

*School Accountability Framework Review
Positioning Statements*

SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK REVIEW

BACKGROUND

Following an extended period of development, including substantial consultation with stakeholder groups, the School Accountability Framework (SAF) was released during 2002.

The SAF describes the fundamental commitments and key concepts on which it is based, presents the four policy points and explains each of its four components: schools plan; schools self-assess; schools produce a School Report; and district directors review schools.

Subsequent to the development of the SAF a draft School Review Framework was introduced in 2003. This document provided further detail in respect of the fourth component of the SAF – district directors review schools. Following completion of the 2003-4 review cycle further development work was undertaken to produce the School Review Framework 2005-2007, which was released in August, 2005.

Additional advice, tools and support documents have recently been made available through the School Accountability website.

The review presents an opportunity to build on the strengths of the current framework, address any weaknesses and consider new directions appropriate to the Western Australian context.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The terms of reference for the School Accountability Framework Review are:

To determine:

- the extent to which the overall intended outcomes of the framework have been achieved;
- the extent to which compliance has been achieved with the four policy statements and the specific components of the framework;
- the extent to which the current framework aligns with and fulfils current stakeholder expectations for school accountability;
- the national and international practices and trends relating to school accountability and how these may inform the WA context; and
- recommendations for any changes required to the current framework.

MANAGEMENT OF THE REVIEW

A Steering Committee has overseen the SAF Review. The Deputy Director General, Schools, is Chair of the Steering Committee and Corporate Executive sponsor for the review.

The Steering Committee comprises all members of the Schools Executive Team and the senior officers from the business area with direct responsibilities related to the review.

The Deputy Director General, Schools, also chairs a Reference Group which includes representatives from the following key stakeholder groups:

Western Australian Council of State School Organisations (WACSSO)
Western Australian District High School Administrators' Association (WADHSAA)
Western Australian Education Support Principals' Association (WAESPA)
Western Australian Primary Principals' Association (WAPPA)
Western Australian Secondary School Executives Association (WASSEA)
Western Australian Secondary Teaching Administrators' Association (WASTAA)
State School Teachers' Union of Western Australia (SSTUWA)
District Directors (2) – one metro, one country
Evaluation and Accountability Directorate (2)
Steering Group (Deputy Director General, Schools; Executive Directors, Schools)

The Director, Evaluation and Accountability has direct management responsibility for the Review, including the independent evaluation. The day to day management of the review, including the development of supporting documentation and executive services to the Reference Group is undertaken by the School Performance Branch.

COMPONENTS OF THE REVIEW

The review has three main components:

- an independent, external evaluation of the current School Accountability Framework;
- investigation of international and national practices and trends relating to school accountability; and
- stakeholder consultation relating to the findings of the evaluation, international and national research and possible future directions.

1. Independent, external evaluation of the current School Accountability Framework

The evaluation examined and responded to the following key questions which address three of the terms of reference of the review.

To what extent have the overall intended outcomes of the framework been achieved?

To what extent has compliance been achieved with the four policy statements and the specific components of the framework?

To what extent does the framework align with and fulfil current stakeholder expectations for school accountability?

The Executive Summary of the independent evaluation has been included as an appendix in this document. The full report is available online from the SAF Review area at <http://www.det.wa.edu.au/education/accountability/>.

2. Investigation of international and national practices and trends relating to school accountability

This component specifically addressed the fourth term of reference. The investigation was carried out by officers within the School Performance Branch who: undertook a review of current literature; gained additional perspectives from key contacts both nationally and

internationally; sought specific input from senior officers who have been involved with study tours relating to school accountability; and built on the draft *Summary of Approaches* document prepared for the Ninth Australasian Accountability Network Meeting in 2005.

The document *National and International Perspectives and Approaches to School Accountability – Executive Summary* has been included as an appendix in this document. A variety of summary and detailed support documents produced for this component of the review are also available online from the SAF Review area at <http://www.det.wa.edu.au/education/accountability/>.

3. Stakeholder consultation

The independent evaluation involved extensive consultation with identified key stakeholders – district directors, principals, teachers and parents. Consultation to date has also included the Change Management Group, Education Executive and discussions and workshops at State Executive and with district directors.

The third component of the review primarily relates to opportunities for stakeholder input following completion of the independent evaluation and the investigation of national and international approaches and trends.

This document has been prepared to summarise the key findings of the previous components in a manner which informs the development of a revised SAF. This document will be used in some forums though it is intended that a draft of the revised SAF will be the primary focus for additional stakeholder consultation.

POSITIONING STATEMENTS

Based on the findings and conclusions of the independent evaluation, the national and international literature review and additional consultation, the SAF Review Steering Committee has developed a set of positioning statements to guide the development of an improved School Accountability Framework.

1. The School Accountability Framework is rigorous, robust and well regarded but is yet to be fully implemented and can be improved.
2. School accountability relates to providing system and public assurance and the ongoing pursuit of quality improvement.
3. School self-assessment is at the heart of effective accountability.
4. Demonstrating accountability is a professional responsibility of school staff and is explicitly linked to performance management.
5. School self-assessment and school review must primarily encompass judgements about the quality of outcomes being achieved by students and should also address the effectiveness of school operations.
6. The introduction of a targeted 'independent' review group would complement the district director review model.
7. The accountability processes must be linked to the availability of comprehensive and appropriate intervention and support.
8. Accountability is a reciprocal concept where the responsibilities of the system (central and district offices), parents and students must be acknowledged and accepted.
9. Providing assurance to the individual school and wider community of the quality of public schools is achieved through a variety of ways.
10. There should only be one framework document supported by a range of quality resources, tools and non-mandated templates.

Each of the following pages present:

- an individual positioning statement;
- additional details and commentary including the rationale for inclusion; and
- an area to record your reactions and comments.

Where significant issues and potential change are presented additional commentary and notes space has been provided.

6. *The introduction of a targeted 'independent' review group would complement the district director review model.*

Several education systems throughout the world have long established external inspection models. Others have more recently introduced such models or are considering them.

One of the perceived strengths of the inspection models is the level of independence achieved, however, such models are generally considered to be expensive and may lack timeliness. Where inspection models have recently been reviewed (including England, New Zealand, Scotland and Victoria) there has been movement to streamline processes including the introduction of differential approaches and a lighter touch for the schools considered as highly effective.

Sanctions and rewards are elements of the accountability processes in some of the countries reviewed, with greater autonomy being awarded to highly effective schools perhaps being the most appealing for the Western Australian public school context.

The independent review found that the vast majority of principals and district directors agreed that the district director was the right person to review schools. The school review was identified as an important feedback mechanism for schools.

Forum discussions indicated that the efficacy of the review process is very dependent on the district director: their skills and knowledge, their understanding of the framework, and also their relationship with individual principals.

The variation in the expectations of different district directors needs to be addressed and there were suggestions for alternative review mechanisms such as the use of teams. It is notable that under the current framework there have been many cases where review visits have involved more than one district director, a district director with an executive director or a district director with a principal in an associate reviewer role.

The aim should be to gain the 'best of both worlds' in a model that retains efficiency.

It is suggested that a small independent (though still internal) review team be formed to undertake detailed reviews of schools identified as requiring intervention and support to become effective. The major outcome of the review would be a detailed action plan for improvement.

The team would be formed on an individual school review basis, drawing on different district directors, principals and other personnel with expertise appropriate for the school under review. While highly effective principals and other personnel would be identified on an individual review basis, additional centrally based positions would be required to form an ongoing core team which would provide the lead reviewer. The role to be played by a school's existing district director needs to be carefully considered.

