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The Science of Learning Research Centre (SLRC)

The SLRC, established in 2012, was funded as an Australian Research Council special research initiative. Its aim was to improve learner outcomes in Australian schools. The SLRC was led by the University of Queensland and the University of Melbourne, with key stakeholders in both the Victorian and Queensland departments of education. By bringing together leading researchers from neuroscience, education and cognitive psychology, and by working together with schools, the SLRC is endeavouring to generate new findings and enhance the practice of educators.

Recent advancements in learning science research mean that we know more about learning now than at any other time in human existence. Neuroscience, cognitive psychology and pedagogic research offer empirical insight into better understanding, measuring and promoting human development.

It is well understood that in order to impact learning, the scientifically validated learning strategies generated by the SLRC must to be connected in reliable and powerful ways with school leaders and classroom practitioners.

Getting the right frequency

Schools are awash in professional learning and so-called improvement stimulus. Professional bodies, publishers, consultants, research institutes, bureaucrats, policymakers, social media and collegiate networks—to name but a few—inundate schools with material that more often than not has simply no impact on the quality of learning inside the classrooms. Irrespective of truth and eminence, these propositions are unable to influence the cognitive maps, beliefs and understandings of educators to the extent necessary.
to effectively improve outcomes for students at scale (Friedlander & Snyder, 1983). Furthermore, there is evidence within organisational learning research to suggest that these attempts to enrich can in fact have the opposite effect. They create a chaos and confusion as schools and teachers deviate from one piece of information towards the next, with inadequate focus and time to learn (O’Day, 2002).

This tension plays out in predictably destructive ways. In their perplexity, schools may choose to actively shut themselves off from these external influences entirely. In that case, isolation often ensues and idiosyncratic practice becomes the norm. Performance invariably slides and the centre is typically left to respond with a program of compliance and bureaucratic accountabilities that inevitably fails to promote widespread organisational adaptation (O’Day, 2002).

There does seem to be consensus that an intelligent model of improvement is required—a model capable of balancing the external accountabilities designed to influence the function of schools with the need to capitalise on the internal professional efficacy within and between schools. Highly effective school improvement programs need to be capable of encouraging growth in schools wherever they might be in their developmental journey. Commonly, schools and networks moving from ‘poor to adequate’ on the improvement continuum are known to subscribe to a suite of prescriptive tactics (Hopkins, Munro, & Craig, 2011). In the absence of a guiding philosophical framework that provides strategic direction, the flurry of surface-level professional development activity can manifest as adhocism. When considering the design for our community of practice, we understood that we needed to support schools to develop a coherent overarching strategy—one that connected the various components of their plan in a manner that promoted both depth and coherence.

Not to but with

For effective translation of learning research to occur at the school and practitioner level, we endorse the creation of new knowledge with the practitioner—and not to the practitioner. The role of practice-based evidence must be respected and supported. Personal and environmental factors influence behaviours in predictive and powerful ways and therefore should be acknowledged appropriately in the engagement. Capacity-building methods that take a social systems view of learning can also positively change the relationship between research and practice. A researcher–practitioner collaboration model succeeds because of its capacity to:

• contribute to the inquiry-based repertoire of the educator
• enhance the fidelity of implementation.

The Science of Learning Network of Schools (SoLNoS)

In the simplest terms, the SoLNoS in Victoria is a learning partnership. It is a pilot network made up of 13 ‘pioneer’ schools, representing all education sectors (faith-based, independent and government) and schooling all stages and ages of learner, from early years to senior secondary. The learning communities are both geographically and socially diverse.

The network’s commitment to itself is to support leadership teams with critical guidance and access to the most relevant and reliable learning research available. As one of us has been a principal and leader for almost 10 years, we are acutely aware of the challenges across our school system in both the understanding of and access to quality learning research.

Wenger’s (2009) research in the domain of communities of practice provides an excellent framework in delineating four key disciplines of an effective community of practice:

• The discipline of domain: What is our partnership about? Why should we care? Are we likely to be useful to each other? What is our learning agenda? What specific set of issues does it entail?

• The discipline of community: Who should be at the table so the partnership can make progress? What effects will their participation have on the trust and dynamics of the group? How do we manage the boundaries of the community?

• The discipline of practice: How can the practice become the curriculum? How can it be made visible and inspectable? What should participants do together to learn and benefit from the partnership?

