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This thesis examines the cost and effectiveness of five selected targeted professional development programs for principals of pilot schools in the Victorian Schools of the Future (SOTF) program. SOTF is a major reform of school management, being conducted by the Victorian Directorate of School Education, which entails a move from a centralised authority to a self-managing one. The programs: Charter Development, Principal Leadership, School Operations, Financial Management and Personnel Management, are chosen from the entire training program because they relate directly to the role of a principal in a SOTF, and in systems elsewhere.

The purpose of this investigation is to consider an overview of the cost and effectiveness of targeted development programs in times of large scale reform in the work place. The research is concerned with the effectiveness of professional development programs from the perceptions of the participants, the extent to which the objectives of the development programs have been met, and to determine direct and opportunity costs associated with the programs. This study helps to document the cost of professional development in the reform by considering the resource allocated, by the central agency, to run professional development programs for school personnel, especially principals. This study’s value lies in the fact that it will inform both the implementation of the SOTF and future policy formulation, as well as the development of similar reforms in Australia and overseas.

Findings result from an analysis of qualitative and quantitative responses to items on a survey instrument. There were two items related to effectiveness, one which depended upon the extent to which a program met its stated objectives, and the other was a set of perceptions from a participant’s perceptions and his/her objectives. The linking of quantitative and qualitative responses on effectiveness was informed by the Bolman and Deal framework of leadership behaviour. Analysis of questionnaire items showed that principals were strongest in their support of the Principal Leadership program. Further breakdown of data according to: Gender, Region, School Type, and Years of Experience, indicated these categories had very little significant effect on principals’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the programs.
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LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AST: Advanced Skills Teacher
CASES: Computerised Administrative System for Schools
CFF: Common Funding Formula
Cost-effectiveness analysis: an analysis of inputs and outputs where inputs are monetary and the outputs are non-monetary (such as goals, objectives).
CRT: Casual Relief Teacher
DSE: Directorate of School Education.
Effectiveness: a measure of how well a program measures up to its objectives.
Efficiency: 'the use of the budget in such a way that, given relative prices, the most productive combination of resources is obtained.' (Levin: 1976 as cited in Abu-Duhou)
Global Budget: 'a formula-based funding model with a common or base element and an equity element. It provides funding for salaries and associated on-costs, operating expenses and maintenance and minor works as a single line budget.' (DSE: 1994)
LEA: Local Education Authority
GMS: Grant-Maintained School
Money costs: relate to the amounts of money that are used in the educational process. Woodhall (1987)
NZ: New Zealand.
Opportunity costs: relate to the value of the resources that have alternative uses. Woodhall (1987)
SOTF: Schools of the Future.
SRI: Student Resource Index.
SRP: Special Responsibility Position.
UK: United Kingdom.
USA: United States of America.
VPPA: Victorian Primary Principals' Association.
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Advocates of school-based management have long argued that, in educational systems which previously may have been characterised by highly centralised bureaucracies, schools should be granted a significant level of autonomy in making decisions about such matters as curriculum, finances and resources, staffing and school policy (Angus, 1992:4).

The current scene within many systems of education in the international setting is one where there is considerable restructuring of the management of public schools. The statement from Angus (1992:4) gives a picture of the reform which is occurring not only in Australia but also in Canada, the United States, Britain, New Zealand and Hong Kong, as well as developing countries, and is occurring in systems where there has been a tradition of centralised authority. The focus of this reform is the move towards self-management accompanied by varying degrees of autonomy, but no common pattern of development is evident. Whether the term is self-management, school-based management, site-based management, devolution, participation or responsive bureaucracy, the meanings can only be understood in the context of the broader educational policy agenda as argued by Angus (1992:4), 'which is itself sensible only in relation to broad social and economic policy directions'.

