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Executive Summary

The Department of Education and Training, Victoria launched the Developmental Learning Framework for School Leaders (DLF) in March 2007 as a central component of the 2003 Blueprint for Government Schools (DET, 2003). Six years later, a decision was made to review the DLF and seek advice on the extent to which it may need revision or redevelopment.

Since that time, the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) has developed the National Professional Standard for Principals (2011). Also, the Department of Education has published a position paper, Toward Victorian as a Learning Community (2012), providing schools with greater autonomy and heightened expectations for accountability. In addition, research on effective school leadership has continued apace providing further reason to review the Framework.

In June 2013, the Bastow Institute of Educational Leadership commissioned the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) to conduct an independent review of Framework for School Leaders (DLF). The brief was to conduct a critical assessment of the content, design, and usability of the Developmental Leadership Framework and make recommendations to the Director of the Bastow Institute of Educational Leadership, on the capacity of the Leadership Framework to adequately support professional learning and certification into the future.

In making its recommendations, ACER drew on two main sources of evidence:

A. Principal’s experience with the current DLF and the iLead 360 degree instrument using an online survey and focus group meetings.
B. A review of the content and design of a selection of highly respected and research-based sets of leadership standards in comparison with the DLF.

A. Principals’ perceptions of the DLF

Survey findings

Respondents (415 school leaders) indicated that the Framework has been widely used, although there was an indication that the rate of usage was decreasing. Most school leaders rated it as clear and useful or very useful in supporting professional learning, principal performance and development processes, principal selection processes, and self-analysis and reflection and school leaders.

Of the 263 respondents who reported using the iLead 360 degree survey in the last two years:

- Very few had used the survey more than once or twice in the last two years for any purpose; the survey was rarely used to support principal selection processes.
- Of those respondents who had used the survey for particular purposes, the majority described it as useful or very useful, and easy to use or very easy to use.
- However, more respondents described the survey as of limited use and difficult to use for principal selection processes.

Focus group findings

Attitudes emerging from the focus group meetings generally reflected the positive findings about the DLF reported in the survey. The DLF was useful because it provided a consistent approach to discussing leadership, or a common language, so that discussions on leadership were more productive.
The DLF creates a common language of leadership and develops an understanding of dimensions and development of leadership practice. It also enables goal setting because it gives you the next developmental step.

Having a model across the system means we are all talking the same language and system professional development becomes possible, efficient and effective. It also means when applying for jobs in any school there is a consistent framework to reference.

They provide a consistent framework across the system. It is useful when meeting with colleagues as you all talk the same language.

However, the focus group discussions did identify some concerns about the effects of the DLF on innovation and creativity, and the difficulties in using the DLF to assess performance. Hard won familiarity was an important factor influencing attitudes. Initially, coming to grips with the DLF and its domains had been a major hurdle for many. Several mentioned that at first the DLF was difficult to decipher, the language was not user-friendly, however, now that they had invested time and effort in coming to grips with it they were not in a hurry to change once again to something new, if it presented a similar prospect.

While the general attitude was that the DLF had made a valuable contribution, the focus groups discussions allowed for some concerns to be identified, particularly about its design and its suitability for assessment purposes, including self-assessment. The first was a concern that the DLF acted more as a straightjacket than a scaffold within which they could write freely about their achievements in relation to the Domains.

The second concern was related to the first. While the DLF contains domains and levels of performance, it does not indicate how to provide evidence of performance in relation to the Domains. A complete set of standards needs not only to describe what is to be assessed but how it is to be assessed. Several participants stated that selection panels, for example, often had insufficient or unsuitable evidence about performance on which to discriminate between applications for principal positions. There was sameness to applications that made it difficult to tell them apart.

**Literature review**

**Content of the DLF**

The literature review revealed that there were only a few differences between the content of the DLF and three of the most highly regarded research-based sets of standards for school leaders, except that the latter give greater emphasis to practices that promote an accountable professional community with shared educational values, a focus on student learning, collaboration, reflective dialogue and deprivatisation of practice (Louis et al., 2010)

A common feature of recent leadership frameworks is the extent to which they now ground their claims, not so much in personal characteristics or capabilities of leaders, as in the DLF, as important as some of these are, but in research-based leadership practices that enable high quality opportunities for student well-being and learning. As Robinson et al., (2008) note in their review of research on the relative impact of different leadership types,

... in general, abstract leadership theories provide poor guides to the specific leadership practices that have greater impact on student outcomes. (p. 658)
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**Design of the DLF**

However, an analysis of the current design of the DLF in comparison with international best practice revealed major limitations. It needs a clearer guiding vision of educational leadership that links to student outcomes. The titles of the Domains need to give a simpler and clearer idea of their respective contents. An introductory research-based rationale is needed for each domain. The domains need to give a clearer idea of the component practices involved in meeting the standard. The current capabilities should be replaced by more specific practices, without being prescriptive.

The DLF needs to better reflect the dynamic nature of leadership practice in schools in the structure and sequence of the domains, and in the relevant component practices for each domain. The profiles or levels of performance are a valuable aspect of the DLF, foreshadowing rubrics that might be applied to assessing evidence about performance. However, they would have been more useful if the kinds of evidence about performance to which they might be applied had been developed.

**Recommendations**

It is evident that the DLF has served its purposes well since 2007. However, it is also evident that there are good reasons to consider developing a new standards framework, or adopting a framework such as the Australian Professional Standard for Principals (APSP) as a basis for developing a more detailed set of standards.

It is recommended that DEECD move toward adopting the National Professional Standard for Principals as a framework for school leaders in Victoria. Like the DLF, the NPSP has five domains. Though the titles are different, the content will be familiar to Victorian school leaders. The APSP domain titles communicate the nature of each domain’s content more clearly.

While recommending adoption of the APSP, it is recognised that its leadership requirements and practices will need more elaboration and development before they can form an adequate basis defining the content standards for purposes such as professional learning, or certification. The Ontario Leadership Framework provides an example of a set of standards that is at a stage where it can be used to develop assessment methods and performance standards for certification purposes.

The Principals Australia Institute is currently exploring the concept of a national professional certification system for principals, based on the APSP framework. If this idea proceeds, one of the first steps will be to develop the APSP content standards to a level where they are detailed enough to be useful in designing assessment methods and in setting standards. Collaboration with and support for this endeavour would enhance DEECD’s ability to build an effective standards-based professional learning and recognitions system for its school leaders.
Introduction

The Bastow Institute of Educational Leadership commissioned the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) to conduct an independent review of the DEECD Developmental Learning Framework for School Leaders (DLF). The DLF was developed in 2007 as a critical element of the then Office of School Education’s Learning to Lead Effective Schools strategy. Six years later, it was believed the time had come to review the DLF and seek advice on the extent to which it may need revision or redevelopment.

Since that time, the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) has developed the National Professional Standard for Principals (2011). Also, the Department of Education has published a position paper, Toward Victorian as a Learning Community (2012), providing schools with greater autonomy and heightened expectations for accountability. In addition, research on effective school leadership has continued apace providing further reason to review the Framework.

The terms of reference for the ACER review were to conduct a critical assessment of the content, design, and usability of the Developmental Leadership Framework and make recommendations to the Director of the Bastow Institute of Educational Leadership, on the capacity of the Leadership Framework to adequately support professional learning and certification into the future.

In conducting the review, ACER drew on two main sources of evidence:

A. Principals’ experience with the current DLF and the ILead 360 degree instrument using an online survey and focus group meetings.
B. A review of recent leadership research and the content and design of a selection of highly respected and research-based sets of leadership standards

Terms of reference for the DLF review

Stage 1 – Review of the current DEECD Leadership Framework

Purpose

The review will include a critical assessment of the content, design, and usability of the Leadership Framework and make recommendations to the Director, Bastow, on the capacity of the Leadership Framework to adequately support professional learning and certification into the future.

In making its recommendations, the review should consider the following issues:

1. The content of the Leadership Framework including:
   a) Whether the Leadership Framework reflects the latest research and evidence about what school leaders need to know, do and understand
   b) The degree to which the Leadership Framework adequately emphasises both leadership and management
   c) The degree to which the Leadership Framework addresses the leadership and management practices listed in paragraph k;
d) The extent to which the Leadership Framework adequately balances system need and reform imperatives with the professional learning needs of individuals and the school and its community

e) The extent to which the Leadership Framework is written in plain language and is jargon-free

2. The design of the Leadership Framework including:

a) The main elements of the Leadership Framework – domains, capabilities, and profiles – and whether this structure reflects best practice

b) Whether the profiles are an effective means of illustrating increasing proficiency in each leadership domain

c) The degree to which the Leadership Framework is a ‘smart tool’ that is easy to use and supports, for example:
   • Performance and development reviews
   • Principal selection
   • Coaching and mentoring

d) An assessment of the Leadership Framework to determine if it is an effective tool for supporting professional learning and certification.

Stage 2 - Process for Developing a New Framework

The Department is seeking advice on a course of action for developing a new framework, or standards, for school leadership. In providing this advice the following issues need to be considered:

a) Close alignment with AITSL’s Professional Standard for Principals, that is, using at a minimum the five areas of leadership identified in the Standard as the framework’s organising construct.

b) Must be developed to serve the following purposes:
   • support professional learning and provide scope for professional certification (if the Department takes the latter course of action in the future);
   • support principal performance and development processes;
   • support principal selection processes; and
   • support self analysis and reflection.

c) The specific knowledge, skills and practices necessary for principals to develop in order to implement initiatives under New Directions for School Leadership and the Teaching Profession and Towards Victoria as a Learning Community. These include but are not limited to the:
   • core management practices of school principals
   • practices needed to establish, maintain and work within school networks
   • practices required to implement robust peer observation and feedback models
• practices that enable risk identification and management
• practices necessary to create and sustain robust approaches to teacher performance management and development

d) How a new framework/standards would be developed including:
   (1) the development of content standards;
   (2) methods of assessing performance against the standards (i.e. how valid evidence about practice (leadership) will be gathered); and
   (3) assessing evidence and setting performance standards.

e) A process for developing a new framework/standards including timeframes.
The Developmental Learning Framework for School Leaders

The Developmental Learning Framework (DLF) for School Leaders was launched in March 2007 by the Department of Education and Training, Victoria, as a central component of the 2003 Blueprint for Government Schools (DET, 2003). In essence, the DLF is a leadership standards framework, and will be regarded as such in this review. As stated in the introduction, the DLF has been developed in recognition of the need to be explicit about the leadership capabilities that teachers and school leaders require to create and sustain effective learning environments. Importantly, it identifies the developmental pathways that will enable teachers and school leaders to set directions for their professional learning. (p. 1)

The Blueprint defined a comprehensive reform agenda for the Victorian school education system. The content of the Blueprint was guided by what was described as the Effective Schools Model (Fraser & Petch, undated). Based on research, the Model identified eight factors that correlated with improved student learning outcomes, of which Professional Leadership was one. A key proposition in the Office of School Education’s approach to school improvement was that

If we develop the capacity of leaders to create the organisational conditions that support high quality instructional practice, then student performance will improve over time (page 6).

It was necessary, therefore, to identify a model or framework that described the knowledge, skills and behaviours required to lead schools effectively. Such a model would aim to:

- guide programs for preparing future school leaders
- support principal performance and development processes, and
- support principal selection processes assist school leaders to:

In addition, the Framework would help individual school leaders to:

- Reflect on their leadership practice.
- Identify strengths
- Identify areas for improvement
- Choose appropriate professional learning activities.

To meet these requirements the Office of School Education selected Sergiovanni’s model of ‘transformational leadership’ (Sergiovanni, 1984) for its accessibility and simplicity. The Sergiovanni model describes five domains of leadership that aim to capture the essential work of school leaders, as shown in Figure 1. It was designed to inform all leadership and professional learning policies and programs, including Principal selection and Principal performance and development processes.
Key features of the DLF

The design of the DLF includes three main components: Leadership Domains, Leadership Capabilities, and Leadership Profiles. Domains represent major areas of leadership practice. Figure 1 shows that the content of each domain is described in terms of a set of three capabilities or indicators. “Capability” refers both to ability to do something and readiness for moving to higher levels of proficiency. They include the broad skills, knowledge and dispositions required for effective leadership performance. The DLF capabilities are generic in the sense that they apply to all leaders within schools, regardless of their role or position. No further elaboration of the capabilities for each domain is provided, although the profiles help to indicate their meaning.

Profiles form the final component of the DLF. They are used to describe levels of performance or expertise within each domain. They aim to help teachers and school leaders to ‘locate’ themselves in relation to their practice and development. To assist them in this process, they can access a customised 360-degree questionnaire called ILead.

Figure 2 provide an example of the way the Domains, Capabilities and Profiles for the Technical Leadership domain are presented. There are five levels of performance in Technical Leadership domain. All domains have five levels of performance, except Symbolic Leadership, which has four.
The DLF points out that each profile:

- Allows for multiple levels of performance to be identified along developmental criteria;
- Defines a series of levels that are hierarchical and sequential;
- Is underpinned by theories of learning;
- Represents a scale in which lower levels are generally precursors to higher levels; and
- Depends on the development and use of quality criteria that are expressed in the form of ordered, transparent descriptions of quality performance.
Principals’ perceptions of the current DLF

Principals’ perceptions of the DLF were gathered by means of an on-line survey and three focus group meetings. The on-line survey was administered in July 2013 and the focus groups meetings were held in August 2013. A copy of the survey instrument is provided in Attachment 1.

