INEVITABLE TOO!
The Total Leader Embraces Mass Customized Learning

by

Chuck Schwahn and Bea McGarvey

Chapter 2 (Excerpt)

THE ELEMENTARY & MIDDLE SCHOOL STRUCTURE

When we wrote and published *Inevitable*, our major concern was with the time-based, limiting Industrial Age structure of our secondary schools. It still is! But we quickly began to receive questions about how we would apply the MCL Vision to the elementary school. That feedback motivated us to add a chapter to *Inevitable* that describes our vision of a flexible and effective structure for elementary learners, teachers, and schools. The entire Elementary MCL Vision chapter is available at the masscustomizedlearning.com website. Give it a study if you want to know more.

Our vision for a MCL elementary and middle school structure differs significantly from the structure of our ideal high school. High schools are structured as one comprehensive and complex organization. When one part of the HS master schedule is changed, it can, and usually does, impact many other aspects of the schedule. The structure of the typical elementary or middle school is not nearly as tightly aligned. One teacher, or a teaching team, can modify their schedule quite freely without impacting any other classrooms. As we thought about the MCL Elementary Vision, we recalled what we learned from Dr. Madeline Hunter. Let's reminisce a bit . . .

CHANNELING MADELINE

Dr. Madeline Hunter, UCLA professor and principal of the UCLA Lab School was our heroine in the late '60s. Her knowledge about learning and her passion for learners made us disciples of her beliefs, theories, and research. Dr. Hunter organized and structured the UCLA lab school around three complementary innovations that she and her staff implemented simultaneously.

Dr. Hunter knew, and believed, that all 6 year-olds did NOT have the same learning needs, and therefore, to put all 6 year-olds together in a 1st grade classroom with one teacher, simply because of their age, didn't make sense. Dr. Hunter believed that elementary schools should be **NON-GRADED**.

A Little Story *(cjs): I heard Dr. Hunter speak to groups of educators a number of times. I got to know her well. She usually took questions. After one of her presentations a teacher asked, "At what age do you think children are ready for kindergarten?" Dr. Hunter responded thoughtfully and softly (and she was always "cool"), "I think that is the wrong question. The real question is 'What is that child ready for?'" It was a brief dialogue that had a lasting impact. Dr. Hunter was a learner-centered person, and her response was a learner-centered response. I learned that day what it meant to be learner-centered. She changed how I think about putting first things first.*

Used with permission within the Maine Cohort for Customized Learning

Dr. Hunter knew and believed that three or four teachers teaming would offer more learning opportunities for learners. She also believed that teachers would become more professional as they studied, learned, and taught together. And therefore, Dr. Hunter believed that the school should be organized around teaching teams; she labeled it **TEAM TEACHING.**

Dr. Hunter knew and believed that teaching teams could be more efficient and more learner-centered in their grouping if they were grouping learners based on their learning needs not by age or ability. She also believed that older children could provide positive role models for the younger learners. She believed that school would be a richer experience for learners if they were non-graded, team-taught, and **MULTI-AGED.**

Elementary non-graded, multi-age teams have existed since Dr. Hunter's time. Hard working, dedicated, and talented teachers have tried to provide rich learning opportunities for children, _but it hasn't been easy._ Today it still isn't easy, but technology has made the non-graded, multi-age team more efficient and effective. Technology, especially when it includes electronic learning portfolios, can also help teaching teams manage their grouping and regrouping process.

You will see Dr. Hunter's themes of _non-graded, multi-age groupings_, and _team teaching_ throughout the MCL Elementary/Middle School Vision – with a twist of technology.

FORM FOLLOWS FUNCTION

This phrase, "form follows function," with its architectural roots helped us to envision a learning community at the elementary or middle level. Instead of putting a new coat of paint on the current structure or form of school, we thought first of the function or purpose of a learning community.

