of the grouping of students. Ms. S complies with Ms. N's argument. Ms. S thinks SFA, because of the different levels, has produced controversy within the teacher atmosphere. She believes that many teachers argue over the different levels, in which they are fighting for the higher levels as opposed to the lower levels. Ms. S also suggests that the program's time restrictions have separated teacher/teacher and teacher/administrator interaction.

Although Ms. S finds the administrators to be helpful, she thinks the program has limited their time to interact with the teachers. She states, "Administrators do provide some support, like services and materials, but they really do not have time to help us anymore."[10] In agreement, Ms. N believes *Success For All* has "put many demands on administrators;" and therefore, they are unable to sufficiently aid the teachers in the program. Ms. C had a different perspective on school relationships. However, her perspective stems from a year's experience within the school without pre-SFA knowledge.

---

[10] Interview #3. Personal Interview. 13 Nov. 2001.

Ms. C believes that the school possesses wonderful relationships in every department (teacher/teacher and teacher/administrator). She views all staff members as supportive and helpful towards one another. She says, "All teachers are willing to share wisdom and different strategies about things during SFA. Both administrators have been very helpful. From my point of view, everybody has been very helpful and willing to make accommodations."[9] However, Ms. C has not had pre-SFA experience within the school. She is not knowledgeable about what life in the school was like prior to the implementation of SFA. She also, a few years prior to working in the school, was trained by the SFA foundation in early learning programs. Therefore, it is difficult to consider Ms. C's argument on positive school relationships. The administrators, however, make a substantial argument about positive school relationships.

The administrators feel the program has had a positive affect on all school relationships (administrator/administrator, administrator/teacher, and teacher/teacher relationships). They believe that the relationships within the school have gained a sense of rapport since the program's implementation. The Facilitator states, "The way I've handled it (the program) so far, the teachers will confide in me. They will tell me things that they probably won't tell anyone else. It's had a positive impact. I have good relationships, good rapport."[5] They also feel that the teachers are very much satisfied with the aid and support they receive from administrators. The Principal suggests the program has had a positive affect on teacher/administrator relationships. She argues, "as long as they see someone as helping them, in which we do provide, then there are no

problems."[7] In terms of teacher/teacher relationships, both the Principal and the Facilitator view the program as improving teacher interaction. The Principal suggests that, "the program provides teachers with the opportunity to actually do a lot of professional conglomeration amongst their teams that they have and the components that they teach."[7] Although the Evaluator is not positioned within the school, she feels the Hartford school has benefited (in terms of school relationships) from *Success For All*.

The Evaluator believes SFA has allowed for the Hartford school's staff to develop close professional and personal relationships. She only visits the school two times a year for evaluations; however, she is in constant contact with the administrators within the school (such as the Principal and the Facilitator). From her knowledge, the administrators are very helpful and supportive to their teachers. They are "always willing to help the teachers when something is confusing or difficult."[6] She also thinks teachers have developed a sense of unity because of the program. They are able work more diligently in teams. Furthermore, she feels her relationship with the Principal and Facilitator is every strong. Overall, the Evaluator believes all administrators work very well together in running a successful program.

Attitudes Towards SFA:

The most contrasting topic between administrators and teachers is on the subject of attitudes towards SFA. I found that the administrators have a very positive outlook on the program in all areas such as student learning, CMT tests, and student/teacher interaction; whereas teachers feel SFA has negatively affected the school in these areas.

Administrators think that the implementation of SFA has provided students with a better education. It has enabled students to develop the necessary skills to increase their learning. The Principal explains the increase in student learning by stating, "We are able to pinpoint the difficulties children are having and we're actually seeing kids move from being at grade level reading to above grade level."[7] Administrators have also found that SFA is improving the "effectiveness" of teachers, which in turn has led to an increase in student learning. The Evaluator argues,

> "I feel students are receiving a better education. Teachers have had many hours of professional development and training, which has a direct correlation with better student achievement and education. Effective teaching results in better education. Daily classroom monitoring has also helped in students receiving a better education as more direct instruction takes place and students are made aware of their expectations."[6]

The Facilitator and the Evaluator see things eye to eye in regards to the *Success For All* program's influence on student learning. The Facilitator finds SFA improves overall teaching methods within the school, which contributes to student learning in a positive manner. She says, " We have new teachers doing reading, monitoring more carefully, who are all involved in intervention strategies. We're accessing so often that we are really seeing where the children are, what they need. It's focused the school a lot more."[5] All of the administrators suggest that student learning has increased since the implementation of SFA because of the affects it has had on reading skills and teacher "effectiveness." However, the majority of the teachers have a different opinion in regards to student learning.