DLF Survey

Four hundred and fifteen school leaders completed the DLF online survey during June 2013, a response rate of about 50%. (A detailed report based on the survey is available on request.) The majority of respondents were employed at a primary school ($n = 280, 68.3\%$) and most were principals ($n = 288, 70.4\%$) or assistant principals ($n = 95, 23.2\%$). Approximately two thirds of respondents were female ($n = 271, 65.9\%$), and the majority were more than 50 years old ($n = 260, 64.2\%$). Most respondents were very experienced teachers with 20.8% having 16–25 years experience, 45.2% between 26–35 years experience and 24.4% more than 35 years teaching experience. There were similar proportions of respondents from each region (North Western 23.4%, North Eastern 21.3%, South Western 27.1%, South Eastern 28.3%).

Findings

Principals were asked to rate the DLF in five categories.

- Useage
- Utility
- Clarity
- Validity
- Professional Development and Levels of Performance

For the 391 respondents who reported using the DLF in the last two years:

- The majority reported using the DLF several times or more in the last two years.
- The majority reported that the DLF was useful or very useful in supporting professional learning, principal performance and development processes, principal selection processes, and self-analysis and reflection.
- The majority reported that the DLF was easy to use or very easy to use for professional learning, principal performance and development processes, principal selection processes, and self-analysis and reflection.
- The majority of respondents believed that the different aspects of the DLF were clear (i.e, language, capabilities, profiles, developmental pathways).
- Respondents were less positive about the extent to which the DLF addressed leadership and management practices.
- The majority of respondents were positive about the validity of the DLF.
- For most items, the pattern of responses was very similar for respondents with different demographic characteristics.

Of the 263 respondents who reported using the iLead 360 degree survey in the last two years:

- Very few had used the survey more than once or twice in the last two years for any purpose; the survey was rarely used to support principal selection processes.
- Of those respondents who had used the survey for particular purposes, the majority described it as useful or very useful, and easy to use or very easy to use.
• More respondents described the survey as of limited use and difficult to use for principal selection processes.
• For most items, the pattern of responses was very similar for respondents with different demographic characteristics.

**Useful Aspects of the Developmental Leadership Framework**

Two hundred and seventy-nine survey respondents (71.4% of those who had used the DLF) provided an additional comment on the useful aspects of the DLF. Respondents often mentioned more than one useful aspect of the DLF; thus, the main themes identified are not mutually exclusive. The most frequently identified useful aspects described by respondents noted that the DLF:

• supported self reflection and provided guidance on development
• provided an account of leadership as multi-dimensional and gave a clear description of domains
• included developmental continua within domains
• provided a consistent approach or a common language to allow discussion of leadership
• provides support for aspects of role (principal selection processes, peer assessment, performance planning, and role clarity)

More than one-half of respondents (57.3%) indicated that the DLF supported their self-reflection, and through identifying strengths and weaknesses in different domains enabled them to plan their professional development needs.

*The DLF gives a framework that the Principal and leadership staff can use to evaluate and reflect upon their performance and identify areas where there is a need for further or continued development and improvement.*

*The DLF provides a systematic and complete view of the different aspects of leadership that should be developed. It assists with self monitoring & goal setting and self reflection without being restrictive and constricting in its framework.*

*The key skills outlined in each aspect of the framework in developmental order help to identify where to go next and what needs to be developed further. It is an ideal tool for self-reflection and for assisting emerging leaders with their development.*

Approximately one third of respondents (29.0%) described the usefulness of the domains of leadership embedded in the DLF. In some cases, the comment reflected the helpfulness of the overall structure of the DLF in supporting professional development.

*Identifying the domains of leadership... Being able to break it down in to the five domains clearly demonstrates that leadership is multifaceted. It describes areas you are able to work on and the developmental continuum of the domains shows you clearly what you need to work on next.*

In other instances, respondents described a specific domain that they had found particularly useful.

*For me, the Technical (Leadership) domain – coming from a classroom into an AP role, you have little idea about the technical side of things until you are in the role. I was fortunate enough to have quality leaders around me who I went to for assistance and advice to help grasp the skills required.*

Approximately 20% of respondents mentioned the developmental continua (the profiles) within the leadership domains of the DLF as useful.
To have access to and knowledge of the leadership domains necessary for school leaders has been most beneficial. The profiles and capabilities have also been a huge support when determining the level of skill attained in each domain.

More than 10% of respondents (13.6%) mentioned that the DLF was useful because it provided a consistent approach to discussing leadership, or a common language, so that discussions on leadership were more productive.

Creates a common language of leadership and develops an understanding of dimensions and development of leadership practice. It also enables goal setting because it gives you the next developmental step.

Having a model across the system means we are all talking the same language and system professional development becomes possible, efficient and effective. It also means when applying for jobs in any school there is a consistent framework to reference.

They provide a consistent framework across the system. It is useful when meeting with colleagues as you all talk the same language.

Approximately one quarter of respondents (24.0%) mentioned one or more aspects of their role for which the DLF provided useful support. These included support for principal selection processes, support for assessment of leadership by peers, support when undertaking performance planning, and providing clarification of leadership roles.

Extent to which the DLF Addresses Leadership and Management Practices

In most areas, a majority of respondents believed that the DLF addressed five leadership and management practices listed in Table 1, at least to a moderate extent. Approximately one third of respondents believed that the DLF addressed practices needed to establish, maintain and work within school networks, practices required to implement robust peer observation and feedback models, and practices necessary to create and sustain robust approaches to teacher performance management and development to a minor extent or not at all. A higher percentage of respondents believed that the DLF addressed practices that enable risk identification and management to a minor extent (43.0%) or not at all (11.5%).

Table 1: Percentage Ratings of the Extent to which the DLF Addresses Leadership and Management Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent does the Leadership Framework address the following leadership and management practices:</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a minor extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a major extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. core management practices of school principals</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. practices needed to establish, maintain and work within school networks</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. practices required to implement robust peer observation and feedback models</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. practices that enable risk identification and management</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. practices necessary to create and sustain robust approaches to teacher performance management and development</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Validity

More than 80% of respondents believed to a moderate or a major extent that the domains and capabilities in the Leadership Framework matched their understanding and experience of what effective school leaders know and do, and believed that the capabilities were valid as a representation of the latest research and evidence about what effective school leaders know and do (Table 2). More than 70% of respondents also believed to a moderate or a major extent that the Profiles provided a valid basis to make judgments about the level of a school leader’s performance, and believed that the DLF identified the leadership capabilities that will drive improvements in teaching and learning. Fewer respondents believed that the DLF identified the capabilities that drive innovation, with 33.2% indicating that the DLF did so to a minor extent and 5.9% suggesting it did so not at all.

Table 2. Percentage Ratings of the Validity of the DLF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent:</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a minor extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a major extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. do the domains and capabilities in the Leadership Framework match your understanding and experience of what effective school leaders know and do?</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. are the capabilities valid as a representation of the latest research and evidence about what effective school leaders know and do?</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. do the Profiles provide a valid basis to make judgments about the level of a school leader’s performance?</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. does the DLF identify the leadership capabilities that will drive improvements in teaching and learning?</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. does the DLF identify the capabilities that drive innovation?</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aspects of the Developmental Leadership Framework that could be improved

Two hundred and forty-two survey respondents (61.9% of those who had used the DLF) provided an additional comment on the useful aspects of the DLF. Respondents often mentioned more than one useful aspect of the DLF; thus, the main themes identified are not mutually exclusive. In general, suggested improvements to the DLF were highly variable, with few suggestions endorsed by more than five respondents. The most frequently identified aspects for desired improvements of the DLF described by respondents included:

- Improving the clarity of the language used in the DLF
- Providing more “real-world” examples of practice
- Improving the presentation format of the DLF
- Developing a more user-friendly version of the iLead survey
- Clarifying the criteria for each level in the DLF

Approximately 10% of respondents believed that no improvements were required for the DLF and many were positive about the current version. A smaller number of respondents (between 4–5%) believed that the DLF could be improved by clarifying the steps between levels of the DLF, by better aligning
levels to appropriate professional learning, and by developing a version of the DLF that was suitable for aspiring leaders and not just for principals.

**Tools and Resources for Supporting Ongoing Development**

Two hundred and twenty two respondents (53.5%) provided suggestions for other tools and resources that would support their ongoing development. There were two main themes in respondents’ suggestions. Respondents sought:

- Ongoing access to high quality, affordable professional learning
- Opportunities to access coaching or mentoring to enhance leadership skills

Approximately 40% of respondents mentioned the desire to access more high quality leadership courses, but many also mentioned that the costs (in time and money) to attend professional learning were sometimes prohibitive. Approximately 20% of respondents sought access to ongoing mentoring and/or coaching, particularly for those who were new to principal roles. A range of other tools and resources were mentioned by smaller numbers of respondents as desirable support for their ongoing development. These included access to the latest research, possibly in the form of professional readings, opportunities for networking and interaction with colleagues, an improved self-reflection tool, and access to more resources (time and money).

**Tools and Resources to Build Leadership Capacity in their School**

Two hundred and twenty six respondents (54.5%) provided suggestions for other tools and resources that would assist them to build leadership capacity in their school. There were two main themes in respondents’ suggestions. Respondents sought:

- Ongoing access to high quality, affordable professional learning
- Opportunities to access coaching or mentoring to enhance leadership skills

A range of other tools and resources were mentioned by smaller numbers of respondents as desirable assistance for building leadership capacity in their schools. These included access to more resources (money and time) to support leadership development activities, access to networking opportunities, access to a clearer leadership framework, an improved 360 degree feedback tool, and opportunities to access leadership development suitable for staff other than those in the principal class.

**Tools and Resources to Assist to Build Leadership Capacity in Networks**

One hundred and seventy-four respondents (41.9%) provided suggestions for other tools and resources that would assist them to build leadership capacity in their network. The two major themes mentioned by respondents as assisting them to build leadership capacity in their network were consistent with those suggested as support for ongoing development and to build leadership capacity in their schools. Respondents sought ongoing access to high quality, affordable professional learning, and they desired opportunities for coaching, mentoring or shadowing of experienced leaders to enhance leadership capacity.

In this section, a higher proportion of respondents mentioned the need to access resources (time and money) to enable them to invest in their network. Some respondents mentioned that their networks were not currently viable; others believed that they required further development to be effective. In order to build leadership capacity in their network, a number of respondents mentioned the need for
further assistance and support from the regions, or access to a Regional Network Leader who could coordinate the activities of the network.

**DLF Focus groups**

Three focus groups meetings with school leaders were held in July 2103 at the Bastow Institute, each lasting 1.5 hours. Each group had about 15 participants, including school leaders from primary and secondary schools and schools from regional Victoria as well as a wide cross-section of schools from the metropolitan area. Prior to the meetings, each participant was sent information about the purposes of the DLF review and a set of questions to be discussed in the focus group meetings. A copy of the questions can be found in Attachment 2.

Attitudes emerging from the focus group meetings generally reflected the positive findings about the DLF reported in the survey findings above.

> If this framework determines how we choose principals then it’s not bad because the principals I know are all right.

> If we need to make a new model then it needs to be better because I don’t think that this framework is flawed.

Familiarity was an important factor influencing attitudes. Initially, coming to grips with the DLF had been a major hurdle for many. Several mentioned that at first the DLF was difficult to decipher, the language was not user-friendly, however, now that they had invested time and effort in coming to grips with it they were not in a hurry to change once again to something new, if it meant having to go through a similar process.

> I like that the framework has been around for a long time; we deal with so many issues at school and the framework gives you time to understand it

> It provides us with a common ground. It’s a framework. Makes recruitment process easier, if there is no framework there is a risk of schools going off

Several mentioned that the language in which the DLF was couched seemed artificial. There was a gulf between the rich and diverse world of school communities and the esoteric language of the leadership domains.

> The DLF seems less user-friendly when you think in terms of learning and challenging your thinking

> Concept of the ILead survey is fantastic. I like that it is online, however the language is not great. Please change the language. The content needs work as well.

A few mentioned university courses they were doing, which

> provided a huge number of examples/articles to read – very up-to-date journal articles from all around the world that would pull apart this framework. In comparison, the framework is outdated from what we are reading about.

Others added the DLF needed more examples to make the profiles come to life:

> It should have examples of leadership or case studies, or documented examples of principals using the framework
It (the DLF) still needs a lot of work - needs more examples, needs a lot of time to get into, rich in profiles, has doubt of levels

While the general attitude was that the DLF had made a valuable contribution, the discussions in the focus groups did allow for some concerns to emerge.

Effects of the DLF on innovation and creativity

Several participants expressed concern about the effect the DLF appeared to be having on the quality of applications for selection or promotion, both their own and those written by other school leaders. Rather than providing a framework within which school leaders could “write their own stories”, so to speak, about how they learned to lead, or how they had successfully led and managed an innovation in their school, it appeared to be having the reverse effect. Unintentionally, the DLF appeared to be having the effect of routinizing applications. Several remarked on the boring sameness and predictability of many applications.

