Research Article

Re-envisioning School: Lessons on School Reform from Montessori District Schools

Ian Parker, PhD
Senior Lecturer
Early Childhood Education
Higher Colleges of Technology
Sharjah, United Arab Emirates

Katie Brown, PhD
Director of Research
National Center for Montessori in the Public Sector
Cary, NC

Annie Frazer, MA
Association Montessori Internationale (AMI) Diploma
Executive Director
Montessori Partnerships for Georgia
Decatur, GA 30030

Abstract

Montessori programs in public school districts are successful and popular, but rare. This study investigates how district leaders make decisions about alternative models for school reform, using Montessori as a focus. This study addresses the following questions: 1) What are the needs in the school district that Montessori could potentially address? 2) What questions would school district leaders need answered about a new curriculum, like Montessori, to consider its implementation? Interviews and focus groups were conducted with 11 leaders from eight school districts. Using the lens of institutional theory, we suggest that the constraints district leaders face when considering alternative models are primarily normative and cultural-cognitive, but that regulative solutions can play a key role in addressing them.

Key Words

Montessori, innovation, curriculum, institutional theory, leadership, decision-making, school reform, school choice

Education scholars have learned that Montessori programs provide many benefits to students, but these programs can be difficult to access. By increasing access to Montessori programs, school districts could benefit from an improvement in students' academic performance. Students in Montessori programs have often performed well on measures of literacy (Rodriguez, Irby, Brown, Lara-Alecio, & Galloway, 2005; Mallett & Schroeder, 2015; Culclasure, Fleming, Riga, & Sprogis, 2018), math (Donabella & Rule, 2008; Brown & Lewis, 2017), and school readiness (Ansari & Winsler, 2014; Lillard & Heise, 2016). Montessori has also improved the academic success of students from low-income, Black and Brown communities (Ansari & Winsler, 2014; Brown & Lewis, 2017). Parents have voiced favorable attitudes toward Montessori programs and were satisfied with the impact it has had on their children (Hiles, 2018). But within the school choice and school reform landscape, Montessori is often excluded from the conversation, despite the research that highlights what Montessori can potentially do for families, students, and schools (Lillard, 2019). If programs like Montessori are demonstrably effective and popular, why aren't there more of them? This study seeks to understand how school district leaders make decisions about alternative models for school improvement and reform, using Montessori as a focus.

Review of Literature

District-level decision making

Decision making at the school district level is subject to both external and internal influences. According to Gamson and Hodge (2016), the school district as an institution remains the main arena where decisions are made about a variety of features - from local educational politics and governance to enrollment and leadership. Effectively run school districts can be sites of powerful instructional change (MacIver & Farley, 2003). In some cases, district-level decision making can be sharply influenced by the power relationship between district leaders and school principals (Xi, Shen, & Sun, 2020). Overall, traditional school districts can be important sites of reform, capable of leading the implementation of reforms before a state adopts them (Marsh & Wohlstetter, 2013). This study is important because it seeks to unpack these dynamics in the context of decision-making for introducing curricula that could potentially aid in school reform.

Montessori school choice & parents

Montessori advocates recognize education as a social justice issue (Lillard, 2021). In the early 1900's, Dr. Maria Montessori's work with poor children in Rome proved that children can learn when they are exposed to nurturing environments that support their development. Today, school choice has been focused on parent empowerment, where parents have the right to choose a school for their child if they find their assigned school does not meet their child's needs (Berends, 2021a, 2021b). While parents want access to schools for their children that will improve their academic performance and well-being, those schools may not be in their local community. For many families, the challenge of school choice centers around lack of access to a better learning environment due to location or transportation.

The Montessori curriculum, often found in private schools, is also delivered in over 500 public schools across the US from preschool through high school, attracting diverse families (Hiles, 2018; Debs, 2019). Lillard (2019) articulates three extrinsic reasons for Montessori's longevity in the US: generally positive student outcomes, teacher satisfaction, and parent endorsement.