While reviews of schools of particular concern would be the focus for the review team it is also suggested that the team might undertake reviews to provide confirmation of schools considered to be highly effective and reviews on a sample basis to validate school and district director judgements.

'In many educational systems everybody seems to hate external evaluation while nobody trusts internal evaluation.' Nevo, (2001)

9. *Providing assurance to the individual school and wider community of the quality of public schools is achieved through a variety of ways.*

In many of the countries reviewed, information for the public, and in particular to the local school community, is provided through annual school reports. These reports and other access to individual school performance information are increasingly being made available through school and system web sites. Guidelines, and in some cases prescription, provide the basis for the content and format of these reports.

In England school profiles have replaced school annual reports. Not unlike the Department's *Schools Online: Directory of Public Schools in Western Australia* system, the school profile provides information on an annual basis to parents and the wider community about school progress that includes priorities, programs and data from a variety of sources.

Countries have taken differing positions on whether inspection/review reports should be made public. New Zealand, England and Scotland all require and provide public reporting of the reports. In contrast, reports are not made publicly available in Singapore and Ireland.

Within the Western Australian public school context recommendations arising from a review visit should be discussed with the school staff and School Council. The end of review cycle report is to be made available to the School Council and the school community. It is suggested that this report should also be made publicly available through *Schools Online*.

The independent evaluation found that nearly all principals thought that their school performance was open to scrutiny by the local community (96%). Forum schools listed many school activities such as newsletters, open days, and reporting, as contributing to that accountability. Parents at forum schools were fairly confident that their children's school was delivering a satisfactory level of teaching.

The consultants concluded that parents judged the quality of education through their day to day communications with the school, as well as the full suite of school activities such as parent nights, assemblies and fetes. Parent interactions with teachers in respect of their own children's progress, including student reports, were particularly important in developing their view of the quality of the school. It was noted that none of these mechanisms are explicitly part of the framework.

Only half of all survey respondents (principals and district directors) thought that the SAF had assisted in providing the wider community with the information it requires to be confident about the quality of public schooling.

Parents understood that the TEE tables printed in the media were not ideal but more information for the community was desired. However, the school report component of the framework was not regarded as appropriate. Around two-thirds of principals did not believe that many of their students' parents were interested in the school report and suggested a briefer document was required. Parents agreed that the school report was of little or no interest to them in its end of year format. They preferred up to date information relevant to their child.

The recent legislative requirements of the Australian Government in relation to individual school performance information reporting have introduced significant complexity for schools. These requirements are now mandated components of school reports. It will be important for the Department to establish whether the inclusion of these requirements and public access to school reports through *Schools Online* will in any way change parents' views of their value.

'Communicating with parents is the key. Being open about what is going on in the school. Are there problems? What are they? How are they being addressed? What is the good news? How are the kids going? Individual feedback on student performance that is meaningful.' (Parent at a forum group)

Evaluation of the School Accountability Framework

Executive Summary
April 2007

Prepared for
the
Department of Education and Training
by



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The School Accountability Framework (SAF) was released during 2002. The SAF describes the fundamental commitments and key concepts on which it is based, presents the four policy points and explains each of its four components: schools plan; schools self-assess; schools produce a School Report; and district directors review schools.

Subsequent to the development of the SAF a draft School Review Framework was introduced in 2003. This document provided further detail in respect of the fourth component of the SAF – district directors review schools. Following completion of the 2003-4 review cycle further development work was undertaken to produce the School Review Framework 2005-2007, which was released in August, 2005. The SAF is now under review. The review has three main components:

1. an independent, external evaluation of the current School Accountability Framework;
2. investigation of international and national practices and trends relating to school accountability; and international and national research and possible future directions.
3. stakeholders consultation relating to the findings of the evaluation, international and national research and possible future directions.

The key evaluation questions addressed in this evaluation study focus on three main areas: the outcomes of the framework; compliance with the four policy statements and components of the framework; and alignment with stakeholder expectations for school accountability. The key evaluation questions, as given in the evaluation brief, were as follows:

1. Have the overall intended outcomes of the framework been achieved?

The overall intended outcomes of the SAF are:

- to provide a coherent and easily understood accountability regime that is manageable for schools;
 - to facilitate collective reflection, analysis and commitment to improvement with every school continually seeking to improve its effectiveness;
 - to ensure that every school's performance is open to scrutiny and that local communities are confident that their schools are providing a quality education that meets the needs of their children;
 - to assist in providing government, DET and the community with the information they require to be confident about the high quality of public schooling.
2. Has compliance been achieved with the four policy statements and the specific components of the framework?
 - All schools are required to produce, in partnership with their school community, a school plan setting out their objectives, priorities, major initiatives and evaluation measures.

- All schools are required to assess their performance in terms of standards of student achievement and the effectiveness of the school.
 - All schools are required to make available to the public and to the district director a school report that describes the school's performance.
 - School staff are accountable to the principal and school principals are accountable to the district director for the performance of a school.
3. Does the framework align with and fulfil current stakeholder expectations for school accountability?

The evaluation study was carried out between July 2006 and February 2007 and consisted of a planning stage, followed by development of data collection instruments, analysis and reporting. Data collection activities included an on-line survey of principals of all Western Australian public schools, as well as on-line and phone surveys of district directors. In addition, parent, teacher and administrator forums were carried out at forum schools around the State.

In total, 610 principal survey responses were received, 23 out of 25 district directors completed the online survey, all 25 of the district directors completed a telephone survey, and a total of 30 forum schools were visited. A frequency count and mean scores were calculated for all quantitative questions, and an analysis of variance carried out to identify any variations in sub-groups.

To clarify the logic behind the design of the framework a program logic analysis was carried out with the reference group. This highlighted the need to distinguish between the "program" of school processes and outcomes, which was trying to develop students to the best of their potential, and the "program" of the school accountability framework which was trying to achieve this by making schools more "effective". Characteristics of an effective school which the framework seeks to foster were determined via research and incorporated into the school review framework.

The study found that schools feel that they are accountable for everything from student achievement to budgets to safety. They also felt that they were accountable to a very large number of stakeholders from the media, to students and parents, but also to all levels of government. Schools were accountable in everything they did within the school and in the community. Everyone in a school was identified as being responsible for school performance; however, it was also felt that parents and the Department had responsibilities that were not part of the model and which needed to be addressed.

There were a number of factors that affected the implementation of accountability. The attitude, skills and knowledge of the principal were a key to a successful implementation. If the principal either didn't understand or didn't support the framework processes and policies, compliance might be achieved but the benefits were unlikely to be delivered. The district director was similarly key as their role could help or

hinder a principal in achieving their aim. A rapid turnover of staff, especially of principals, disrupted the implementation process whilst a conservative or resisting staff could undermine it. Larger primary schools often found the logistics of implementing consultative processes more difficult to achieve, as did secondary schools. On the other hand, they also tended to have more resources compared with very small schools.

Responses to each of the key evaluation questions were given and key issues were identified. These findings and issues are summarised below.

KEQ1. Have the overall intended outcomes of the framework been achieved?

Is the SAF a coherent and easily understood accountability regime that is manageable for schools?

The large majority of stakeholders agreed that the framework overall was coherent (85% of principal respondents; 96% of district director respondents) and easily understood (81% of principal respondents; 96% of district director respondents). However, principals felt that the framework lacked specific direction and that more guidance in the form of templates, exemplars and tools would make it more coherent and overall easier to implement. The variation in the expectations between different district directors was seen to detract from the model and had led to inconsistencies in the way in which the framework was applied. Overall, however, the model was seen as the best alternative, and as achieving its main objective of schools demonstrating accountability.

