

# INTELLIGENT LEADERSHIP

# STUDIES IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

---

## VOLUME 6

---

### *Series Editor*

Kenneth Leithwood, OISE, University of Toronto, Canada

### *Editorial Board*

Christopher Day, University of Nottingham, United Kingdom  
Stephen Jacobson, Graduate School of Education, Buffalo, U.S.A.  
Bill Mulford, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia  
Peter Slegers, University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands

### **SCOPE OF THE SERIES**

Leadership we know makes all the difference in success or failures of organizations. This series will bring together in a highly readable way the most recent insights in successful leadership. Emphasis will be placed on research focused on pre-collegiate educational organizations. Volumes should address issues related to leadership at all levels of the educational system and be written in a style accessible to scholars, educational practitioners and policy makers throughout the world.

The volumes – monographs and edited volumes – should represent work from different parts in the world.

*The titles published in this series are listed at the end of this volume.*

# INTELLIGENT LEADERSHIP

## Constructs for Thinking Education Leaders

*Edited by*

John M. Burger  
*Ministry of Education  
Alberta, Canada*

Charles F. Webber  
*University of Calgary, Canada*

*and*

Patricia Klinck  
*KeyLinks International  
Consulting Ltd., Canada*

 Springer

A C.I.P. Catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-1-4020-6021-2 (HB)  
ISBN 978-1-4020-6022-9 (e-book)

---

Published by Springer,  
P.O. Box 17, 3300 AA Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

*www.springer.com*

*Printed on acid-free paper*

All Rights Reserved  
© 2007 Springer

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

About the Authors	vii
Preface	xi
Acknowledgments	xiii
1. In Search of the Elusive General Theory <i>John Burger</i>	1
2. Observations on Leadership: Linking Theory, Practice and Lived Experience <i>Patricia Klinck</i>	13
3. Change Theory as a Force for School Improvement <i>Michael Fullan</i>	27
4. What We Know About Educational Leadership <i>Kenneth Leithwood</i>	41
5. Contemporary Learning Theories, Instructional Design and Leadership <i>Larry Sackney and Brenda Mergel</i>	67
6. Democratic School Leadership in Canada's Public School Systems: Professional Value and Social Ethic <i>Paul T. Begley and Lindy Zaretsky</i>	99
7. School and Community <i>Charles F. Webber and Bill Mulford</i>	119
8. Using Resources Effectively in Education <i>Ben Levin and Nancy Naylor</i>	143

9. Leading Towards Learning and Achievement: The Role of Quality Classroom Assessment 159  
*Anne Davies*
10. A Survey of Existing School Leadership Preparation and Development Programs 183  
*Janice Wallace, Rosemary Foster and Jose da Costa*

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Dr. Paul T. Begley is a Professor of Educational Leadership at the Pennsylvania State University, and Executive Director of the Willower Center for the Study of Leadership and Ethics, a University Council for Educational Administration Program Center.

Dr. John Burger is a Senior Manager in the Accountability and Reporting Division of Alberta Education in Edmonton Alberta, Canada. John also holds Adjunct Associate Professor appointments at the University of Calgary, where he has taught courses in Classroom Assessment and Educational Leadership, and the University of Alberta.

Dr. José (Joe) L. da Costa is a professor and chair of the Department of Educational Policy Studies in the Faculty of Education, University of Alberta. Joe's research focuses on how educational programming and administrative structures impact student success in school. His research program has included work on pre-kindergarten, full-day kindergarten, small class-size at the grade one level, in-school mentoring, and teacher and administrator professional development.

Dr. Anne Davies is a researcher/writer in the area of classroom assessment. She works with educators at all levels in support of student learning using quality assessment practices. Author and co-author of more than 24 books and multimedia resources; Anne works with educators internationally. Find out more at [http://www.connect2learning.com/anne\\_davies/media/pdf/anne\\_davies\\_cv.pdf](http://www.connect2learning.com/anne_davies/media/pdf/anne_davies_cv.pdf)

Dr. Rosemary Foster is currently an associate professor of educational administration and leadership as well as associate dean, teacher education at the University of Alberta. Rosemary's research interests and academic writing are in the area of school leadership, teacher education and northern and aboriginal education.

Dr. Michael Fullan is the former Dean of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. Recognized as an international authority on educational reform, Michael is engaged in training, consulting, and evaluating change projects around the world. His ideas for managing change are used in many countries, and his books have been published in many languages. Michael led the evaluation team which conducted the four-year assessment of the National Literacy and Numeracy Strategy in England from 1998–2003. In April 2004 he was appointed Special Advisor to the Premier and Minister of Education in Ontario.