Various writers (Angus, 1992; Caldwell & Spinks, 1992; Harman, Beare & Berkley, 1991) believe that the changes, which are examples of political decentralisation, are being promoted in times of economic concern. Knight, Lingard and Porter (1993) support this by stating that, in the context of 'hard times', most Western countries have sought to restructure public schooling, to make it more responsive to the economy. On this basis Caldwell and Spinks (1992) advocate that:

it is simply more efficient and effective in the late twentieth century to restructure systems of education so that central bureaucracies are relatively small and schools are empowered to manage their own affairs within a centrally determined framework of direction and support. Two arguments have usually been offered, one is concerned with responsiveness, the other with priorities for resource allocation in times of economic restraint or budgetary crisis (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:14).
The key feature of this movement has been the devolution of various responsibilities from the central authority to the local level principals and school councils. These responsibilities, mainly administrative, relate to local control of the budget, selection of staff, salaries, and maintenance of the plant (Knight, Lingard and Porter, 1993:3). This process at times has been referred to as the self-managing school, or school-based management. In this study, the self-managing school is one where:

there has been significant and consistent decentralisation to the school level of authority and responsibility to make decisions related to the allocation of resources, with resources defined broadly to include matters related to curriculum, personnel, finance and facilities, in a system of education having centrally determined goals, priorities and frameworks for accountability (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:31).

Such moves in Australia towards the self-management of government schools are occurring concurrently with the re-structuring of public systems of education. The focus of this thesis, which began in 1993, was on the then proposed Schools of the Future, hereafter SOTF, program for the government schools of the State of Victoria. The SOTF program is one whereby the central agency for public education, the Directorate of School Education, hereafter DSE, was devolving decisions related to budget, staffing, and the curriculum to the local level. At the same time the DSE was reduced both in size and functions to a strategic core.

The economic rationalist argument prevailed in times where resourcing public enterprises had become difficult, and when tasks of the centralised bureaucracy had become more complex, and the range less routine. Reasons often given for policy changes are in terms of efficiency and equity, in addition to effectiveness and improving student outcomes. Angus (1992) argues that, in this period of social and economic uncertainty, policies that appeal to accountability and efficient administration are most likely to be seen as the right way to run schools. Hughes (1991) claims that in the Australian setting 'the major purpose of these changes (does) not relate to schools, but to the locus of control of systems' (Hughes, 1991:51).

However, education was not the only public service that had been affected in Victoria, health and welfare were equally vulnerable services. As Lingard, Knight and Porter (1993) point out, the current arguments of efficiency and effectiveness were contained within the broader debates of 'the reform of the public sector', whereas Caldwell & Spinks (1992) take the view that there was extra pressure on
governments because of the advances in costly technology and high public expectations. They write that one should 'consider also the high cost of increasingly sophisticated approaches to law enforcement, defence, transportation and education' (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:16). One response from governments, faced with such economic dilemmas, which has been mirrored around the world, was to cut educational expenditure. Not only were there cuts at the school level but also at the central level, resulting in reduced numbers of personnel and a reduction in the services provided. In Victoria alone 'the introduction of the Schools of the Future policy has occurred amidst unprecedented cuts to the State's education budget. In generating $100 million reduction for the 1993 financial year, 55 schools were closed, 3700 cleaners sacked and 4000 teachers given redundancy packages' (Brennan, 1993:3). Caldwell & Spinks (1992) also noted that 'central authorities have adopted a powerful but sharply focused role. It is essentially one of determining goals, setting priorities and building frameworks for accountability' (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992:9). This then set the scene for centralised systems of education supporting and developing the rhetoric for school-based management.

A. Aim of the Research

This thesis is about the SOTF program, with particular focus on some of the professional development activities for principals, and evaluation of these activities. The overall aim of this research is to examine the cost and the perceived effectiveness of targeted professional development programs in times of large scale reform in the work place. The examination is concerned with the extent, from the perspectives of the participants (principals), to which the objectives of the development programs have been met, given the costs associated with the programs. The research takes into account both quantitative and qualitative data.