Rather than to be very specific about how a MCL elementary/middle school should be structured (the form), we began with guidelines (the function) that will help teams of teachers create a structure that meets the needs of their specific team and their specific learners. When we created the MCL HS Vision, we were thinking of 1500 learners and approximately 60 teachers. As we created this MCL Elementary School Vision, we were thinking of an elementary or middle school of 400 to 600 learners. A good place to start is with approximately 75-100 multi-age learners and 3 or 4 teachers – teams of learning facilitators. An expanded option might include more learning facilitators all focusing on specific learning goals within a content area. The more learning facilitators, the more they can "share the load."

Therefore, we are quite firm with "guidelines" that are core to the vision, and a bit less directive with how it might look. We will share, in a bit, some "best options" being designed by teams of learning facilitators.

But, first let's take a look at our firm guidelines for the Elementary/Middle School MCL Vision. When we visit classrooms in learning communities, we watch for three firm guidelines:

1. Learning facilitators (teachers) sharing the load;
2. Flexible grouping and regrouping of learners around specific learning goals; not tracking (!);
3. Learners invested in their learning.

GUIDELINE # 1: SHARING THE LOAD

It is impossible for a single teacher in a single classroom to meet the learning needs of every learner every day. There. We said it. A requisite for mass customizing learning is for learning facilitators to *share the load*.

Instead of every learning facilitator being responsible for and expert in every single learning goal or topic, they become the expert or "guru" in specific areas for the learning community. Their moniker is "Fraction Guru" or "Narrative Writing Guru" instead of "Grade 4 Teacher." This sharing capitalizes on the strengths and interests of the learning facilitators. And, the Fraction Guru can more easily differentiate to meet the individual learning needs of each learner. Another learning facilitator is doing the same for, let's say, narrative writing.

Meeting the individual needs of learners means creating learning opportunities for those fraction related learner outcomes based on:

> the learning level of the learner;
> the learning style of the learner;
> the interests of the learner; and
> the relevance of the learning to the learner's world.

Much easier to do if learning facilitators are sharing the load! Additionally, meeting the needs of individual learners would involve identifying those fraction related learner outcomes best learned online.

> *"How does the virtual learning experience*
> *SUPERCHARGE*
> *what happens inside*
> *the physical learning experience?"*
>
> **Salman Kahn**

We expect that approximately 30% - 40% of elementary learner outcomes – the simpler, more literal learning goals - could be learned online effectively and efficiently, leaving teachers with smaller groups and allowing for personalized learning around the complex learning goals. Salman Kahn's quote says it. We want to be clear. Technology will not replace teachers. Learners need teachers. Key questions for the Fraction Guru are "What are those fraction related outcomes that are best learned online? And, what are those that require face-to-face experiences with the learning facilitator?" Let's outsource what we can to technology freeing the learning facilitator to focus on those complex application and problem solving goals.

GUIDELINE # 2: GROUPING AND REGROUPING

Non-grading, multi-age grouping, and team teaching can be observed. On a visit, we see these structures in operation, hear the buzz, and see learners engaged in differing activities. But the thing we don't see, and can't see, is, "How did these kids get to these specific groups, to these specific learning opportunities; how do they know where to go; what criteria did learning facilitators use to form these groups; in the end, how will we know that kids aren't falling through the cracks . . ."

Because these concerns are so critical to the "would-be adopter" of the Elementary MCL Vision, we share with you four levels of how learning facilitators might design for MCL. In the spirit of being transparent, know that the names of these learning facilitators are fictitious and their stories are composites of what some teams are doing or planning to do.

THE POWER GOAL MODEL (Michelle's Story)

I'm Michelle. I am a member of a three person team working with 75 learners ages 6-8.

When visitors come to our school to see our MCL team in operation, they always ask us how we group our kids, why are these learners in this particular group, how do the children know where to go, do these groups change or are they like the "blackbirds, redbirds, and bluebirds." In a way, the process we use for grouping is very complex. We are beginning to use electronic portfolio software to help us keep track of the learning goals for each learner and this helps us to form groups. But in another way, a more practical way, the grouping process our team first used was quite simple.