Dr. Patricia Klinck began her career as an advocate for bilingualism in public education in Western Canada. From these experiences she undertook a wide variety

of senior educational leadership positions at both the system and provincial level. Her work in designing programs to develop leaders brought her an invitation from Edith Cowan University (Perth) to design and coordinate their first Women in Leadership program. Since then her company, KeyLinks International Consulting Ltd, <http://www.keylinks.ab.ca> conducts seminars and public lectures on a variety of organizational issues.

Dr. Kenneth Leithwood is Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy at OISE/University of Toronto. His research and writing concerns school leadership, educational policy and organizational change. Dr. Leithwood has published more than 70 referred journal articles, and authored or edited more than two dozen books. For example, he is the senior editor of both the first and second *International Handbooks on Educational Leadership and Administration* (Kluwer Publishers, 1996, 2003).

Dr. Ben Levin is the former Deputy Minister of Education in the Ontario Ministry of Education, and also holds a Canada Research Chair in Education Policy and Leadership at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. His most recent book is *Governing Education* (University of Toronto Press, 2005).

Brenda Mergel, M.Ed., is the Webmaster and Instructional Materials Development Coordinator for the College of Education, University of Saskatchewan. Prior to her current position, Brenda taught high school Mathematics, Science and Physical Education and was an Adult Educator in Northern Saskatchewan.

Dr. Bill Mulford is Professor and Director of the Leadership for Learning Research Group in the Faculty of Education at the University of Tasmania. He is an internationally recognised educator with a deep interest in the areas of educational leadership, effective implementation of educational change and school effectiveness and improvement. His awards include the Australian Council for Educational Administration Gold Medal for academic attainment, successful practice and an outstanding record of contributing to the field.

Nancy Naylor is Assistant Deputy Minister for the School Business and Finance Division of the Ontario Ministry of Education. She has held a variety of senior positions in the Ontario government, and has contributed papers to a number of conferences on education and social policy.

Dr. Larry Sackney is a professor of Educational Administration at the University of Saskatchewan. Larry's research interests are learning communities, knowledge management, school improvement, leadership, and systemic reform. He has done consultancies at the provincial, national and international levels.

Dr. Janice Wallace is an Associate Professor at the University of Alberta where she teaches courses on administrative theory and practice. Her research focuses on equity issues in educational organizations and the effects of globalization on the work of administrators in restructured education systems. She is currently exploring the effects of gender in education career choices with a focus on theories of masculinity

Dr. Charles F. Webber is Professor and Associate Dean in the Graduate Division of Educational Research in the Faculty of Education at the University of Calgary



in Canada. His current research focuses on cross-cultural leadership development, including technology-mediated leadership development. During his career as an educator he has served as a classroom teacher, curriculum consultant, principal, and professor. He was the founding editor of the *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning* [www.ucalgary.ca/~iejll](http://www.ucalgary.ca/~iejll) published by the University of Calgary Press, and he is the past academic editor of the *Educational Forum*, a scholarly journal published by the American educational honor society *Kappa Delta Pi* based in Indianapolis.

Dr. Lindy Zaretsky is Superintendent of Student Services and Leadership and Staff Development in the Simcoe County District School Board, Ontario Canada. She has been a teacher, consultant, and administrator in a variety of school settings for 17 years in the Greater Toronto Area. Her research focuses on parent advocacy and special education, values and educational leadership, and social justice. She has authored publications in the areas of advocacy, social justice, and educational leadership.

## PREFACE

The idea for this book grew out of a research conference held at the University of Calgary in the summer of 2003. At the conclusion of the conference the inter-connectivity of a number of research topics discussed seemed worth exploring. The observation of this inter-connectivity led to some extended collegial speculation and follow-up discussion in Calgary and at subsequent AERA conferences in San Diego in 2004 and Montreal in 2005 on whether a general theory of what works in education was possible. Such a general theory would need to link what we know about creating and sustaining effective schools with what we know about creating and sustaining effective educational leadership. And this became the challenge for the authors as they accepted and took up the challenge of considering if a search for a unified or general theory of what works in education could have merit.

Through networking, both in person and electronically, the book's conceptual scheme was shared with a group of both leading and emerging education researchers, primarily in Canada, but also in Australia and the United States. However, the experience of the researchers is quite international in scope. As chapters were submitted they were shared with the authors' group to support the inter-connectedness of the books key theme.

The chapters were completed at a differential rate, one after another with some overlap in time, and as they were completed a key question slowly emerged; i.e. it is one thing to read about and to construct an understanding of effective schools and effective leadership research, but how do you incorporate the knowledge and skill sets into a more integrated self, able to make the theory to practice leap in consistently compelling ways?

