

The Living Network of Schools Owned by Teachers and Students

April 1, 1998

Stanisław D. Glazek

Institute of Theoretical Physics, Warsaw University
ul. Hoża 69, 00-681 Warsaw

Abstract

This paper describes a network of teachers and students who form a living system of education at all levels. Organization of schools is based on new principles. One person can be a teacher in one area or activity and a student in another. Schools are owned and governed by the teachers and students. The system is powered at all levels equally by the will of students to learn and the will of teachers to learn and to share their expertise with students.

We describe main processes and structural principles of the network. The key processes are the process of learning by inquiry and the processes of design and learning by redesign. We also describe steps required to initiate the network growth process from small scale seeds. This avoids wasting human resources and money on a large scale. The first step we suggest for the teams of teachers and researchers who are interested in building the network is studying a bit of basic physics by inquiry using specially designed and well tested materials.

The network is economically sound. We distinguish the economy of the network because we claim that the freedom and safety of learning and teaching processes can be based only on the financial independence of teachers who gained their independence as a result of developing and using these processes. The system is designed to ensure highest quality in all respects. The design described here is provided as illustration for the underlying principles and their implications rather than as the ultimate structure. In fact, the living network is expected to evolve and adapt efficiently.

CONTENTS:

1. Introduction	<i>The lion claw and the educational trade mark</i>	2
2. Structure of the network	<i>The super-conducting wiring of learning by inquiry</i>	4
3. Ownership principles	<i>The rocket riders build and share the spaceship</i>	7
4. Governance principles	<i>Brain cells know their responsibilities</i>	8
5. Sources of income and finance management	<i>Buy your pass to the fastest lane</i>	9
6. Assessment and recognition	<i>The credit guaranteed in gold</i>	10
7. Archives	<i>You may know what is going on</i>	11
8. Preparation, design, launch, feedback and redesign	<i>Neverending adventure</i>	11
9. Community and state support	<i>They line up to help</i>	10
10. Seeds and timing	<i>A sequoia seed is billions times smaller than the tree</i>	11
11. Initial business proposal	<i>Are you ready?</i>	12
12. Communication	<i>We enable people to learn effectively</i>	12
13. Conclusion	<i>Will universities lead in future?</i>	13

1. INTRODUCTION

It is bad that our educational system does not teach students how to learn effectively. It is bad students are often lost and not interested in learning at school. But it is very bad that teachers at all levels get used to thinking they cannot change much in the way they teach. First of all, we teach the way we were taught. Secondly, it is very hard to make changes. We want to reach our students' minds but we feel we have to do it in the environment which we have little influence on as individuals. Most importantly, the environment is not safe for experimentation on better ways of teaching. We know we have to complete an overwhelmingly difficult program. We know we have unacceptably short time to do so. We have little freedom to make choices. And we will be criticized if we admit our students do not learn much. In fact, we do not even know how bad and how little they learn, although we certainly know it is not enough. More interestingly, we hesitate to work on measuring how much they learn. We do not have time to do that. And it would be hard to accept to everybody in the system that our students do not learn how to think critically, how to learn effectively and how to approach new problems requiring solution. But if we admitted we do not know how to teach effectively we would question our competence and jeopardize our living.

Assuming that the overarching goal of education is to train people in learning effectively so that they are able to learn and change throughout their whole life, one is faced with the question: What needs to be changed in our current concept of teaching? For example, it is clear that a child learns very efficiently when it feels safe and when it can experiment. It can touch, taste, break and throw things, make its mother angry, etc. The child learns from failure and pain or success and pleasure. When such learning is wisely instructed I call it learning by inquiry. In mature form learning by inquiry is the only way humans truly learn new things and become owners and users of what they learned. I claim teachers could learn how to teach effectively if they worked in the environment safe for experimentation and had good examples to study and patterns to discover. Also, children will eagerly learn if guided by a teacher who feels like a lion letting cubs play with food before showing them how to hunt. Teachers will be self-motivated to learn and to teach by inquiry if the best sources to learn from are made available to them. One such already existing source is physics, the most advanced science driven by inquiry. I will return to this point later.

If the freedom to learn is the prerequisite to teachers' action, on the one hand, and the fear of rejection when attempting new approaches originates in the fear of losing financial security in the current system, on the other hand, then, the way out is to create a system in which successful attempts of teaching in a better way will be rewarded with more financial independence for teachers. This independence is the bottom line security condition which we do not have satisfied and which we have to have satisfied to feel free to explore. But our safety has to result directly from our work, not from top-down orders. The reason is that the arbitrary top-down ruling may change at any time for some reason and the temporarily existing safety will be gone, as if the lion went away. However, if teachers and students work in a self-conscious network, which is in control of its income and spending and which is driven by merit of the overarching goal of education and, if teachers generate their income through their own action then, no arbitrary budget decisions could take away from us our freedom to learn and teach by inquiry the best way we can.

In the network I envision, whenever we will see the excitement about learning new things in the eyes of our students we will know we are making irreversible progress. We will be learning ourselves how to better the way we teach. We will engage in the work on creating new opportunities for achieving better results more often. We will be building our own system, and our own future. Thus, the ownership principle becomes the basis for the overarching goal of education. We the teachers and students working in our own network become the lions protecting our own development and future and we become the guarantors of our freedom to learn by inquiry both the subject matters and how to teach better.

Being a teacher and observing teachers in schools of all levels one can notice that the money a teacher earns for doing the job is not related to the depth of learning experience provided to students. On average, teachers are not in a position to be entrepreneurial [1] in their schools and they do not pursue quests like motivated professionals who create prosperity of their disciplines [2]. Teachers themselves do not achieve clear results that could raise awe in students and motivate them to learning. A tired teacher at the end of the day is supposed to check a pile of poorly done homework and accept the lack of future. Little time is left to the teacher for personal growth, gaining respect and winning intellectual freedom. [3] The lion cub eats well after a good hunt. Teachers eat the same no matter how well they teach. But the coupling I postulate between the results of teaching and teacher's income must not be confused with using greed for money to serve educational purposes. That would certainly not work.

The money reward to teachers in contemporary society is essential for many reasons. The key one

is that low-paid teachers cannot teach students about achievements of the society. For they know these achievements only second hand and only as much as can be bought using very limited and already allocated funds. And currently even a modest attempt on the part of public school teachers to change this situation may take away their basic income because the system is not open to experimentation. Moreover, if the high quality teacher's work is not steadily improving the teacher's social status, the situation becomes the primary example in the eyes of students for the fact that learning more with more understanding is not the way to make one's life complete. Students will learn to think independently from other sources and not from the limited and helpless teachers.

But most importantly, a typical teacher is subjected to power of an arbitrary educational system and she or he cannot teach students how to execute their rights to learn, understand, build, improve, prosper and be happy in life.[4] No wonder teachers believe that their work environment has never permitted them to show what they can really do.[5] In turn, no bright child wants to follow the lead to a dead end and become a teacher. This is very bad because without the brightest talent the teachers have little chance to change their status. There is no exception to this rule, from the lowest to highest levels of educational institutions.