We began by forming cross grade level teams. Some teams in our Learning Community cross two grade levels. Others cross three grade levels. It used to make sense to group learners according to age . . . or did it ever? Now, it makes more sense to share the load as Learning Facilitators. We realized there were 6-, 7-, and 8-year olds that had the same learning need, for instance, adding two digits. Why weren't we sharing the load to address this learning need? Some learners needed place value, while others needed to understand measurement. Thus began what we now term our "Power Goal Sessions."

Every once in a while, the three of us Learning Facilitators would say, it is time . . . Time to schedule a one to two week focus on "power goals." We would identify three learnings that our learners needed. Jokingly, we asked, "What are the three things that are driving us to eat a bag of M & M peanuts every night," as we lament what these kids still don't know! Three – because there were three of us. Sometimes we were able to include the Assistant Principal, which gave us a fourth goal. We started with Math because it seemed the easiest due to its hierarchical nature.

Once the goals were identified, we sorted which learner needed which power goal. Before our technology software was up and running, we did this ourselves. It wasn't hard to do so. I only had to look at my 28 learners and determine which of the four power goals would be their focus. And so . . . we grouped them. Notice, everyone has a power goal. This is not about creating an "intervention" period. As well intended as that is, it not so subtly creates what Carol Dweck (Mindset: The New Psychology of Success) would call a fixed mindset culture.

Let me take a minute to describe how the learning would happen within the Power Goal class. When I was the Fraction Power Goal teacher, I would have 2-4 sub-groups or levels of fractions within the class. We came to affectionately call them: Baby-bear fractions; Momma-bear fractions; Papa-bear fractions; and sometimes Grampy-fractions. We designed these groups similar to what used to be called "centers." These power goal centers included independent work, partner work, and technology supported work. Periodically, each group would meet me at my teaching table for direct instruction from me . . . 'cause they need me! Notice that it was easy for me to design, differentiate, and customize the center work for individuals because I only had fractions to worry about. I was able to design activities and strategies for specific learning styles and learning interests. This was SO freeing and empowering!

The key – and this is important to MCL – the Baby-bear fraction learners did not move as a cohort to the next level. Instead, learners could move at their own pace. A learner – a fast runner – could zoom through a couple levels in a short period of time.

The result was quite amazing! Our learners were engaged – meeting with success. That old adage, "Success breeds success," became our refrain. And . . . because of how we structured or re-structured we were able to laser the instruction – customize it to those groups of learners. Because we were able to efficiently focus our instruction, they became proficient. The more proficient they became the more engaged they were. The more engaged they were, the more proficient they became. Hard to tell which came first the chicken or the egg . . . the success or the engagement!

We also added a tracking component. Some teams used the concept of Merit Badge; others the concept of Passport Book. As learners demonstrated mastery for – let's say – Baby-bear fractions, their Passport Book was stamped or they received a quarter of their Merit Badge. This was a magic potent for them! Many nagged us that they wanted to show us that they had mastered a certain level of their power goal . . . to get their well-earned stamp.

We have had such success with our once-in-a-while Power Goal Model that we are thinking of doing it all the time. A team of Learning Facilitators from a Middle School visited. They liked what they saw and are planning to implement our model routinely. They learned from us. We think we can now learn from them. Stay tuned.

THE WORKSHOP MODEL (Brad's Story)

I am Brad. I am a Learning Facilitator in a Learning Community which includes learners ages 11 through 13. I am one of six "Math Learning Facilitators." For now, I am the "Math Learning Facilitator" for Fractions, Decimals, Linear Measurement, Telling Time, and Money. Those topics change as the learning needs of our learners change. For example, if we are effective in creating a mass customized learning community, at some point, we should have little need – if any – for e.g. adding single digit numbers. Instead, we would need to add e.g. basic equations.