Applications are boring to read because they are all based on this framework – very mechanistic – not personal – trying to mould their personalities to fit this document

Applications are too robotic; the same template based on the framework is available on the website

The Framework is too rigid

I’m afraid there are creative people who are forced to be a robot because they are forced to use this framework

This framework is too prescriptive. It will be out-dated.

Framework is not creative. It should give the ability to adapt and contextualise.

What appears to be lacking in the DLF, according to these views, are guidelines about how school leaders might document their performance and show how they have met the standards implied by the DLF. There is a big difference between writing the usual kind of CV and building a professional portfolio. A professional portfolio, such as one for architects or artists, contains evidence of performance – of one’s best work. Building a portfolio and selecting entries encourages diversity and innovation.

In contrast, several principals referred to a fear of revealing creative or innovative aspects of their leadership, in case it might undermine how their applications were judged.

The Framework forces applicants to not be creative as they might like - Masks the personality of the applicant

People are afraid and don’t get the chance to say what they would like to say

Despite our best efforts to interpret applications, we run risks of systemising and typecasting

It is speculation, but the risks some applicants saw in being original or different may stem from the way the DLF is designed. The DLF does not provide guidelines for documenting examples of leadership initiatives. Such guidelines would help school leaders to build a portfolio of examples showing how they met the standards implied by the Domains and capabilities. The profiles or rubrics are there in the DLF, indicating levels of performance, however, it remains unclear how school leaders are expected to provide evidence about their performance. (This information might be provided elsewhere, but it is not in the DLF.) In this vein, applicants might find the DLF more helpful if it used the language of leadership “practices” rather than leadership “capabilities”. This issue is revisited later in this report.
Difficulties using the DLF to assess performance: Problems with the profiles

Focus group members raised another issues similar to that above. For example, several related stories about their surprise when their well-prepared applications for leadership positions, ticking all the boxes so to speak, had not led to being short-listed. This may be because of the very sameness of applications referred to above, making it difficult for panel members to tell them apart. As panel member, they had found it hard to discriminate between applicants of the basis of what was written in their applications.

It’s (the DLF) too artificial. Doesn’t show what do you need to be good at to be a principal. What characteristics match up with certain levels? Hard to decipher what to do next.

Lack of ideas/info about how to show how you meet the standards in your school context
As principals, we make decisions - we tick off what we feel as a competency, it’s much harder to provide evidence and to say you meet that criterion clearly.

A good set of standards points clearly to what a domain is about but still provides flexibility for people to add to it.

These concerns may also reflect limitations arising from the way the DLF is designed. It might be called the problem of the missing middle. The DLF contains domains and levels of performance, but it does not provide guidelines about how to provide evidence of performance in relation to the Domains. This is the necessary link between Domains and the rubrics in most sets of standards. Guidelines for how a school leader might provide evidence of performance are missing.

It is as if an athlete was being told they are going to be assessed in terms of how fast they can run, without telling them the conditions under which their running performance will be assessed. The ILEAD 360 degree instrument can provide useful feedback about opinions, but it has limited validity as a measure of performance – of successfully undertaking leadership initiatives that have improved a particular area of school functioning, or student outcomes. This is where school leaders may need a more complete leadership standards framework; one that includes methods of preparing a professional portfolio of successfully completed leadership initiatives.
A Comparison of the content and design of the DLF with a selection of highly respected and research-based leadership standards

Content: Does the Leadership Framework reflect the latest research and evidence about what school leaders need to know, do and understand?

A considerable amount of research on school leadership has been conducted since the Sergiovanni model was developed in 1984. The most straightforward way to address this question carefully, given the timeframe, was to compare the DLF with the most recent and respected leadership standards frameworks internationally. The following three were selected because they were based on thorough, original reviews of recent research:

- The National Board Standards for Accomplished Principals 2010 (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.)

Each is based on a careful analysis of original empirical studies. The Ontario Leadership Framework (OLF), for example, is limited to leadership practices for which there is “systematic empirical evidence of positive effects on valued student learning outcomes” (Leithwood, 2012, p. 11).

ISLLC 2008 is a revised version of the ISLLC 1996 standards and is based on a two-year process of updating relevant research since 1996. The ISLLC developers have created an online database (http://events.ccsso.org/projects/ISLLC2008Research/index.cfm) containing a representative sample of 83 empirical and 47 references that support the six 2008 ISLLC standards. It includes all of the research and other authoritative sources of information reviewed as part of the process of updating the ISLLC standards.

A committee of twenty-one independent expert educational leaders, researchers academics, business leaders and policymakers developed the National Board Standards for Accomplished Principals. The resulting work was subjected to an extensive public review process.

Summary versions of each set of standards can be found in Attachments 3 to 8. All three aim to guide and improve professional preparation and development. However, unlike the OLF and the ISLLC standards, the National Board standards were developed specifically for the purpose of providing certification to experienced and successful school leaders. (The NBPTS has also developed standards for accomplished teacher and teacher leader certification.) The ISLLC standards are geared more to initial licensure of school leaders. The OLF is described as a “key source of objectives for leadership developers in the province, and . . . (a) defensible basis on which to assess and provide feedback about the quality of leadership enacted in schools and school systems” (Leithwood, 2012, p. 3). They are also intended to assist recruitment and selection procedures.

A common feature of recent frameworks such as these is the extent to which they now ground their claims, not so much in personal characteristics or capabilities of leaders, as important as some of these are, but in research-based leadership practices that enable high quality opportunities for student well-being and learning. As Robinson et al., (2008) note in their review of research on the relative impact of different leadership types,
Leadership frameworks such as these are “generic” in the sense that they are limited to leadership practices for which there is strong empirical evidence. They do not aim to include items that may be added as part of a school leader’s contractual duties within a particular employing authority. These may include in a local industrial agreement; or form part of a local system for performance management.

Instead, they aim to capture what school leaders know and do no matter where their school is located. In this sense they are meant to be context-free. The ISLLC standards, for example, are national level “policy standards”, to be adapted and applied by policy-makers at state and district level. Most states in the USA use or adapt the ISLLC standards to their local context. They are also non-prescriptive in the sense that they do not prescribe any particular way of meeting the standards.

The content of these standards will now be compared, first at the levels of purposes and domains, and then in terms of the way each elaborates on the domains. Finally, they will be compared in terms of how they incorporate leadership requirements or capabilities such as professional knowledge, values and social skills.

**Purposes**

As is usual with most professional standards, the OLF, ISLLC and National Board Standards begin with a guiding conception of that profession’s values and purposes, in this case school leadership. For example, the *Ontario Leadership Framework* (OLF), defines leadership as

> the exercise of influence on organizational members and diverse stakeholders toward the identification and achievement of the organization’s vision and goals. (Leithwood (2012) p. 3)

For Fullan (2001):

> The litmus test of all leadership is whether it mobilises people’s commitment to putting their energy into actions designed to improve things. It is individual commitment, but above all it is collective mobilisation.” (p. 9).

Elmore (2004) puts it even more plainly when he defines educational leadership as

> the guidance and direction of instructional improvement”. (p. 13)

Robinson (2010) comments on Elmore’s definition in these terms:

> This definition sets an ambitious agenda for school leaders and for leadership training programmes. It declares that the purpose of educational leadership is not only (for example) to develop a cohesive culture, have good communication channels with staff and students, and monitor and evaluate instruction—it is to do all these things in a manner that improves teaching and learning.

It is noteworthy that the DLF does not appear to have a guiding conception of educational leadership. Recent conceptions, such as those above, illustrate how, greater emphasis is given to direct and indirect links between leadership, student opportunities to learn and student outcomes since the Sergiovanni framework was developed in 1984.
Most leadership frameworks are also introduced by a set of values or propositions that guided the development of the content standards, such as these principles for the ISLLC standards (p.8). The standards should:

1. Reflect the centrality of student learning;
2. Acknowledge the changing role of the school leader;
3. Recognize the collaborative nature of school leadership;
4. Improve the quality of the profession;
5. Inform performance-based systems of assessment and evaluation for school leaders;
6. Demonstrate integration and coherence; and
7. Advance access, opportunity, and empowerment for all members of the school community.

A similar set of principles that guided the development of the National Board Standards can be found in Attachment 6. No doubt the DLF was guided by similar principles, but they are not made explicit.

**Domains**

Writers of recent leadership standards frameworks usually begin by categorising the practices of successful leaders into a small number of areas or “domains”. A domain is a set of leadership practices linked to a common purpose, such as “setting directions” in the OLF.

Table 3 shows the domains included in the DLF, the OLF and the ISLLC standards frameworks. The DLF and the OLF frameworks have five domains (as does the National Standard for School Leaders), whereas ISLLC has six standards. Although developers of latest versions the OLF and the ISLLC have maintained much the same domains as earlier versions, we shall see that both have made significant changes to the way in which the domains are elaborated. Instead of “competencies” or “capabilities”, both now elaborate their domains in terms of practices, actions or functions. In other words, each tries to answer the question, “what are the kinds of things we would be able to observe if a school leader was meeting that standard?” rather than what personal characteristics do they need to bring to the task.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Leadership</td>
<td>Setting Directions</td>
<td>Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An effective leader demonstrates an understanding of the characteristics of effective schools and a capacity to lead the school community in promoting a vision of the future, underpinned by common purposes and values that will secure the commitment and alignment of stakeholders to realise the potential of all students.</td>
<td>The principal builds a shared vision, fosters the acceptance of group goals and sets and communicates high performance expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Leadership</td>
<td>Building Relationships and Developing People</td>
<td>Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An effective leader demonstrates the ability to foster a safe, purposeful and inclusive learning environment and a capacity to develop constructive and respectful relationships with staff, students, parents and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>The principal strives to foster genuine trusting relationships with students, staff, families and communities, guided by a sense of mutual respect. The principal affirms and empowers others to work in the best interests of all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic leadership</td>
<td>Developing the Organization to Sustain Desired Practices</td>
<td>Ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An effective leader demonstrates the capacity to model important values and behaviours to the school and community, including a commitment to creating and sustaining effective professional learning communities within the school and across all levels of the system.</td>
<td>The principal builds collaborative cultures, structures the organization for success, and connects the school to its wider environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Leadership</td>
<td>Leading the Instructional Program</td>
<td>Collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An effective leader demonstrates the capacity to optimise the school’s financial, human and physical resources through sound management practices and organisational systems that contribute to the achievement of the school’s vision and goals.</td>
<td>The principal sets high expectations for learning outcomes and monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of instruction. The principal manages the school effectively so that everyone can focus on teaching and learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
<td>Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An effective leader demonstrates the capacity to lead, manage and monitor the school improvement process through a current and critical understanding of the learning process and its implications for enhancing high quality teaching and learning.</td>
<td>The principal is responsible for creating conditions for student success and is accountable to students, parents, the community, supervisors and to the board for ensuring that students benefit from a high quality education. The principal is specifically accountable for the goals set out in the school improvement plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A close reading of Table 3 shows that, although the headings are different, there is considerable commonality between the frameworks at the domain level in terms of content. In part, this reflects the fact that in a sense each is working with the same “cake”; however the decisions about how to divide the cake are varied and somewhat arbitrary.

Each conceptualises what school leaders should know and be able to do in a similar way. Each has a domain emphasising that effective school leaders develop a shared vision for their school. Each has a domain about their role in building trusting and respectful relationships and a positive learning environment. Each has a domain describing the importance of sound management practices.

There is little in the OLF and the ISLLC domains that is not in the DLF. However, there is a stronger emphasis in the OLF and ISLLC on the link between leadership and student learning outcomes. Recent research has drawn attention to the crucial connection between school leadership and student achievement, providing new resources to guide developers of standards, policies, and practices. The sixth ISLLC standard concerns understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

The differences are more a matter of emphasis than substance. The OLF uses headings that point clearly to a particular group of practices, like setting directions and leading the instructional program, whereas the DLF domains names are more obscure. The kinds of practices a domain name like “Symbolic Leadership” is referring to are not immediately obvious.

The Sergiovanni domain labels come from an era where it was common to attach many different adjectives to the term ‘leadership’, implying that there are different types of leadership. This practice has been dropped. Recent leadership standards frameworks like the OLF usually have one guiding conception or definition of leadership, and the domains and point to areas of school functioning where leadership is needed.

Perhaps more so than the DLF, the OLF and the ISLLC standards provide the underlying logic to the way their domains are organised. As Leithwood explains in relation to the OLF:

*The first three . . . domains reflect social theory suggesting that the performance of organizational members is a function of their motivation, ability and the settings in which they work. So key functions of leaders include assisting their teachers and other organizational colleagues to further develop their motivations (one of the primary purposes for (Domain 1) Setting Directions) and abilities (the purpose for (Domain 2) Building Relationships and Developing People) to accomplish organizational goals, as well as to create and sustain supportive work settings (the goal of (Domain 3) Developing the Organization to Sustain Desired Practices).*

*Every organization has a unique “technology” for accomplishing its primary purposes and the fourth domain of practices included in the OLF, Improving the Instructional Program, reflects that “technology” for schools (teaching and learning). The fifth and final domain of OLF practices (Securing Accountability) is justified by the policy context in which contemporary public schooling finds itself, one which places unprecedented demands on leaders to publicly demonstrate the progress being made toward accomplishing the purposes established for their organizations.*
Another change in emphasis in recent designs is less apparent, but significant. Whereas the DLF domains were conceptualised in terms of leadership capabilities or competencies characteristic of the person, in this case the school leader, the OLF and ISLLC conceptualise the domains in terms of leadership or organisational “practices” or “functions”. As we shall see, the meaning of each domain is now elaborated in terms of observable actions.