The overall aim of this research is achieved through an examination of both the costs and the perceived effectiveness of the targeted training programs provided by the DSE for school personnel. The targeted professional development programs chosen: were Charter Development, Principal Leadership, School Operations, Financial Management, and Personnel Management. They were selected because they were the programs attended in the main by principals, and related directly to the role of a principal in a SOTF. This evaluation will help to inform other systems, in Australia and elsewhere, about the effectiveness and role played by such training programs in fostering the tenets of SOTF. As well, they are the types of
programs likely to be replicated in other systems. A subsidiary task is to ascertain the cost of the implementation process.

**B. Rationale for the Research**

The SOTF program is a major reform in the history of public education in Victoria. In essence, the reform is a further decentralising of the management of the public education system. This study, on resource allocation, by a central agency, in running professional development programs for school personnel, especially principals, will help to document the cost of the reform. The study of the effectiveness of the programs from the perceptions of the principals aids in the documentation of the reform. The importance of the research lies in the fact that it will inform both future policy and further implementation of the SOTF, and the development of similar reforms in Australia and overseas. Thus, it will be a useful policy and planning document for the DSE in Victoria and other systems of education.

The outcomes of this research will also make a unique contribution to the overall material gathered and conclusions reached in the Cooperative Research Project on the Role of the Principal in Victoria's Schools of the Future. The Cooperative Research Project is a joint initiative of the Victorian Primary Principals' Association (VPPA), the Victorian Association of Secondary Schools Principals (VASSP), the Directorate of School Education (DSE), and the Institute of Education (now the Faculty of Education) at the University of Melbourne. The Cooperative Research Project aims at investigating the purpose, processes and outcomes of Schools of the Future, giving particular attention to the role of the principal. Five dimensions for investigation have been developed within the project: policy outcomes, strategic leadership, professional development, change to workplace practice and resource allocation. This thesis, which focuses on the cost and effectiveness overview of the targeted professional development programs for principals during the pilot phase of the SOTF program, is located within the project investigating resource allocation.

**C. Significance of the Research**

The significance of this study is that it examines firstly, the cost of providing special professional development programs for principals of schools, and secondly, the effectiveness of the programs as
perceived by principals. Given the timing of the implementation of the SOTF and this research, this study is part of the first macro-analysis of the implementation of Victoria’s latest educational policy and educational reform, and is the first of its kind. As such, it adds to the knowledge about the process of implementing change in educational administrative settings, and in the financial administration of education. In particular, it adds to the knowledge base of the implementation of self-management in schools. There are also lessons to be learned for future development programs, as the research will inform other central agencies about the types of professional development activities, which are seen by participants to be effective, and the level of resourcing required.

As the research is concerned with the question of intended objectives and perceived benefits, the outcomes will lead to an analysis of the benefits of the professional development targeted programs - for example, describe how have principals of schools from the SOTF program benefitted, and, what were those benefits.

The research findings will point the way to further development of funding models to be used by systems that provide professional development programs in times of major structural reform, both educational and financial. The aim will be to extend further the boundaries of knowledge and practice.

**D. Research Questions**

The thesis also aims to examine the costs outlaid by the central agency, the DSE, in providing professional development for schools participating in the SOFT pilot programs, and to examine the effectiveness of professional development programs as perceived by principals of schools in times of major structural reform. In particular, knowledge is provided of the perceptions, of principals of schools in the pilot SOTF program, on five of the Targeted Professional Development Programs conducted in Term 4, 1993. The programs were: Charter Development, Principal Leadership, School Operations, Financial Management, and Personnel Management. Perceptions of these programs were made by principals in light of practice during the year that followed the training programs. The thesis provides suggestions for further professional development activities for principals, as the reform moves to embrace all Victorian government schools. In order to provide the required knowledge the following research questions were proposed:
1. What are the intended objectives and perceived benefits, when considering the system as a whole, of the professional development programs for Principals of Victorian Primary and Secondary schools taking part in the SOTF pilot program?

2. What is the perceived effectiveness the professional development programs for Principals of Victorian Primary and Secondary schools taking part in the SOTF pilot program?

3. What are the costs to the central agency of the professional development programs for Principals of Victorian Primary and Secondary schools taking part in the SOTF pilot program?