• The discipline of convening: Who will take leadership in holding a social learning space for this partnership? How can we make sure that the partnership sustains a productive inquiry? Who are the external stakeholders and what are their roles? What resources are available to support the process? (p. 12)

These disciplines proved valuable in the establishment of the guiding principles and common beliefs of the SoLNoS network.
Understanding how schools learn best

There were always going to be clear challenges in settling on an ideal networked learning model—one agile enough to be able to meet the diverse demands of a multiplicity of learning contexts. So what were the options? The research of Nadler (1970) and Glaser (1962) suggested that different theories of instruction are appropriate for different contexts. Few in education would dispute this. The complexity of the task and the capability of the learner are represented in a two-type taxonomy related to a corresponding model of instruction, shown in Figure 1.

**First order: Training**

Training or behavioural models are generally associated with specific actionable objectives. In schools, we see examples including compliance and certification modules. In this domain, learning is generally surface-level. Learners are often working with static content, by themselves, and because they have been instructed to. Consequently, the generic nature of the program renders it impotent in developing the capacity of the individual to think and act differently. In schools, learning design of this nature encourages an awareness of an organisation’s first-order priorities, which are generally akin to keeping everybody alive, out of jail and off the front page of the morning papers.

**Second order: Teaching**

Cognitive models of instruction, such as didactic teaching, are associated with the development of a broader set of objectives than training models. This usually involves more complex tasks that require decision-making and professional judgement. Learners are also expected to draw from a set of established disciplines. Activity-based learning is a common feature of this methodology, and the learner outcomes are often predetermined and limited by the complexity of the task. Large institutions such as universities and government departments rely heavily on second-order learning strategies because they are conducive with the institutional mindset. They are also convenient; however, they are not overly effective in building more complex skills with highly competent learners.

**Third order: Self-directed inquiry**

Psychological models of learning are intended to facilitate greater connections between the learner and the learning. Developmental at this level is distinguished from second-order learning most notably by an increased focus on metacognitive strategies. Self-directed inquiry regularly requires a set of core learner capabilities to permit the level of independence necessary, and therefore teaching and training approaches can be deployed at times to complement third-order strategies and provide the necessary surface-level learning.
The effect of the professional development experience is strongly associated with the features of the activity rather than the format and content (Desimone, 2009). Given that teacher professional learning aims to improve student outcomes, it should be measured against its ability to impact the following aspects:

- the knowledge, beliefs and skills of an individual or group
- the practices evidently impacting student learning.

Consequently, it was necessary in the design of the SoLNoS to develop an associated evaluative framework and performance metrics.

In light of the research, when we contemplated the SoLNoS model of practice, it was essential that a school’s engagement with learning science was positioned in a very specific way. Simply having the research on a website or as part of a series of attractive publications was obviously not going to be enough. The very principles that govern human learning needed to live in the experience for SoLNoS members. Relevance, autonomy, collaboration and authentic outcomes would be central to its success.

A school’s experience

Point Cook Prep to Year 9 College is a large government school situated in one of Australia’s fastest developing growth corridors. Led by its principal, Frank Vetere—a co-author of this paper—and through the SoLNoS, Point Cook College has embarked on a schoolwide plan to better embed student-centred learning structures and related pedagogical practices within its curriculum and learning programs. The college aims to improve student engagement across the school so that every child is better connected and suitably challenged in their learning. Student voice, learner agency, assessment practices and student leadership are the lead research constructs.

The SoLNoS proposes to do three things:

1. support schools’ understanding of the research constructs that sit behind their priority areas by helping them to move from potentially lightweight colloquial interpretations to a firmer grasp of more dependable definitions and frameworks
2. support schools to better interpret the data and evidence being used to inform their strategic directions by encouraging deeper analysis of both validity and reliability
3. support the design and implementation of a professional learning strategy for the professional workforces in the schools.

The SoLNoS is assisting the professional workforce in schools like Point Cook College to understand, measure and promote learning more effectively.

The SLRC at the University of Melbourne is truly proud to be working with these 13 dynamic pilot school communities and early learning centres as part of the inaugural SoLNoS. In supporting our coalition of leadership teams to better connect learning research with school improvement strategy, we facilitate a powerful and authentic community of practice predicated on building capacity to build capacity.
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