Previous versions of the OLF and the ISLLC standards incorporated the idea of competencies or capabilities within each domain, which meant that each domain included an extensive list of skills, knowledge and attitudes or values. This made the elaborations of each domain cumbersome. It also led to considerable repetition, as the skills, knowledge and attitudes were similar across the domains. The 1994 version of the ISLLC standards, for example, contained 29 competencies for Standard 1 (shared vision), whereas the 2008 version revised version reduced this to five functions. (A function is defined as an action or action for which a person is responsible.)

Instead of attempting to identify the knowledge and attitudes and values or dispositions for each domain or standard, recent versions usually separate out the capabilities and treat them as cross-cutting themes common to, or underpinning, all the standards or domains.

The AITSL National Standard for School Leadership, for example, reflects these changes. It contains five sets of “professional practices” or domains:

1. Leading teaching and learning
2. Developing self and others
3. Leading improvement, innovation and change
4. Leading the management of the school
5. Engaging and working with the community

In addition, the Standard makes a clear distinction between these practices (areas where leadership needs to be exercised) and the competencies need to carry them out, which it calls “Leadership requirements”: vision and values; knowledge and understanding; and personal qualities, social and interpersonal skills. The distinction is not watertight. The AITSL standard seems to suggest, for example, that vision is a characteristic belonging to the person, whereas for developers of the OLF and ISLLC standards it is a domain of leadership practice. The National Standard has a domain reflecting the importance for student outcomes of engaging and working with the community, whereas this aspect is muted in the DLF.

Leadership and management

One of the questions the review was asked to address was, “Does the Leadership Framework adequately emphasise both leadership and management?” The distinction between leadership and management has been dissected for many years. Instead of emphasising the distinction, recent leadership standards frameworks like the OLF adopt an integrative approach to the concepts of leadership and management, recognising that both are important to successful schools, and that they are interdependent. School leaders are more likely to ensure quality conditions for learning if all aspects of the school are well managed and aligned with the need to implement its vision and meet its goals.

As indicated earlier, the survey revealed that school leaders in Victoria believed that the DLF did address several management functions at least moderately, but there was a clear indication that functions such as teacher performance management and development, peer observation and feedback and risk identification and management needed to be strengthened. However, whether
the specific details of how these functions are conducted should be included in a generic leadership framework is a matter for decision-making at the jurisdictional level.

**Introduction to the Domains and Standards**

f) The OLF, and the ISLLC and National Board standards go to considerable length to introduce their domains and standards. The National Board typical provides three to four pages explaining and illustrating each standard. Box 1 provides an extract from the OLF showing the introduction to Domain 1. It provides a strong rationale for the domain, “Setting Directions”, as something accomplished school leaders should be expected to do Not only does it provide a clear rationale for the domain, it also provides research citations to support the recommended practices for each domain. In contrast, the elaborations of each domain in the DLF are limited to the brief paragraphs in Table 3 above.

A brief paragraph is used to describe each of the Domains in the DLF, as shown in Table 3, whereas each Domain in the OLF is introduced with several paragraphs, as shown in Box 1 for Domain 1. The same applies to the ISLLC and National Board Standards.

**Elaborating the content of the Domains**

The focus in this section is on how each leadership standards framework elaborates on or explains the intention and content of each domain. As mentioned above recent standards are described in terms of the actions or practices involved in meeting those standards, rather than pre-requisite capabilities or competencies. The standards shift focus, pointing to observables and to performance. This makes them more useful for professional development planning. It also makes them more useful for designing methods to assess performance and how to set performance standards; that is, how to decide whether the standards have been met.

The Ontario Leadership Framework will be used as an example here, although the ISLLC and National Board Standards could have served the purpose just as well. Table 4 illustrates how Domain 1 in the OLF, setting directions, is elaborated in terms of practices and in terms of the elements or indicators of these practices. (A complete version of the OLF is provided in Attachment 3). Together, the four practices aim to cover most areas where action is needed if a worthwhile and shared vision is to be implemented successfully. Not only do the directions need to be set; enabling shorter-term goals need to be identified and met.
Box 1: Extract from the Ontario Leadership Framework (Leithwood, 2012)

Introduction to Domain 1: Setting Directions

The primary purpose to be served by this set of leadership practices is to ensure that organizational members and other stakeholders are working toward the same set of purposes and that these purposes are a legitimate expression of both provincial policy and local community aspirations. Provincial policy directions will typically be very explicit, so not difficult to discern. Forging directions for the school, which also reflect local community aspirations, is typically more challenging, particularly for schools serving highly diverse communities, given the province’s commitment to inclusive education.

Shared purposes contribute to alignment of effort, which increases not only the effectiveness but the efficiency of the school organization. But the less obvious purpose for direction setting is about motivation. Almost all contemporary theories of human motivation place individual person’s goals at the heart of their theories; people are motivated by goals or purposes in which they strongly believe, for whatever reason. These purposes might arise from deeply held values and beliefs, sometimes called “moral”, as for example, improving the life chances of disadvantaged children. But they might, as well, be much more “mundane” although still quite important (e.g., making more money).

Whether conscious of it or not, everyone is motivated by multiple purposes that range from simple to complex, other-centered to individually-centered, abstract to concrete and the like. The leadership challenge is to bring together – or align – at least some of the individual purposes motivating students, staff and other school stakeholders with the purposes of the school, as a whole, as well as with the prevailing policy goals of the school system and province.

Improving the literacy and numeracy skills of students is an example of a goal common to most school systems and schools in Ontario and expressly part of provincial policy. It is a goal to be accomplished as one means of moving toward Ontario’s vision of the educated graduate, a person sufficiently literate and numerate to thrive both socially and economically in an unknowable future and to make a productive contribution to the quality of that future for others.

As this example begins to make clear, the directions set for a school should range from quite abstract to quite specific. OLF refers to the broadest, longest term or most abstract purposes as “vision” and the more specific and shorter-term purposes as “goals”. Both are quite important for school stakeholders to understand and agree on. Broad visions build commitment (they are “targets that beckon”) appealing, as they typically do, to relatively fundamental values and beliefs. Specific goals, on the other hand, signal priorities for school improvement efforts right now if progress is to be made toward the vision. Goals often point to new capacities that staff might need to develop, as well, especially if it is clear to everyone involved that leaders hold high expectations for the achievement of the vision and goals.

Of course, neither vision nor goals carry much motivational “weight” unless they are well-known to all or most of the school’s stakeholders. Vision and goals need to be widely communicated, preferably through participation in their identification to begin with, through persuasion or through other effective communication strategies. Which of these and other possible methods might work best depends very much on the context in which leaders find themselves.
Table 4: Ontario Leadership Framework showing elaboration of Domain 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAINS</th>
<th>PRACTICES</th>
<th>ELEMENTS/INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Setting Directions | A. Building a shared vision: | Leaders who are successful at building a shared vision:  
- Establish, with staff, students and other stakeholders, an overall sense of purpose or vision for work in their schools to which they are all strongly committed;  
- Build understanding of the specific implications of the schools’ vision for its’ programs and the nature of classroom instruction;  
- Encourage the development of organizational norms that support openness to change in the direction of that purpose or vision;  
- Help staff and other stakeholders to understand the relationship between their schools’ vision and board and provincial policy initiatives and priorities. |
| B. Identifying Specific, Shared, Short-term Goals | Leaders who are effective in identifying specific, shared, short-term goals for their schools’ improvement efforts: |  
- Facilitate stakeholder engagement in processes for identifying specific school goals;  
- Do whatever is necessary to make the goals clear to all stakeholders;  
- Regularly encourage staff to evaluate their progress toward achieving school goals;  
- Encourage staff to develop and periodically review individual professional growth goals, as well as the relationship between their individual professional goals and the school’s goals  
- Make frequent explicit reference to (and use of) the school’s goals when engaged in decisions about school programs and directions;  
- Build consensus among students, staff and other stakeholders for the school’s goals and priorities. |
| C. Creating High performance Expectations | Leaders who successfully enact this practice: |  
- Have high expectations for teachers, for students, and for themselves;  
- Devote additional effort to creating high expectations among staff for the achievement of students who have traditionally struggled to be successful at school;  
- Encourage staff to be innovative, if needed, in achieving those expectations;  
- Encourage staff to assume responsibility for achieving the schools vision and goals with all students;  
- Make their expectations known through both their words and (especially) their actions. |
| D. Communicating the Vision and Goals | Leaders successfully communicate their schools’ directions when they: |  
- Use many different formal and informal opportunities to explain the overall vision and goals established for the school to stakeholders;  
- Demonstrate to all stakeholders what the school's visions and goals mean in practice;  
- Regularly invite different stakeholder groups to describe how their work furthers the schools’ vision and goals. |
High expectations need to be translated into actions and players need to identify what the vision means for their practice. The OLF contains a similar analysis of the practices and elements that would be observable if the standard was being implemented. As Box 1 and Table 4 indicate, the OLF practices and elements give a clearer guide than the DLF about what is involved in setting worthwhile directions successfully.

To some extent, mapping out practices and elements for each domain is an exercise in logic as well as research. It is not just a case of saying effective leaders develop a shared vision. The four *Practices* statements provide a complete picture of actions or functions involved in embedding a worthwhile vision with high expectations. Of course, exactly how that should be done or what the vision is should be is not prescribed. However, that an accomplished should be able to perform the four practices in setting directions is, in a sense, non-negotiable. The same applies to the other domains.

Another important consideration is to ensure statements about leadership are placed at the appropriate level, whether at the domain level, the practices level or the element or indicator level. These hierarchical levels move from the general to the specific – from domains to indicators. Sometimes statements should be moved to a different level. It is also important to examine whether statements are placed in the appropriate domain category. The over-riding aim is to maximise clarity and to ensure the internal coherence of the domains and standards as a group.

Although there is no one best way to organise the statements, it is possible to see a relatively clear logic behind the organisation of the domains and practices in the OLF. The same applies to the ISLLC policy standards (Attachments 4 & 5). The National Board standards follow a different model, as shown in Attachments 6 & 7, however the logic is still clear. To assist applicants prepare for certification, the National Board provides a diagram of the “Architecture of Accomplished Educational Leading” (Attachment 8) showing how its nine core propositions come together in any effort to lead and manage improvements in school functioning.

This architecture provides a clear guide to applicants as they prepare their portfolio entries for certification. The National Board standards are developed with a clear eye on the need to ensure they are assessable. It also provides assessors with a clear structure of the evidence they are to look for in the entries. As mentioned earlier, in reporting issues emerging from the focus groups, and the difficulties some expressed in preparing applications, it seems clear that Victorian school leaders would benefit from more detailed guidelines like these when they prepare evidence about how they meet the standards.

**Design: Does the design of the DLF reflect best practice?**

The previous section on the design of the OLF (Table 4) will be used as a reference point in addressing questions about the design of the DLF – its domains, capabilities, and profiles. The ISLLC and the National Board standards will also help to serve the same purpose as they are also widely regarded as examples of best practice in designing school leadership standards.

Table 5 provides a rearrangement of the DLF to facilitate comparison with the OLF, ISLLC and the National Board. It shows how the meaning of the DLF domains is elaborated and described first in terms of capabilities and then using indicators of performance levels. (Level 3 was chosen because it most closely matches the accomplished principal performance level implied by the OLF, ISLLC and National Board standards.) It is recognised that the Profiles in the DLF are more akin to rubrics describing levels of performance, but they serve a similar purpose to the elements or indicators in a framework like the OLF.
Table 5: The Structure of the DLF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Capabilities</th>
<th>Indicators (Adapted from Level 3 performance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cultural Leadership| > Thinks and plans strategically  
> Aligns resources with desired outcomes  
> Holds self and others to account | • Leaders make public and reinforce the relationship between the school vision, goals and improvement strategies and use a range of approaches to secure the commitment of others.  
• They use the school’s customs and traditions to enhance student connectedness to the school.  
• Processes are established for families and carers to participate in whole-school decision-making.  
• They formally recognise and acknowledge the achievements of individuals and teams.  
• They form partnerships with other organisations to expand learning and teaching opportunities and work with stakeholders for the benefit of the school community.  
• They seek opportunities to share their knowledge and expertise within and beyond their school. |
| Technical Leadership| > Shapes the future  
> Develops a unique school culture  
> Sustains partnerships and networks | • Leaders use an understanding of the school’s context, including the school’s readiness for change, to decide how and when to implement improvement initiatives.  
• They develop processes to monitor progress towards achieving school goals and priorities.  
• They analyse the use of resources in relation to student learning and establish performance measures to assess the impact of these resources on priorities.  
• When setting expectations for performance and behaviour, they engage the school community in the development of protocols. |
| Human Leadership   | > Advocates for all students  
> Develops relationships  
> Develops individual and collective capacity | • Leaders develop protocols that support a just and secure environment.  
• They purposefully engage in activities to build relationships and demonstrate empathy when dealing with others.  
• Opportunities to participate in decision-making are provided.  
• Leaders differentially allocate resources and match the expertise of members of the school, local and wider community to the needs of students.  
• They act as a coach or mentor to others. |
| Educational Leadership| > Shapes pedagogy | • Leaders design learning, teaching and management interactions based on how |
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| **demonstrates the capacity to lead, manage and monitor the school improvement process through a current and critical understanding of the learning process and its implications for enhancing high quality teaching and learning** | **> Focuses on achievement**  
**> Promotes inquiry and reflection** | **people learn and support the application of learning theories in classroom practice.**  
**- School practices are monitored to ensure alignment of curriculum, pedagogy, assessment and reporting with goals for student learning.**  
**- They design a curriculum that is responsive to system changes and to changes in the student cohort.**  
**- Leaders manage staff performance and development to improve student outcomes and monitor the extent to which feedback informs professional learning.**  
**- Opportunities for reflection are incorporated in a range of forums.** |
|---|---|---|
| **Symbolic leadership**  
An effective leader demonstrates the capacity to model important values and behaviours to the school and community, including a commitment to creating and sustaining effective professional learning communities within the school and across all levels of the system | **> Develops and manages self**  
**> Aligns actions with shared values**  
**> Creates and shares knowledge** | **Leaders ensure that the school’s values are reflected in school practices and that goals are achieved through well-defined and defensible processes.**  
**- They evaluate processes to ensure their continuing alignment with school goals.**  
**- Collaborative practices are established across the school community and structures and processes that support wellbeing are created.**  
**- They design a whole school professional learning strategy that aligns individual learning plans with school goals and support staff to link their own evidence-based research to practice.**  
**- They actively promote the value of public education.** |

Once again, it seems from Table 5 that there are few major differences in the content of a domain like “Cultural Leadership” in the DLF and a domain like “Setting Directions” in the OLF (see Table 4 above), or Standard 1 in the ISLLC standards, or Standard 2 in the NBPTS standards (Attachment 7). However, there seem to be differences in the clarity, the focus and the logic in the way statements are organised and written in the DLF, compared with the others.