Theoretical framework

Institutional theory is a framework that helps us conceptualize the decision-making process that institutions' leaders face. Education leaders face the push-and-pull of satisfying multiple stakeholders with conflicting values on the path to appeasing both their local school community and the broader institutional community (Casto & Sipple, 2011; Scott, 2001). Scott (2014) asserts that institutions' organizational structures are based on up to three different "pillars" of constraint: regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive (see Table 1). Regulatory processes revolve around the action of establishing rules, examining others' conformity to them, and dictating rewards or punishments to influence future behavior. The regulative pillar holds the central ingredients of force, sanctions or rewards, and expedient responses which in turn undergird the concept of authority. The normative pillar defines goals and designates appropriate ways to pursue them. It represents the coupling of values and norms. Values represent the comparison of existing structures or behaviors with the preferred or desirable construction of standards. Norms define legitimate means to pursue valued results and specify how things should be done (Scott, 2014). Next, the cultural-cognitive aspect of institutions "stresses the central role played by the socially mediated construction of a common framework of meanings" (p.69). We leverage this conceptual framework to understand district leaders' perceptions of Montessori and their thoughts, questions, and concerns about implementing a model like Montessori.

Table 1

Three Pillars of Institutions (adapted from Scott, 2014, p.60)

	Regulative	Normative	Cultural-Cognitive
Basis of legitimacy	Legally sanctioned	Morally governed	Comprehensible Recognizable Culturally supported
Logic	Instrumentality	Appropriateness	Orthodoxy
Indicators	Rules	Certification	Common beliefs
	Laws Sanctions	Accreditation	Shared logics of action
			Isomorphism

Methods

We conducted an interview study (Roulston, 2010) to strengthen our understanding of school district leaders' perceptions of the Montessori curriculum. Our specific research questions were:

1.) *What are the needs in the school district that Montessori could potentially address?*
2.) *What questions would school district leaders need answered about a new curriculum, like Montessori, in order to consider its implementation (i.e. child outcomes data, logistics, financing, school readiness data, etc.)?*

The study included 11 leaders from 8 school districts that do and do not have public Montessori programs (see Table 2). The participants took part in virtual/remote focus groups and interviews representing districts from each of five geographic regions (see Table 3).

Table 2

Focus Group (FG) Data Collection

		Mid-Atlantic	West	Southeast	Midwest	Northeast
Districts without Montessori	Before lit. review	FG #1				FG#7
	After lit. review	FG #2				
Districts with Montessori		FG #3	FG #4	FG #5	FG#6	

Table 3

Interview Data Sources

Region	District	Participants	Status of Montessori
Mid-Atlantic	Cherry-Blossom Public Schools	Ms. Flowers	Existing Montessori
	Rosebush Public Schools	Dr. Barry	Existing Montessori
	Bayside County	Dr. Wilson	No Montessori
Southeast	Sunflower County Public Schools	Ms. Nelson	Existing Montessori
	Marigold County Public Schools	Dr. Gordon	Existing Montessori
Midwest	Emerald City Public Schools	Dr. Payton	New Montessori program
West	Harrington Public Schools	Ms. Osborne; Ms. Dexter; Mr. Ross; Ms. Gonzalez	Existing Montessori
Northeast	Seaside Public Schools	Dr. Hopkins	Considered Montessori, decided not to proceed

Data collection

Focus group interview protocols can be found in Appendix A. For participants from districts with public Montessori, the one focus group interview per region included consideration of the needs Montessori fulfills in the district as well as the process, implementation, and supports that are involved with operating a district Montessori program.

For the districts without public Montessori, we designed a 2-part interview process. After the first interview, the participant received a literature review sharing the history, objectives, and effectiveness of Montessori programs. The second interview captured changes to the participant's thinking after the participant read about Montessori outcomes. In practice, we only implemented this two-part focus group process with one of our two non-Montessori districts, because the participant from the second district was already deeply familiar with Montessori education.

Participant recruitment strategies included convenience sampling where the researchers leveraged professional networks for targeted selection. Targeted school district leaders included Directors of Innovation, Early Learning/Childhood Education, Curriculum and Instruction, and Head Start, and similar roles.