Stakeholders also thought the framework was easily understood (81% of principals; 96% of district directors). The concepts were familiar as they were based on the action learning cycle. Therefore, there was a general understanding of the framework, even when specific details were not known.

The large majority of principals indicated that the requirements of the framework were manageable in their school (85%) and district directors agreed (96%). The main concern that schools had, however, was that the framework was administratively time consuming. Forum feedback suggests that the manageability is overestimated. Schools thought that the framework would be more manageable for schools if system wide data were provided by central office and professional development and support was provided when required. Were templates and examples made available, administrative staff felt that this would reduce the time and energy it takes developing appropriate measures from scratch, and would offer guidance to those less skilled in such tasks.

Does the SAF facilitate collective reflection, analysis and commitment to improvement with every school continually seeking to improve its effectiveness?

The large majority of respondents appreciated the role that the framework had played in emphasising schools' commitment to improvement (principals – 82%; district directors – 96%). Nearly all schools believed that the collection, analysis and use of evidence was the foundation of schools' accountability process (principals – 93%; district directors – 100%). They also believed that their school demonstrated a sense of

ownership for school improvement (principals 87%; district directors – 91%). However, it seems that the framework is seen to be a little less effective at promoting collective reflection in schools, particularly in the view of district directors (principals – 78%; district directors – 70%). The notion of self assessment and its role in identifying areas for self improvement was the strength of the framework most commonly identified by principals (176 comments, 24%).

In schools where the framework was successfully being implemented, collective reflection and review and analysis of performance data was a precursor to development of the following year's plan. On the other hand, forums provided evidence of teachers who didn't see the need for the more rigorous requirements of the framework, whose self assessment was done "in their head" and who didn't think teachers needed to be answerable to anyone further than their principal.

Does the SAF ensure that every school's performance is open to scrutiny and that local communities are confident that their schools are providing a quality education that meets the needs of their children?

Nearly all principals thought that their school performance was open to scrutiny by the local community (96%). Forum schools listed many school activities such as newsletters, open days, and reporting, as contributing to that accountability. Parents at forum schools were fairly confident that their children's school was delivering a satisfactory level of teaching. If not, they often offered reasons such as lack of school resources (teachers, education assistants, fences, pencils).

The methods that the parents used to judge quality of education were the day to day communications with the school, as well as the full suite of school activities such as parent nights, assemblies and fetes. In addition, children's reports were important to judge the progress of their child in particular. However, none of these mechanisms are explicitly part of the framework.

Does the SAF assist in providing government, DET and the community with the information they require to be confident about the high quality of public schooling?

A large majority of stakeholders recognised that the wider community is concerned about the quality of public education (principals 83%; district directors – 100%) and believed that they were entitled to performance information about the school (principals 89%; district directors – 78%). However, only half of the respondents thought that the SAF had assisted in providing the wider community with the information it requires to be confident about the quality of public schooling (principals 51%; district directors – 48%). Again, more information for the community was desired and the school report component of the framework did not fulfil this function appropriately. While parents understood that the TEE tables printed in the media were not ideal: they did want more performance information – more testing, more information about strengths of different schools and the achievement of VET students.

KEQ2. Has compliance been achieved with the four policy statements and the specific components of the framework?

Generally, compliance with the four policy statements had been achieved. However, the commitment of schools to the philosophy and processes of the framework and their application varied greatly.

Schools plan

Principals reported that their school plan is produced in partnership with parents (78%) and that it had the support of the School Council (99%). However, forum discussions revealed that compliance reporting could be misleading as in most schools it was only parents on the council who were aware there was a plan, and had little input into it, merely accepting completed plans. Again, while principals reported that developing a plan was integral to school business for all their staff (91%), forum discussions showed that while the concept of school plans were generally well accepted, their incorporation into every day school life varied from working documents whose development, revision and use were totally integrated into school activities, to mostly irrelevant documents provided by school administration to teachers.

Schools self assess

Most principals believed that their school is rigorous in assessing its performance in terms of *student outcomes* (86%). In contrast, of the district director respondents, only 57% agreed that all or most schools were rigorous. Similarly, while 86% of all principals believed their schools were rigorous in assessing the school's performance in terms of *effectiveness of the school's operations* only half (52%) of the district directors supported this view. This shows a considerable difference in opinion which forum discussions suggest shows the different levels of acceptance regarding the need for evidence to demonstrate achievement. It also suggests a lack of awareness or acceptance of district directors' expectations.

School report

Nearly all principals (95%) claimed that their school reports were compliant with the requirements outlined in the SAF, and 91% of district directors agreed that all or most schools were. Principals saw the reports as useful but time consuming to compile. Principals and district directors differed over whether the school report clearly reported against the planned objectives (principals 87% compared with 48% for district directors) and whether the report only reported good news (14% principals; 39% district directors). Respondents considered that school reports were to be written in a way which makes them easily understood by the school community (principal respondents – 91%; District directors – 87%). However, about two-thirds of principals (65%) do not believe that many of their students' parents are interested in the school report and suggested a briefer document for parents. The report was useful for a number of purposes but not very relevant to parents in its end of year format. Another form may be more appropriate. It may also be appropriate to consider providing administrative assistance to schools for producing reports. Parents agreed that the school report was of little or no

interest to them, as they tended to use other methods to judge their school's performance.

School review

The accountability of teachers to principals was clearly identified. In practice, principals' lack of ability to sanction recalcitrant staff was seen as limiting that accountability. The majority of principals and district directors agreed that the district director was the right person to review schools. Principals were relatively positive about the district director review process. For example, on the question of whether district directors spend enough time at their school to review their performance, 73% of principal respondents thought they did, and district directors agreed (74%). Most principals (89%) agreed that they could rely on their district director for support and mentoring. The majority also felt that individual school circumstances are taken into consideration during reviews (84%) and 88% felt that district directors had a good understanding of their school's strengths and weaknesses.

Forum school discussions indicated that the efficacy of the review process was very dependent on the district director: their skills and knowledge, their understanding of the framework, and also their relationship with individual principals. The variation in requirements of different district directors and the implementation of the framework, were seen to be issues.

KEQ3. Does the framework align with and fulfil current stakeholder expectations for school accountability?

Schools see the framework as the best on offer. Stakeholders liked the model and considered it a success (81% of principals; 96% of district directors). They believed schools were better able to demonstrate accountability than before the SAF was introduced (85% of principals; 96% of district directors). They also thought it was applicable to different types of schools (79% of principals; 87% of district directors).

The school plan was the best-implemented component of the framework, strongly embedded in school business. However, the involvement of parents is more difficult to achieve. The self-assessment model was well regarded even though there were issues regarding the accountability for performance on statewide testing and the development of appropriate measures. Parents were also not very interested in the school reports as they preferred up to date information relevant to their child. The accountability chain was well understood and the school review identified as an important feedback mechanism for schools. There were, however, suggestions for alternative review mechanisms such as the use of teams.

Conclusion

Overall, the school accountability framework is a well regarded, robust model. Of the components, the school plan is the most embedded, the school report the most irrelevant and the use of evidence for school self-assessment the most resisted. Progress has been made in implementing the processes identified as being integral to effective schools, but the majority of that progress has only occurred since the provision of the

School Review framework. Continued attention to the district director reviews is necessary to maintain the momentum of implementation and achieve full integration of the requirements into all schools. Small adjustments to the framework may provide improvements, for example, changes to the way that the review is carried out, inclusion of school-parent communication into the framework, improvements to the consistency with which the model is administered, the amalgamation of the two framework documents, and the publishing of measurement tools and examples.