Being a student and observing students one sees they do not learn at school enthusiastically. Students are not engaged mentally in the learning processes to the extent required to learn effectively. [6] One or two teachers impress a student sometimes but students too rarely see their school as a source of inspiration. They are often forced to do things they consider useless. Their compliance and hard work on assignments elevate their opinion among teachers but do not bring outcomes of clear on-line value to them. The school does not teach us how to learn according to current needs and how to use the knowledge and skills to steadily advance in life.[4]

This article describes principles one can use in attempting to change the educational status quo at the beginning of 21st century. The place to start is the reader's own workplace and neighborhood. But before the reader gets a chance to start thinking how to go about her or his contribution to the process of redesigning education [8] I need to describe the processes I envision. Therefore, I invent a model structure and describe how the processes work in that structure. This article is limited to these two subjects. My aim is to show one needs to start thinking in terms of the system processes in order to find out how to make the overarching goal of education a driving force.

The vital processes of learning in the system I envision involve exchange and trade of knowledge, skills, materials and other resources such as time needed for learning and practice. The structure of the system supports this trading. Nevertheless, I shall first describe the structure of the system because the processes of learning and trading occur in the structure. The structure is changing according to the needs of the processes. Therefore, I will describe only an initially conceivable structure. In fact, it is not known that a single stable structure may fulfill the needs of learning processes. [9] It is more probable that the structure will evolve as is common to life and our civilization.[10]

It is essential to understand what kind of trading I am talking about. Teachers are perceived as hired by the society to push knowledge that is not produced by them. Teachers are considered to be passive in creating civilization. Teachers are supposed to pump civilization into students' heads as if it were pumping gas into a car. A math teacher is perceived as someone to teach addition, not as somebody to teach thinking and learning on the example of addition. A student is perceived as a car that needs gas. Students are not perceived as having delicate brains to be loaded with skills and checked for flawless function by extremely competent artists of human mind-crafting. The way we look at the educational system resembles dumb work on trivial projects such as repainting white boards in color or hitting white and black keys. Students are not seen as learning how to become artists and teachers are certainly not perceived as masters. Therefore, teachers are denied the right to collect money as if they were creating something desirable to us by their own minds and hands. Teachers are so used to the treatment that they seem not to see they can learn more and become owners of a new generation school system.

But I need to warn the reader right away that a private school is not the idea I am talking about. What I am talking about is a new profession of teaching based on serious research aiming at understanding how to teach effectively. Professional teachers form a network of experts on the subject matter and teaching techniques. The network teachers earn more if they teach better. These teachers can say that their profession offers them multiple opportunities for personal and intellectual growth every day. And the teacher future looks brighter the more apt a student she or he is, at all levels, from the nursery to the highest academia.

My claim is that educational systems are hard to change because teachers are not owners of their trade. While all prospering businesses buy something, do work on the bought material and sell the result for a higher price, or provide services using their own knowledge and ability which is thus being sold, teachers

are hired for a job that is considered in a way to be merely loading wagons with potatoes. The potatoes, trucks, ramps and trains belong to us. Anybody can do the loading job. And the students leave the station full of potatoes like wagons. We are shocked that they are not illuminated Picassos, Liszts or Pasteurs. We demand a lot providing merely a regular pay for compliance with rules.

Teachers need motivation to transform their occupation into a profession. Current systems are such that attempts to innovate put the regular income of a teacher in jeopardy. Trying new things is very risky because it is not guaranteed to bring results. Nobody wants to stop teachers from trying but the system effectively forces them to quit because they get tired and burn out. There is no structure to support innovation. There is no structure to develop innovations into elements of teaching profession and culture. And there is no way for teachers to be fully recognized. Therefore, teachers have to find a way to win the recognition of their trade themselves. They need to start trading with what they possess and do.

In fact, a successful teacher is an owner of incredible gifts, someone who possesses unusual skills and knowledge and can set a high price on services provided for students. Students can be active learners from competent teachers. Both need freedom to build a system to function in a natural way. And a clear suggestion for such a system to have a chance to succeed can be found in universities.

University professors are considered to be owners of their wisdom because they participate in the process of creating science. Teachers could be seen as owners of their teaching materials and techniques if they were creating the materials and methods they use. University students are responsible for what they spend their parents' money on and the same could happen with students in lower schools. Universities are populated by a whole hierarchy of people with different levels of knowledge and skills while at school we have only teachers and students. A global network of schools based on the principles of a new generation university which belongs to teachers and students is the vision I describe.

The main problem with the model invented in this article is that it is too complicated to comprehend and judge quickly. Moreover, it is full of conflicts. If it could work it would only do so through a balance of opposing forces. One can easily point out apparent inconsistencies. To explain why the described system could work one would have to answer an unending chain of questions and the answers would stimulate new questions. Solutions to problems showing up in the system have to be invented on-line as the whole system grows. But what I am trying to sell is not the particular model. I am using the model to convey the idea that the simple principle of schools owned by teachers and students immediately leads to incredibly rich structures and provides clear criteria for distinguishing which new elements of the system might be useful and survive and which not and die. The ownership principle opens a new way of thinking about education. If this is understood by the reader, the rest is details that may change in time.

2. STRUCTURE OF THE NETWORK

It is important not to perceive the structure I describe as rigid and ultimately defined. A living company evolves.[10] The model example I provide here is arbitrary but it illustrates the underlying principles. The principles themselves are not arbitrary. If the described model structure has drawbacks, including serious ones, they should be thought of as resulting from a long evolution and one should ask the question what processes exist in the system that can resolve these problems. The structure I describe is arbitrary because no real process of evolution existed to create it in a natural self-correcting way. This is not a problem since the model is only a tool to bring up relevant issues.

Every teacher and every student is a member of the network as an individual with equal rights to all other individual members. The members form teams, classes, schools, school districts, school regions, academies and a single society of professors of education with its own hierarchy. These subgroups have different responsibilities and are distinguished by the responsibilities.

The responsibility of a team is to learn an assigned (or chosen) subject. A team contains about 4 or 5 members (between 3 and 7) and exists for as long as the assignment or chosen task is not completed. There may be 4 students in a team, or 4 teachers, or 4 professors, or a mixture thereof. Teams are formed according to the demands of the subject they are supposed to study. A team is the basic element of the system because it is the learning engine which delivers the result of its learning process: a report on what and how the team learned carrying out its project, and a product the team was supposed to produce through the project.

Teams form classes of varying size according to the amount of assistance the subject matter requires. Subjects such as floating or sinking of rigid bodies in liquids [12] can be studied in classes of 4, 8 or even 10 teams. Such an "Archimedes" class may require one to three instructors for assistance. The notion of a class is distinguished by the notion of instructors. Since teams encounter difficulties when learning new

things and new ways of thinking they need to ask questions and verify their reasoning with instructors. The instructors can be students, graduate students, teachers, graduate teachers, professors, graduate professors and professors of education. It depends on the kind of class they instruct. For example, the class studying the notion of the contexts of productive learning [6] according to modules designed in analogy to Ref. [12] in case of physics may require instructors to become members of the teams. I will return later to the issue of materials for teaching the context of productive learning by inquiry since in the network I envision the context of productive learning by inquiry is a basic building element and in the current systems of education this context is almost entirely absent.

Classes form schools. It is important to form schools in order to sustain social aspects of the learning processes. Schools are to serve their surrounding communities. An elementary school is fairly local in this respect while a top ranking university may have a mission of national or even global outreach. Schools are distinguished by having a principal and a body of teachers. Schools are basic posts of the system. Schools owned by teachers and students form a network because it is easier to operate in the network than outside of it. The network is international because it draws on teaching and learning experiences which are published and useful across the world.