Data analysis

Focus groups and interviews lasted 45 minutes to one hour. Using Atlas.ti, codes from the transcribed interviews were grouped and refined to address the research questions. Codes were then categorized into subthemes representing the participants' dispositions towards Montessori, public schools, and implications for implementing a new curriculum with community stakeholders. From the subthemes, we synthesized the saturated codes to form overarching themes which we address in the Results section.

Results

School districts' needs that Montessori could potentially address

In sharing their perceptions of and experiences with Montessori, district leaders spoke about specific problems Montessori could address, as well as benefits or potential benefits such a program could bring to their districts.

The need for post-pandemic support

Several leaders discussed the potential of Montessori to mitigate the negative effects of the COVID pandemic. As they work to support students' learning despite pandemic learning loss, some districts are recentering the need to support the whole child, including social-emotional learning in the school setting.

Because Montessori education moves at each child's pace and offers opportunities to be active in a constructive way, it was seen as having the potential to support improved behavior and academic skills after the isolation and academic losses of the COVID-19 school shutdowns. Other participants spoke about Montessori as a way to help children develop executive functions, which they perceive as greatly needed after multiple years of distance learning.

The need to strengthen academics

Whether or not they currently had Montessori in their districts, leaders saw Montessori as one answer

to the need for stronger academics and a better educational experience for children. One leader emphasized the power of Montessori to strengthen the learning environment in early childhood. She discussed the gaps and challenges in her district's early learning program that she felt the introduction of Montessori could address:

> "We found that there were misunderstandings in teachers' knowledge about mathematical thinking and how to systematically introduce math concepts to young children … And within the literacy piece, there was also this lack of understanding about phonological and phonemic awareness."

She saw Montessori as a solution that would address these gaps in the district's early learning program and better prepare children for academic work.

Many district leaders saw Montessori helping students develop the skills and capacities they wanted them to have at the end of their schooling experience. Ms. Flowers said, "I do see a difference in the way that the students in the Montessori classrooms are able to attend to a task, their independent thinking." The outcomes she attributed to Montessori aligned with her district's profile of the kinds of graduates they wanted to produce.

The need to retain families in the public school system

Many participants attested to the popularity of Montessori in their districts. In some cases, there are not enough Montessori spots to meet the demand from parents. Ms. Flowers explained:

> "The problem is it's so popular that we can't meet the demand. That's the big concern. But to the community, the seats are just like gold. It's like the golden ticket."

In some districts, the Montessori program is helping to retain students in the public school system who might otherwise attend private schools. "It gives the parents an option if they're looking for something different than a traditional classroom."

These three needs: for post-pandemic recovery, for enhanced academic achievement, and for supporting family retention, were the most significant needs district leaders identified that they saw Montessori as helping to meet.

Questions school leaders would need answered to consider Montessori implementation

Participants all understood Montessori's adoption within a school district as a multi-layered initiative that involved multiple stakeholder groups. When considering a new program or curriculum, school leaders reported questions and concerns across three broad categories: their own understanding of the program, the sociopolitical context for the decision, and the nuts and bolts of what it would take to implement the program

Leader understanding

Many of the leaders we spoke with had some prior knowledge of Montessori from their personal lives; many were Montessori parents or had colleagues or family members whose children attended Montessori schools. Though these experiences generally made them "believers" in the potential of the Montessori method, they recognized that they needed to supplement these personal experiences with

professional development. Dr. Payton described how he had some knowledge of Montessori as a parent to two young children in a Montessori school, but that he "really expanded [his] knowledge once moving to Hickory City around Montessori" because he "had to supervise and evaluate the principals and continue to recruit for those schools." This anecdote highlights the different level of understanding that is needed to engage with Montessori as an educator versus as a parent.

Local context

District leaders also spoke in detail about how a new Montessori program would need to be planned and implemented within their specific geographic, political, and district contexts. Leaders have to consider what's going on in their district and their community; how will this program fit with existing initiatives and priorities? How will the community respond? Leaders spoke about Montessori as potentially dovetailing with existing district initiatives around school choice, early childhood, and equity. Indeed, Dr. Payton described his district's new Montessori program specifically as a tactic to combat historical inequities:

> "So in our equity policy, it really clearly spells out that we will dismantle and disrupt systems, processes, and procedures that we have set up that continuously create advantages for some and disadvantaging others with the ultimate goal of ensuring that student outcomes can no longer be predicated on race, socioeconomic status, or any other marginalized identities…Most public school systems that have public Montessori, it's traditionally a signature school or magnet school. The way ours is set up, it's a neighborhood school… It's our school with our highest number of free and reduced lunch families in that area."