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES AND APPROACHES TO SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(December 2006)

INTRODUCTION

This document provides an Executive Summary of the findings of the research undertaken in respect of component 2 of the School Accountability Framework Review – National and International Perspectives and Approaches to School Accountability.

This component of the Review required the investigation and review of current international literature, the documentation of input from senior Department of Education and Training officers who had been involved with school accountability related study tours and the updating of the Summary of Approaches document originally prepared for the 2005 Australasian Accountability Network Meeting.

Elaborations related to this Executive Summary can be located in a range of summary and detailed papers that provide a rich source of information from a wide range of both Australian and international approaches. These papers are available from the SAF Review area of <http://www.det.wa.edu.au/education/accountability/>.

In addition to these papers, information on the approaches undertaken in other countries and the perspectives of key authors arising from the literature review are included in this Executive Summary.

The literature review is primarily focused on accountability in the government or public sector within Australia and internationally. The extent to which sectors exist and are differentiated varies throughout the world. Similar accountability processes are evident in some countries, particularly where the government provides the major funding source and where external inspectorates are in place. Within Australia private school accountability is linked to registration renewal. The processes are generally of an operational compliance nature. In addition there are a variety of processes involving School Boards and system level administrative bodies.

In preparing this paper it has been assumed that, for the Western Australian context, school accountability relates to providing system and public assurance and the ongoing pursuit of quality improvement. De Grauwe and Naidoo (2004:39) conclude that 'the challenge is not to choose between accountability and quality improvement, but to find the right balance between these aims, between internal and external evaluation, between the criteria set by central authorities and those set by the school staff itself, between the demands of the 'public' and the needs of the professional community.'

Earl & LeMahieu (cited in Earl, 2005:7) contend that '*Accounting* is gathering, organising and reporting information that describes performance, *Accountability* is the conversation about what the information means and how it fits with everything else that we know, and about how to use it to make positive changes.'

COMMON ELEMENTS, DIFFERENCES AND TRENDS

Our review of the literature highlighted the following common elements, differences and trends.

Gurr (2006:2) notes that, 'in recent times there has been intense interest in most parts of the world to create systems for monitoring school performance'. De Grauwe and Naidoo (2004:20) refer to 'the worldwide trend towards school evaluation'. Cuttance's (Raddi, 2005:4-6) national and international review of school accountability approaches reports trends towards the incorporation of school self-evaluation, greater access to school performance information and a significant element of external independent assessment and reporting.

Approaches to school accountability are often national or at least strongly influenced by agendas at the national level and many are heavily reliant on the conduct and reporting of standardised tests in specific curriculum areas undertaken by students at selected points of schooling.

Several systems throughout the world have long established **external inspection models** (including England, Scotland and Ireland). Others have more recently introduced such models or are considering them including New Zealand, Netherlands and some Australian states. In many cases the external inspection is valued by stakeholders, particularly the media and parents. However, inspection models are generally considered to be expensive. Where these models have recently been reviewed (including England, New Zealand, Scotland and Victoria) there has been movement to streamline processes such as differential approaches and a lighter touch for the schools considered as highly effective. MacBeath (2006:16) concludes that 'the logic of proportionality is clearly accepted as something for the future'.

Opinion is divided on the impact of school evaluation and accountability processes on the performance of schools. Many authors question the inherent value of the components of some systems. Elmore (cited in Gurr, 2006:3) 'disputes the long-term worth of external accountability environments and suggests that for real and sustained school improvement, teachers and principals need to take more responsibility for the outcomes they influence.'

Hattie (2005:12-13) argues that 'we must develop an accountability system that is located from the student level upwards, directly involving and influencing the teacher and principal level, as such a system is more likely to have major effects on the quality of teaching and learning.'

In cautioning the evaluation of school effectiveness on the basis of narrow, even inappropriate, performance indicators, Ainscow (2005:10) challenges us to 'measure what we value, rather than is often the case, valuing what we can measure'. In considering the United States context Jones (2004:1) calls for 'a new model of accountability – one that is balanced and comprehensive, one that involves much more than test scores.'

In contrast with general trends De Grauwe (2004:78) notes that in Finland, a country that consistently performs at the highest level in international tests, 'the national inspection system was discontinued in 1991. Decision-makers felt that the benefits from external inspection and advice services were minimal and that, in view of the high level of training and professionalism of teachers and the strong parental interest in the schooling of their children, quality control could be entirely trusted to them.'

Many systems have developed **accountability frameworks** which feature the components of school planning, school self-assessment, school reporting and school review (internal or external). Self-assessment and reporting are usually annually

based, planning is often both longer term (3-4 years, strategic) and annual (operational) with review cycles varying from 3-6 years. Western Australia's public school system's current two-yearly review cycle, based on a series of interactions between district directors and schools, rather than a one-off event, appears to be unique.

There is an increasing **emphasis on school self-assessment**. Various terms such as school self-evaluation, self-review or self-assessment, this is a prominent feature in the processes of all Australian public school systems and countries including New Zealand, England, Scotland, Ireland, Canada, Hong Kong, Singapore, Finland and the Netherlands. Even where independent inspection systems are established the potential value of school self-evaluation is increasingly being acknowledged.

Riley and MacBeath (2000:1) note that 'The self-evaluating and self-improving school is the school that has the in-built resilience to meet change, as well as the internal capacity and know-how to assess its strengths and weaknesses, and build its development planning on that solid foundation.'

In summarising the 2002 international seminar 'School Evaluation for Quality Improvement' De Grauwe and Naidoo's report, (2004:13-14) 'paints the contours of a school evaluation system, focused on improvement, empowerment and accountability rather than the latter alone. While acknowledging the role of standardised testing and external validation they note that 'School self-evaluation stands at the heart of such a system.'

Broader frameworks for inspection/review, including those in New Zealand, England, Scotland, Ireland, Singapore, Hong Kong and Australia have been developed in contrast to USA's almost exclusive reliance on 'high stakes' testing, sometimes referred to as 'results based accountability' (Anderson, 2005). The broader frameworks reflect the findings from the significant body of school effectiveness research (see for example Scheerens, 2000 and Cresswell, 2004).

Despite these broader frameworks and **public reporting** related to them, it is often the various analyses of test results, including the publication of achievement tables, rankings and league tables that are used in an attempt to assure public confidence. Countries have taken differing positions on whether inspection/review reports should be made public. New Zealand, England and Scotland all require and provide public reporting of the reports. In contrast, reports are not made publicly available in Singapore and Ireland. MacBeath (2006:13) notes that the agreement by Hong Kong's Education and Manpower Bureau 'not to publicise school reports is already easing anxiety'.

In many of the countries reviewed, information for the public, and in particular to the local school community, is also provided through **annual school reports**. These reports and other access to individual school performance information are increasingly being made available through school and system web sites. Guidelines, and in some cases prescription, provide the basis for the content and format of these reports.

The use of **growth models**, sometimes labelled value-added analysis, is evident in England, Hong Kong, Singapore, some Australian states and some states in the USA. Growth models are being considered for the processes that support the No Child Left Behind legislation in the USA.

Attention is also turning to **support processes**. De Grauwe and Naidoo (2004:12) note that 'schools simply need more than information on their performance; they also need guidance on how to improve and support while attempting such improvement. When evaluation is simply limited to information, it will be of little help. When it

consists mainly of informing the public of school results it could actually be harmful...’.