**Domain titles**

Several observations can be made about the way the content of the DLF is structured. As mentioned earlier, several respondents in the focus group meetings pointed out that the language used to describe the domains is not easy to penetrate. Setting directions, as a title for Domain 1 in the OLF, for example, does a better job of conveying what the domain is about than Cultural Leadership. A similar comment could be made about the titles for each of the DLF domains. In terms of the OLF, Leithwood (2012) points out that

*These practices, as a whole, do not align themselves with any specific leadership model or theory. While leadership models and theories provide a conceptual coherence which can assist in building understanding, no existing individual theory or model captures a sufficient proportion of what leaders actually do to serve the purposes intended for the OLF. That said, the OLF does reflect most of the practices found in current models of both “instructional” and “transformational” leadership. Using a term that is becoming common in the educational*
leadership literature, it is an “integrated” model, although a more fully developed one than appears in the literature to date. This integrated model aims to capture the relatively direct efforts of successful leaders to improve the quality of teaching and learning in their schools (the primary focus of instructional leadership models), as well as their efforts to create organizational conditions which enable and support those improvement efforts (the primary focus of transformational leadership models). Leithwood, p. 12)

The nature of each Domain could be communicated more effectively using simple direct titles such as those used in the OLF. The current titles also give the impression that there are different types of leadership, when in fact they refer to areas of school functioning where leadership is needed. However, even if the titles for the DLF domains were changed there would still be a need to improve the clarity of their content.

Domains and capabilities vs Domains and practices

As mentioned above, the description for Domain 1 in the DLF is limited to this brief and somewhat elusive statement:

An effective leader demonstrates an understanding of the characteristics of effective schools and a capacity to lead the school community in promoting a vision of the future, underpinned by common purposes and values that will secure the commitment and alignment of stakeholders to realise the potential of all students.

The other domain statements are similarly elusive if form. In part this is because the DLF domain descriptions use the language of “capabilities” whereas the OLF uses the language of “practices” (e.g. “demonstrates an understanding of”; “a capacity to”. Because of this, the description of the domain remains at a high level of generality, compared with the OLF and the ISLLC and National Board standards. It does not describe what an accomplished school leader actually does.

There is nothing “wrong” about these domain statements or this kind of language. However, it fails to give the reader a clear idea of what they are expected to do to meet the standard. This may also explain some of the frustration expressed by participants in the focus groups about the difficulties they experienced in how to provide evidence of their work. Although differences between the two types of statements are not watertight, it is apparent that the language of practices gives greater clarity as to what a domain is about and what successful school leaders actually do.

The underlying “logic” of leadership frameworks

Domains are ways of categorising the work of successful school leaders. They also define the scope of their work, although local jurisdictions may add additional components, such as system-specific requirements concerning managing the performance of teachers or the religious context of the school.

As Figure 1 above shows, the five domains in the DLF are seen as interconnected and interdependent. In practice, successful leadership draws on and brings together knowledge and skills from all five domains. However, it is important that the contents of each Domain are clearly differentiated, if not exclusive, categories.

The hierarchical nature of a framework like OLF is clear, as the practices together describe what is involved in a domain like “Setting Directions”, and the indicators provide more illustrations of what successful leaders do.
The DLF is also organised hierarchically, however, as Table 5 shows it is not so easy to see the logic behind it. Sometimes it is not clear why certain capabilities are listed under certain domains. For example, the “Shapes the future” capability is placed within the Technical Leadership domain, when it would it would seem to fit more appropriately under “Cultural Leadership, which is about promoting a vision of the future. Likewise, the capability “Develops a unique school culture” is in the Technical Leadership domain, which appears to be more about management than cultural leadership.

More examples could be provided, but it seems that the capabilities listed in the DLF were not derived in the same way as the practices in the OLF. The latter were derived from a careful analysis of what successful school leaders do within each major area of responsibility, as defined by the domains. And these practices are justified by research, whereas the DLF capabilities are difficult to convert into variables or measures. By their nature, it is difficult to conduct research into the effects of such indefinable variables as “shapes the future”.

**Dealing with capabilities**

Capabilities belonging to the person are undoubtedly important in successful leadership. The DLF describes leadership capabilities as the “knowledge, skills and dispositions required for effective leadership performance” (p. 4). However, on close inspection it is not clear that they are capabilities in this sense, or actions (see Table 5). Take for example, the capabilities for Cultural Leadership:

- Shapes the future
- Develops a unique school structure
- Sustains partnership and networks

These seem to describe broad purposes or goals rather than the kinds of knowledge, skills and dispositions that leaders need to acquire if they about to provide cultural leadership and build a shared vision for their school. (And why should a school structure be “unique”?) It appears that the DLF actually does not provide a clear analysis of the capabilities that underpin its expectations for school leaders.

How have others handled this challenge? Writers of standards for teaching and leadership have grappled for some time with problem of how to incorporate dispositions. The earlier iterations of the OLF and the ISLLC standards show that they spent a lot of effort identifying the knowledge, skills and values/attitudes/dispositions for each domain or standard. The result was a large, cumbersome and repetitive list of capabilities. The lists were similar across the domains and standards, as each required much the same knowledge, skills and dispositions.

As a result, recent leadership frameworks have adopted the practice of separating leadership capabilities from areas of school functioning where leadership is needed. In other words, the framework has one guiding conception of what leaders know and do (not five as implied by the five domain titles in the DLF) and five or six domains where those capabilities need to be applied. (ACER developed this approach some years ago when it prepared *Standards of Practice for Leaders in Catholic Schools* for the Catholic Education Office in 2003.) Most frameworks now treat capabilities as a set of common themes cross-cutting all the domains. The OLF identifies three types of capabilities, which it calls resources, that leaders need to bring to their practice; cognitive, psychological and social resources.
Figure 3 shows that these “personal leadership resources” cut across and are required for all five of the OLF domains. This helps to simplify the framework structure. Writers of the AITSL standards have adopted a similar practice.

**Figure 3 Cross-cutting capabilities in the OLF**

The importance of coherence and sequence in a set of leadership standards

An important feature of professional standards is that, as a group, they reflect a model of good practice. We are talking here about the way the standards are sequenced. For example, a well-structured and coherent set of teaching standards reflects the dynamic cycle of what it means to think and act like a teacher – from getting to know where your students are at, to planning for learning, to teaching, to assessment and evaluation of one’s teaching and further planning assessment and working with colleagues and parents. The standards are not just a list of unrelated components or competencies. The sequence reflects the holistic and seamless nature of good teaching, which integrates the standards in effective practice.

The same applies to leadership standards, if it is intended that they be useful for assessment purposes, whether that be self-assessment or providing evidence of performance to peers for purposes such as selection, performance management or professional certification.

The sequence of domains in the OLF has a clearly explained logic, beginning with setting directions, based on evidence about current practice and outcomes. The sequence tries to capture what it means to think and act like a school leader. The domains reflect the stages involved in planning and implementing efforts to improve any particular area of school functioning, such as comparing current practice with the schools values and vision to identify needs and set directions, developing strategic plans to meet that need, building capacity, mobilising effort, implementing the plan, collecting data, reviewing progress, and so on. A clear sequence to a set of standards makes them more useful for developing methods for gathering evidence about performance. (The National Board “Architecture of Accomplished Educational Leading is a useful model in this respect. See Attachment 8. This is because the National Board Standards have been designed specifically with assessment for certification purposes in mind.)
The DLF does not appear to have a clear sequence to it. The pentagon diagram of the DLF domains does reflect the links between the domains, but not the sequence. It is a collection of important aspects of leadership without a logic to its structure. This limits its usefulness when school leaders try to use it to assess their practice or when they try to assemble evidence about their practice in relation to the standards. Several focus group participants referred to their frustration in this regard, and the boring sameness to applications for school leader positions.

**Profiles and levels of performance**

The profiles are a unique feature of the DLF. There is nothing equivalent in the other frameworks. Unlike the OLF, ISLLC and National Board standards, they do not appear to have been derived from an analysis of actions required to undertake specific leadership initiatives successfully. They are described as “levels of performance”, but it is not clear what they are levels of performance in, except school leadership in a very general sense, such as “Technical Leadership”. The profiles in the DLF seem isolated from any particular methods of assessment to which they are to be applied. They are similar to rubrics, but the type of evidence about leadership performance to which the rubrics are to be applied is not specified.

This is not the place to go into details, but recent methods of standards-based performance assessment do not attempt to develop different assessment methods and rubrics for each domain or each standard. Rather, they ask for evidence based on the completion of authentic leadership tasks over extended periods of time, maybe a year or more. In the main, the evidence consists of the “natural harvest” of artefacts and data that an accomplished school leader would gather as a matter of course in planning and evaluating projects to improve some aspect of school functioning. When documented in a structured portfolio entry, for example, the entry provides evidence related to several domains and standards at the same time. It is clear that the current DLF profiles would not be appropriate for assessment specific this kind of evidence.

Most survey respondents thought the ILead 360 degree instrument was a useful source of feedback about their proficiency in each leadership domain. However, it is not so clear that the instrument is a valid measure of performance for purposes such as selection or certification.
Summary of Part B

The survey and focus group discussions showed that the Framework has been widely used, although there was an indication that the rate of usage was decreasing. Most school leaders rated it as clear and useful or very useful in supporting professional learning, principal performance and development processes, principal selection processes, and self-analysis and reflection and school leaders.

Members of focus groups generally agreed. The DLF was useful because it provided a consistent approach to discussing leadership, or a common language, so that discussions on leadership were more productive.

*Creates a common language of leadership and develops an understanding of dimensions and development of leadership practice. It also enables goal setting because it gives you the next developmental step.*

*Having a model across the system means we are all talking the same language and system professional development becomes possible, efficient and effective. It also means when applying for jobs in any school there is a consistent framework to reference.*

*They provide a consistent framework across the system. It is useful when meeting with colleagues as you all talk the same language.*

However, the focus group discussions did identify some concerns about the effects of the DLF on innovation and creativity and difficulties using the DLF to assess performance.

The literature review revealed that there were only a few differences between the content of the DLF and three of the most highly regarded research-based sets of standards for school leaders.

However, an analysis of the current design of the DLF in comparison with international best practice revealed major limitations. It need a clearer guiding vision of educational leadership. The titles of the Domains need to give a simpler and clearer idea of their respective content. An introductory research-based rationale is needed for each domain. The domains need to give a clearer idea of the component practices involved in meeting the standard. The current capabilities should be replaced by more specific practices, without being prescriptive.

The DLF needs to better reflect the dynamic nature of leadership practice in schools in the structure and sequence of the domains, and in the relevant component practices for each domain. The profiles or levels of performance are a valuable aspect of the DLF, foreshadowing rubrics that might be applied to assessing evidence about performance. However, they would have been more useful if the kinds of evidence about performance to which they might be applied had been developed.
Recommendations for a Process for Developing a New Framework

The final section of this review responds to the request for “advice on a course of action for developing a new framework, or standards, for school leadership.”

It is evident that the DLF has served its purposes well since 2007. However, it is also evident that there are good reasons to consider developing a new standards framework, or adopting a framework such as the National Professional Standard for Principals as a basis for developing a more detailed set of standards.