This leader views his district's nascent Montessori program as a tool to increase access to quality early learning experiences for an underserved community. However, in Ridgeview, Dr. Wilson indicated that questions of access were part of the reason why the district decided *not* to launch a Montessori program. His district is geographically divided into three zones, with no transportation provided across zones.

A Montessori program in any one zone would not have been accessible to students in the other two zones unless they could provide their own transportation—a situation which would create disparities in access. Thus, district leaders can view the idea of a Montessori program entirely differently, based on their local contexts.

Funding

Part of the local context includes funding possibilities and constraints, which district leaders described as a significant factor in their decision-making.

Virtually all of our participants described creative approaches to funding existing or prospective Montessori programs. Leaders cited the substantial cost of purchasing a classroom's worth of Montessori materials, as well as the ongoing cost of staffing Montessori classrooms with two adults. Funding for teacher training was also a concern.

Funding needs for implementing or expanding Montessori may be similar, but solutions vary from district to district. Participants described a wide variety of potential funding sources for Montessori programs: Head Start funds, Race to the Top money, capital funds, grants magnet school

funding, state funds, and local funds. Our conversations with district leaders indicate that while funding district Montessori programs can be done, it isn't easy, and the path to success varies across districts.

Stakeholder perspectives

District leaders named a variety of stakeholder groups they would consult about a prospective Montessori program, consisting largely of educators at various levels of the district hierarchy. Dr. Wilson described the need to enlist support from leaders in various district departments: "You have to make sure that you have the CFO on board as well as, you have to have… Curriculum and Instruction."

Teachers came up as a particularly important stakeholder group. In attempting to bring Montessori to Seaside, Dr. Hopkins devoted extensive time and energy to winning over the teachers in her district's existing early childhood programs: "We included our center-based programs in part of that process. I had to get the buy-in from the public school teachers first."

None of the leaders we spoke with described families as playing a significant role in decision-making around curriculum. However, participants consistently described a need for parents to develop understanding of Montessori for the program to succeed.

Dr. Payton of Emerald City Public Schools knew that parents' approval would hinge on their understanding of Montessori and its potential benefits. His district has implemented "Parent Nights" where parents can learn what goes on in a Montessori classroom. When asked about the parent and community response, Dr. Payton described initial suspicion giving way to enthusiasm:

> "Initially there was a small amount of feedback, thinking that we were trying to bring a charter school to Emerald City. And so continuously communicating that [the Montessori program is part of our] public school system…It's not a magnet or signature school, it's for the Springfield families. And I will say the overwhelming majority of families and community members have been super excited about the Montessori program over at Springfield."

The Montessori parent nights served to inform and clarify aspects of the Montessori program and were well-utilized by the parents. It was important for parents and families to understand what their children would be experiencing in the incoming Montessori classrooms. When stakeholders come to understand Montessori, as in Emerald City, they can play a powerful role in determining a program's success.

Adoption and implementation

Unsurprisingly, when considering the implementation of a new Montessori program, district leaders had many questions and concerns about the "how." Some of these were concrete and mechanical, such as those around teacher preparation, facilities, and funding. Others were more abstract, including questions about how to make sure programs were equitable, accessible, and comprehensible for families.

Facilities

Unlike Montessori charter schools, which are typically organized around Montessori ways and structures from the beginning, school districts are not starting from scratch.

Our participants spoke thoughtfully about what existing structures and programs in their district would need to be modified in order to make space—literally and figuratively—for a Montessori program. Ms. Flowers and others reported that raising capital for new facilities would be a big and long-term project for their districts. Similarly, Dr. Wilson pointed out that carving out space from existing school buildings would disrupt long-standing feeder patterns and potentially cause upset in those communities.