Revised processes in England include the introduction of School Improvement Partners. In Scotland a system of proportional response has been established linked to the findings of school inspections. In some USA and Australian states various regional and district based services are called upon to support schools in response to reviews and the analysis of test results.

Finland, South Korea and Singapore have a strong focus on teacher training and continued professional development for serving teachers and principals. In Finland the initial selection process for students applying for the teacher education program is very rigorous. All teachers graduate with a Masters degree (5 years).

South Korea has recently introduced an **evaluation system for teachers and principals**, while in Singapore teachers and principals are appraised using the Enhanced Performance Management System. Every school is to have a School Staff Developer to ensure that training and professional development programs encompass teacher needs while maintaining a focus on school goals.

Experienced teachers in Ontario, Canada are formally evaluated every three years. Inexperienced teachers are mentored, closely monitored and evaluated. An unsatisfactory rating for any teacher can result in a recommendation for termination.

In providing a framework for examining directions for educational accountabilities for K-12 education in Saskatchewan, Canada, Leithwood (2005) proposes the adoption of a reciprocal, professional approach. In addition to the assessment of student progress and stakeholder opinions, the importance of developing and appraising teacher and administrator performance against professional standards is emphasised.

The National College of School Leadership in England provides continuous learning requirements for Head teachers. From April 2004 it has been mandatory for all Head teachers in government schools to hold or be in the process of securing the National Professional Qualification for Headship.

Sanctions and rewards are elements of the accountability processes in some of the countries reviewed including USA, England and Scotland. Current state law in California provides award programs, both monetary and non monetary for schools that meet the Academic Performance Index which is the cornerstone of California’s Public Schools Accountability Act 1999.

Singapore appears to have the most formal reward and recognition system in place through its Masterplan of Awards (MoA) which recognises school success in the delivery of holistic education. The awards have three levels and are linked to Singapore’s School Excellence Model. Schools are also rewarded by being classified as autonomous.

AUSTRALIA

All government schools in Australian states and territories have processes to ensure school accountability and the underlying principles are very similar. There is flexibility within each state and territory approach to accommodate a range of schools and school populations.

While terminology may differ, the common elements established in all Australian government school accountability processes include – a school accountability

framework, school plan, school self-assessment, annual school report and school review.

Cuttance (2005:5) concludes that 'most systems allow schools flexibility in how they present school plans – a guided approach rather than prescription is the norm.' Schools in South Australia (SA) use a template format for their site plan. Tasmanian schools use a template to produce their Partnership Agreement however their School Improvement Plan (SIP) is school determined. Non-mandated templates for the School Plan are available in SA and Victoria. Differences are evident in the extent to which parents and the community are involved in school planning.

School self-assessment is a highly valued element of school accountability throughout Australia. Different school self-assessment tools and rating scales are used to measure a school's performance. All states would be using their population based testing programs for the purpose of assisting school self-evaluation. In some states, such as Victoria, parent and teacher surveys are mandated as part of the self-evaluation process. Victoria has also recently introduced a mandated template for school self-evaluation and SA is piloting a self-review template in 2007.

Only schools in Western Australia (WA) and the Australian Capital Territory (ACT), after undertaking a school self-assessment, determine a judgement about their performance, ACT – five point scale (Aspiring, Developing, Functioning, Achieving and Excelling), WA – (Effective/ in need of intervention and support).

Schools in Tasmania, ACT and the Northern Territory (NT) conform to a mandated template for their annual report. A report template is available in Victoria but is not mandated for schools to use. New South Wales (NSW) had a highly controlled and mandated template approach but have recently moved to allow schools much greater flexibility. Currently, WA, SA and Queensland do not provide templates, however, as is the case in the other states, the reports reflect the mandated and guideline requirements outlined in their respective accountability frameworks and related policies.

The most diverse element of the school accountability processes within Australia is that of school reviews which are either conducted internally or externally.

The ACT, SA and NT have been considering introducing external review models. The ACT has established a contracted, external, independent coordinator role, though reviews have been undertaken by internal teams. SA now appears to be settling on reviews undertaken by district directors. Internal reviews are conducted by district directors in WA, school development officers in NSW and executive directors of schools in Queensland.

Victoria has a differential review model based on the performance and circumstances of schools. Reviews may be negotiated, continuous or diagnostic. The continuous and diagnostic reviews involve accredited external school reviewers. Negotiated reviews involve a 'critical friend'.

In NSW and Tasmania the internal reviews are linked to evidence which suggests attention may be required. Within Queensland a review by exception is also a part of the internal process.

School review cycles vary. They are two yearly in WA, three yearly in the ACT, NT, Queensland and SA and four yearly in Victoria. School reviews are not part of a mandatory cycle in NSW and Tasmania. WA is the only state to base its review on cumulative visits from the district directors.

A number of states now allow external accreditations to be undertaken by organisations such as the Council of Internationally Accredited Schools (CIAS).

At this point in time WA, SA, NT and Tasmania are reviewing their school accountability processes.

In his review of school accountability in Australia Gurr (2006:1) comments that, 'school education in Australia is a complex interplay between federal and state governments, and between government and non-government schools.' The Australian Government is increasing its involvement in areas that have traditionally been the jurisdiction of state and territory governments and their respective education systems. This includes legislative requirements associated with the reporting of individual student performance, annual school performance reporting and national testing to be introduced in 2008. The provision of significant Commonwealth funding is linked to jurisdiction compliance with these requirements.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL STUDY TOURS

In the second half of 2004 and early 2005, senior officers from the Department of Education and Training had an opportunity to participate in international educational study tours. One executive director and seven district directors were selected to be interviewed in May, September and October 2006 because of the accountability focus of their particular study tour.

The range of school accountability processes encountered by the senior departmental officers varied enormously from Croatia, a country seeking advice on establishing a self-management quality assurance model, through to Scotland, the USA, England, and Ireland, all countries with established accountability systems in place. With the exception of Ireland these countries also imposed sanctions for schools determined to be performing poorly.

In contrast, Finland was found to have no apparent school accountability system, however, a very strong focus on teacher recruitment, training and development is operating within a culture where education is highly valued. Parents and community confidence in their local school was seen to be strong in Finland, Scotland and Ireland.

Feedback from the participants suggested that aspects of potential interest for the WA context included: the use of quite detailed frameworks to assist school self-evaluation and review (Scotland – How Good is Our School, Ireland – Looking at Our School, England – the Self- Evaluation Form); the importance now being placed on school self-evaluation; the external inspection processes being used with public and private schools often being reviewed using the same accountability model; the differing roles undertaken by layers of government or authorities and the review of these; the use (and over-use) of standardised test results; moves for lighter touch in reviews and associated proportional response; the significant costs associated with external inspectorates; and the use of sanctions and rewards.

An emphasis on ongoing professional development and support for developing the capacity of school leaders and teachers was particularly evident in Finland, England and Ireland.

It was also evident that, as is the case in Australia, processes were often being refined and reviewed.

SELECTED COUNTRY OVERVIEWS

This paper makes reference to a wide range of school accountability processes from countries throughout the world. This section highlights key aspects of the approaches taken in a selection of the countries - USA, England, South Korea, Singapore and New Zealand.

USA

The 'No Child Left Behind' (NCLB) law (2002) mandates that USA states adopt comprehensive accountability systems for identifying and improving underperforming schools. The major focus of NCLB is to provide all children with a fair, equal and significant opportunity to obtain high quality education. The law aims to have all students performing at proficient levels on state academic assessments in mathematics, reading (grades 3 – 8) and science (elementary and grades 10 – 12) by 2014. NCLB specifically prohibits any national testing or federally controlled curriculum. The law covers all public schools in all states of the USA and some private schools.