The answer to this question started to become apparent upon reading all of the chapters and considering them together, and perhaps not too surprisingly, involved thinking about this question as part of a mode of being, a type of world view, if you will. There was once an episode in *Star Trek*, where the spaceship, the *Enterprise*, came into contact with an entity that was best described as "pure intelligence." Such an entity might well be considered to have defied characteristics such as omnipotence, and in theory would be able to consider all of the variables that operate in the present in such a way as to be able to consistently and perfectly predict the future outcomes of any decision. Such ability might be considered a kind of cosmic general theory.

As educators, we probably have never had the opportunity of coming into practical contact with an entity we could describe as “pure intelligence”, although we can all think of leaders who display varying amounts of this quality. So, we do the best we can under the circumstances of the human condition and search for general theories that connect what we do know in more compelling ways than to consider knowledge in discrete and disconnected constructs. And, we try to seek out people who can stimulate our thinking and help us inform our own emerging general theory of what works in education.

It is our hope that this book helps you the reader as you engage in your own search for ideas, knowledge and insights that contribute to effective educational leadership.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book would not have been possible if it were not for a number of individuals who offered support and encouragement to pursue the idea that a loose coalition of widely geographically separated educational researchers could be brought together to pursue an exploration of the off the wall concept that a unified theory of what works in education would even be worth exploring. Dr. Patricia Klinck was the first to provide this encouragement, followed shortly thereafter by Dr. Charles Webber. Dr. Kenneth Leithwood also expressed early encouragement and provided a vital link to the publisher, Springer, who offered a book contract on the basis of the exploratory opening chapter. All of the authors who joined this venture as members of the writing team are of course fundamental to this book coming into being. Special thanks also are extended to Kathy Fast of Alberta Education who provided editing and formatting support. Lastly, I want to recognize my wife, Nancy, whose support, encouragement and patience was manifested as much of the writing occurred while on our various vacations in Comox, British Columbia.

John Burger, Ph.D.

# CHAPTER 1

## IN SEARCH OF THE ELUSIVE GENERAL THEORY

JOHN BURGER

*Alberta Education*

The basic premise of this book is that the definition and explication of a general theory of what works in education, based on a solid base of educational research, has the potential to lead schools and school systems to excellence. Extensive change and development in many national and provincial education systems in the past 20 years have occurred to the extent that a general theory of what works in education is possible. However, even armed with a general theory, the mechanisms for translating theory to practice are handicapped by insufficiently developed leadership networks capable of effecting truly collaborative models focused on effective reform. Schmoker, (2004: 431) in his recent critique of overly complex approaches to educational reform disconnected from practitioners, concludes,

*We can no longer afford to be innocent of the fact that ‘collaboration’ improves performance.... For this [collaboration] to happen, we have to reach a ‘tipping point’ the moment when – sometimes quite quickly – people’s actions and attitudes change dramatically.... Such a tipping point – from reform to true collaboration – could represent the most productive shift in the history of educational practice.*

If we extend Schmoker’s argument to the premise of this book, we are led to the conclusion that it is the absence of more systemic models of collaborative leadership that has inhibited education from becoming a more research-based profession with a clear, theoretical framework of what makes schools successful.

Attempts have been made in Canada in the past to develop more systemic models of leadership development, but these attempts have had limited success. In November 1988, a group of Canadian educators gathered in Vancouver to begin discussions on the potential of developing a Canadian network focused on enhancing educational leadership in Canada. The discussion at the initial meeting in Vancouver was based partially on Marilyn Ferguson’s theory of dissipative structures, which explores the theory that the potential for building and maintaining a social structure is dependent on the dynamic tension between the forces that

hold it together vs. the forces that can pull it apart (Ferguson, 1980:162–170). The thinking that emerged at the end of the meeting concluded that there were stronger forces compelling the creation of an educational leadership network than the forces working against such a structure. Ultimately the foundation for the Canadian Educational Leadership Network (CELN) was successfully laid. Connections were established with a wide range of organizations such as the B.C. Principals Association, the Alberta Department of Education, the University of Saskatchewan, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, and others.

Concurrent with the creation of the CELN, in Alberta, Canada, a provincial organization called the Alberta Consortium for the Development of Leadership in Education (ACDLE) was formed on May 5, 1988 which connected all of the key provincial stakeholders to focus on the need to develop educational leadership capacity. The ACDLE contracted researchers at the University of Alberta to conduct a needs assessment of educational leadership in the province (Montgomerie, Peters and Ward: 1991). This report identified five key issues that effectively limited the potential for educational leadership to stimulate educational change in Alberta:

- 1) leadership was characterized as “safe” and “lacking in vision or creativity” and devoid of collaborative networking;
- 2) a lack of “social consensus” and common vision to guide educational leaders in understanding what is appropriate to expect of schools was identified;
- 3) an absence of risk-taking behavior was identified and attributed to the essentially political nature of educational leadership;
- 4) a lack of balance between theoretical content and field-based experience was attributed to leadership development programs at Alberta universities; and,
- 5) effective leadership was deemed less a function of funding leadership development programs (especially in times of fiscal restraint) and more a matter of developing collaborative cultures and cooperation between agencies.