Our Math team started with the "Power Goal Model" described above by Michelle. Like Michelle and her team, we began to see – well – the power of the Power Goal Model. And thought, how might we do it routinely – not just once in a while? This thinking gave birth to what we call "The (Math) Workshop Model."

In the Industrial Age Model of schools, the six of us were called "Math teachers;" two Grade 6 Math, two Grade 7 Math, two Grade 8 Math. We realized early on that in our previously called "department meetings," we were all complaining about the same things. Our students still did not know how to _____ (fill in the blank with any Math term or phrase). Each of us was trying to teach our grade specific curriculum realizing that the knowledge of our students spanned from what might be considered elementary math all the way to high school math. Sure, we tried to meet the needs of students outside of the grade level curriculum – with limited success . . . because . . . well, we weren't 'sharing the load.' We all were trying to address EVERYTHING with all of our students.

We heard about the "Power Goal Model" at Michelle's Learning Community. We visited. It was the turning point for the six of us. We were no longer a group of Math teachers in department meetings characterized by reactive problem solving and lamenting if only students . . . if only parents . . . if only the district . . . You get the picture! We became a team of Learning Facilitators engaged in proactive, collaborative problem solving. The operative word here is "collaborative." We saw the power in sharing the load.

We approached our principal, Jane Spencer, with our idea. She, as always, has supported and fostered the entrepreneurial thinking of teachers. Jane and we realize that creating a mass customized learning community is an "inside job." We do not want to wait until someone else (Bill Gates?) does it to us.

Our proposal was to schedule Math during the same two periods every day for all six of us. This was a bit of a challenge, but Jane, with some of our input, pulled it off. So, essentially, all learners had Math at generally the same time. Once we got started, however, occasionally some learners left a Math period or two to go to a Related Arts class (music, performing arts, visual arts). We realized that if we were mass producing learning, teaching in batches, then learners leaving would be a huge disruption. Instead, as we were mass customizing learning, learners occasionally leaving for other learning needs was not a problem. The learner (and we) just picked up where the learner left off.

The grouping and regrouping of learners is the same as in the Power Goal Model. We just do it all the time. At first, it was a bit overwhelming to figure out who goes where and how to keep track of each learner. Two things helped along the way. The first was that we all became "Learning Coaches" for 12 – 15 learners in our middle school. All professional staff were included, that is the principal, the speech therapist, the visual arts teachers, etc. So, we were able to keep these coaching groups to 12 or so learners. We put two coaching periods into the weekly schedule. As the Learning Coach, I monitor the "Customized Learning Plan (CLP)" for my 12. So, I was active in ensuring that my 12 were working appropriate Math goals. The learners were active as well depending on their self-directedness. Surprising, but gratifying to us was that this structure developed self-directedness in the learners. What a great by-product of creating a mass customized learning structure and culture!

The second thing that helped our grouping and regrouping was the adoption of our ePortfolio electronic tracking system. With a couple of quick clicks we can identify those learners who need a specific learner outcome and who also have the prerequisite learnings that help to ensure a successful learning experience. The learners and their parents have access to ePortfolio and can easily see the learner's progress in their Customized Learning Plan. We considered instituting a merit badge system as Michelle's team did. However, we realized the ePortfolio did just that.

THE SEMINAR MODEL (Jordan's Story)

I am Jordan, one of the Learning Facilitators on "Team Five." We work with learners ages 8-10. Previously, we would have been known as teachers for grades 3, 4, and 5. We are a strong collaborative team. Always have been. Although we had always worked in "silos," focusing on our grade level curriculum, we often collaborated on school-wide units or topics throughout the year. You might describe it as parallel play with an occasional coming together in one sandbox.