Teachers form a school to create a body of sufficient expertise in the subject matters to be able to teach and to form a setting in which their own development of skills and knowledge will be possible through sharing duties and exchanging experiences and results. Teachers of one or more schools may form a team to learn and work on some problem. The striking feature of the system driven by the learning of teams of various kind is a possibility of a self-organized virtual school formed of classes of teams of teachers as a result of their own recognition that the problem they want to study requires such structure, with a body of super-teachers drawn from other elements of the network.

The key function the principal is responsible for is to make the school productive. The productivity is measured by the results of students on standard tests and by the number of team reports from the school sold on the system market. It is a big success to produce a good report which sells well.

We need to recall that a team may be composed not only of students but of teachers as well, and a team may include people from outside the school. In that case, the team result is shared according to prescribed rules. Consequently, the number of reports or publications or student achievements do not need to be simple integers and instead of using special measures the school outcome is measured in terms of money: total sales minus total investment divided by the number of school members. Details of the accounting will be discussed later, but we need to mention three things.

One is that the team results may be highly professional and even able to solve practical community or wider problems. Therefore, they may be copyrighted, patented or sold. For example, an outstanding teaching material on the subject of sinking and floating, electric currents or optics, such as Ref. [12], may be in high demand in all schools or, a local solution to the problem of child care and a computer program needed in its administration, written by students and teachers, may have broad applications.

The other is that the standard test results of students need to be accounted for in money. Therefore, there are tables developed of equivalence between credits and money. Credits are universal for the whole system but they may be equivalent to more money in a better school when considered as a product and less money in a better school when considered as an expense. This point will be further discussed in the Section dealing with finances. Here we mention only that the accounting of schools and reviewing principal's performance in terms of money makes it evident that education is not a burden to the society but a source of major income if money is properly invested. Accounting of education in terms of money also prevents wasting public funds for education. For it is too easy to spend money without accountability while good accounting creates responsibility.

The third thing is that details of the calculation do matter. In fact, they are essential. It is not obvious how to evaluate results of education in terms of money. Therefore, the method is a subject of ongoing studies. The studies are essential to the network because the education it offers must be useful to the society for the system to prosper and be actually paid as much as it aspires to. The studies feedback is critical to long term planning and development of the evaluation rules for credits in terms of money. But the studies are essential for many more reasons, vital to the network. Here are some examples: design and redesign of curriculum structures, admission, examination and testing procedures, hiring policy, communication with employers, satisfying needs of the job market through the network and longitudinal studies of alumni careers. Therefore, the evaluation scheme is a permanent source of initiative for improving the network to better serve the society. The details are hot subjects in the network.

School districts are formed by schools spontaneously to coordinate work and express opinions of many

schools in a selective and organized fashion which guarantees coherent action in defense or promotion of the districts educational or other interests. The body of representatives is elected by schools. Therefore, the districts are distinguished by their representatives who serve their needs. Districts are formed to contain schools of their choice and do not have to be restricted to primary, middle or high schools only. Districts prosper if their schools earn money.

School regions include school districts and universities. The regions are formed to allow universities and schools to utilize their resources in producing team reports and selling them. The principal role of regions is to provide permanent in-service learning opportunities to every member of the system on the highest possible level. Teachers study in the region to keep abreast of the science or art they teach. University students, graduate students and faculties study ways their research capacity can be enhanced through becoming more useful in education, mainly through many opportunities of delegating responsibility for teaching to students. [8]

One of the students mission becomes then to work with less educated students on their learning skills, using the best materials available. Students who excel in teaching can pursue studies in the system and become teachers. It takes a region to create conditions for such advanced studies. Two reasons are essential. The region is the smallest structure whose size provides sufficient amount of students with talent for teaching and becoming teachers of teachers. The region is the smallest structure that can support high quality research. Regions are large enough to create conditions for unlimited personal growth of their members. School regions are also useful in creating a sufficiently stable environment to support educational processes in the periods of setbacks.

A school region is distinguished by the board of trustees whose role is to assure healthy economy of the region educational services. Trustees of a region are elected by the region members. The boards of trustees use help of academies.

Academies are organizations quite independent of the team, school, district and regional structure. They are the regional networks of experts who contribute their expertise to the region system and are recognized by the system as such. The academies are professional organizations of providers of services to the system. Academies recruit their members following their own rules. Academies can undertake action of their choice driven by the need of the system. A key additional function of academies is the publication of journals.

Academies publish refereed journals on education and sell them in the system as an additional source of income. The new striking feature of the journals is that they have subsections for learning materials which can be bought separately and in large quantities. School teams may attempt to publish outstanding reports in the journals. [7]

The whole network of schools of all kinds requires a body of distinguished teachers for passing judgments on issues important to the whole system. This is a Society of Professors of Education. Members of the society have at least 100,000 copies of educational materials sold through the system. But in order to become a Professor of Education a candidate must have a record of working in the system for at least 25 years and have educated at least 25 teachers who sold more than 10,000 copies each of teaching materials through subsections in the refereed academic journals.

The network of schools is global and its international character is obvious to all members. It is clear that translation of the academic journals plays an important role in the international contacts and learning across the globe.

Different countries may have districts and regions of different sizes but no administrative superstructure above regions is needed or allowed. There exist data banks connected in the network so that no central headquarters are required and still the system is perfectly conscious of its identity. Members identify themselves by contributing to the processes of the system and by using its structures. Regions may easily cross state boundaries for their structure is governed by the processes they support. Examples of well known existing international network structures are Internet and VISA International [11].

Analogies exist between the school network and other essential systems in our civilization. The system of electric power distribution is a leading example. [2] One can think of many analogies between the two systems. Let me give you a surprising example. One may think about the contexts of productive learning as analogous to the super-conducting wires, about the processes of learning and teaching by inquiry and circulation of teaching materials as analogous to the electric currents and about the overarching goal of education as analogous to the principle of optimizing the load factors. Human brains are the sources of power. The rules of science, democracy and total quality are analogous to the Kirchhoff rules. The ownership principle is analogous to the closed circuit condition for the currents to flow. The transition from the contemporary educational systems to the networks of schools owned by teachers and students is analogous to the transition

from the direct to alternating current in the case of the electric power systems.

3. OWNERSHIP PRINCIPLES

The forms of ownership I describe are invented for illustration, have drawbacks and are partly contradictory. Such a situation may be realistic but the model I describe is not sufficiently studied to claim that much. One would have to study mathematical models of the ownership structure including mechanisms of governance, income, spending and population changes to make reasonable evaluations of the ownership principles and I have not done such studies. Still, the ownership principles are essential to the network idea and I offer a scenario to think about.

The system that can emerge from a real trial may evolve to other forms of the ownership but it is clear that if the system belongs to teachers and students at the beginning and grows successfully there will be little incentive for taking the ownership away from the primary constituents. And if many systems are initiated some ownership schemes will succeed and some will die.

Two different forms of ownership exist in the envisioned network, one for teachers and one for students. The need to differentiate comes from the fact that teachers support their own living (and their families') through the work in the system while the students' living is supported by parents or other supporters. In addition, there is a mechanism built in for a gradual change in the form of ownership available to students who learn particularly easily, satisfy well defined criteria and choose to make a career in the system.