Although the teachers found there to be one positive aspect of the SFA program, much of their arguments revolve around the negatives. The one positive contribution of the program is that it helps students in the middle and at the top of their class increase in developmental reading skills. However, two out of the three teachers find that SFA negatively affects bottom level students (those students at the lowest reading level according to their grade). They believe these are the students the program is supposed to be direct towards; nonetheless, these are the students it is hurting the most. Ms. S explains the situation by saying, "Certain students are falling behind in the program and it is almost impossible to bring them to a level of everyone in their class. Although some students are benefiting, the students falling behind are the ones we should be focusing on with a program like this. We should be directing the program towards the children that are at a lower level than the rest of their classmates."[10] They believe the structure of the program limits their ability to give each student one-on-one attention, allowing for lower level students to fall behind in the end. The majority of the teachers also feel the SFA program negatively affects a teacher's work and relationships, which essentially affects student learning. They argue that teachers, due to pressure from the SFA foundation, are becoming more competitive with one another and are less concentrated on student learning. Ms. N explains her opinion about student learning by stating,

"For the most part you have a lot of unhappy teachers. People are not enjoying their profession. There's just too much pressure from the foundation. Everybody starts to worry about messing up and whether their job is in jeopardy. So, the focus shifts from the children learning. I think you have a whole bunch of teachers more worried about their jobs than teachers enjoying what they're doing with the children."[8]

Furthermore, teachers do not feel the program is directly correlated with the increase in CMT test results.

Two out of the three teachers think SFA does not directly affect the CMT test results in a significant way. They see other factors as major contributors to such a considerable increase such as parental involvement. Ms. S argues that, "there's more parental involvement these days, which means more support. There's more technology and more preparation for the test. There are also more after-school programs which aid the children in writing strategies."[8] Ms. N contributes to the argument by explaining the idea that "SFA is aligned with the CMT tests."[8] However, she feels that the SFA lessons do not necessarily concentrate on all aspects of the CMT test. In contrary, administrators do in fact believe the *Success For All* program is a major contributor to the increase in CMT test scores.

Although they are aware of other variables that may contribute, the majority of administrators argue that SFA is a significant factor in the CMT success. They feel the program has led to better student reading achievement. This improvement in reading skills enables students to perform well on the CMT tests. The Evaluator states, "I believe SFA has played an integral factor in the increase in CMT test scores within the Hartford district. The higher level of SFA implementation results in better student reading achievement...Aligning CMT standards along with SFA curriculum has also played a very important part in these gains."[6] The Facilitator also feels the program has increased the reading skills of students, which has contributed to CMT success. She feels that student performance, especially in test scores, have increased considerably since the

implementation of *Success For All.* The Principal suggests that the implementation

period of only two years is difficult to judge as to whether SFA and the CMT test can be

directly correlated to one another. However, she does find that it has significantly

improved student reading which is a key aspect of the CMT tests. The administrators

believe the SFA program has strengthened student/teacher interaction as well.

The administrators feel student/teacher interaction has improved due to the

cooperative learning structure of the SFA program. The Principal suggests that the open

discussion atmosphere within the classroom is beneficial for students and teachers. Both

groups are able to communicate with one another in a more sufficient manner. The

Evaluator finds the Principal's claim to be quite accurate. She believes that "cooperative

learning is the key."[6] She argues that the learning interaction amongst students

themselves provides teachers with opportunity to facilitate the classroom. The Evaluator

also views cooperative learning as a major contribution to the bettering student/teacher

interaction. She explains the improvement by stating, "The program is so structured that

teachers are expected to direct the instruction. At other times, they're facilitating the

learning and the students are interacting amongst themselves. It's changed. It's become

less teacher directed and more of cooperative learning, and kids are helping each other

learn."[5] The majority of the teachers are very much in disagreement with the

administrators on the topic of student/teacher interaction.