We were happy and comfortable in this culture of "doing school," until . . . Until what? It is a bit hard to think back to what changed for us. It really was the coming together of a number of insights. Best described as the "perfect storm." Any one of these things, on its own, would not have motivated (pushed?) us to think differently. But together they caused significant tension and disequilibrium. We finally accepted and faced the following realities:

➢ *More and more learners were not meeting with success.*
➢ *No longer could we rationalize failure, as "That's just the way it is. Some are smart and some are not."*
➢ *Bless our hearts . . . we have tried to meet the individual needs of kids, but it is ~~nearly~~ impossible to do it alone.*
➢ *MCL is the vision we have always had and wanted. MCL brings hope.*

And so . . . our "Team Five" rolled up our sleeves to significantly change how we delivered the learning. We began by reading three books:

> *Inevitable: Mass Customized Learning (Schwahn & McGarvey)*
> *Mindset (Dweck)*
> *The One World Schoolhouse (Kahn)*

We were motivated by the video of Chapter 7 in Inevitable and thought, "How could we do that for little guys?" Thus began our creating "The Seminar Model."

As with most Learning Facilitators, we are overwhelmed with the number of standards and benchmarks expected of learners. There are way too many. We hope, but are not confident, that folks at the national level will get real! Fortunately, curriculum leaders in a number of districts, including ours, have partnered to get clarity around what learners need to know, do, and be like. This knowledge is organized for us into three categories of learner outcomes: content knowledge, reasoning processes, and life-long habits of mind.

To begin, we reviewed and studied these three categories of learner outcomes for this <u>age span</u> (not grade level). The district work, which mapped out the progression, pathways, or sequence of the learner outcomes, was very helpful. We identified outcomes our learners have mastered, outcomes they need, and outcomes that might be linked with, or be complementary to, other learner outcomes . . . and through this process, discussion, and debate, we reached consensus as to which learner outcomes to cluster. The clusters were a mix of affective and cognitive outcomes: content outcomes, reasoning outcomes, and habits of mind outcomes.

These clusters became the basis for integrated seminars. We were already very adept at creating integrated units of study. So, creating seminars was an easy step for us. We decided the seminars should be no more than 3 weeks or 8-10 class periods. This may change as we become more experienced. Some seminars may be shorter, others longer. We shall see.

Our next step was to create cool titles for the seminars. We wanted titles that would catch learner interest and signal that "school" is going to look different. Examples include:

> *Apps for Kids: Making Steve Jobs Proud*
> *I'm a Poet and I Know It!*
> *A Kid's Life in the U.S.*
> *Science IS Everywhere!*

Around the World in 18 Days
Writing for Stephen-King-Wannabees
Customs & Cultures: Mine & Yours
Point of View: Looking at it Both Ways

With seminars we incorporated rather serendipitously something that we discovered was a magical ingredient to learner engagement: CHOICE. We gave them options based on their interests. They had to take some seminars over the course of their three years with us. Others were options. They loved it. When we first started offering seminars, we did it just once – to see how it would go. A few weeks after that initial two-week seminar, I announced to my class that we were going to do another round of seminars. They applauded! Let me say that again. They applauded!!! Seminars are now the rule, not the exception.

Let me say a word about how instruction works within the seminar. Please realize this is a work in progress. We come together as Team Five and identify what is working and what needs tweaking. The following are on our "Tweaking" list:

- o *We are now identifying prerequisite knowledge that learners must have mastered to "enroll" in the seminar.*
- o *We are identifying online resources for the simpler, foundational outcomes for a specific seminar.*
- o *We are wrapping each seminar around a complex reasoning process that we are directly teaching.*
- o *We are asking learners for seminars they would like to have created.*

In summary, here's what's happening: Learners are working on outcomes they need with content that is interesting to them. Learning Facilitators are sharing the load to make this happen. The result: Learners are engaged in learning activities. Learners are meeting with success on the learner outcomes. A win-win for everyone.