Teachers own shares. Shares bring dividends. Shares cannot be bought. They can be earned. A teacher receives a prescribed basic number of shares when when joins the system. The basic number of shares ascribed to a job position is proportional to the time necessary for doing the job and the complexity of the tasks. The complexity factors are tabulated and published. The basic number of shares corresponding to a full time job of lowest complexity brings enough dividends to live if the whole system works productively and efficiently. Advancing in the hierarchy of teaching positions results from the growing ability to become responsible for more demanding jobs to which a larger basic number of shares is ascribed.

Anyone in the system can earn more shares than the basic number for her or his position by doing the job better. In particular, one can earn shares by publishing educational materials. To give a striking example: a cleaning staff member of some school may publish a material on economic organization of efficient cleaning in schools so useful it may sell in thousands of copies. The number of shares is proportional to the number of copies sold. Conduction of every activity in the network is evaluated in terms of shares. Every teacher knows the number of shares in the whole system and in her or his possession. Once the yearly budget forecast is published it is straightforward to foresee the individual basic income for the current year and everybody can evaluate their own additional income knowing the number of shares they have in addition to the basic number.

Students own credits. Credits have to be earned by passing standard tests and written and oral exams and by publishing individual and team reports through the academic journals (this is independent of the fact that producing team reports is the main source of learning experience for students). To be able to earn a credit a student has to buy a pass for a course that leads to the credit. Students can buy passes for money. They can also work in the system as teachers, administrative assistants or other staff, earn shares and pay for passes from their dividends. When students join the system to work as teachers their shares become sources of dividends as for teachers.

One can disclaim shares by leaving the system. Such shares die; cease to exist. For example, when a student finishes education in the system the number of her or his shares at that point is multiplied by the current value of a yearly dividend per share. This says how much the student was making a year at graduation - it tells potential employers how much they have to offer the alumna or alumnus to attract attention. In turn, students know how much they can expect on the basis of their education. The shares of the alumni are subtracted from the total number of shares. When a teacher leaves the system her or his shares are processed in the same way.

Possession of a large number of shares opens unlimited opportunities for personal growth and attaining intellectual freedom. Putting the process of individual growth of teachers and students on top of other processes and setting priorities in such a way that ownership remains in the hands of teachers and students no matter what happens, has one key implication: teachers become vitally interested in reform since reform as a process of redesign (cf. [13]) is the natural way of improving their own living. At the same time otherwise insoluble or hard problems may become less forbidding.

I give examples of problems I heard about in "Discovery" [14] and in "Reading Recovery" [15]. "Dis-

covery” and “Reading Recovery” are educational reforms of unusual quality, “Reading Recovery” being one of the most advanced reform models in the world. But before I give the examples I need to explain why I am giving these examples. Namely, I only mean to suggest that if the ownership by teachers and students were seriously considered from the beginning then, new ways of approaching the problems could come to mind. Because of my limited knowledge about “Discovery” (which educated several thousand teachers) and “Reading Recovery” (which operates in about 9000 schools in the US alone and continues to grow), my suggestions are hypothetic. However, my goal is not to tell leaders of “Discovery” or “Reading Recovery” what they should have been or should be doing. My aim is only to show that the ownership principle implies a new way of thinking about problems of education.

In the case of project “Discovery”, I think the ownership principles could have changed the project recruiting scheme, profiles of the teacher leaders education and organization of their work, and the motivation of teachers attending summer institutes. The institutes would have new elements in the program of great interest for people seeking a status of independent thinkers and educators. Most importantly, however, at the end of the project when public funds expired, the participants could be prepared to sustain their independent network and continue to benefit thousands of students without a shock of disappearing outside support. The above conclusion may appear surprising in its simplicity. However, I recall meeting teachers, teacher leaders and directors in the project who did not expect to be left out in the cold. Most importantly, they found themselves rapidly developed, with broadened horizons and, ironically, unable to plainly return to their previous roles in the existing system having no room for growth in the directions they found attractive.

In the case of “Reading Recovery”, one might suggest that teachers and teacher leaders who would own the system could be motivated to develop their skills beyond the requirements set by leading scientists. They could have vested interests in enhancing rather than diluting standards of their services to children with diffusion of the system. The research leaders could securely develop the system if their judges were not arbitrarily selected but were mainly the teachers and parents who know first hand the project results and appreciate outcomes of the longitudinal studies. Even more importantly, the research leaders of their own self-improving system could attract new young researchers by the fact that the principle of “Reading Recovery” approach to reading could be extended to other disciplines if enough research were done. One direction which I consider very important is the development of materials for children having difficulties with learning science, materials analogous to the McDermott’s modules on physics [12] and the reading books in “Reading Recovery”. The projection into future would be totally unbounded and exciting. The system could remain highly interesting to its leaders independently of false outside opinions.

4. GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLES

All schools in the network have equal rights and the same standards of excellence. For individuals, there is a schedule of ranks based on the number of shares. People of lower rank usually pay attention to people with higher rank because those with higher rank usually know better how to earn shares. The principles of effective teaching govern in the network.

The average number of shares per teacher in a school measures the quality of the school. Schools are also measured by achievements of their students - the number of credits per student.

Credits are well defined through common standards and other criteria, such as juror judgments. The standard tests are built on the principle of one framework problem with varying input data which imply different correct output answers using the same reasoning. The tests verify understanding and reasoning. The skill of reason is the goal of education. The correct result is of value.

Shares become worthless if students do not buy passes to earn credits. Therefore, teachers are interested in keeping high the number of sold passes. This leads to the improvement of quality of education since students have freedom to make choices how to use their budgets. There is no prescribed governance structure that would need to be imposed artificially because of needs to serve other interests than the wisdom-centered learning. [16]

Team leaders are elected within a team. Everybody can suggest a leader but it is the team who decides.

Class leaders are elected by the class. Classes can and often do bid for teachers for specific courses. Teachers have the right to choose with which class they will work. Teachers usually prefer to choose a bidding class with highest number of credits and shares. If there is a conflict without a rational solution the right of choice and responsibility for making decision belong to the teacher who has more shares in the system.

School principals are elected by the school teachers and students equally for a period of 5 years. There

is a limit of 3 such periods for a single person to be a principal.

District representatives are elected from the whole district membership in the network by all teachers and students for 7 years to ensure continuity. Schools vote separately on a list of candidates. The number of votes per school is equal to the number of shares owned by members of that school. One person can serve up to 2 periods.

Region trustees are elected for unlimited time. A trustee ends her or his service only voluntarily. Candidates are suggested by school districts. In order to become a trustee one has to have at least ten times as many shares as average number of shares per teacher in the region on the election day. The second condition is that the candidate for a trustee must have worked in the system as a teacher for at least 10 years. These conditions eliminate the situation where some important person becomes a trustee despite that this person is fully ignorant about the system. This condition also helps to select people who are successful as teachers and have a remarkable record of achievement outside the network.

There is a danger of lowering the price of passes to sell large numbers of them. This is easily avoided through a feedback loop because good teachers will not work for free with too many students and such practice dies out. On the other hand, there is an issue of the system becoming a monopoly and dictating a too high price on the passes. Therefore, the system is built from more than one independent subsystems of shares and credits. There is no artificial limitation on the number of such subsystems. Teachers are free to initiate new subsystems but there is a requirement that a subsystem must be adopted by at least three schools. To create a subsystem teachers of the schools set up a company according to the common law and the subsystem becomes a partner in the network.