4. What can be done to improve the efficiency of providing further professional development programs for all Principals of Victorian Primary and Secondary schools taking part in the SOTF program?

**E. Research Methodology**

To indicate how the research was to be completed, the research methodology, explained in Chapter Four, provides information on both the quantitative and qualitative components of the research. There are two aspects to the data collection: data on cost, which came from the DSE, and, data on effectiveness collected from a survey which used a questionnaire responded to by principals who had taken part in the SOTF Pilot program. The questionnaire had both quantitative and qualitative aspects, and administered to a sample of principals from the 325 schools that had taken part in the SOTF Pilot program. This survey instrument comprised 51 items grouped in ten sections. The concerns of the sections were Background, Targeted Programs for Term 4 1993, Charter Development, Principal Leadership, School Operations, Financial management, Personnel management, Effect on cost to schools of absences of school personnel at programs, Impact of targeted programs on day-to-day practice, and Future professional development programs for principals. The final form of the questionnaire, see Appendix III for the Questionnaire for Principals of Pilot Schools, was formulated after a small sample of principals had been interviewed. This small sample had been identified by the Cooperative Research Project as being willing to participate in further research. These interviews together with the instrument used in the Cooperative Research Project, noted earlier, aided in finalising the research instrument for this research.
F. Limitations of the Research

The period of research covers only the first year of the SOTF program, and therefore any findings are not global, but relate only to that period.

- All figures and measures of cost are only as reliable as are the elements of data on cost obtained from the DSE.

- All conclusions reached from an analysis of the questionnaire must be treated with some degree of caution, and can only apply to those who have responded to the survey. These conclusions are therefore limited in generalisation, as of the 325 schools involved in the pilot phase, responses were only received from 121 principals, indicating they were willing to participate in follow-up studies. These became the sample for this research. Here, there is an element of self-selection present, as the 121 principals were those who had indicated that they were prepared to be part of a follow-up survey.

- Due to the unique nature of this reform, that is, from a centralised model of resourcing of schools to the self-management model there is no study from an Australian setting or elsewhere which can be used for comparison.

G. Overview of Thesis

Chapter One focuses on introducing the thesis. It covers the outline, purpose and significance of the research. A rationale for the research is given together with a statement of the research questions, as well as the significance of the research and possible future use for its findings.

Chapter Two explores the context in which this major reform of public schooling, SOTF, exists in Victoria, with a description of the main aspects of the reform and its historical development. This chapter contains a survey of the literature on restructuring, school-based management and the experiences of self-managing schools. As the research involves the role of the Principal within the school, current views of leadership are explored.

Chapter Three considers the SOTF pilot program, the intentions for the full program, and the significant changes it will make to the management of Victoria's schools. It includes a review on the role of the principal as a key person in implementing reform at the local level. The chapter contains a description of
the full range of targeted professional development programs for personnel of Pilot Schools. A clarification of practices as developed elsewhere, particularly in NZ and Canada is given, as these have informed the Victorian DSE in initiating its SOTF program.

Chapter Four deals with the conceptual framework, research design methodology and sampling, together with questionnaire construction. The chapter takes into account the relevant background to research methods and assumptions underlying the procedures. As well, analyses of methods of determining cost, effectiveness and efficiency in educational settings are made.

Chapter Five contains displays of data together with a set of analyses of the quantitative data as recorded by the principals on responses to items of the survey instrument. Analyses are provided by gender, region, school type, and years of experience. The chapter also reports on the analyses of the quantitative data relating to the costs of the targeted programs.

Chapter Six reports on the analyses of the qualitative data, from principals' responses to questionnaire items, relating to the five targeted Professional Development programs.

Chapter Seven forms a connection with the conceptual framework developed in chapter four. It provides a report on future professional development for principals, and also applies the conceptual framework for linking the analyses, both quantitative and qualitative, on effectiveness from Chapters Five and Six, by relating them to the Frames of Leadership as explained in the Bolman and Deal book, *Reframing Organizations*.