THE COMBINATION MODEL (Jane's Story)

I am Jane Spencer, principal of the middle level Learning Community with learners ages 11-13. Brad told you his story of creating the "Workshop Model" for mass customizing learning. Although we are in different buildings, Brad and I meet regularly with Jordan and Michelle. We are on a district level MCL team. We share a commitment to this compelling vision. We have celebrated the successes of each implementation model. And, we have problem solved together the challenges faced in each implementation model. The power of group problem solving is quite amazing! These sessions have brought us to our next goal, which is to combine the Workshop Model and the Seminar Model.

Our preliminary plans are to expand the Workshop Model to include an hour in the morning on Math Workshop, an hour on ELA Workshop, and an hour on Complex Thinking Workshop - with Learning Facilitators grouping and regrouping learners as described above and with Learning Facilitators sharing the load. These would focus on the foundational learner outcomes for these areas.

The afternoon would be for seminars for application of those morning workshop foundational learner outcomes integrated with more complex learner outcomes in Science, Social Studies, Visual and Performing Arts, etc. This is all a work in progress. We reflect and adjust often.

We began this work without technology. We kept track with notebooks and file folders on each learner. Cumbersome, exhausting, but it worked. We created our own spreadsheets and databases to keep and sort data to group and regroup learners. It was primitive, tiptoeing, and perhaps tinkering. But it was a start. We were determined to meet the individual learning needs of our kids.

We knew the technology was within reach . . . and so it has come to us. Today's customizing technology has helped us leap into customizing learning. Our ePortfolio system has what I call the "Amazon magic." I am not sure <u>how</u> Amazon customizes for clients. To me, it is magical. Finally, we are seeing that magic in our infrastructure technology. Our ePortfolio, with its magical algorithms, knows the style of the learner, the interest of the learner, and the learning needs of the learner. That data allows us to create Customized Learning Plans for each learner. From that we design the lessons and learning experiences in our workshop and seminar models. And, now we are adding one-to-one devices. MCL is becoming a reality!

GUIDELINE # 3: LEARNERS INVESTED IN THEIR LEARNING

The third guideline for the Elementary/Middle School MCL Vision is less tangible. It is about the culture within the classroom. MCL fosters a culture of learning, continuous improvement, and engagement. MCL triggers natural, intrinsic motivation. This is probably the biggest hurdle for some. Many of the "ya' . . . buts" that we encounter are based in old-fashioned understandings of motivation. Many still think students don't like to learn and don't want to learn. And so, we must manipulate them to learn using rewards and punishments.

Designing a learning community in which each learner is learning within his style of learning, at level and pace of learning, with content of high interest IS what creates learner motivation and engagement. "Learners invested in their learning" is the *byproduct* of a MCL learning community.

What we do and how we do it characterizes our culture. Key questions to ask OFTEN are:

- *Is what we are doing about learning and support or about control and compliance?*
- *Is what we are doing about learning or doing school?*
- *Is what we are doing about engagement or manipulation?*

The words and actions of learners will answer those questions.

- *Do mistakes fuel their effort/persistence or derail/embarrass them?*
- *Do they embrace or avoid challenges?*
- *Do they welcome or dismiss constructive criticism?*

Listen to their words.

A Little Story (bmcg) If I am asked to work with a Learning Community for multiple days, I ask that everyone read Carol Dweck's book, Mindset. It gives us a common understanding and common vocabulary about, as her subtitle says, the psychology of success. It provides the foundation for understanding that we in schools control the conditions for success . . . and for how a learner views his potential for success. We have the ability to create a culture of "I <u>can</u> get better!" (Growth Mindset); or, a culture of "I either have it or I don't." (Fixed Mindset).

With a fixed and growth mindset filter, look at what we say and do in schools. Everything we do is well intended, but in not so subtle ways, we are giving learners messages that they either have it or they don't. How about "Intervention Period?" What's the message? "You go to intervention period, I do not." Instead, let's have a "Power Goal Period" in which everyone has a goal they are working on. Changing one word sends a powerful message.