The standards of credit requirements and the educational materials are used across the board equally in all subsystems. Shares in different subsystems are compared using the ratio of the average number of credits obtained by students in the subsystem during the last year per share in the subsystem. Credits are universal because they are based on satisfying most objectively measured requirements by students while the subsystem share value depends on the subsystem. Each subsystem share value is calculated in terms of a universal share value for the whole system. The total number of the universal shares is equal to the sum of numbers of the universal shares in all subsystems.

All subsystems are free to function without state or community support for students (taxes) but if they use public money as income to pay dividends they have to comply with the general share evaluation scheme in which the share value is defined by test results for students. Testing schemes are continuously redesigned to satisfy changing requirements of the job market and the network. The testing practice is based on verifying thinking skills, understanding subjects and ability to learn new things, in mandatory agreement with the overarching goal of education. That this condition is satisfied results from the fact that the true value of the network to the society is precisely the supply of contexts of productive learning. In other words, the network tests students if they purchased and acquired what they intended to when paying for the passes.

The common share evaluation system is needed by all subsystems. The subsystems want to demonstrate effectiveness and quality of the education they offer. They want to attract the best students. Subsystems compete by keeping the number of credits issued per share as high as possible to keep the share value high. The reason standards are not reduced is that the demands for credits are universal and in check by all constituents. The network is also being constantly evaluated from the point of view of the job market. The market economy cures negative features in the network as it does for itself outside the network. The bonding scheme is based on the market competition for best students and its reluctance to hire poorly educated alumni. In turn, nobody is interested in educating students whom nobody wants to hire. Therefore, the schools keep records of their alumni careers. There is a whole area of studies on measuring alumni careers for meaningful comparisons.

5. SOURCES OF INCOME AND FINANCE MANAGEMENT

The system collects money for teaching students directly from the students budgets. The budget money is provided, for example, by parents for education of their children, by a local community to pay for education of its teachers, by state and international organizations for training of professionals or by foundations through grants for scientists doing research in the system. Students buy passes to earn credits.

It is essential for students to administer the process of purchasing passes. This way they learn the cost of their education and how to avoid waste of their money. The purchase of a pass to earn every single credit is done by a student separately, in an on-line process of learning how to manage her or his education program. The youngest students are being helped in this respect by their parents or guardians. There is a scheme of

reducing the responsibility of parents or guardians as students grow up. There is a system of consultants to students and data banks for their use. Every school has its own data bank with a network connection to help students make choices.

Students have individual budgets for their education. All students have equal access to the minimal budget for purchasing a basic set of passes. The basic set defines the level of education guaranteed to be available to every student in the system. Students need to raise, borrow or earn more money to cover costs of passes to additional credits of choice for their careers. Students demonstrate their records to obtain such funds.

The budgets for students come from states (taxes), public or private and national or international organizations of all kinds interested in educating students of all kinds, and from students themselves. But the dominant source is the direct payment by parents or employers. In the fully operating system which is already blended with structures of whole societies, parents and employers may temporarily deduct transfers made to budgets of students they support. The deductions are allowed for as long as a student needs to earn credits or until the time foreseen for earning the credits expires.

However, in the current situation such a scheme is not directly implementable since taxes are paid today according to schedules that have nothing to do with how the tax money will be spent. In other words, we pay taxes on what we earn and we have no direct way to say how we want our money to be spent. There is no entry on the contemporary tax forms concerned with what we wish to provide our money for, except, for example, church taxes in some countries. Hopefully, in a future tax forms one will find entries for education. Until then, what I can offer in practice today is merely a seed or initial business plan for first steps on the way to make the educational network belong to teachers and students. This is described in next Sections below.

The total amount of money collected by the network for a fiscal academic year (or semester) is divided by the number of shares issued to date and the resulting number defines the total dividend per share. Owners of shares decide how to use the money they receive through their shares. They form organizations in the system to use their money. For example, each and every member of a school brings a definite amount of money for use by the school. The sum of money of all members has to cover all expenses of the school, including the owners income. A good teacher with many shares becomes thus a great asset to the school. Her or his opinion about teaching practice cannot be neglected. Such teachers make the schools going.

Teachers form schools voluntarily. If they do not form schools their shares will lose value - no single teacher is able to offer a comprehensive education. The same motivates formation and existence of districts and regions.

A highly sophisticated system of collecting payments, share accounts and copy rights is in operation. But the system rules are simple, published and easily available. They protect rights and intellectual properties of teachers and students, warrant creation of the contexts of productive learning and serve the overarching goal of education.

The financial management is not delegated to outside companies. The outside auditors are hired but mainly to help in eliminating errors and for communication purposes with outside the network.

The network employs its own highest quality accountants who are also teachers. The accountants are deeply aware of the network principles and serve well the network educational agenda. They teach the network accounting to their less experienced colleagues and students. Much of the work is done by the students as part of their credit earning in accounting and related subjects. Similar delegation of work and responsibility is practiced in all administrative functions.

The individual shares are issued by the subsystems according to their needs and the number of shares issued by every subsystem is decided within the subsystem. These shares are evaluable in terms of the universal shares. The number of the universal shares in the whole network is an abstract number which roughly equals the number of individual shares and results from the accounting rules. Thus, the individual share brings dividends in amount comparable to a universal share. You can check what is the dividend one gets for a single share in some school and you have an idea about the level of education the school offers.

Changes in the network accounting are induced by the majority vote, on recommendation by representatives of districts, with approving opinion of the region trustees. The Society of Professors of Education is obliged to help in assessment of proposed changes in the accounting rules used by regions.

The reason for that no monopoly can emerge is that many subsystems exist and they compete to win their share in serving educational needs of the society.

There exist also ways of giving money to the network and specifying the money is given to a subsystem or other unit for some purpose. The money is used then by issuing a corresponding number of new shares

and distributing those shares in agreement with the intention of the donor.

6. ASSESSMENT AND RECOGNITION

The bottom line in assessing the quality of work and productivity of teachers and students is the number of credits they produce. Therefore, the credit system is a subject of continuous research, redesign, application and feedback. [13] The notion of a credit guaranteed in gold explains the quality of reasoning skills and knowledge of students who earned the credit.

The award winning teachers obtain one time money prizes or a number of shares. Dividends from the prize shares are collectible over different periods of time; longest times for most prestigious awards.

If the number of shares grows with time and the number of students does not grow the value of a dividend per share becomes smaller with time, and one has to earn more shares to keep the individual income rising.

No other measure than students performance on universal tests is used in assessing effectiveness of teaching. But owners of copy rights for teaching materials and patents for teaching techniques collect royalties on their use.

Since there are differences between districts in student readiness to learn the districts must specialize in different levels of education. Whenever an opportunity arises for a school district to go to a higher level the opportunity is taken because it is preferred by the job market to employ people with higher number of credits. The credit system is such that gaining merely basic skills and knowledge cannot bring a high number of credits. A large number of credits may be obtained only by a student who learns many skills and subjects very well and the achieved level is verified thoroughly and trustworthy.