These questions about facilities, of course, are tangled up in the questions about budgets and funding described above. In the absence of capital funds for new facilities, district leaders who wish to implement Montessori are faced with the prospect of disrupting an existing school to make it happen–which can sometimes create an opportunity for Montessori. Dr. Payton related that part of the impetus for Emerald City's new Montessori program was to bolster enrollment at a school that was in danger of closing due to budgetary constraints:

> "It really came twofold in terms of us looking at Montessori. One was dealing with our budget cuts as a result of COVID. We had a loss of enrollment. There were proposals to close schools. Our board took school closure off the table. And if we're not talking about closing schools, we have to be talking about growing. So that was one part of the conversation."

These examples suggest that while in some places, facilities are a problem for Montessori programs, in others, Montessori provides a solution to a facilities problem.

Staffing, training, and professional development

District leaders recognized that it was not enough to have a building; that building would need teachers who were prepared to implement the Montessori method. Leaders had questions about how to provide initial Montessori training for teachers, as well as ongoing instructional support and professional development. Other participants spoke to the challenges of recruiting teachers in the first place in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Several district leaders referenced the need to support specialized professional development for Montessori teachers and staff. Even when district leaders recognize and respect Montessori teachers' need for professional development that is relevant to their pedagogy, they sometimes have questions about how to deliver that alongside district-wide professional development initiatives targeted at traditional schools:

> "We have a districtwide PD plan, and we have districtwide professional development seminars and professional development days, and all of those things that are not grounded in Montessori practice. So, it's always really, really challenging to figure out how do we support this small number of teachers when their programming looks very different."

To address this, Cherry-Blossom School District started a Montessori Institute, which supports Montessori educators during the district's new teacher orientation.

Harrington Public Schools responded to the same challenge by reorganizing the supervisory structure within the district. They have recently gathered all the district's Montessori schools under the direction of one assistant superintendent with Montessori knowledge, rather than having them supported by different assistant superintendents on the basis of geography as they were before.

Access and family engagement

Leaders had thoughtful questions about how to market and communicate Montessori in their communities, and expressed a desire to be intentional about making their Montessori programs accessible to those who could benefit the most. The theme of equity arose in every one of our conversations, and leaders voiced questions about how to ensure that access to Montessori programs was equitable. They were cognizant of historical patterns of inequity in the distribution of resources, frequently along racial lines. Their questions around this issue were very nuts-and-bolts, pertaining to logistical concerns like transportation and lotteries.

Discussion

We embarked upon this research to better understand the decision-making process behind specialized programs and curricula like Montessori. Using the lens of institutional theory, we suggest that the constraints district leaders face when considering alternative models are primarily normative and cultural-cognitive, but that regulative solutions can play a key role in addressing them. Scott (2014) describes cultural-cognitive constraints as "the common frames and patterns of belief that comprise an organization's culture … the organizing logics that structure organizational fields … the shared assumptions and ideologies that define" systems (p. 68). A district's openness to alternative models often hinges on whether leaders have the tools and information they need to challenge shared assumptions and ideologies about schooling (a cultural-cognitive constraint).

Another important outcome from this work is that teachers are a key constituency. The district leaders we interviewed voiced significant concerns about how teachers would react to a Montessori program in their district. Anyone hoping to build momentum for a special program would do well to get teachers on board, and to be proactive in planning for teacher training and recruitment. Teachers are influenced by both normative and cultural-cognitive constraints.

Their understandings of their role within the system can function as a cultural-cognitive constraint, and the traditionally focused norms and protocols within the district function as a normative constraint. Interestingly, regulative solutions (such as creating structures for Montessori-specific professional development) can push back against normative constraints within a district and make space for cultural-cognitive growth.

We did identify one regulative constraint: school funding. Unsurprisingly, the cost of a Montessori program was a key factor for many of our participants, driven in no small part by the cost of teacher training. The start-up costs for a new public Montessori program can be steep, and our participants expressed a need to be creative both in finding this funding and in messaging the investment. This communication requires overcoming some cultural-cognitive constraints stemming from beliefs about how resources should be deployed.

Conclusion

For many years, public Montessori advocates called for more research to demonstrate the outcomes the public Montessori programs can produce for students. Now that we have a critical mass of studies demonstrating how Montessori programs can benefit children and families, we suggest that a lack of research is no longer the most important barrier to the expansion of Montessori in school districts in the United States.