Let me tell a little story here. I may be a bit sketchy on the details of the story, but the punch line said by this 6-year old is accurate.

Three Learning Facilitators, one each in K-2, teamed to group and regroup learners around specific learning goals – not ability/tracking. Learning goals were identified on a progression rather than identified as specific goals for Kindergarten, for Grade 1 or Grade 2. They are just goals for learning. Learners were grouped across age levels depending on the learning goal they needed.

One little guy was told he would work down the hall with another Learning Facilitator starting the following day.   His home-based Learning Facilitator was a bit worried because he had already been with a number of Learning Facilitators. Now, he was to face a new one. He got off the bus the next day crying. He cried at recess. He cried at lunchtime. Her worry confirmed, his Learning Facilitator asked if he was crying all morning because he was "going to Second Grade?" His response, "What's Second Grade?" She knew once she said "Second Grade" that she was back in the Industrial Age vocabulary of school. Easy to do for even the most avid MCL advocate! And . . . his answer: priceless! By the way, the crying was logical: a forgotten snack, a skinned knee, and spilled milk.

<u>We</u> create the conditions for success. The problem is the structure. We are reminded of the words of W. Edwards Deming, the Total Quality Management (TQM) guru:

   "Well over 90% of the problem in organizations lies with the structures, not with the people."

The Industrial Age structures, processes, and procedures prevent us from meeting the individual needs of our learners. Period.

We trust that we have given you enough of the content of *Inevitable* that the remainder of *inevitable Too! The Total Leader Embraces the Inevitable* will be easy to follow. But we are just paranoid enough to close with a listing of three critical aspects of Mass Customized Learning.

YOU'RE NOT DOING MCL UNLESS . . .

What differentiates Mass Customized Learning from other change efforts? When will you know that you are indeed customizing learning to each learner every hour of every day? You're not doing MCL unless:

1. ***No Assembly Line Allowed.*** If your system has not replaced the bureaucratic, Industrial Age assembly line, YOU ARE NOT DOING MASS CUSTOMIZED LEARNING. At best you are merely tinkering! That outdated structure is what causes school systems to be time based rather than learning based. That assembly line structure stops teachers and school systems from applying the most basic and powerful research regarding learners and learning and teachers and teaching.

2. ***Total Learner Focus.*** If the learner is not at the center of all-important decisions, you are not doing Mass Customized Learning. A total learner focus means:

   - We must begin our planning with an understanding of "who is the learner walking through our doors." What has been their experiences, how have they learned to this point, what is their life like outside of school?
   - We must ask ourselves what the world will be like that our learners will face when they leave/graduate from our system. What will be their opportunities, what will be their challenges and, therefore, what must they know, be able to do, and "be like," to succeed in that world.
   - When we have identified learner outcomes to the best of our knowledge and ability, we then must ask about each outcome, "how is this learner outcome best learned."
   - And finally, we must apply today's technologies to restructure our learning communities making it possible to meet the needs of every learner every hour of every day.

3. ***Natural Intrinsic Motivators.*** If learning is natural, what motivates us to be learners? Today's schools, to a large degree, focus on extrinsic rewards, basically in the form of rewards and punishments. When the rewards and punishments are removed, the behaviors caused by these motivators tend to cease. MCL focuses on four known and powerful intrinsic motivators. Learners are motivated to learn:

   a. When the learning is at the optimal level of challenge, not so difficult that it discourages, and not so easy that it's boring,
   b. When they are allowed to learn in a learning style that works for them, for some that would be through listening or reading, for others it might be seeing or doing,
   c. When the content through which they are learning is interesting to them, and,
   d. When they find relevance and meaning in what they are learning.

If you find this description of the MCL Vision to be of high interest and you would like to learn more, we recommend that you read *Inevitable: Mass Customized Learning*.