Title 1 schools, defined by student enrolment, census, poverty and other data, receive federal funding. Title 1 schools who fail to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) on the cross cohort comparisons of the percent of students meeting the proficiency standards in one year compared to the previous year's percent proficient, face sanctions. Non Title 1 schools that do not make AYP do not face sanctions, however these schools must amend their school accountability plans to indicate how they will improve. States must provide parents and the public with annual report cards on school district performance. Information on student achievement is disaggregated by sub groups. NCLB is highly expensive and up for renewal in 2007.

Within the demanding framework established by NCLB, states in the USA have determined their own testing regimes, methods for monitoring performance and supervisory, evaluative and support processes. States have also developed their own responses for both high and low performing schools.

ENGLAND

The moves towards a more balanced and sustainable approach to school accountability processes in England followed the release of the Government's Green Paper in 2003 called *Every Child Matters*. Under the accountability and integration proposal outlined in this paper, the creation of an inspection framework for children's services was to be actioned with the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) taking the lead in bringing together joint inspection teams.

Following a long history of an inspectorial model for school accountability dating back to 1839, Ofsted was established in 1993 as a non ministerial department to inspect educational facilities throughout England.

In 2004 *A New Relationship with Schools* (NRwS) document and subsequent NRwS publications, developed jointly between Ofsted and the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) were released. The NRwS document acknowledged that times had changed and schools were more likely to have established systems in place for self-evaluation, development planning and performance management. The NRwS documents describe the importance of, and new requirements relating to, school self-assessment, improvement planning, and the introduction of nationally accredited School Improvement Partners.

The vision for the educational service was subsequently outlined in the *Ofsted Strategic Plan 2005 – 2008* and the Government's October 2005 White Paper *Higher Standards, Better Schools for All*.

The new school accountability arrangements commenced implementation in September 2005. Schools are now inspected every three years, with inspection reports made available to parents and published on the Ofsted website.

A school usually receives two to five working days notice of the inspection and inspections are proportional to need. Schools are required to inform parents of the inspection. The size of the inspection team is dependent upon the size of the school and ranges from one to five inspectors. The inspection team spends no longer than two days in the school. Lighter touch inspections of one day involving one inspector occur for high performing schools.

A feature of the new arrangement is the focus on school self-evaluation and the completion of the Self-Evaluation Form (SEF). Inspectors study the school's SEF, the School's Performance and Assessment (PANDA) report and the report from the previous inspection to prepare a pre-inspection briefing about the school.

When schools are inspected they are judged on a four point rating scale. If a school's overall effectiveness is judged as causing concern, the school can be placed on special measures or issued with a notice to improve. The progress of these schools is monitored by HM Inspectors and they receive their first visit four to six months after designation. If there is no improvement, a school causing concern can, subject to a formal warning, be closed and replaced by a Fresh Start school.

Under the national curriculum, students undertake four sets of national tests corresponding to attainment targets under four key stages – ages 7, 11, 14 and 16. These tests are in mathematics and English in all key stages and in science in key stages 2, 3 and 4. School results are published each year in the form of league tables.

RAISEonline (Reporting and Analysis for Improvement through School self-Evaluation) is a single source of school data and analysis developed by Ofsted using the results of the national testing program. It is due for release in the autumn term 2006 and replaces the PANDA report and the Pupil Achievement Tracker system.

To ensure that direct support is provided to schools the School Improvement Partner (SIP) initiative is being implemented. By the end of 2007 all schools will have a nationally accredited SIP.

School Improvement Partnership Boards have been established in some local education authorities to oversee school improvement in one or more schools. In some cases a failing school may be replaced by an academy. An academy is a new type of secondary school usually established in a disadvantaged area by sponsors, working in partnership with government and local education partners.

School profiles have replaced school annual reports. The school profile provides information on an annual basis to parents and the wider community about school progress that includes priorities, programs and data from a variety of sources.

SOUTH KOREA

Culturally there is a strong focus on valuing education and teachers in South Korea. The Korean proverb, 'One should not step even on the shadow of one's teacher' highlights the degree of respect traditionally given to teachers.

Educational changes and developments such as the introduction of the national curriculum are linked to political events. 'To ensure accountability, the evaluation policy of schools has been carried out throughout the country since 1997. However, the results of this policy are obscure and controvertible' (Jin, 2001). The National Assessment of Educational Achievement was established in 1998 and in 2004 random sample testing was conducted in grades 6, 9 and 10 in a range of learning areas. A new approach for the evaluation of teachers and principals based on professional standards has recently been introduced.

An external evaluation committee system has been established with provincial and metropolitan offices of education administering school evaluations, usually on an annual basis. 'Each office is responsible for the preparation of evaluation areas, criteria and methods, and establishing an evaluation committee. The educational administrators, school principals and vice-principals, school teachers, university professors, researchers and parental representatives who are appointed to evaluation committees receive no special training.' The school evaluation 'is focused on learning and teaching, curriculum, student needs and community consciousness', however, the evaluations 'do not deal with all aspects of the school nor is there uniformity in the criteria used or the schedule...The results of school evaluations are used for supervision consultations and as a basis for providing financial rewards to well-performing schools.' (De Grauwe and Naidoo, 2004:26)

Despite its success in achieving high test scores the highly competitive nature of the system and in particular the emphasis placed on the College Scholastic Ability Test (CSAT), which determines entry to one of three main universities, draws extensive criticism. Parents allocate significant funding and students devote extensive time to out of school tutoring in preparation for the examinations.

SINGAPORE

The School Excellence Model (SEM), adapted from a business model, was introduced to Singaporean schools in 2000 to guide schools in their capacity for reflection, self-assessment and to prepare the school for change.

SEM has provided schools with a more systemic framework and holistic approach to self- assessment by measuring both outcomes and processes and requiring schools to examine their practices not independently but as parts contributing to a whole (Hean, 2002:2,3). Cluster superintendents facilitate the school improvement process.

Consultancy on school self-assessment and external validation of schools is provided by the School Appraisal Branch. School validation is five-yearly with the external evaluation teams drawn from a range of backgrounds. (Ministry of Education, 2006:1)

The Branch is responsible for the implementation of the Masterplan of Awards (MoA). These were introduced in 1998 to recognise school success and sustained achievement in both educational process and educational outcomes (based on examinations). The objectives of the award plan include:

- used as a school accountability tool for MOE to identify good practices that can be used to improve the education system.
- used as a benchmarking tool for schools to measure their performance against that of other schools as part of continual improvement.
- used as a source of information to allow parents and students to make informed choices when selecting schools. (Ministry of Education, 2006:2)

The Branch also validates applicants for Autonomous Status and assists schools with their application for the Singapore Quality Class Award. Autonomous schools were introduced in 1994 to reward quality education provision with increased school funding and flexibility.

In 2004 School Achievement Tables replaced the previously available ranking lists. The School Achievement Tables are intended to provide a broader view of the performance of schools with the focus on both academic and non academic subjects.

The Primary School Leaving Examination (PSLE) undertaken at the end of Primary 6 appears to have particular importance in the system as it is used to determine student placement to a variety of secondary school tracks or streams which generally lead to differing outcomes.

NEW ZEALAND

The school accountability framework in New Zealand is based on the English and Scottish models, however, there are elements included in the framework that are very similar to Australia including strategic planning/ annual plan, self-review, annual reporting and school review. A feature is the integrated approach to external review and self-review.