The first set of reasons derives from the limitations of the DLF as a basis for documenting and assessing evidence of leadership initiatives, as indicated in the section on focus groups. The second set derives from comparing the design of the DLF with recent designs for leadership standards. This review has provided examples of designs regarded as best practice internationally. It is clear that designers have moved on to new forms that provide a clearer guide to successful practices and a more valid basis on which to assess school leader performance.

Comparisons with more leadership standards frameworks also helped to identify areas where the DLF could be improved. While the core content of the DLF was similar to best practice internationally, the review revealed important changes in emphasis and in the language and design since the DLF was written. These mean that the DLF would require a major overhaul if it was to be consistent with best practice.

Another option would be to use the AITSL National Professionals Standards for Principals (APSP) as a foundation for developing a more detailed version tailored to the Victorian context. Table 6 provides a comparison between the National Professional Standards for Principals and the Ontario Leadership Framework. Comparisons with well-researched leadership standards frameworks, such as the OLF, ISLLC and the National Board can help to suggest where it might be considered appropriate to modify or revise the APSP. Professional standards should be reviewed regularly in the light of research and professional judgment.

It is clear from Table 6 that the APSP and the OLF domains have much in common (as is the case with the ISLLC and National Board standards), but there are also some significant differences. The APSP is stronger on building links with the school’s wider community, a strong point. The OLF appears to give more emphasis to setting directions and developing a shared vision, but it needs to be remembered that the APSP includes vision in its “Leadership Requirements” (in contrast with most sets of standards). The OLF, like the National Board and the ISLLC standards, foregrounds the importance of an accountable professional culture, but this aspect is muted in the APSP.
Table 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Leading teaching and learning</strong></td>
<td>Setting Directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals create a positive culture of challenge and support, enabling effective teaching that promotes enthusiastic, independent learners, committed to lifelong learning.</td>
<td>The principal builds a shared vision, fosters the acceptance of group goals and sets and communicates high performance expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Developing self and others</strong></td>
<td>Building Relationships and Developing People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals work with and through others to build a professional learning community that is focused on the continuous improvement of teaching and learning.</td>
<td>The principal strives to foster genuine trusting relationships with students, staff, families and communities, guided by a sense of mutual respect. The principal affirms and empowers others to work in the best interests of all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Leading improvement, innovation and change</strong></td>
<td>Developing the Organization to Sustain Desired Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals work with others to produce and implement clear, evidence-based improvement plans and policies for the development of the school and its facilities.</td>
<td>The principal builds collaborative cultures, structures the organization for success, and connects the school to its wider environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Leading the management of the school</strong></td>
<td>Leading the Instructional Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals use a range of data management methods and technologies to ensure that the school’s resources and staff are efficiently organised and managed to provide an effective and safe learning environment as well as value for money.</td>
<td>The principal sets high expectations for learning outcomes and monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of instruction. The principal manages the school effectively so that everyone can focus on teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Engaging and working with the community</strong></td>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals embrace inclusion and help build a culture of high expectations that takes account of the richness and diversity of the school’s wider community and the education systems and sectors.</td>
<td>The principal is responsible for creating conditions for student success and is accountable to students, parents, the community, supervisors and to the board for ensuring that students benefit from a high quality education. The principal is specifically accountable for the goals set out in the school improvement plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also clear that the differences in terms of content are relatively minor, as are differences in structure, although a personal view is that the OLF has a clearer rationale for the sequence of its domains. The APSP has a similar design to the other standards frameworks in the sense that it makes the distinction between the quality that school leaders need to bring to leadership and the areas of school functioning where leadership initiatives and action are needed. Unlike the OLF and the ISLLC standards, the APSP includes a rudimentary model illustrating the nature of leadership action.

For these reasons, it is recommended that DEECD move toward adopting the National Professional Standard for Principals as a framework for school leaders in Victoria. Like the DLF, the APSP has five domains. Though the titles are different, the content will be familiar to Victorian school leaders. The APSP domain titles communicate the nature of each domain’s content more clearly.

At this point, it may be helpful to point out the difference between describing standards (content standards) and setting standards (performance standards). Describing standards is an attempt to articulate the professional knowledge and skill that is valued. These are often referred to as Content Standards. This process necessarily depends on bringing expert practitioners together and, through extensive iterations of research reviews, discussion, drafting, circulation for comment, redrafting, and so on, working toward a consensus about what, in the present case, accomplished school leaders know and do to promote, for example, an accountable professional community in their school. (This type of process is different from that use to develop the APSP, as I understand it.)
Setting standards is quite a different exercise. Crudely speaking, standard setting is a process of agreeing on how good is good enough: that is, setting the Performance Standards. It is about determining the performance level considered acceptable for a specified purpose, and setting the cutting or passing score; for example, the score for deciding whether a school leader has attained advanced standards set by a professional body. A standard points to and describes a desirable level of performance.

It is important to keep in mind that standards are not fully developed until it has been made clear how they will be used to judge performance. There are three steps to developing a complete set of performance standards for purposes such as professional learning and professional certification:

- **Defining the content standards.** These describe what do highly accomplished school leaders know and do and what aspiring leaders need to get better at. Content standards describe what is to be assessed.

- **Developing valid and consistent assessment methods.** These are valid methods for gathering evidence about what a leader knows and is able to do in relation to the standards; and

- **Setting performance standards.** Developing reliable procedures for assessing that evidence and deciding whether a school leader has met the standard.

In other words, a full set of standards must point not only to what will be measured, but also to how evidence about capability and performance will be gathered, and how judgments will be made about whether the standards have been met, as shown in Figure 1.

**Figure 1: Conceptual framework for developing standards-based assessments**

![Conceptual framework for developing standards-based assessments](image)

The OLF, ISLLC and the National Board provide examples of well-developed content standards. They are in a form that provides a basis for moving to the next stage of developing and trialling valid methods for assessing the content standards. It usually takes at least a year for a typical standards NBPTS writing committee (usually 12-15 members) to develop and validate content standards consisting of domains, standards, indicators and elaborations.

When we look at the APSP in comparison, it is clear that there is a significant difference between its stage of development and that of standards frameworks such as the OLF, ISLLC and the National Board. Some idea of the difference can be gauged by examining the OLF in Attachment 3, bearing in mind that even that version is still not the full version of the OLF content standards. (For the full version, see Leithwood, 2012). Similarly, the National Board content standards are 40 pages long (NBPTS, 2010). The elaborated version of the ISLLC standards with performance expectations and indicators is 30 pages long.
In comparison, it is clear that at this stage the APSP is mainly a framework, with only limited elaborations of its requirements and domains. There is no equivalent to the elaborations in the OLF and the ISLLC and National Board standards in the APSP in terms of practices. It is not a fully developed set of content standards. At this stage it is more correct to regard the APSP as a framework within which standards can be developed, than as a standard or a set of standards. It is certainly not a standard in the usual sense of that term; a measure that can be used to assess whether that standard has been met.

Fully developed standards are tools for making informed and useful judgments about performance in order to improve it. Standards should not strictly be called standards until all three stages in Figure 1 have been completed. Only then will it be clear how they are to be used to judge performance. By definition, standards are measures and must be assessable. Standards are of little use if they cannot be used to assess performance; even the assessment is of one’s own performance.

While recommending adoption of the APSP, it is recognised that its leadership requirements and practices will need more elaboration and development before they can form an adequate basis defining the content standards for certification purposes. The Ontario Leadership Framework provides an example of a set of standards that is at a stage where it can be used to develop assessment methods and performance standards for certification purposes.

The National Board is farthest down the track of completing all three stages in Figure 1. Its standards are specifically designed with assessment for certification in mind. As part of developing its national certification system, several hundred principals have volunteered to trial experimental forms of structured portfolio tasks based on developing and implement projects to meet identified needs and improve school functioning.

Methods for gathering evidence relevant to standards for certification must be rigorous. Paradoxical though it may seem, the more valid and reliable the methods of performance assessment the more useful they are for formative evaluations and professional learning purposes.

Where possible, each assessment method should provide evidence against several standards at the same time. Ideally, the assessments tasks should be valid or “authentic”; that is, they should be based on meaningful chunks of the typical work that accomplished school leaders perform over time. The most promising types of evidence for this purpose are structured portfolio entries. This type of assessment task provides evidence relevant to several standards at the same time. A school leader’s portfolio for certification would contain several entries providing evidence of leadership initiatives that met particular needs or improved school functioning and covered all the standards.

Developing and implementing a rigorous certification system is a major enterprise. Completing all three steps in Figure 1 is a five-year task at least - and an expensive one. The Principals Australia Institute is currently exploring the concept of a national professional certification system for principals, based on the APSP framework. If this idea proceeds, one of the first steps would be to develop the APSP content standards to a level where they were detailed enough to be useful in designing assessment methods and in setting standards.
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ATTACHMENT 1 : Instrument for surveying school leaders’ perceptions of the DLF

Review of the Developmental Learning Framework for School Leaders

The Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) is conducting an independent review of the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) Developmental Learning Framework for School Leaders (DLF), on behalf of the Bastow Institute of Educational Leadership.

This questionnaire aims to provide school leaders with an opportunity to assist in that review.

INTRODUCTION

The Developmental Learning Framework (DLF) was developed in 2007 as a critical element of the then Office of School Education’s Learning to Lead Effective Schools strategy. Its main aims were to assist teachers and school leaders to:

- Reflect on their leadership practice
- Identify strengths
- Identify areas for improvement
- Choose appropriate professional learning activities.

Six years later, it is time to review the DLF in light of these aims and to seek advice on the extent to which it may need revision or redevelopment. Also, since that time, The Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) has developed a National Professional Standard for Principals. Further research on leadership has also been conducted and will be considered as part of this review.

We would greatly appreciate your assistance in conducting this review. The professional experience and judgment of school leaders like you is vital to its success.

It will take no more than 15 minutes to complete the survey. ACER guarantees that all responses will remain confidential.
A Review of Victoria’s Development Learning Framework for School Leaders

THE DEVELOPMENTAL LEARNING FRAMEWORK FOR SCHOOL LEADERS

To remind you of the key features of the Developmental Learning Framework (DLF) we have included the following brief description.

The DLF describes five domains of leadership that aim to capture the essential work of school leaders. It was designed to inform all leadership and professional learning policies and programs, including Principal selection and Principal performance and development processes.

The DLF provides profiles within each domain to illustrate levels of proficiency in the capabilities relevant to each domain.
YOUR BACKGROUND

Your school is:
☐ Primary
☐ Secondary
☐ P-12
☐ Specialist
☐ Other

Your position is:
☐ Principal
☐ Assistant Principal
☐ Leading Teacher
☐ Other

Gender:
☐ Female
☐ Male

Age range:
☐ 20-35
☐ 36-50
☐ 51+

Years of teaching experience:
☐ 0-15
☐ 16-25
☐ 26-35
☐ 35+

Your region:
☐ North Western
☐ North Eastern
☐ South Western
☐ South Eastern
THE DEVELOPMENTAL LEARNING FRAMEWORK

Have you used the DLF for any purpose over the past two years? *

☐ Yes (if Yes, proceeds to Section A)
☐ No (if No, skips to Section H)

Section A: USEAGE
How many times have you used the DLF over the past two years for the following purposes? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>None at all</th>
<th>Once or twice</th>
<th>Several times</th>
<th>Many times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To identify your professional learning needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support principal performance and development processes?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support principal selection processes?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To analyse and reflect on your performance as a leader?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To recommend using the DLF to colleagues?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section B: UTILITY
How useful has the DLF been in supporting the following purposes? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Of limited use</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>professional learning</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal performance and development processes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal selection processes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-analysis and reflection</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How easy has the DLF been to use for the following purposes? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Very difficult to use</th>
<th>Some difficulty in use</th>
<th>Easy to use</th>
<th>Very easy to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>professional learning</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal performance and development processes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal selection processes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-analysis and reflection</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section C: CLARITY
**To what extent: ***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a minor extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a major extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>are the language and terms in the DLF clear and “user friendly”?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do the profiles give a clear description of the increasing levels of proficiency in each domain?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are the leadership capabilities required of teachers and school leaders (to create and sustain effective learning environments) clear?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are the developmental pathways in setting directions for your professional development clear?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section D: VALIDITY
**To what extent does the Leadership Framework address the following leadership and management practices: ***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a minor extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a major extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>core management practices of school principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices needed to establish, maintain and work within school networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices required to implement robust peer observation and feedback models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices that enable risk identification and management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices necessary to create and sustain robust approaches to teacher performance management and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**To what extent: ***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a minor extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a major extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>do the domains and capabilities in the Leadership Framework match your understanding and experience of what effective school leaders know and do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are the capabilities valid as a representation of the latest research and evidence about what effective school leaders know and do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section E: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE
To what extent: *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a minor extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a major extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>does the Leadership Framework adequately balance system need and reform imperatives with the professional learning needs of individuals and the school and its community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do the levels described in the Profiles distinguish well between different levels of performance in leadership (e.g. from novice to expert)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are the Profiles an effective means of illustrating increasing proficiency in each leadership domain?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do the Profiles clearly indicate what school leaders need to know and be able to do to meet each proficiency level?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have you used the Profiles to determine your current stage of development as a leader</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does the DLF provide you with clear guidelines about the kinds of actions on your part that will enhance your school’s functioning?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is the Leadership Framework an effective tool for supporting professional learning?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section F: Questions in this section concern the iLead 360-degree survey

The iLead 360-degree feedback survey, based on the DLF, is a tool to assist teachers and school leaders to reflect on their leadership capabilities and development needs.
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In the past two years, have you used the iLead 360-degree survey, or recommended the survey to colleagues?*

☐ Yes (If yes proceed)
☐ No (If no skip to Section G)
How many times have you used the iLead 360 degree survey over the past two years for the following purposes? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>None at all</th>
<th>Once or twice</th>
<th>Several times</th>
<th>Many times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to identify your professional learning needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to support principal performance and development processes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to support principal selection processes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to analyse and reflect on your performance as a leader?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to recommend using the iLead 360 degree survey to colleagues?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How useful has the iLead 360 degree survey been in supporting the following purposes? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Of limited use</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>professional learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal performance and development processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal selection processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-analysis and reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How easy has the iLead 360 degree survey been to use for the following purposes? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Very difficult to use</th>
<th>Some difficulty in use</th>
<th>Easy to use</th>
<th>Very easy to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>professional learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal performance and development processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal selection processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-analysis and reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section G: COMMENTS

Please indicate what are the most useful aspects of the DLF and why they are useful?