The protection of teachers rights to benefit from selling of their teaching materials is secured by the general patent and copyright laws. A recent example of such laws are laws prohibiting unauthorized duplication of video tapes or compact discs and fighting pirates across the world.

The highest recognition available to teachers and students is based on leadership positions they win in their own network units. For example, a team distinguishes its leader, a school distinguishes its principal and academies distinguish their leaders.

7. ARCHIVES

The system keeps an archive, in many copies and in a flexible network of easy access. The archive is sophisticated in its purpose, structure and availability. Highly sophisticated librarians manage the archives and make sure no member of the system is denied access to data. The contemporary electronic libraries such as the Los Alamos National Laboratory electronic preprint library [17] can serve as a prototype example of the network archive.

The archive plays the role of a patent office library for educational materials, copy right guard (issuing single authorized copies), source of information and ground for longitudinal studies (independently of the studies conducted by the network subsystems) and the forum for research and discussion on educational matters including the performance of the system itself.

However, the archive is not able or allowed to become a publisher or distributor of academic journals. The publication of journals is reserved to academies in order to secure the journals high quality through the peer review processes. Still, the archive is indispensable since it provides information the publishers cannot provide, such as access to publications from different publishers.

8. PREPARATION, DESIGN, LAUNCH, FEEDBACK AND REDESIGN

The leading idea of the network is that teachers and students can build a healthy and rapidly evolving educational network if they start doing it step by step on sound economical basis. In the envisioned system, a group of interested teachers starts from earning funds for opening a small school.

Thus, the first step a group of teachers does is they decide they want to create their own school. The group then gets in touch with a local network subsystem to learn about what and how one can do to begin with. The local subsystem delegates a specialist who helps the group in identifying their goals. They draw the first draft of their vision, mission and business plan statements to present it to the subsystem they want to join. The group first investment is time and work on its own education in the already existing network.

This education allows the group to start building a plan how to create a new school and beyond. More about it in Section 10.

The design, launch, collecting and analyzing data and redesign processes are gradually becoming a habit of the group. [13] Once they succeed in setting a school in operation they begin to build partnerships with other schools of the subsystem and learn how the network works. The feedback from the network is essential for the new school development.

A mature school participates in the network operation without limitations. Schools of distinguished quality benefit from serving less developed schools by sharing their expertise. For example, an experienced teacher can teach a class of colleagues how to manage their time at school more effectively and, as a result, have more time available for personal growth. [3] Where is the time coming from? The skillful teacher knows how to help students learn on their own, how to organize their work so that older or more experienced students help younger or less experienced ones. The teacher knows how to set up the teams work so that the teacher has plenty of time to think about the most interesting things to her or him. Teams of students can easily do a lot of work which otherwise overwhelms overworked and over-stressed teachers.

9. COMMUNITY AND STATE SUPPORT

Schools of the network are so effective they are eagerly welcome in local communities. It is worth for the community and state to invest in the learning processes kept alive by the schools of the network since these processes educate sophisticated alumni. It is essential to understand that schools never have a problem with getting local support because they grow out of local initiatives. They also never lose state support because no state is going to risk opinion of having no interest in the best possible education of citizens. Once a school is formed it operates for as long as its share value is reasonable. The school grows and brings higher income to teachers when its share value grows.

Communities are proud of the quality of their schools and press local governments for execution of productive educational policy.

10. SEEDS AND TIMING

The envisioned network of schools owned by teachers and students is built in analogy to leaving organisms. Life begins in small seeds, not big scale projects. We have four elements to mention in the analogy.

- A single member of the network, a teacher or a student grows from an isolated individual of limited horizons to a member of a learning community with broad horizons and freedom to make choices. Thus, the seeds of the network come from personal learning and growth of its members.
- A school is born and it advances through levels of professional efficiency. A new post of the network emerges and supplies its strength to the whole structure, as a leaf or root of a tree.
- The whole network grows and improves its services to the society. A small size of an initial stage does not prevent the development into an impressive structure as much as the size of a sequoia seed does not exclude a giant forest in future.
- The core ideas evolve from the embryos such as this article to mature driving ideas for large systems if the ideas are helpful in practice. The educational network is a seed for bigger changes in our global civilization.

The small size of seeds is important, not accidental or resulting solely from financial limitations. The small size of seeds is the condition which eliminates huge errors. The hardships of life teach members of the network how to go about developing their own schools. They are helped by the network in a number of essential ways characteristic of productive teaching but a school must learn how to grow and become strong. Only self-consistent and well adapting structures survive. Thus, even if the network could afford financing large scale projects it does not do it lightly without careful studies.

It will take a long time before a reasonably mature version of the envisioned network can become a reality and show its ability to improve and survive on the basis of effective education of its members. 50 to 100 years is not a bad guess. Before that happens, contemporary groups of teachers interested in building such a

network must start with other enterprises in mind than creating the whole new educational system at once. The seeds must be sown differently.

The point is following. The existing educational systems have long traditions. There exists no counterexample of comparable magnitude that could substantiate claims one can do better. It is pointless to quarrel about what is good or bad and engage in easy to create wars of opinions. Moreover, it would be silly and immature on anybody's part to claim knowledge of how to build a better system of education than the existing ones to the extent that once the solution is adopted from top to bottom no problem will arise. The principles of life do not favor concepts such as Frankenstein. Therefore, the network concept stays away from such ideas.

In contrast, teachers and students undertaking action to address their basic needs to learn and grow should not be met with a strong opposition. For opposing such movement cannot be supported by reason and any such opposition would contradict the purpose of education.

The timing idea is that once a growing self-organizing network of teachers and students begins to practice meaningful education it will be easier to found, fund and find (3f) exemplary schools where the contexts of productive learning [6] and learning by inquiry [12] is bread and butter.

Teachers need to prepare themselves to take initiative much earlier. One place to start with is after-school or after-work activities for youth and adults in the local community. [20] The author knows that physical phenomena such as electric currents flowing in a circuit of batteries, bulbs, switches and wires, or a daily movement of the gnomon shadow on a sundial, provide opportunities for teaching how powerful is learning by inquiry. Understanding of the solar system or laws of electricity on the basis of a conscious inquiry induces deep changes in the learning habits. To get going, a team of teachers needs to see this happen to themselves and their students. Then, they need to repeat the success working with new people. For example, one can teach grandparents how to work with their grandchildren. Another viable program is a summer vacation or holiday camp for youth or adults. [20] It is essential that the activities are conducted by experienced people using materials of high quality, at least as good as "Physics by Inquiry" [12]. Teachers engaging in such initiatives become active learners of the subject matters. More importantly, they begin to learn how they can become professionals. Teaching and learning according to principles of scientific inquiry are the cornerstone processes in the network development and one has to begin there. The same principles are then available for application in teaching and learning in other areas without limitation.

The initial studies must be economically sound, with direct collection of money from parents or employers. This way first self-organized learning teams of teachers may emerge. Otherwise they burn out. The teams learn what is involved in the enterprise. For example, a small company is subject to many laws teachers do not learn about in college. [19] The small scale operation is an indispensable source of knowledge for teachers about what they can accomplish. Only those who know their trade can build a school of the network.

The key characteristic of the contemporary situation in educational systems is the lack of shared understanding what is the goal of education. The seed activity must focus on building a shared practical vision of education among a team members. The remaining paragraphs in this Section describe the first seed activity which the founders of the network should seriously consider.