These five issues individually would present a critique of education, but they have functioned interactively and have had the effect in their totality of reinforcing an education system that can be slow to adapt, or react to, or to capitalize on external change stimuli.

Following the creation of the ACDLE and CELN, several years of effort at local, provincial and national levels transpired and culminated in an application to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) to provide funding support to a pan-Canadian educational leadership network. Unfortunately the SSHRC application was not successful. In Alberta, the absence of the SSHRC support, coupled with some degree of inter-stakeholder doubts about the efficacy of more collaborative leadership models, stimulated the dissipative forces working against the ACDLE and a national leadership development network. Instead of a national - provincial vision of educational leadership development, regional models within the province began to be seen as more sustainable, particularly in relationship to traditional catchments areas and role responsibilities for leadership development of Alberta universities. When the Alberta Department of Education withdrew its

membership in the ACDLE due to the perception of increasing political risk associated with the ACDLE, a few stakeholders tried to keep it alive, but eventually it dissipated, with the result that educational leadership development in Alberta remains a largely atomized and disconnected process.

Despite this story of failed efforts to create a pan-Canadian or even a provincial leadership development network, this book is dedicated to testing the hypothesis that the “universe” of education has changed significantly in the past 18 years since the initial efforts to create the ACDLE and CELN, and that the epistemological and ontological forces supportive of educational leadership networks now are stronger than forces opposing development of more systemic models of leadership.

This is not to say that the forces supportive of educational leadership have overwhelmed the dissipative forces, only that the balance is tipping in favor of more systemic models of educational leadership. Among the first prerequisites for the supportive forces to advance is simply recognizing the possibility that what we know about leading educational organizations to excellence is coming together in more integrated and holistic ways, similar to Stephen Hawking and others search for a unifying theory of the forces that explain the creation and expansion of the universe. In his Foreword to *A Brief History of Time*, Hawking (1996: viii) describes,

*...the progress that has been made recently in finding ‘dualities’ or correspondences between apparently different theories of physics. These correspondences are a strong indication that there is a complete unified theory of physics, but they also suggest that it may not be possible to express this theory in a single fundamental formulation. Instead, we may have to use different reflections of the underlying theory in different situations.*

The possibilities that may accrue when we apply Hawking’s thinking from physics to education are intriguing. For example, evolving conceptions of childhood and youth underscore the importance of policy frameworks to be responsive to the unique needs, identity formation and social-economic contexts of youth (Hebert and Hartley, 2004). These evolving conceptualizations hold promise for connecting theories of curriculum, instruction, assessment and pedagogy, as is evidenced by the growing literature on understanding by design (McTighe, Seif and Wiggins, 2004). Such theoretical linkages can transcend traditional organizational boundaries between schools/classroom and ministries of education or faculties of education, and can help to ensure that education systems are more able to personalize learning in fundamentally important ways to better respond to and meet the needs of students.

Technology also is playing a significant role in changing how people network and share insights, ideas and strategies for stimulating change. The idea for this book would never have been launched without the networking power of email and the research potential of the internet. Technology allows more to be done with less effort than ever before, while breaking down barriers of time and distance. Collaboration and sharing, two fundamental properties of more effective leadership, are greatly facilitated by information and communications technology.

Another contributing force to a unifying theory supportive of excellence in education is the emerging alignment of research methods and epistemological

foundations for understanding educational research. Old debates that raged in the 1980's and 1990's between quantitative, logical positivistic vs. qualitative, naturalistic inquiry methods for knowing and understanding what works in educational contexts are giving way to more holistic and unified approaches to inquiry (Wolstenholme, 1999). Furthermore, in his recent discussion of the role of educational research in transforming schools, Slavin (2003:24) sees educational leaders, "...becoming increasingly sophisticated in judging the adequacy of research, and, as a result the quality and usefulness of research will grow." While lamenting that education (in the United States but perhaps more universally) has been too much influenced by ideology than knowledge-based reform, Slavin (2003:24) concludes, "Evidence-based reform honors the best traditions of our profession and promises to transform schooling for all students."