Please indicate what aspects of the DLF could be improved?

Section H

Which of the following reasons explain why you have not used the DLF? *

Please choose all that apply:

☐ I am not aware of the DLF
☐ I have not had enough training on how to use it
☐ I did not find it relevant to my school context
☐ It was unclear and difficult to apply in practice
☐ Other:

Thank you for completing this survey

You have indicated that you have not used the DLF for any purpose over the past two years. If this is the case, you are not required to answer any further questions. Please click the submit button to complete the survey.

Submit Your Survey.
Thank you for completing this survey.
ATTACHMENT 2 : Questions for focus group discussion

Section A: USEFULNESS

1. How many times have you used the DLF over the past two years for the following purposes?
   a. to identify your professional learning needs?
   b. to support principal performance and development processes?
   c. to support principal selection processes?
   d. to analysis and reflect on your performance as a leader?
2. How useful has the DLF been in supporting these purposes?
3. How easy has the DLF been to use for these purposes?
4. How many times have you recommended using the DLF to colleagues in the past two years?
5. To what extent are the language and terms in the DLF clear and “user friendly”??
6. How clear are the main elements of the Leadership Framework – the domains, the capabilities, and the profiles?
7. To what extent do the profiles give a clear description of the increasing levels of proficiency in each domain?
8. How clear are the developmental pathways in setting directions for your professional development?

Section B: VALIDITY

9. To what degree do the domains and capabilities in the Leadership Framework match your understanding and experience of what effective school leaders know and do?
10. To what degree does the Leadership Framework address the following leadership and management practices:
   a. core management practices of school principals
   b. practices needed to establish, maintain and work within school networks
   c. practices required to implement robust peer observation and feedback models
   d. practices that enable risk identification and management
   e. practices necessary to create and sustain robust approaches to teacher performance management and development
11. How valid are the capabilities as a representation of the latest research and evidence-about what effective school leaders know and do?
12. Do the profiles provide a valid basis to make judgments about the level of a school leader’s performance?
13. How difficult is it to judge what you have to do to be able to meet a particular level of performance or standard?

Section C: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE

14. Is the Leadership Framework an effective tool for supporting professional learning?
15. To what extent does the Leadership Framework adequately balance system need and reform imperatives with the professional learning needs of individuals and the school and its community?
16. How well do the levels described in the Profiles distinguish between different levels of performance in leadership (e.g. from novice to expert)?

17. Are the profiles an effective means of illustrating increasing proficiency in each leadership domain?

18. How clearly do the profiles indicate what school leaders need know and be able to do to meet each proficiency level?

19. Does the DLF provide you with clear guidelines about the kinds of actions on your part that will enhance your school’s functioning?

Section F: QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE ILEAD 360 DEGREE SURVEY

20. How many times have you used the iLead 360 degree survey over the past two years for the following purposes?
   a. to identify your professional learning needs?
   b. to support principal performance and development processes?
   c. to support principal selection processes?
   d. to analysis and reflect on your performance as a leader?

21. How useful has the iLead 360 degree survey been in supporting these purposes?

22. How easy has the iLead 360 degree survey been to use for these purposes?
## ATTACHMENT 3: Summary of the Ontario Leadership Framework 2012
(Adapted from Leithwood, 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAINS</th>
<th>PRACTICES</th>
<th>COMPONENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Setting Directions</strong></td>
<td><strong>A. Building a shared vision:</strong> Establish, with staff, students and other stakeholders, an overall sense of purpose or vision for work in their schools to which they are all strongly committed; Build understanding of the specific implications of the schools’ vision for its’ programs and the nature of classroom instruction; Encourage the development of organizational norms that support openness to change in the direction of that purpose or vision; Help staff and other stakeholders to understand the relationship between their schools’ vision and board and provincial policy initiatives and priorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Identifying Specific, Shared, Short-term Goals</strong></td>
<td>Facilitate stakeholder engagement in processes for identifying specific school goals; Do whatever is necessary to make the goals clear to all stakeholders; Regularly encourage staff to evaluate their progress toward achieving school goals; Encourage staff to develop and periodically review individual professional growth goals, as well as the relationship between their individual professional goals and the school’s goals Make frequent explicit reference to (and use of) the school’s goals when engaged in decisions about school programs and directions; Build consensus among students, staff and other stakeholders for the school’s goals and priorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Creating High performance Expectations</strong></td>
<td>Have high expectations for teachers, for students, and for themselves; Devote additional effort to creating high expectations among staff for the achievement of students who have traditionally struggled to be successful at school; Encourage staff to be innovative, if needed, in achieving those expectations; Encourage staff to assume responsibility for achieving the schools vision and goals with all students; Make their expectations known through both their words and (especially) their actions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Communicating the Vision and Goals</strong></td>
<td>Use many different formal and informal opportunities to explain the overall vision and goals established for the school to stakeholders; Demonstrate to all stakeholders what the school’s visions and goals mean in practice; Regularly invite different stakeholder groups to describe how their work furthers the schools’ vision and goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Domains, Practices, and Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Building Relationships and Developing People</strong></td>
<td>Providing Support and Demonstrating Consideration for Individual Staff Members</td>
<td>Recognize individual staff member accomplishments; Take staff members’ opinion into consideration when initiating actions that affect their work; Build upon and respond to individual staff members’ unique needs and expertise; Treat individuals and groups equitably.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stimulating Growth in the Professional Capacities of Staff</td>
<td>Encourage staff to reflect on what they are trying to achieve with students and how they are doing it; Lead discussions about the relative merits of current and alternative practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge staff to re-examine the extent to which their practices contribute to the learning and well-being of all of their students; Facilitate opportunities for staff to learn from each other; Are a source of new ideas for staff learning; Encourage staff to pursue their own goals for professional learning; Encourage staff to develop and review their own professional growth goals and their relationship to school goals and priorities; Encourage staff to try new practices consistent with their own interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modeling the School’s Values and Practices</td>
<td>Are highly visible in their schools; Are easily accessible to staff, parents and students; Have relatively frequent, meaningful, interactions with teachers, students and parents; Demonstrate the importance of continuous learning through visible engagement in their own professional learning; Exemplify, through their own actions, the school’s core values and many of its desired practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building trusting relationships with and among staff, students and parents</td>
<td>Are visibly competent when carrying out their tasks; Act in ways that consistently reflect the school’s core values and priorities; Demonstrate respect for staff, students and parents by listening to their ideas, being open to those ideas and genuinely considering their value; Encourage staff, students and parents to listen to one another’s ideas and genuinely consider their value; Create norms in the school which value constructive debate about best practices; Demonstrate respect, care and personal regard for students, staff and parents; Encourage staff, students and parents to demonstrate respect, care and personal regard for one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishing productive working relationships with teacher federation representatives</td>
<td>Explicitly including federation representatives (along with staff more generally) in processes for establishing goals for school improvement; Encouraging federation representatives to keep their members well-informed about their work with school leaders; Encouraging federation representatives to collaborate in determining how to implement labor contract provisions so as not to significantly impede school improvement work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMAINS</td>
<td>PRACTICES</td>
<td>COMPONENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Developing the Organization to Sustain Desired Practices</td>
<td>Building Collaborative Cultures and Distributing Leadership</td>
<td>Model collaboration in the conduct of their own work; Nurture mutual respect and trust among those involved in collaborating; Help develop the shared determination of group processes and outcomes; Help develop clarity about goals and roles for collaboration; Encourage a willingness to compromise among collaborators; Foster open and fluent communication among collaborators; Provide adequate and consistent resources in support of collaborative work; Involve staff in the design and implementation of important school decisions and policies; Provide staff with leadership opportunities and support them as they take on these opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structuring the Organization to Facilitate Collaboration</td>
<td>Create timetables for teaching that maximize time on task for students; Provide regular opportunities and encouragement for teachers to work together on instructional improvement; Establish team and group structures for problem solving; Participate with staff in their collective instructional improvement work; Distribute leadership for selected tasks; and Engage teachers in making decisions that affect their instructional work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Productive Relationships with Families and Communities</td>
<td>Create a school environment in which parents are welcomed, respected and valued as partners in their children’s learning; Demonstrate the type of leadership which parents trust (leadership which is confident, systematic and attentive to the details of the school’s functioning); Develop staff commitment to engaging parents in the school; With staff, work directly with diverse families to help them provide their children with supports in the home that will contribute to their success at schools; Assist staff to better use the social and intellectual capital of students from diverse family backgrounds for instructional purposes in their classrooms; Encourage staff to adopt a broad view of what might be entailed in parent engagement, a view that permits more parents to be involved than would be possible if engagement meant only attendance at events in the school, for example: when needed, help connect families to the wider network of social services they may need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connecting the School to its Wider Environment</td>
<td>To other expert school and district leaders; To those knowledgeable about policy developments in the province; and To members of the educational research community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMAINS</td>
<td>PRACTICES</td>
<td>COMPONENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a Safe and Healthy School Environment</td>
<td>Securing their schools’ physical facilities from unwanted intrusions and intruders; Maintaining the physical facilities in a safe, healthy and attractive condition; Communicating standards for non-violent behavior and upholding those standards in an equitable manner; Empowering adults in the school to play a leadership role in promoting a positive school climate and model appropriate behaviour; Implementing and monitoring the use of appropriate discipline practices not only in classrooms but in all other locations within their schools; Developing, with staff and students, processes to identify and resolve conflicts quickly and effectively; Providing opportunities for staff and students to learn about effective conflict resolution strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocating resources in support of the school’s vision and goals</td>
<td>Secure sufficient resources of all types (e.g., staff expertise, curriculum material, time) needed to carry out the instructional work of the school; Manage efficient budgetary processes; Provide sustained funding for their schools’ improvement priorities; Distribute resources of all types in ways that are closely aligned with the school’s improvement priorities; Revisit and realign the nature, amount, and alignment of resources as priorities for school improvement change. Ensure effective oversight and accountability of resources to support priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improving the Instructional Program</td>
<td>Staffing the instructional program. 1. Criteria for selecting staff Commitment to the ongoing improvement of their own instructional capacities; Extensive pedagogical content knowledge and/or the potential to acquire such knowledge; Willingness and ability to collaborate with other staff members for purposes of instructional and school improvement; General agreement with the school’s goals and priorities and a willingness to help accomplish those goals and priorities</td>
<td>Professional development Providing professional development and other forms of support for teachers; Giving teachers more roles (distributing leadership); Providing time for collaboration and planning; Creating a shared vision for instruction; Building trusting relationships among staff and with school leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMAINS</td>
<td>PRACTICES</td>
<td>COMPONENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing instructional support. 2.</td>
<td>Actively overseeing the instructional program;</td>
<td>Providing adequate preparation time for teachers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinating what is taught across subjects and grades to avoid unnecessary</td>
<td>Being a useful source of advice to teachers about how to solve classroom problems;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>overlap while providing needed reinforcement and extension of learning</td>
<td>Engaging teachers in observing effective instructional practices among colleagues in their own school, as well as in other schools;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>goals;</td>
<td>Participating with staff in their instructional improvement work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observing in classrooms and providing constructive feedback that is useful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to teachers;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing adequate preparation time for teachers;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being a useful source of advice to teachers about how to solve classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>problems;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engaging teachers in observing effective instructional practices among</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>colleagues in their own school, as well as in other schools;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participating with staff in their instructional improvement work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring student learning and school</td>
<td>Assist their staffs in understanding the importance of student assessment</td>
<td>Collect and use data about the status of those classroom and school conditions serving as the focus of their school improvement efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvement progress 3.</td>
<td>“for, of, and as learning”;</td>
<td>Time for staff members to meet in order to analyze, interpret and act on results;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborate with staff during the process of data interpretation;</td>
<td>Suitable professional development for teachers about how to collect, interpret and use systematically-collected evidence in their classrooms and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use multiple sources of evidence when diagnosing student progress;</td>
<td>schools;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Award priority to identifying students most in need of additional support;</td>
<td>An organizational culture which supports explicit data use in almost all decision making;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate explicit data use in almost all decisions about student</td>
<td>Partnerships with those outside the school, when needed, who are able to assist in data interpretation and use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning and school improvement;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examine trends in student achievement over time (one or more years),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rather than just at one point in time, when assessing student learning;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collect and use data about the status of those classroom and school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conditions serving as the focus of their school improvement efforts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time for staff members to meet in order to analyze, interpret and act on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>results;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suitable professional development for teachers about how to collect,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interpret and use systematically-collected evidence in their classrooms and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>schools;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An organizational culture which supports explicit data use in almost all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decision making;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnerships with those outside the school, when needed, who are able to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assist in data interpretation and use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffering staff from distractions to their</td>
<td>Create and enforce consistent, school-wide discipline policies;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work 4.</td>
<td>Minimize daily disruptions to classroom instructional time;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement a systematic procedure for deciding how best to respond to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>initiatives from outside the school;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop, with staff, guidelines to govern the amount of time teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spend on non-instructional and out-of-school activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regularly assess the contribution of all out-of-classroom activities to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the learning priorities of students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5. Securing Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAINS</th>
<th>PRACTICES</th>
<th>COMPONENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building staff members’ sense of internal accountability</strong></td>
<td>Promoting collective responsibility and accountability for student achievement and well-being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insisting on the use of evidence that is of “high quality”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regularly engaging staff in the analysis of such evidence about the learning progress of all students;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessing one’s own contributions to school achievements and taking account of feedback from others;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participating actively in personal external evaluation and making adjustments to better meet expectations and goals;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helping staff make connections between school goals and ministry goals in order to strengthen commitment to school improvement efforts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 6. Meeting the demands for external accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING THE DEMANDS FOR EXTERNAL ACCOUNTABILITY</th>
<th>CLEARLY DEFINE INDIVIDUAL STAFF ACCOUNTABILITIES IN TERMS THAT ARE UNDERSTOOD, AGREED TO AND CAN BE RIGOROUSLY REVIEWED AND EVALUATED;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measure and monitor teacher and leader effectiveness using evidence about changes in student achievement and well-being;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Align school targets with board and provincial targets;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide an accurate and transparent account of the school’s performance to all school stakeholders (e.g., ministry, board, parents, community);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create organizational structures that reflect the school’s values and ensure that management systems, structures and processes reflect legal requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: This is only a summary of the ISLLC standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **An education leader promotes the success of every student by:** | **A.** Collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission  
**B.** Collect and use data to identify goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and promote organizational learning  
**C.** Create and implement plans to achieve goals  
**D.** Promote continuous and sustainable improvement  
**E.** Monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans |
| **1. Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.** | **A.** Nurture and sustain a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations  
**B.** Create a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program  
**C.** Create a personalized and motivating learning environment for students  
**D.** Supervise instruction  
**E.** Develop assessment and accountability systems to monitor student progress  
**F.** Develop the instructional and leadership capacity of staff  
**G.** Maximize time spent on quality instruction  
**H.** Promote the use of the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning  
**I.** Monitor and evaluate the impact of the instructional program |
| **2. Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.** | **A.** Monitor and evaluate the management and operational systems  
**B.** Obtain, allocate, align, and efficiently utilize human, fiscal, and technological resources  
**C.** Promote and protect the welfare and safety of students and staff  
**D.** Develop the capacity for distributed leadership  
**E.** Ensure teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instruction and student learning |
| **3. Ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.** | **A.** Collect and analyse data and information pertinent to the educational environment  
**B.** Promote understanding, appreciation, and use of the community’s diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources  
**C.** Build and sustain positive relationships with families and caregivers  
**D.** Build and sustain productive relationships with community partners |
| **4. Collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.** | **A.** Ensure a system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success  
**B.** Model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behaviour  
**C.** Safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity  
**D.** Consider and evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making  
**E.** Promote social justice and ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling |
| **5. Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.** | **A.** Advocate for children, families, and caregivers  
**B.** Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning  
**C.** Assess, analyse, and anticipate emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies |
| **6. Understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.** | **A.** Collect and analyse data and information pertinent to the educational environment  
**B.** Promote understanding, appreciation, and use of the community’s diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources  
**C.** Build and sustain positive relationships with families and caregivers  
**D.** Build and sustain productive relationships with community partners |