REFLECTION: ASSESS AND PLAN

The following self-assessment rubrics (Figures 2.5 – 2.8) might help you to reflect on your knowledge and skills related to *The Mass Customized Learning Vision* and to focus your professional development.

REFLECTION QUESTION 1 (MASS CUSTOMIZED LEARNING)

I. SELF ASSESS *(How am I doing?)*	*What is the degree to which I understand why Mass Customized Learning is inevitable?*

4 INNOVATING	*I can lead discussions on why and how the Mass Customized Learning Vision is compelling, needed, and doable.*
3 APPLYING	*I can explain how customizing technologies will make and are making it possible to customized learning for learners.*
2 DEVELOPING	*I can explain why and how learners needs (how they think and act) have changed.* *I can explain why and how the Industrial Age structure is outdated, used to make sense, but doesn't any more.*
1 BEGINNING	

II. PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT *(What do I need to do?)*	III. SUPPORT RESOURCES *(Where can I get help?)*
What are strategies that I will do to improve my understanding why Mass Customized Learning is inevitable?	*What and/or who are resources that will help me to get better at my understanding why Mass Customized Learning is inevitable.*

Figure 2.5

REFLECTION QUESTION 2 (MASS CUSTOMIZED LEARNING)

I. SELF ASSESS *(How am I doing?)*	What is the degree to which I understand the Mass Customized Learning Vision?
4 INNOVATING	*I can help others understand the Mass Customized Learning Vision.*
3 APPLYING	*I can explain how Mass Customized Learning is about transformation not tinkering.*
2 DEVELOPING	*I can define what "Mass Customized Learning" means.* *I can explain why having a vision is important.*
1 BEGINNING	

II. PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT *(What do I need to do?)*	III. SUPPORT RESOURCES *(Where can I get help?)*
What are strategies that I will do to improve my understanding of the Mass Customized Learning Vision?	*What and/or who are resources that will help me to get better at understanding the Mass Customized*

	Learning Vision?

Figure 2.6

REFLECTION QUESTION 3 (MASS CUSTOMIZED LEARNING)

I. SELF ASSESS *(How am I doing?)*	What is the degree to which I understand Mass Customized Learning at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels?
4 INNOVATING	*I can lead others in understanding Mass Customized Learning at the elementary, middle, or secondary levels.*
3 APPLYING	*I have implemented MCL structures and practices at the elementary, middle, or secondary levels.*
2 DEVELOPING	*I can identify starter steps in creating MCL structures and practices at the elementary, middle, or secondary levels.*
1 BEGINNING	*I can create a general picture of what Mass Customized Learning might look like at elementary, middle, or secondary levels.*

II. PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT *(What do I need to do?)*	III. SUPPORT RESOURCES *(Where can I get help?)*
What are strategies that I will do to improve my understanding of Mass Customized Learning at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels?	*What and/or who are resources that will help me improve my understanding of Mass Customized Learning at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels?*

Figure 2.7

REFLECTION QUESTION 4 (MASS CUSTOMIZED LEARNING)

I. SELF ASSESS *(How am I doing?)*	What is the degree to which I understand how Mass Customized Learning is different from other change efforts?
4 INNOVATING	*I can lead others in understanding the "You're Not Doing MCL" characteristics.*

Used with permission within the Maine Cohort for Customized Learning

3 APPLYING	*I have implemented MCL structures and practices that reflect the "You're Not Doing MCL" characteristics.*
2 DEVELOPING	*I can explain the "You're Not Doing MCL" characteristics: no assembly line; total learner focus; intrinsic motivators.*
1 BEGINNING	*I am unsure of the difference between Mass Customized Learning and previous or current change efforts.*

II. PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT *(What do I need to do?)*	III. SUPPORT RESOURCES *(Where can I get help?)*
What are strategies that I will do to improve my understanding how Mass Customized Learning is different from other change efforts?	*What and/or who are resources that will help me improve my understanding how Mass Customized Learning is different from other change efforts?*

Figure 2.8