This unification of inquiry is occurring simultaneously with evolutionary growth in systems of educational accountability. Educational theorists such as Stiggins (2001) and Reeves (2004) are building the case for much more comprehensive approaches to assessing student achievement. Emphasis by governments on standardized testing as the only way of assessing education system performance, while still the primary foundation for accountability systems in the U.S. under the No Child Left Behind legislation, is being supplemented in other areas (Alberta Learning, 2004) by broader and deeper approaches to evaluating program effectiveness based on teachers' daily assessment work - quantitative, qualitative and intuitive - as a basis for judging levels of student achievement.

Government sanctioned policy has the potential to provide an environment supportive of reform-oriented educational leadership, although this potential has been muted by the negative tone or connotation of reform oriented policies that have been prominent since the mid-90's. Levin (2003: 3) has identified two specific problems with contemporary education policy;

*"First, the overall policy approach has been excessively negative in tone, which has itself had important and unfortunate effects. Second, we have not focused on those variables that are most likely to yield real and lasting improvement."*

The policy mix clearly has not been optimally balanced to generate strong, broad-spectrum political support, particularly from the key people responsible for policy implementation - classroom teachers (Burger, et.al., 2000), (Lynn, 1998). Some of this imbalance may indeed be due to the possibility that policy has not been targeted appropriately. As Levin (2003:3) has noted, reform-oriented policies have tended to concentrate ineffectually on structural changes targeting such areas as jurisdiction boundaries, the financing of education, the role of school councils, school-based decision-making etc. As a consequence, these reform-oriented policies have not reached down to the fundamentally important components that educational research has shown to effect student achievement. Schmoker (2004:424) sums this situation up as follows;



*But here's the problem. Such 'learning communities' – rightly defined – are still extremely rare. For years, they have been supplanted and obscured by hugely popular, but patently discredited, reform and improvement models. The record is clear that these failed, unnecessarily complex reforms have had only the most negligible impact on what should be our core concern: the quality of teaching students receive.*

In addition to the hypothesis of misdirected policy, it is absolutely crucial to consider the hypothesis that the absence of integrated, systemic leadership development serves to ensure that reform-oriented policies will not be adopted by the policy implementers because the prerequisite inter-organization visioning process is consequently absent. In essence, systemic reform cannot be successfully implemented without mechanisms supportive of systemic leadership.

Reflecting on the importance of leadership, Leithwood, et. al. (2004:5) recently have concluded that “Leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to what students learn at school.” Effective leadership, however, casts its shadow well beyond school-related factors and is a key element in a general or unified theory of what works in education. It follows then that a key opportunity lies in identifying how to create effective leadership networks necessary for achieving the system-level supports required for excellence and optimizing learning for students. In their discussion of contemporary policy contexts in relation to effective leadership, Leithwood, et.al. (2004:11) comment,

*At the moment, large-scale, accountability-oriented policy contexts are pervasive for educational leaders across the country. States are key actors in the enactment of educational leadership. Currently, the focus on state standards and accountability systems is driving local decisions and policies in ways that are unprecedented.*

Although Leithwood, et. al. (2004: 12) observe that research about successful leadership practices in accountability driven contexts is “in its infancy”, they are able to infer broad level goals that would characterize emerging models of effective educational leadership. These goals would include:

- 1) creating and sustaining competitive schools;
- 2) empowering others, especially via data-informed decision-making
- 3) providing instructional guidance, setting professional standards; and,
- 4) effecting strategic school improvement planning.

Interestingly, it can be argued these four goals should be inherent components of any state-mandated accountability model, and that the policy framework underlying an accountability model needs to support the articulation among and between these leadership goals. But even if such interconnected and well-informed accountability policy frameworks exist, they represent necessary, but not sufficient conditions for successful and effective leadership.

Perhaps the biggest challenge and opportunity in this context for leaders is building a consensus around what data-informed decision-making should look like. The literature on classroom assessment is characterized by considerable debate around the appropriate uses and applications of state-mandated achievement tests and how test data should be used to inform decision-making at the school and

jurisdiction levels (Burger and Krueger, 2002). Certainly, over-reliance on state-mandated achievement tests may be just as problematic as ignoring such data, and yet more inclusive and balanced models of data that can inform decision-making around what works best for student learning are relatively rare.

More than 20 years ago, Bloom (1980) wrote about the power of formative student assessment as one of a few “alterable variables” that are well within the purview of teachers to wield as a direct determinant of improved student learning. More recently, Stiggins (2001) has linked the power of formative assessment with student involvement in classroom assessment as an approach that has been demonstrated to contribute dramatically to student success. The Alberta Assessment Consortium has witnessed continuing growth over the past ten years of teacher and administrator interest in formative classroom assessment (Alberta Assessment Consortium: 2003). Focusing on formative classroom assessment is a promising practice for individual students and teachers. However, its potential for stimulating growth in student success is exponentially increased when formative assessment becomes part of the “data-informed decision making” Leithwood, et.al. (2004) discuss as a means for giving greater voice to community stakeholders, especially the community of students and their parents. Formative assessment linked to student involvement in classroom assessment is one of the more effective drivers of improvement in student learning that is ultimately visible in summative assessments (Stiggins, 2001).