Indeed, Montessori is just one example of educational innovation that is supported by research, but still not widely implemented. This study highlights the normative and cultural-cognitive constraints that, too often, prevent educators from translating research to practice.

Our data suggest that both the catalysts and barriers for the growth of the public Montessori movement in district settings are hyperlocal, and local advocates will be best situated to understand these factors.

Although district leaders are the decision makers in their districts, a variety of stakeholder groups, including teachers and families, must be engaged to successfully re-envision school.

These findings can inform the larger conversation about innovative educational models as well as providing guidance to advocates working for the adoption of Montessori.

Author Biographies

Ian Parker is a senior lecturer in early childhood education in the Higher Colleges of Technology in the United Arab Emirates. E-mail: idparkerphd@gmail.com

Katie Brown is director of research at the National Center for Montessori in the Public Sector. E-mail: katie.brown@public-montessori.org

Annie Frazer is the founder and executive director of Montessori Partnerships for Georgia. E-mail: annie@montessori-partnerships.org

References

Ansari, A., & Winsler, A. (2020). The long-term benefits of Montessori pre-K for Latinx children from low-income families. *Applied Developmental Science*, 1-15.

Berends, M. (2021a). The continuously evolving landscape of school choice in the United States. In H. Richard Milner IV & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *Handbook of Urban Education* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Berends, M. (2021b). The current landscape of school choice in the United States. *Phi Delta Kappan, 103*(1), 14-19.

Culclasure, B., Fleming, D.J., Riga, G., & Sprogis, A. (2018). An Evaluation of Montessori Education in South Carolina's Public Schools. *The Riley Institute at Furman University.* Retrieved from https://riley.furman.edu/sites/default/files/docs/MontessoriOverallResultsFINAL.pdf

Debs, M. (2019). *Diverse families, desirable schools: Public Montessori in the era of school choice.* Harvard Education Press.

Debs, M., de Brouwer, J., Murray, A. K., Lawrence, L., Tyne, M., & von der Wehl, C. (2022). Global diffusion of Montessori schools: A report from the 2022 Global Montessori Census. *Journal of Montessori Research, 8*(2), 1-15.

Donabella, M. A., & Rule, A. C. (2008). Four seventh grade students who qualify for academic intervention services in mathematics learning multi-digit multiplication with the Montessori checkerboard. *Teaching Exceptional Children Plus, 4*(3) Article 2.

Hiles, E. (2018). Parents' reasons for sending their child to Montessori schools. *Journal of Montessori Research, 4*(1), 1-13. DOI:https://doi.org/10.17161/jomr.v4i1.6714

Lillard, A. S., & Heise, M. J. (2016). An intervention study: Removing supplemented materials from Montessori classrooms associated with better child outcomes. *Journal of Montessori Research, 2*(1), 16-26.

Lillard, A.S. (2019). Shunned and admired: Montessori, self-determination, and a case for radical school reform. *Educational Psychology Review, 31*, 939-965. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09483-3

Lillard, A.S. (2021). Montessori as an alternative early childhood education, *Early Child Development and Care, 191*(7-8), 1196-1206. DOI: 10.1080/03004430.2020.1832998

Lillard, A. S., Tong, X., & Bray, P. M. (2023). Seeking racial and ethnic parity in preschool outcomes: An exploratory study of public Montessori schools vs. business-as-usual schools. *Journal of Montessori Research, 9*(1).

MacIver, M. A., & Farley, E. (2003). Bringing the district back in: The role of the central office in improving instruction and student achievement. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk, Johns Hopkins University.

Mallett, J. D., & Schroeder, J. L. (2015). Academic achievement outcomes: A comparison of Montessori and non-Montessori public elementary school students. *Journal of Elementary Education, 25*(1), 39-53.

Marsh, J. A., & Wohlstetter, P. (2013). Recent trends in intergovernmental relations: The resurgence of local actors in education policy. *Educational Researcher, 42*, 276–283.

Montessori Public Policy Initiative. (2015). Montessori essentials. Retrieved from https://montessoriadvocacy.org/resources/#tools-links

Roulston, K. (2010). *Reflective interviewing: A guide to theory and practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.