A Review of Victoria’s Development Learning Framework for School Leaders
### ATTACHMENT 5: Elaboration of Standard 1, CCSSO/ISLLC: performance expectations and indicators for education leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard/Performance expectation</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1: Vision, Mission, and Goals    | A. High Expectations for All | A leader...  
Education leaders ensure the achievement of all students by guiding the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, strong organizational mission, and high expectations for every student. |
|                                  | The vision and goals establish high, measurable expectations for all students and educators. | 1. Uses varied sources of information and analyzes data about current practices and outcomes to shape a vision, mission, and goals with high, measurable expectations for all students and educators. |
|                                  | A leader... | 2. Aligns the vision, mission, and goals to school, district, state, and federal policies (such as content standards and achievement targets). |
|                                  | A leader... | 3. Incorporates diverse perspectives and crafts consensus about vision, mission, and goals that are high and achievable for every student when provided with appropriate, effective learning opportunities. |
|                                  | A leader... | 4. Advocates for a specific vision of learning in which every student has equitable, appropriate, and effective learning opportunities and achieves at high levels. |
|                                  | B. Shared Commitments to Implement the Vision, Mission, and Goals | The process of creating and sustaining the vision, mission, and goals is inclusive, building common understandings and genuine commitment among all stakeholders. |
|                                  | A leader... | 1. Establishes, conducts, and evaluates processes used to engage staff and community in a shared vision, mission, and goals. |
|                                  | A leader... | 2. Engages diverse stakeholders, including those with conflicting perspectives, in ways that build shared understanding and commitment to vision, mission, and goals. |
|                                  | A leader... | 3. Develops shared commitments and responsibilities that are distributed among staff and the community for making decisions and evaluating actions and outcomes. |
|                                  | A leader... | 4. Communicates and acts from shared vision, mission, and goals so educators and the community understand, support, and act on them consistently. |
|                                  | A leader... | 5. Advocates for and acts on commitments in the vision, mission, and goals to provide equitable, appropriate, and effective learning opportunities for every student. |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element C. Continuous Improvement toward the Vision, Mission, and Goals</th>
<th>A leader...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education leaders ensure the achievement of all students by guiding the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, strong organizational mission, and high expectations for every student</td>
<td>1. Uses or develops data systems and other sources of information (e.g., test scores, teacher reports, student work samples) to identify unique strengths and needs of students, gaps between current outcomes and goals, and areas for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators: A leader...</td>
<td>2. Makes decisions informed by data, research, and best practices to shape plans, programs, and activities and regularly review their effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Uses data to determine effective change strategies, engaging staff and community stakeholders in planning and carrying out changes in programs and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Identifies and removes barriers to achieving the vision, mission, and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Incorporates the vision and goals into planning (e.g., strategic plan, school improvement plan), change strategies, and instructional programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Obtains and aligns resources (such as learning technologies, staff, time, funding, materials, training, and so on) to achieve the vision, mission, and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Revises plans, programs, and activities based on systematic evidence and reviews of progress toward the vision, mission, and goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 6: National Board Propositions for Accomplished Educational Leaders

Skills
1. Accomplished educational leaders continuously cultivate their understanding of leadership and the change process to meet high levels of performance. (Leadership)
2. Accomplished educational leaders have a clear vision and inspire and engage stakeholders in developing and realizing the mission. (Vision)
3. Accomplished educational leaders manage and leverage systems and processes to achieve desired results. (Management)

Applications
4. Accomplished educational leaders are committed to student and adult learners and to their development. (Learners & Learning)
5. Accomplished educational leaders drive, facilitate, and monitor the teaching and learning process. (Instruction)
6. Accomplished educational leaders act with a sense of urgency to foster a cohesive culture of learning. (Culture)

Dispositions
7. Accomplished educational leaders model professional, ethical behavior and expect it from others. (Ethics)
8. Accomplished educational leaders ensure equitable learning opportunities and high expectations for all. (Equity)
9. Accomplished educational leaders advocate on behalf of their schools, communities, and profession. (Advocacy)
ATTACHMENT 7: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) Accomplished Principal Standards
(Summary only)

Accomplished Principal Standards

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) Accomplished Principal Standards breaks new ground by creating benchmarks for performance at the highest level for accomplished principals. First and foremost, these standards are intended to define and describe accomplished leadership for school principals. They may also be used by individuals to raise their practice, by organizations and institutions of higher education for principal preparation programs, and by school districts and states for professional development of current principals. The standards presented here should be viewed as aspirational. To aspire is to be inspired, to stretch, and to dedicate oneself to reaching a distinguished goal. As the hallmark of accomplished principals across the country, these standards will elevate the work of all staff in the learning community and in the district and realize high performance for all students.

The Standard Statements

Standard I: Leadership for Results
Accomplished principals lead with a sense of urgency and achieve the highest results for all students and adults. They build organizational capacity by developing leadership in others. These dynamic, forward-thinking principals lead collaborative organizations that realize and sustain positive change that enhances teacher practice and improves student learning.

Standard II: Vision and Mission
Accomplished principals lead and inspire the learning community to develop, articulate, and commit to a shared and compelling vision of the highest levels of student learning and adult instructional practice. These principals advance the mission through collaborative processes that focus and drive the organization toward the vision.

Standard III: Teaching and Learning
Accomplished principals ensure that teaching and learning are the primary focus of the organization. As stewards of learning, these principals lead the implementation of a rigorous, relevant, and balanced curriculum. They work collaboratively to implement a common instructional framework that aligns curriculum with teaching, assessment, and learning, and provides a common language for instructional quality that guides teacher conversation, practice, observation, evaluation, and feedback. They know a full range of pedagogy and make certain that all adults have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to support student success.

Standard IV: Knowledge of Students and Adults
Accomplished principals ensure that each student and adult in the learning community is known and valued. These principals develop systems so that individuals are supported socially, emotionally, and intellectually, in their development, learning, and achievement.
Standard V: Culture
Accomplished principals inspire and nurture a culture of high expectations, where actions support the common values and beliefs of the organization. These principals build authentic, productive relationships that foster a collaborative spirit. They honor the culture of the students, adults, and larger community, demonstrating respect for diversity and ensuring equity. They create and maintain a trusting, safe environment that promotes effective adult practice and student learning.

Standard VI: Strategic Management
Accomplished principals skillfully lead the design, development, and implementation of strategic management systems and processes that actualize the vision and mission. These principals lead the monitoring and adaptation of systems and processes to ensure they are effective and efficient in support of a high-performing organization focused on effective teaching and learning.

Standard VII: Advocacy
Accomplished principals effectively advocate internally and externally to advance the organization’s vision and mission. These principals strategically seek, inform, and mobilize influential educational, political, and community leaders to advocate for all students and adults in the learning community.

Standard VIII: Ethics
Accomplished principals are ethical. They consistently demonstrate a high degree of personal and professional ethics exemplified by integrity, justice, and equity. These principals establish a culture in which exemplary ethical behaviour is practiced by all stakeholders.

Standard IX: Reflection and Growth
Accomplished principals are humble lead learners who make their practice public and view their own learning as a foundational part of the work of school leadership. They are reflective practitioners who build on their strengths and identify areas for personal and professional growth. They adapt their paradigm and practice to result in improved student performance and enhanced teacher instruction through reflective practices.
ATTACHMENT 8: The NBPTS Architecture of Accomplished Educational Leading

The Architecture of Accomplished Educational Leading triple helix illustrates the upwardly spiraling process reflective of an accomplished educational leader’s practice. The three strands portray the skills, applications and dispositions as defined in the core propositions and applied through eight stages in an integrated process.

1. Your Learning Community & Your Leadership
   - What is the vision/mission?
   - What are the goals for the learning community?
   - What is the context of your learning community?
   - Where are your stakeholders in relation to the vision/mission?
   - What do they need or you need from them?
   - What are your leadership strengths?
   - How can you effectively lead your learning community?
   - How can you and your learning community achieve desired results?
   - (Leadership, Vision, Management, Culture, Learners & Learning, Ethics, Equity, Advocacy)

2. Engage stakeholders in setting equitable, substantive and high value goals informed by data.
   - Ethics, Equity, Advocacy

3. Design, develop and deploy organizational, curricular and instructional interventions to strengthen the learning culture and achieve goals.
   - Leadership, Management, Culture, Ethics, Advocacy

4. Lead, facilitate and use interventions, resources and systems while developing stakeholder capacity to build a learning culture and achieve desired results.
   - (Management, Culture, Initiation, Ethics, Equity, Advocacy)

5. Engage the broader district and community to provide resources and support interventions, system building and change to achieve the goals.
   - Leadership, Vision, Management, Advocacy

6. Assess and adjust systems and strategies to strengthen the learning culture and better achieve goals for all learners.
   - Leadership, Management, Culture, Ethics, Equity, Advocacy

7. Celebrate successes, reflect on the opportunities for all, and inspire stakeholders inside and outside the learning community to high levels of performance.
   - (Leadership, Vision, Learners & Learning, Ethics, Equity, Advocacy)

8. Set new goals that build on all students' and adults' successes and needs to advance the school's mission and vision, increase growth and performance, and strengthen your leadership.
   - Leadership, Vision, Learners & Learning, Equity, Advocacy