In Alberta, a pilot project (Alberta Learning, 2002) is exploring ways in which the provincial student achievement database of standardized, criterion-referenced achievement test results can be supplemented with teacher’s judgment of their students grade level of achievement anchored in the learning outcomes in the provincially mandated curricula. This project demonstrates one of the powerful evolutionary changes that is permeating the provincial education system and will support more collaborative models of leadership, as it stimulates wider understanding of what works best for students. Questions around data quality and the validity and reliability of teacher-based assessment have been examined (Alberta Learning, 2005) and early indications are that teacher-based data demonstrates satisfactory concurrent and predictive validity relative to groupings of students based on classification of special learning needs.

More importantly, however, is the parallel message that questions around program effectiveness can be answered just as well and perhaps better when standardized test data is supplemented by teacher-generated data on student achievement. It would seem to be almost a truism that the richer the data and related information informing matters of student achievement, the greater is the empowerment possible through shared data and multiple ways of knowing for more effective educational leadership.

As important as classroom assessment and a broader range of data are for informing decisions around what works in maximizing student achievement, the reform agenda of governments tend to go well beyond assessment matters. Alberta initiated its first in-depth examination of its education system in more than 30 years with the Alberta Commission On Learning in June 2002. The Alberta Commission

on Learning noted its key objective was to, "...examine not just short-term issues and pressures in the system but to look beyond the hot buttons of the day and consider where our province and our society are headed and how we can make sure our education system is as responsive as possible." Alberta Learning, 2003: 20). Following a review process that was, "...comprehensive, involving an extensive consultation process, public meetings, submissions and presentations, meetings with education stakeholders and experts, discussions with students, meetings with Aboriginal leaders, visits to schools, and a comprehensive research program..." (Alberta Learning, 2003: 21) the Alberta Commission on Learning published its final report in October 2003.

At roughly the same time, halfway across the country in Ontario, a similar review process was underway under the leadership of a investigative team from OISE/UT (Leithwood, Fullan and Watson, 2003). This team was commissioned to prepare a position paper on the future of education in Ontario. The purpose of *The Schools We Need* report was described as;

*Following the most tumultuous decade in Ontario educational history, and seven years after the release of the report of the Royal Commission on Learning, it seemed time to examine where Ontario education is now and where the province should be headed in the future. The Schools We Need provided an audit of current education policy in Ontario with suggestions on how to improve our schools (Leithwood, Fullan and Watson, 2003: 1).*

The Ontario review was grounded in similar ways to the Alberta review and included public opinion studies, analysis of student achievement data, analysis of provincial funding formulas, research about policies and practices for improving teaching and learning, and reflected the authors' experience in reform initiatives in Canada and internationally, and feedback to the authors from a wide range of respondents to an early draft of the report.

Given the proximity in time, but considerable geographic distance, it is a compelling observation to see how similar the two reports are, both of which set the agenda for future leadership challenges for governments and their stakeholders in education delivery. The Ontario report presented 17 recommendations within five constructs whereas the Alberta report presented 95 recommendations within nine constructs. When these constructs are compared (Table 1) we can see there is a high degree of general level similarity in the conceptual framework (related recommendations are noted in parentheses) that emerged from these critical frameworks. While the general organizing categories in these two reports suggest a degree of comparability, when we drill down and consider the specific recommendations in these reports, an even higher degree of parallelism is apparent. As Table 2 demonstrates, almost all 17 of the Ontario report recommendations have a counterpart in the Alberta report. This parallelism tends to suggest the future reform agenda in these two provinces, and perhaps much more broadly given the universality seen in educational reforms of the past decade, are remarkably similar.

What forces are at work or underway in education to prompt such similar reports? The similarities in these two reports might be explained in several ways. The environmental context manifested through the political and economic agendas in

*Table 1. Organizing Constructs in Ontario and Alberta Reform Reports (Corresponding recommendations in parentheses)*

The Schools We Need - Ontario	Every Child Learns... - Alberta
Vision (1-6)	Ready to Learn (1-4) What Children Learn (5-12) The Schools We Need (13-26) Success for Every Child (27-52)
Governance (7-8), Evidence (9-10), Support for Teachers (11-14)	Good Governance (81-86) Making the Grade (53-60) Technology Plus (61-68) Excellent Teachers and School Leaders (69-80)
Adequate and Flexible Funding (15-17);	Investing in our Children's Future (87-95)

Ontario and Alberta, as in much of the western world in the 1990's, was characterized by a drive for efficiency, reduced public spending and increased accountability. These common agendas may have created similar reactionary patterns and therefore similar solution sets to make things right again.