Two out of the three teachers believe the SFA program has substantially changed

student/teacher interaction in a negative manner. They believe *Success For All*'s rigid

program structure has caused for less one-on-one interaction between students and

teachers. For instance, Ms. S argues, "I do not have time to talk to students. I have to follow the program's every word. It is so structured that I cannot waste any time with any individual student."[10] Ms. N finds the same result in her experience with student/teacher interaction. She feels that the lack of time within the actual program takes away from time with individual students. Thus, certain students (mainly lower level students) become frustrated with the time limitations of the program. When asked the question on student/teacher interaction she answers,

> "We have no freedom to make things more interesting for them (the students). We push them a lot. We rush them. Sometimes a student is finally getting something and we have to stop them and say, 'can't do this now because we have to move on.' So, I think its easy for a student to become very frustrated with the teacher."[8]

Thus, the two teachers find that their restrictive work structure in SFA has prevented them from interacting with students.

Ms. C had a completely different attitude towards the program than the other two teachers. She believes the program has positively affected the school. However, she was not present during pre-SFA years at this particular school. Although we cannot ignore her opinion, we can still come to the conclusion that her judgment is arguable based on her lack of experience within the school. Nonetheless, Ms. C finds that the program does in fact negatively affect teachers. She states, "Staff wise, I think it's (SFA) had a negative affect because of the stress that has been put on teachers to be perfect. They have no creativity to throw anything that they've been taught, but develop mentally

correct practices, throw everything out the window and follow a manual."[9] It is evident

that Ms. C has recognized the affects the program has had on the pre-SFA teachers.

Conclusion

In conclusion to my research, I believe that the different work experiences of both

groups, administrators and teachers, seem to have shaped their contrasting attitudes

towards the _Success For All_ program. Administrators' change in work has primarily been

time investment in the program. They devote a significant amount of time to the program

to ensure that it is being implemented correctly. Furthermore, they are responsible for its

"effectiveness" within the school. Their time investment reflects their devotion to the

SFA program's success. They are dedicated to improving the program. Thus, the

administrators are more likely to search for the positives of the program since they are

responsible for its success. They find the SFA program has made improvements in all

areas of the educational atmosphere within the school (such as student learning, test

scores, and student/teacher interaction). They blindly hunt for improvements because of

the dedication and loyalty they have to the SFA foundation. Administrators do not want

to consider, in any way, that the program has had a negative affect on the school. In

contrary, the teachers are not there to ensure the success of _Success For All_; rather, they

are there to carry out the goals of the program. Thus, they have a contrasting work

experience and viewpoint about SFA.

Since the implementation of SFA, the teachers' work experience difficulties and

lack of enjoyment have derived from the change in structure of their jobs. Many of the

problems they experience within their work relates to their teaching restrictions. They

find that the extremely structured *Success For All* program limits their freedom and creativity. Furthermore, it has affected their relationships within the school in a negative manner. Their attitudes are a pure reflection of their displeasing teaching atmosphere. The teachers argue that the strict structure of the program negatively affects the school. They believe that student learning has been affected for a few reasons: 1) teachers are restricted from integrating their own teachings and creativity into the program, 2) teachers are unable to give certain students (mostly lower level students) the individual, one-on-one attention they deserve in order to increase their developmental skills, and 3) the program has produced a competitive atmosphere between teachers which indirectly affects student learning. It is evident that the restrictions and difficulties the teachers experience within their work have led them to possess a negative attitude towards the program and its contribution to the school. Overall, they feel the SFA program has utterly changed the work of teachers, and in turn has harmed student learning and the relationships within the school.

As I stated earlier, one of the teachers I chose to interview was not present in the school prior to *Success For All*. Therefore, it was quite difficult to consider her arguments as evidence. Although she did agree with arguments put forth by the other teachers, she still had contrasting opinions about the program. I did include her viewpoint in my research; however, I found them to be quite debatable due to her lack of work experience. If I could start from the beginning, or even just continue my project, I would seek to find more pre-SFA teacher to interview. I believe the more pre-SFA teachers in my sample would increase the validity of my argument.

Since I concentrated my study on one particular school within the Hartford district, I know that I cannot generalize about the entire district. My research pertains primarily to this particular Hartford elementary school. Although, I would say that the evidence I put forth is a good indication of the experiences and attitudes that may exist amongst other SFA administrators and teachers within Hartford.