Rodriguez, L., Irby, B. J., Brown, G., Lara-Alecio, R., & Galloway, M. (2005). An analysis of reading achievement related to prekindergarten Montessori and transitional bilingual education. In V. Gonzalez & J. Tinajero (Eds.), *Review of research and practice* (pp. 45-65). Laurence Earlbaum Associates.

Scott, W.R. (2014). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities* (4th edition). Sage.

Appendix A

Focus Group Interview Protocols

Montessori District Leaders

1. Please define your role and responsibilities in the school district and share how many years you have been serving in this role.
2. How would you describe the structure and landscape of your district's approach to education? How does Montessori fit in?
3. What led to the creation of your Montessori program? What challenges or concerns did you face during the initial implementation of your Montessori program?
4. In your view, what assets does Montessori bring to your district?
5. What holds you back from expanding your Montessori program?
6. Has the district ever conducted an evaluation of the Montessori program? If so, what were the results?

Non-Montessori District Leaders Interview #1

1. Please define your role and responsibilities in the school district and share how many years you have been serving in this role.
2. How would you describe the structure and landscape of early childhood education (ECE) in this district?
3. In your view, what is the purpose of education?

4. What factors are considered when deciding what programs or curricula to offer in your district? What programs are offered now? What role do families play in these decisions?
5. What are your top priorities for the 21-22 school year and beyond?
6. Tell us what you know about Montessori. Where does your current knowledge come from? What do you think about it?
7. Has your district ever explored or implemented Montessori in the past?

Non-Montessori District Leaders Interview #2

1. Tell us your perceptions about Montessori. Did the literature review change your views at all? How?
2. What, if any, benefits do you think Montessori would bring to your district? What might a Montessori program look like in your district?
3. What challenges or hurdles do you foresee if your district decided to pursue Montessori?
4. How do you expect parents and families would respond to a Montessori program in the district?
5. What questions or concerns do you have about Montessori that are still unanswered or unaddressed?

Mission and Scope, Copyright, Privacy, Ethics, Upcoming Themes, Author Guidelines, Submissions, Publication Rates & Publication Timeline

The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* is a refereed, blind-reviewed, quarterly journal with a focus on research and evidence-based practice that advances the profession of education administration.

Mission and Scope

The **mission** of the Journal is to provide peer-reviewed, user-friendly, and methodologically sound research that practicing school and district administrations can use to take action and that higher education faculty can use to prepare future school and district administrators. The Journal publishes accepted manuscripts in the following categories: (1) Evidence-based Practice, (2) Original Research, (3) Research-informed Commentary, and (4) Book Reviews.

The **scope** for submissions focuses on the intersection of five factors of school and district administration: (a) administrators, (b) teachers, (c) students, (d) subject matter, and (e) settings. The Journal encourages submissions that focus on the intersection of factors a-e. The Journal discourages submissions that focus only on personal reflections and opinions.

Copyright

Authors please note: By submitting a manuscript the author/s acknowledge that the submitted manuscript is not under review by any other publisher or society, and the manuscript represents original work completed by the authors and not previously published as per professional ethics based on APA guidelines, most recent edition. By submitting a manuscript, authors agree to transfer without charge the following rights to AASA, its publications, and especially the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* upon acceptance of the manuscript. The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* is indexed by several services and is also a member of the Directory of Open Access Journals. This means there is worldwide access to all content. Authors must agree to first worldwide serial publication rights and the right for the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* and AASA to grant permissions for use of works as the editors judge appropriate for the redistribution, repackaging, and/or marketing of all works and any metadata associated with the works in professional indexing and reference services. Any revenues received by AASA and the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* from redistribution are used to support the continued marketing, publication, and distribution of articles.

Privacy

The names and e-mail addresses entered in this journal site will be used exclusively for the stated purposes of this journal and will not be made available for any other purpose or to any other party. Please note that the journal is available, via the Internet at no cost, to audiences around the world. Authors' names and e-mail addresses are posted for each article. Authors who agree to have their manuscripts published in the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* agree to have their names and e-mail addresses posted on their articles for public viewing.