My claim is that the notions of the context of productive learning, learning by inquiry and the overarching goal of education are not commonly understood. I have noticed in science and educational institutions that almost never the bottom line of research and learning is put on the table as worth investigation. I have not heard people asking seriously what and how we really want to learn and why. Such issues go beyond the common discussion. They seem to be obvious. I claim they are too damn difficult to understand so that anybody worrying about their position cannot seriously admit ignorance in this area. The ignorance is covered by a tendency to push in the direction which is known and safe to the individual.

The next logical step is to ask: Do we have a textbook, a module analogous to Ref. [12], and a program which would be teaching what is the essence of productive learning by inquiry? My answer is: No. Moreover, the non-existence of such a module for learning how to teach by inquiry clearly shows our reform efforts are weak and missing the key innovation element. I suggest that the teams interested in building the network of schools owned by teachers and students start from creating their own versions of such modules. The modules should then be refined in the process of educating new people who join the founding teams. A new school founding team should start from work on their school cooking-book and I claim they should start from learning themselves what is food.

I give you another analogy which is useful here. Think about the educational system and the air transportation system.[8] In the air transportation the notion of flying was clear to everybody since they saw a smallest bird in action. From Icarus to Boeing 747, all participants of whatever was being done knew

beyond any doubt what they have to demonstrate or see in order to say they fly. In the educational system, no analogous notion exists. The notion of flight in education can be the context of productive learning by inquiry, but it seems to be top secret now, or more probably, the notion does not even exist in the most educators and politicians minds. I do not blame anybody. The notion is very difficult to understand. You have to combine ideas of most advanced sciences and arts, climb high up on top of them and see far enough to come to grips with the notion of flying in education to try your own wings. Talking about the design of the wing curvature or the airplane factory management is premature when the notion of flying is not known. A school founding team needs to understand what they mean by flying in education before they can start working on their propeller.

Moreover, the majority of complaints about performance of the educational systems is not serious.[4] Namely, the relevant people do not understand the crisis to the extent of saying: I am not doing the right thing now, I am not teaching effectively, I do not know what is the context of productive learning by inquiry, I am unable to achieve the overarching goal of education for my students, I, in the first place, need to start thinking what I am doing. In other words, it is not only unclear what is flying but it is also not true that people realize they do not know what is flying in education. To the contrary, most educators are convinced they know something well enough to teach others. In fact, it often becomes comparable to teaching Little Mermaid how to comb her hair with a fork.[18] The way one shows to somebody that something is not the way that person thinks is following: one asks the person to make a verifiable prediction of the real status of the matter in question and then one verifies the prediction together with the person. If the verification shows the person's prediction was false the person is shocked, becomes curious, starts thinking begins to listen. This is teaching by inquiry. To start learning by inquiry you have to feel safe to ask questions about what bothers you.

My punch line is here. There is a science of incomparable clarity and focus in learning by inquiry. It is physics. Basic physics is the most transparent source of understanding what it means to learn effectively. And we already have a well tested material to study the notion of learning by inquiry in physics. This is Ref. [12]. The first thing to do for a team of teachers who want to understand what they are truly after if they want to join the living network of schools is to study electric circuits or optics in the way similar to the one from Ref. [12]. Then comes learning about what "Discovery" accomplished in Ohio and where it failed.[14] At this point one begins to understand the value of the context of productive learning in physics and how hard it is to create it. Then, one needs to ask what is "Reading Recovery" extending from New Zealand to the U.S.A. and where it is going.[15] The context of productive learning by inquiry comes at this stage more clearly into your sight. Next step is to talk to the Learning by Redesign [13] and learn by inquiry in the context of your path about past reforms and the status of science of change. Finally, once you become an owner of a clear notion of the context of productive learning by inquiry you can start your independent thinking about the living network of schools owned by teachers and students. If this outline frightens you, forget the network idea.

11. INITIAL BUSINESS PROPOSAL

The faculty member in a university who is prepared to do so might help a few colleagues to study the notion of productive learning by inquiry and understand the benefits of using the technique. A group of faculty members could set a program for learning by inquiry in the areas they see fit, at all required levels and for all people they want to talk to. This activity could produce the first shared notion of the purpose of education in the faculty team.

Three school teachers and a university faculty could spend a semester preparing a one semester course on electricity or optics by inquiry. They would have to provide their money for equipment and their time for the work and learning. In Poland, the investment could presumably be at the level of about 150 zł per person per month. That makes 2400 zł for 4 people in a 4 month semester with about 2 hours of studying session and 2 hours of preparation a week. The team would learn principles of learning and teaching by inquiry.

In a second semester, the same team could deliver a course for youth, adults, or both, to about 30 clients for money. Each client paying 50 zł a month makes 1,500 zł per month and about 6,000 zł in four months. Divided by 4 it gives 1,500 zł per teacher for all expenses of the course, or 375 zł per month. Suppose all the money is spent on equipment and other expenses. One can buy a lot of nice stuff for this money. The next semester has much lower spending because a lot of the equipment is already in place, the time required is shorter since there is experience accumulated, and the price may even go up if the first trial creates demand

and the course is considerably improved. Suppose the spending is slightly higher than in the first semester of preparation, say 175 zł instead of 150 zł. Then, the next semester brings 200 zł per month of income per teacher. This means the income compensating the initial money investment in one or two years.

The major product of the first few semesters of the team work is a set of materials which allow a skillful teacher to engage many students in a highly productive learning process. Such material can be published and sold in the future in many copies. But what is created goes far beyond that - teachers begin to act using their new skills and their own process of continuous learning and self-development takes off.

The question is how to move forward with the idea of founding a new school. One team is not sufficient. Organization of summer camps and new courses should lead to a larger group of teachers in association with university teachers who can conceive a mission, a vision and a plan to found the school. A breathtaking variety of problems need solution to make this work. Business strategies are just a small part of it (for example, see Ref. [19]). But it is hard to imagine anybody or anything will be able to stop the development. On the contrary, with such grass root movement and solid preparation one can expect many foundations of education to be ready to support the plan. Publishers and distributors of the teaching materials would certainly be interested in the promotion and the widest possible use of maximal number of issues. They would sign contracts for producing such materials.

This time my punch line is here: the university faculty trained in teaching by inquiry could start teaching elementary science by inquiry to teachers whose participation in the program would be paid by employers (schools, communities, institutions engaging in education of teachers, foundations). The great benefit to the university faculties is they suddenly become obviously and undeniably useful to the whole society (remember, students have parents and it is the parents who keep the country going), irreplaceable and in high demand for doing what they are well prepared to do subject-wise, what they enjoy to do by nature and what they can eagerly do to raise their income without interference with their research as much and as stressfully as teaching ineffectively hoards of under-prepared students interferes with their underpaid research activities at the university. Long term benefits to scientists are then obvious and not limited. Most importantly, however, the faculty members begin to feel free to learn a completely new stuff and start thinking in new dimensions.

There is an important aspect to mention in such an approach: those who learn by inquiry are ready to tackle hard problems. They will spontaneously advance their knowledge and understanding. They will be driven by curiosity. They will create the culture able to sustain the movement towards the network of schools. And they will grow personally with the development of the network. The network will serve more students and bring respect and enthusiasm to leaders of effective learning. The network will continuously need its top experts to keep it on track and going. Everybody will have to learn at new levels about new difficult matters and how to solve problems efficiently, bringing splendor to the educational enterprise.