Alternatively, it may be that educational research has reached a stage of evolutionary development such that distinct and considered applications of this research-based knowledge have emerged and are being applied consistently to the same, targeted areas. It is also possible that both explanations are operating in an interactive and synergistic way.

If the political and research agendas are merging, and this would seem to be a plausible explanation, then it is of critical importance to explore what the similarities in the reform agenda and related strategies mean for governments and their stakeholders. An emerging general theory of what works in education has the potential to make the critical connections in a matrix of political and epistemological meaning.

Canadian researchers' contributions to such an emerging theory supportive of excellence in schools have been significant in explaining these forces and provide the foundation for this book. In the following chapters, Klinck takes us on a journey reflecting how professional and life experiences interact to constantly shape conceptualizations of self as educational leader. Fullan's discussion of change theory as a force for system level improvement goes beyond defining what the components of change theory are to a consideration of how leadership networks are also a necessary condition of successful system level change. Leithwood's description of effective leadership processes brings additional clarity to what effective educational leadership looks like in context. For example, Leithwood presents a very sensitive and realistic treatment of teachers' emotional states as a closely related function of effective educational leadership networks. Both Fullan and Leithwood help to define what components would be required if a general theory of what works in creating effective schools were to emerge in a way that helps to transcend what is known about leadership with how it is enacted. These opening chapters set

*Table 2. Comparison of Specific Recommendations in Ontario and Alberta Reform Reports*

The Schools We Need - Ontario	Every Child Learns... - Alberta
Commitment to strengthening the public school system (1).	Provide high quality choices while preserving and enhancing public schools (25).
Ensure strong foundational skills of literacy and numeracy, citizenship and ethical behaviour (2).	Ensure that all schools encourage positive attitudes, good behaviour and respect for others (24).
Increase the range of choices within the public system (3).	Provide high quality choices (25).
Provide full-day junior and senior kindergarten programs (4).	Establish parenting centres, junior kindergarten programs, full day kindergarten programs and ensure better coordination of programs for children (1–4).
Invest in non-school policies such as prenatal health, high quality early childhood learning and housing supports to reduce student mobility (5).	Ensure that adequate support is in place for coordinated services with health centres, Child and Family Services Authorities, community organizations and parenting centres (42).
Improve achievement in literacy and mathematics (6).	Create provincial proficiency standards for ... students who are not proficient in English... and provide funding until students reach the standard (52)
Maintain central responsibility for setting curriculum, providing resources and monitoring progress (7).	Maintain and continuously improve Alberta's comprehensive and balanced curriculum (6).
Provide more discretion to schools and school districts in the implementation of provincial priorities (8).	Maintain a balance between centralized and decentralized responsibilities for the provincial government and school boards (82).
Develop education policies that are systematically "evidence-informed" (9).	Support research and innovative approaches for improving student outcomes (54).
Data collection for monitoring the implementation and the effects of provincial policy (10).	Results from provincial achievement tests are used along with ongoing classroom assessments to guide and inform plans for improving students' achievement (55).
Review and revise, as needed, the exit standards and means of assessing those standards in teacher training programs (11).	Review and improve current pre-service programs for teachers (69).
Stimulate professional learning over the entire cycle of a teacher's professional life (12).	Develop and implement comprehensive professional development and require all teachers to have targeted annual professional development plans (72–73).
Foster recruitment, retention and development of high caliber candidates (13).	Require school jurisdictions to adapt the first-year experience and provide effective coaching for beginning teachers (71).

*(continued)*

Table 2. *continued*

The Schools We Need - Ontario	Every Child Learns... - Alberta
Support leadership development for principals, district administrators and teachers through revised standards for leadership development and the establishment of a fund supporting high quality programs (14).	Develop a quality practice standard required for principles; establish a program to prepare and certify principles; establish a Council of Education Executives to provide certification, support and professional development for principles; develop a program for preparing superintendents and to provide professional development and support to them (76–79).
Restore sufficient funding (15).	Address the current shortfall in funds as soon as possible (87).
Alter the funding formula such that a portion is reserved as a non-restricted block grant that can be used flexibly by school districts (16).	Allow school boards to requisition their local residents for up to 10% of the amount raised through provincial education property taxes (94).
Establish a central fund to which school districts could apply for support to focus on specific areas known to have a positive impact on student learning (17).	Phase in funding for new initiatives recommended by the Commission on a priority basis (93).

the context for more specific treatments of other factors that help to define what effective educational leadership looks like.