School planning requirements are legislated with the requirement for the production of a School Charter which includes both a strategic, longer term perspective and an annually updated plan (priorities, targets, strategies, resourcing etc). School reporting is also a legislative requirement and includes an assessment of progress against planned outcomes.

The Education Review Office (ERO) is responsible for reviews of all schools – public and private. Review reports go to the school boards of trustees and the government, and are made public on the ERO website. The review cycle is every 3-4 years.

A significantly revised review process was introduced in 2002 which included greater emphasis on school self-review, and student engagement and achievement. The review process is supported through key documentation including the *Framework for Reviews in Schools*, *Evaluation Indicators for Education Reviews in Schools* and the *Board Assurance Statement and Self-Audit Checklists*. The Framework was updated in 2006.

ERO also undertakes Supplementary Reviews (where the performance of a school causes concern) and Special reviews (investigations in response to specific issues). In 2000, ERO introduced post-review assistance to help boards of trustees develop plans of action to address issues identified in their school review report.

While ERO is separate from the Ministry of Education they both work to support improvement in schools.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Around the world, school accountability systems vary due to the community values and the political and cultural influences within particular countries. There is evidence to suggest that in recent years there has been a convergence of approaches as jurisdictions learn from each other and continue to seek more effective and efficient processes.

This Executive Summary has highlighted the main features and trends relating to school accountability in systems across Australia and internationally. A number of supporting papers are available which provide further detail for many of the approaches and perspectives noted here.

In considering the approaches and key elements referred to in this paper it is essential that Western Australia's unique context is acknowledged in the determination of an appropriate framework that will best meet the agreed purpose and intended outcomes for school accountability.

School Accountability Framework Review
National and International Perspectives and Approaches
Selected References

The following references have been selected from the wide range of papers, articles, books and websites which were used in the development of a range of summary and detailed research papers and culminated in the writing of the Executive Summary. These papers with full reference lists are available from the SAF Review area at <http://www.det.wa.edu.au/education/accountability/>.

Ainscow, M. (2005). *The next big challenge: inclusive school improvement*, keynote presentation at the International Congress of School Effectiveness and Improvement, Barcelona, January, 2005, 10.

Abelmann, C. and Elmore, R. (1999). *When Accountability Knocks Will Anyone Answer?*, CPRW Research Report Series, 37–43.

Anderson, J. A. (2005). *Accountability in education*, The International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris and the International Academy of Education, Brussels.

Australian Government, Department of Education, Science and Training. (2004). *Schooling Issues Digest School Effectiveness*, Canberra.

De Grauwe, A. and Naidoo, J. (2004). *School evaluation for quality improvement*, ANTRIEP report presented at the Meeting of the Asian Network of Training and Research Institutions in Educational Planning, 2-4 July, 2002, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, published in UNESCO: International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris, 2004.

Department of Education, (2002). *The School Accountability Framework*. Western Australia.

Dillon, S. (2006). *Schools Slow in Closing the Gaps Between Races*, New York Times, 20 November.

Earl, L. (2005). *From accounting to accountability: Harnessing data for school improvement*, keynote paper presented at the Using Data to Support Learning ACER Research Conference, 7-9 August, 2005, Melbourne, Victoria, published in the Conference Proceedings, Australian Council for Educational Research, 2005, 9-10.

Gurr, D. (2006). *A Review of School Accountability in Australia*, paper presented at the Australian Council for Educational Leadership National Conference, 3-6 October, 2006, Canberra.

Hattie, J. (2005). *What is the nature of evidence that makes a difference to learning?* keynote paper presented at the Using Data to Support Learning ACER Research Conference, 7-9 August, 2005, Melbourne, Victoria, published in the Conference Proceedings, Australian Council for Educational Research, 2005, 12-13.

Hopkins, D. (2006). *International perspectives on School Leadership for Systemic Improvement*, OECD Activity on Improving School Leadership, London.

Jones, K. (2004). *A Balanced School Accountability Model: An Alternative to High– Stakes Testing*, Phi Delta Kappan, V. 85, No. 8, 584 – 590.

Leithwood, K. (2005). *Educational Accountability: Issues and Alternatives*, Research Report #05-01(May) for Saskatchewan School Boards Association, University of Toronto.

MacBeath, J. (2006). *Leadership as a Subversive Activity*, monograph presented at the Australian Council for Educational Leadership National Conference, 3-6 October, 2006, Canberra.

MacBeath, J. (2006). *New Relationships for Old Inspection and self evaluation in England and Hong Kong*, International Studies in Educational Administration, Journal of the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management, V. 34, No. 2, 2-18.

Nevo, D. (2001). *School Evaluation: Internal or External?*, Studies in Education Evaluation 27, 95-106.

Radii, (2005). *Planning and Accountability for School Improvement, National and International Literature Review* Report prepared for the Student Outcomes Division of the Victorian Department of Education and Training. (available from cuttance@bigpond.net.au)

Riley, K and MacBeath, J. (2000). *Quality Assurance, 'Effectiveness' Indicators and Support Systems: Putting Self Evaluation in Place*, paper presented at World Bank Learning Week, February 2000, as part of the Effective Schools and Teachers Thematic Group session, *Evaluating School Performance: Tools and Approaches*.

Scheerens, J. (2000). *Improving school effectiveness*, UNESCO: International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris.

Australia

Australian Capital Territory:

Australian Capital Territory Education and Training. (2004). *School Improvement Framework for achieving high standards in student learning, innovation and best practice in ACT government schools. Guidelines for School Improvement.* found at <http://www.decs.act.gov.au>

New South Wales:

New South Wales Department of Education and Training. (2005). *School Development Policy.* found at <http://www.det.nsw.edu.au>

Northern Territory:

Department of Employment, Education and Training, Northern Territory. (2006) *School Planning and accountability Framework.* found at <http://www.deet.nt.gov.au/>

Queensland:

Education Queensland. (2002). *School Improvement and Accountability Framework Policy and Guidelines.* found at <http://education.qld.gov.au/>

South Australia:

Department Education and Children's Services, South Australia. (2006). *DECS School/Preschool Improvement and Accountability Framework.* found at <http://www.decs.sa.gov.au/quality/pages/20690>

Tasmania:

Tasmania Department of Education. (2004). *School Improvement Review Guide.* found at <http://www.education.tas.gov.au>

Victoria:

Department of Education and Training, Victoria. (2006). *Accountability and Improvement Framework for Victorian Government Schools 2007.* found at <http://www.education.vic.gov.au/>

Western Australia:

Department of Education, Western Australia. (2002). *The School Accountability Framework.*

Government of Western Australia, Department of Education and Training. (2005) *School Review Framework 2005 – 2007.* found at <http://www.det.wa.edu.au/>

International

England:

Department for Education and Skills. (2005). *A New Relationship with Schools.*

found at <http://www.defs.gov.uk>

Department for Education and Skills. (2005). *A New Relationship with Schools: Next Steps.*

found at <http://www.defs.gov.uk>

Department for Education and Skills. (2006). *Schools Achieving Success.*

found at <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/achievinguccess/>

H M Government. (2005). *Higher Standards, Better Schools for All – More Choice for parents and pupils – Summary.* London, Department of Education and Skills.

H M Government. (2005). *Higher Standards, Better Schools for All – More choice for parents and pupils,* London, Department of Education and Skills.

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted). (2004). *Strategic Plan 2005 – 2008,* London, HMSO.