Ethics

The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* uses a double-blind peer-review process to maintain scientific integrity of its published materials. Peer-reviewed articles are one hallmark of the scientific method and the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* believes in the importance of maintaining the integrity of the scientific process in order to bring high quality literature to the education leadership community. We expect our authors to follow the same ethical guidelines. We refer readers to the latest edition of the APA Style Guide to review the ethical expectations for publication in a scholarly journal.

Themes and Topics of Interest

Below are themes and areas of interest for publication cycles.

1. Governance, Funding, and Control of Public Education
2. Federal Education Policy and the Future of Public Education
3. Federal, State, and Local Governmental Relationships
4. Teacher Quality (e.g. hiring, assessment, evaluation, development, and compensation of teachers)
5. School Administrator Quality (e.g. hiring, preparation, assessment, evaluation, development, and compensation of principals and other school administrators)
6. Data and Information Systems (for both summative and formative evaluative purposes)
7. Charter Schools and Other Alternatives to Public Schools
8. Turning Around Low-Performing Schools and Districts
9. Large Scale Assessment Policy and Programs
10. Curriculum and Instruction
11. School Reform Policies
12. Financial Issues

Submissions

Length of manuscripts should be as follows: Research and evidence-based practice articles between **2,800** and **4,800** words; commentaries between **1,600** and **3,800** words; book and media reviews between **400** and **800** words. Articles, commentaries, book and media reviews, citations and references are to follow the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, **latest edition**. Permission to use previously copyrighted materials is the responsibility of the author, not the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*.

Cover page checklist:

1. title of the article:
   identify if the submission is original research, evidence-based practice, commentary, or book review
2. contributor name(s)
3. terminal degree
4. academic rank
5. department
6. college or university
7. city, state
8. telephone and fax numbers
9. e-mail address
10. 120-word abstract that conforms to APA style
11. six to eight key words that reflect the essence of the submission
12. 40-word biographical sketch

Please do not submit page numbers in headers or footers. Rather than use footnotes, it is preferred authors embed footnote content in the body of the article. Also note**, APA guidelines are changed so that one space is required after the period at the end of a sentence**. Articles are to be submitted to the editor by e-mail as an electronic attachment in Microsoft Word, Times New Roman, 12 Font.

Acceptance Rates

The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* maintains of record of acceptance rates for each of the quarterly issues published annually. The percentage of acceptance rates since 2010 is as follows:

2012: 22%
2013: 15%
2014: 20%
2015: 22%
2016: 19%
2017: 20%
2018: 19%
2019: 19%
2020: 18%
2021: 17%
2022: 17%
2023: 17%
2024: 16%

Book Review Guidelines

Book review guidelines should adhere to the author guidelines as found above. The format of the book review is to include the following:

- Full title of book
- Author
- Publisher, city, state, year, # of pages, price
- Name and affiliation of reviewer
- Contact information for reviewer: address, city, state, zip code, e-mail address, telephone and fax
- Reviewer biography
- Date of submission

Publication Timeline

Issue	Deadline to Submit Articles	Notification to Authors of Editorial Review Board Decisions	To AASA for Formatting and Editing	Issue Available on AASA website
Spring	October 1	January 1	February 15	April 1
Summer	February 1	April 1	May 15	July1
Fall	May 1	July 1	August 15	October 1
Winter	August 1	October 1	November 15	February 1

Additional Information

Contributors will be notified of editorial board decisions within eight weeks of receipt of papers at the editorial office. Articles to be returned must be accompanied by a postage-paid, self-addressed envelope.

The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* reserves the right to make minor editorial changes without seeking approval from contributors.

Materials published in the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* do not constitute endorsement of the content or conclusions presented.

The Journal is listed in Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities. Articles are also archived in the ERIC collection. The Journal is available on the Internet and considered an open access document.

Editor

Kenneth Mitchell, EdD
AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice

To contact by postal mail:
Dr. Ken Mitchell
Associate Professor
School of Education
Manhattanville University
2900 Purchase Street
Purchase, NY 01057

Associate Editor

Brian Osborne, EdD
AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice

To submit articles electronically: bosborne@lehigh.edu