Sackney and Mergel's contextually rich review of the nexus between learning theory and effective leadership is compelling, especially when conceptualized as one of Leithwood's key leadership components of "managing instruction." Begley and Zaretsky's insights into democratic leadership in schools demonstrates the complexities of value articulation, rationality, cultural dynamics and dialogue as highly interactive components that can be structured to support school improvement. Webber and Mulford extend the thinking in the Begley and Zaretsky chapter as they explore the linkages between schools and proximal and distal communities. Through this analysis they identify issues that are fundamentally linked to how what works in school-community relations and networking can contribute to our quest for a more general theory of what works in education.

Levin and Naylor discuss how resources allocated to education might be used more effectively. They illuminate how what we know from educational research can be reified through more effective decision-making by education leaders in a context of more effective education planning. Davies' extensive review of emerging models of classroom assessment includes a discussion of specific leadership strategies for supporting assessment for learning.

The book concludes with DaCosta, Foster and Wallace's review of educational leadership development programs in Canada. One potential application of

this book is its potential contribution to informing what educational leadership development programs should be. This survey provides a useful context for this application.

The above chapter authors, in their collective wisdom and synergy, begin to flesh out what a general theory of what works in education would look like within a new reform context. This book, it is hoped, will make a small contribution to defining the framework for a renaissance in education leadership at a critical juncture in the history of western education, for to paraphrase Hawking (1996: viii), it may well be that the “universe” [of education] is governed by a set of rational laws and/or processes that we can discover and understand.

## REFERENCES

- Alberta Assessment Consortium. 2003. *Refocus: Looking at Assessment for Learning*. Edmonton, AB. Author. [www.aac.ab.ca](http://www.aac.ab.ca)
- Alberta Learning. 2002. *Beyond MIRS: New Directions for Program Evaluation - Pilot Project Backgrounder*. Edmonton, AB. Author.
- Alberta Learning. 2003. *Every Child Learns. Every Child Succeeds. Report and recommendations on Learning*. Edmonton, AB. Author.
- Alberta Learning. 2004. *Beyond MIRS Pilot Project Assessment – Final Report*. Edmonton, AB. Author.
- Alberta Learning. 2005. *Beyond MIRS Data Technical Report – Summary*. Edmonton, AB. Author.
- Bloom, B.. 1980. “The New Direction in Educational Research: Alterable Variables.” *Phi Delta Kappan*. Vol. 61. No. 6.
- Burger, et. al. 2000. Implementation of the Alberta Accountability Framework. Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy. University of Manitoba. Issue 17. <http://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/issuesOnline.html>
- Burger, J.M. and Krueger, M. 2001. “A Balanced Approach to High Stakes Testing: An Analysis of the Literature with Policy Implications.” *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning*. University of Calgary. Vol. Xx. No. s. <http://www.ucalgary.ca/~iejll/>
- Ferguson, M. 1980. *The Aquarian Conspiracy*. Houghton Mifflin Co. Boston.
- Hawkins, S. 1996. *A Brief History of Time*. Bantam Books. New York.
- Hebert, Y. and Hartley, W.J. 2004. “Conceptions of Childhood and Youth as Social Representations of Economic and Political Ideologies in Canada.” University of Calgary. Calgary, AB.
- Leithwood, K., Fullan, M. and Watson, N. 2003. *The Schools We Need. A New Blueprint for Ontario – Final Report*. OISE/UT. Toronto, ON.
- Leithwood, K., et. al. 2004. *How Leadership Influences Student Learning*. OISE/UT. Toronto, ON.
- Levin, B. 2003. “Better Education: The Role of Canadian Governments.” *CEA-Whitworth Award Talk*. University of Manitoba. Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Lynn, D. 1998. *Breaking Through the Ceiling*. Paper delivered to the College of Alberta School Superintendents, Edmonton, AB.
- McTighe, J., Seif, E. and Wiggins, G. 2004. “You Can Teach for Meaning.” *Educational Leadership*. Vol. 62., No. 1.
- Montgomerie, C., Peters, F. and Ward, K. 1991. *Educational Leadership in Alberta*. University of Alberta. Edmonton, AB.
- Reeves, D.B. 2004. *Accountability for Learning: How Teachers and School Leaders Can Take Charge*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, VA.
- Schmoker, M. 2004. “Tipping Point: From Feckless Reform to Substantive Instructional Improvement,” *Phi Delta Kappan*. Vol. 85. No. 6.
- Slavin, R.E. 2003. “A Reader’s Guide to Scientifically Based Research.” *Educational Leadership*. Vol. 60. No. 5.