New teams will be trained to become able to offer training to many new teachers. The university faculty sharing the vision will be able to help in building the network of schools owned by teachers and students and the schools will produce students ready to study at the universities. Training of new teams will be based on a set of meta-teaching materials on the subject matter and methods of founding new schools and developing the network. People will not be merely hired to do all these things - they will own the network and make it live up to their expectations. The network will become a good client of the university faculties.

12. COMMUNICATION

The key roles of communication are exchange of information within the network and informing society about the network ability to teach, improve itself and grow. Internet-like structures may help but they will be only tools in the processes of importance.

The most important communication process in the network is the transfer (describing, explaining, selling and buying) of teaching materials combined with courses on teaching and learning how to use them offered by specially trained users.

The most important information sent to the society is the current dividend per share and the total number of existing universal shares. The published numbers include also the average number of shares earned by teachers and students in the whole system. In addition, tables of subsystem averages are published with explanation of their meaning. The tables help students, parents, foundations etc. in judgment of the subsystems performance. Next, the cost of the education of a single student and the profit from education of a single student are published with explanation of how both are calculated.

13. CONCLUSION

There is one consequence of the educational system belonging to teachers and students at all levels that has not been fully described yet and must be reiterated here. Namely, such a network could naturally support basic research. Moreover, it could do so without asking for immediate industrial applications. The new motivation comes from the fact that an educational system will not be truly useful, indispensable and always worth investment unless it becomes an independent source of enlightenment. New discoveries could first apply in driving education before being used in industry. Today, we learn at schools what happens in the world. In the new system, it would be natural for the world to eagerly learn what is being discussed at schools - an unthinkable situation today.

While today no economic competition in scientific progress between educational systems and industries is possible, the new system could engage in such competition. The engagement might have incredible consequences for the speed of developing our civilization. Imagine young people learning about the current status of our knowledge and understanding of the real world first hand and searching for solutions to problems without bias of employment and other commitments.

I also need to explain the opportunity the network creates for the contemporary university. The unique opportunity lies in the leadership role the university could try to attain. But we need to remember that the contemporary university is not an unquestionable institution that fulfills its mission and may securely keep going as it did so far. [11]

The well known problem the university faces is that freshman students are not sufficiently educated at schools to undertake studies of modern science. The university becomes a place to teach elementary subjects because schools cannot fulfill their mission. Schools are supposed to teach so much so quickly that they are unable to help students learn with understanding. Understanding is replaced with a mindless drill of memory. Students become alumni who do not know how to learn new subjects. Worse, they are trained in faking knowledge and understanding. Thus, the contemporary university must face the highly probable possibility of becoming a high school of the 21st century and never gain the leadership position it might dream about or believe in attaining.

The main point is not merely that the university teachers would certainly enjoy having better prepared students as entrants (better students means better chances for prosperity of their professors). The point is that the university may become obsolete and useless no matter how good a science it supports if the students will not be able to study there in sufficient numbers. The above statement is not guaranteed to motivate a revolution in educational paradigms.[21] But it means that universities have to help schools in changing their practice. I give the following example.

The university works as a hierarchy of teaching and learning staff from students to graduate students to teaching assistants to postdocs to levels of professorship, and administration. Climbing the ladder is related with achievements in science, teaching, building research teams, personal growth, gaining respect and winning intellectual freedom without limits. Simpler tasks are delegated down the hierarchy. The most advanced processes of study and teaching at the university are in the hands of the most talented and most educated people. How is the school organized? There are only teachers and students, and administration.

The questions to ask at the university are the following. How would you explain the utility of your system to school teachers if they asked? How could one implement similar principles at the school level? Why do teachers not come to ask how to do that with their students? At the same time one could ask the following questions at school. Why don't you try to create a structure like in a university? Why don't you talk about it with the university people? Are they not helpful or plainly ignorant? The university should consider the opportunity of helping to build and lead a living network of schools owned by teachers and students. It could make a difference.

Acknowledgment

The author would like to thank Ken Wilson for many stimulating discussions and comments. Multiple discussions with Seymour Sarason are gratefully acknowledged. The author benefited from meetings with Charlie Ericson, Constance Barsky and Ben Daviss. He also wishes to thank Maria Ekiel-Jeżewska for discussions and collaboration on teaching experiments.

References

- [1] P. F. Drucker, *Managing the Non-Profit Organization*, Harper Business, New York, 1990, and other books by the same author, such as *Innovation and Entrepreneurship*.
- [2] T. Hughes, *Networks of Power: Electrification in Western Society 1880-1930*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1983.
- [3] S. R. Covey, *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*, Fireside, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1990.
- [4] M. G. Fullan with S. Stiegelbauer, *The new meaning of educational change*, Teachers College Press, New York, 1991.
- [5] D. C. Lortie, *Schoolteacher: a sociological study*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1975.
- [6] S. B. Sarason, *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1971; S. B. Sarason, *The Predictable Failure of Education Reform: Can We Change Course Before It's Too Late?*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1991; S. B. Sarason, *Political leadership and educational failure*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1998.
- [7] A contemporary example of a journal publishing useful materials is the European Journal of Physics, see <http://www.iop.org/Journals/ej>.
- [8] K. G. Wilson and B. Daviss, *Redesigning Education*, Hoyt, Boston, 1995.
- [9] K. G. Wilson and C. Barsky wrote articles about successive generations of models of reforms, in analogy to the generations of models in computer, car or airplane industries, such as Windows '95 or DC's and Boeings of different numbers. For information see Ref. [13].
- [10] A. de Geus, *The Living Company*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston 1997.
- [11] D. W. Hock, *Institutions in the Age of Mindcrafting*, Talk given at the Bionomics Annual Conference, San Francisco, California, October 1994; send mail to info@CascadePolicy.org, see also <http://www.fastcompany.com>.
- [12] L. C. McDermott et al., *Physics by Inquiry*, Wiley, New York, 1996.
- [13] Learning by Redesign, The Ohio State University, see www.physics.ohio-state.edu/~redesign/home.html or write to redesign@pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu.
- [14] *Discovery* - the Ohio educational reform is described in *Project Discovery Annual Reports* (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio Board of Regents, 1992 to 1996), see also Ref. [13].
- [15] M. Clay, *Observing Young Readers: selected papers*, Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH, 1982. The *Reading Recovery* system is described in C. A. Lyons, Gay Su Pinnell, D. E. DeFord, *Partners in Learning*, Teachers College Press, New York, 1993.
- [16] I borrow the term "wisdom-centered learning" from K. Wilson.
- [17] See <http://xxx.lanl.gov>. Another prototype in the case of education per se is the AAPT Abstract database for the American Journal of Physics and The Physics Teacher, see <http://www.phy.nau.edu/~danmac/AAPTDB/index.html>.
- [18] "Little Mermaid", an animated motion picture by the Disney company.
- [19] W. J. Markowski, *ABC small business'u*, Marcus s.c., Łódź, 1997.
- [20] M. Ekiel-Jeżewska, *Session Materials of the Discoverers Club*, Warsaw 1995-97, unpublished.
- [21] T. S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1970.