Ofsted. (2006). *About Us.*

found at <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/howwework/>

Ofsted. (2005). *Every child matters.*

found at www.ofsted.gov.uk

Ofsted. (2006). *Self Evaluation*.

found at <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/schools/sef.cfm>

Ofsted. (2006). *Welcome to Ofsted*.

found at <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/>

Ireland:

Department of Education and Science. (2004). *Looking at our School an aid to self-evaluation in primary schools*, Evaluation Support & Research Unit.

found at www.education.ie

Department of Education and Science. (2004). *Looking at our School an aid to self-evaluation in second-level schools*, Evaluation Support & Research Unit.

found at www.education.ie

Department of Education and Science. (2004). *Professional Code of Practice on Evaluation and Reporting for the Inspectorate*.

found at www.education.ie

Department of Education and Science. (2004). *The Inspectorate: A Brief Guide*. found at www.education.ie

New Zealand:

<http://www.minedu.govt.nz>

Education Review Office. (2005). *Framework for Reviews in Schools*.

found at <http://www.ero.govt.nz>

Education Review Office. (2005). *Review Process for Schools*.

found at <http://www.ero.govt.nz>

Education Review Office. (2005). *Evaluation Indicators for Education Reviews in Schools*.

found at <http://www.ero.govt.nz>

Ontario, Canada:

Cowley, P. and Easton, S. (2006). *Report on Ontario's Elementary Schools*, Fraser Institute.

CUPE Research. (2002). *Report of the Education Equality Task Force (The Rozanski Commission)*.

found at <http://www.ontario.cupe.ca/www./s42779a6f79fc9/a4277b0a2675df>

Education Quality and Accountability Office. (2004). *Ensuring Quality Assessments: Enhancements to EQAO's Assessment Program – The Move Forward*.

found at http://www.eqao.com/pdf_e/04/04p027e.pdf

Education Quality and Accountability Office. (2005). *Guide to School and Board Improvement Planning*.

found at http://www.eqao.com/pdf_e/051/051P011e.pdf

Education Quality and Accountability Office - News Releases. (2006). *Continued Growth for Ontario Students in Critical Reading, Writing and Math Skills*.

found at <http://www.eqao.com/NR/ReleaseViewer.aspx?Lang=E&release=b06R004>

Education Quality and Accountability Office. (2005). *Working Together for Student Success – A School Improvement Planning Guide*.

found at http://www.eqao.com/pdf_e/05/05p043e.pdf

Leithwood, K. Fullan, M. Watson, N. (2003). *The Schools We Need A New Blueprint for Ontario Final Report*.

found at <http://schoolsweneed.oise.utoronto.ca>

Ministry of Education. (2006). *Education Facts*.

found at <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/educationFacts.html>

Ministry of Education. (2002). *Supporting Teaching Excellence*.

found at <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/teacher/manual.pdf>

Ministry of Education. (2006). *The New Teacher Induction Program*.

found at <http://tpfr.edu.gov.on.ca/ntip/TPA520ENG%20-%20Final.pdf>

Ontario College of Teachers. (2006). *Foundations of Professional Practice*.

Ontario College of Teachers. (2006). *The Ethical Standards of the Teaching Profession*.

found at http://www.oct.ca/standards/ethical_standards.aspx?lang=en-CA

Ontario College of Teachers. (2006) *The Professional Learning Framework for the Teaching Profession*.

Ontario College of Teachers. (2006). *The Standards of Practice for the Teaching Profession*.

found at http://www.oct.ca/standards/standards_of_practice.aspx?lang=en-CA

Ontario Federation of Independent Schools. (2005). *School Review Process*

found at <http://www.ofis.ca/main/tiki-index.php?page=School+Review+Process>

Ontario Ministry of Children and Youth Services. (2005). *Best Start*.

found at www.children.gov.on.ca

Scotland:

HM Inspectorate of Education. (2002). *How Good is our School?*

found at <http://www.hmie.gov.uk>

Singapore:

Ministry of Education, *Education in Singapore*.

found at <http://www.moe.edu.sg/>

Tee, N. (2003). *The Singapore School and the School Excellence Model*, Educational Research for Policy and Practice 2, 27–39, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

South Korea:

Choi, E. (2006). *Korean Educational Policies and Current Issues*, Chungbuk National University, Korea.

<http://english.moe.go.kr/html/education/?menu=01>

<http://english.moe.kr/html/policy/>

<http://english.moe.kr/html/policy/>

http://www.kice.re/kice/eng/info/info_1.jsp

http://www.kice.re/kice/eng/info/info_2.jsp

http://www.kice.re/kice/eng/info/info_3.jsp

International Bureau of Education. (2004). *Quality Education for All Young People: Challenges, Trends and Priorities*, National Report of the Republic of Korea by Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development.

found at <http://www.ibe.unesco.org/International/ICE47/English/Natreps/reports/Korearep.pdf>

Lee, I. Park, J. Kim, O. (2004). *A Study on the Development of Model and Standards for Improvement of Teacher's Professional Competency in Student Evaluation*, Korea Institute of Curriculum and Evaluation.

South Korean Education in Comparison to its Asian Neighbours.

found at <http://www.paulnoll.com/Korea/History/South-Korea-compare-edu.html>

Suh, S. (2000). *Adapting Education to the Information Age – A White Paper*, Ministry of Education, Korea Education and Research Information Service,

Seoul National University, *The Present Trend of School reform (1994 – present)*.

found at <http://aped.snu.ac.kr/cyberedu/cyberedu1/eng/eng5-03.html>

Weidman, J. and Park, N. (2002). *Recent Trends and Developments in Education in the Republic of Korea*, World Education News and Reviews.

USA:

US Department of Education. (2006). *No Child Left Behind*.

found at <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml?src=pb>

US Department of Education. (2006). *The History of No Child Left Behind*.

found at http://www.ed.gov/nclb/overview/intro/guide/guide_pg10.html

US Department of Education. (2006). *The History of No Child Left Behind*.

found at http://www.ed.gov/nclb/overview/intro/guide/guide_pg11.html

US Department of Education. (2006). *The History of No Child Left Behind*.

found at http://www.ed.gov/nclb/overview/intro/guide/guide_pg12.html

California:

California Department of Education. (2005). *No Child Left Behind*.

found at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/index.asp>

California State Board of Education Actions. (2005). *No Child Left Behind*.

found at <http://www.csba.org/nclb/nclb.htm>

Consolidated State Accountability Work book. (2004). California.

Chicago:

Approved Accountability Workbook for Illinois. (2005).

Chicago Public Schools. (2004). *No Child Left Behind*.

found at <http://nclb.cps.k12.il.us/>

Chicago Public Schools. (2006). *CPS at a Glance*.

found at <http://www.cps.k12.il.us/AtAGlance.html>

Chicago Public Schools. (2006). *Renaissance 2010*.

found at <http://www.ren2010.cps.k12.il.us/>

Illinois State Board of Education. (2006). *Adequate Yearly Progress*.

found at <http://www.isbe.net/ayp/default.htm>

Illinois State Board of Education, (2006). *Illinois Education Second to None*.

found at <http://www.isbe.state.il.us/>

Illinois State Board of Education. (2006). *Adequate Yearly Progress*.

found at <http://www.isbe.net/ayp/default.htm>

Sanders, W. (2003). *Value Added Approaches to School accountability: Results and Lessons from an Evaluation*, Chicago, Illinois.

Temkin, J. (2003). *Take a Walk on a Walkthrough*, Catalyst, September, Chicago.

New York:

Accountability Peer Review. New York. (2004).