The final chapter, Chapter Eight, presents findings and conclusions of the research together with recommendations for bodies funding professional development programs in times of major reform. These recommendations result from a consideration of the responses to the questionnaires. This chapter also indicates proposals for further research, and includes a postscript.

**H. Summary of Chapter One**

The current educational scene around the western world is one with reform of public education a common issue. Such reform is an attempt on the part of systems of education to respond to the economic reality of their situation. The current major structural reform of public schooling in Victoria, SOTF, mirrors what is happening elsewhere in the world. Victoria provides an example of a situation where a highly
centralised form of educational management is moving towards a devolved system, where its schools are to become self-managing.

The object of this chapter was to set the scene for research into the cost and effectiveness of targeted professional development programs for principals of schools in the public sector of Victoria during the pilot program of the SOTF. The rationale and significance of this research into the targeted Professional Development activities for principals of the SOTF pilot program, relate to the unique opportunity this provided to survey data and opinions of principals, regarding specially devised programs during the time of a major reform in educational administration. The results help to point the way to further development of funding models to be used by systems that provide professional development programs for key personnel in times of major structural reform.
CHAPTER 2
THE CONTEXT OF CHANGE

It is possible to view the move towards self-management in schools throughout the world as a response to a set of prevailing conditions. This chapter explores the history of decentralisation of school education in Victoria, and on a wider basis, attempts to make education systems more efficient, the state of educational offering, the desire for participatory action, and the 'effective schools' movement.

A. The Move Toward Self-Management

When considering the State of Victoria there has been a history of at least a 20-year movement towards a devolutionary mode of power for government schools, particularly with respect to the growing responsibilities of School Councils, and greater school responsibility for budgets and local selection of staff. The move towards the SOTF has been an evolutionary one, but, the final proposal for the program occurred at a time of economic restraint and cutback. The SOTF program emerged from the culture and experience of the administration of public education in Victoria.

In 1968, Victorian schools were given responsibility for curriculum matters, which previously had been externally controlled by a rigid examination system. Accompanying these, there appeared opportunities for decisions to be taken in regard to other aspects of school management, such as allocation of time for subjects, evaluation and reporting, and use of buildings. Chapman (1987) indicates that this was the first time principals were given freedom to make decisions for their schools without having to have those decisions ratified by the central authority. Principals were able to take on some of the financial responsibility. Implementation of procedures for teacher assessment and promotion became direct tasks at the local level. Other milestones in the move towards self-management includes the reformation of School Councils.

Demands for reform led to the Liberal (conservative) government's decision, with the full support of the Director-General of Education, to decentralise administration to regions and schools in 1975. Regional Offices were established and teacher and student representation on what had previously been the largely advisory parent School Councils was initiated by 1976 (Watkins and Blackmore, 1993:195).
This was a 'devolution of authority from the bureaucracy of the Education Department to the community of the school ... Whilst the principal remained ultimately responsible for the determination of the school's educational policy, members of the school community were, for the first time, given statutory authority to advise the principal on the development of that policy' (Chapman, 1987:126).

In the 1980s there were other developments such as a White Paper on Strategies and Structures for Education in Victoria Government Schools by the Liberal government (1980). The underlying themes were: devolution and decentralisation of power and responsibility, increased participation by parents, community, teachers and principals in education governance at all levels, improved consultation, economy and efficiency in management, effective coordination of policies, and appropriate mechanisms for internal and external reviews of schools. Harman, who drafted the White Paper in the latter part of 1980, points out that the drafting of the White Paper was part of a process of planned change, though there was a recognition that in bringing about structural and policy changes in large bureaucratic systems, where human services were involved, barriers would be encountered. In essence, the planned change proposed by the White Paper developed from a desire to bring about the following changes simultaneously:

- restructure the central office of the Department,
- decentralise and devolve substantial powers to regional councils and the staff of schools,
- provide for improved consultation and much wider participation in governance of schools,
- develop a responsive bureaucracy directed to servicing and assisting schools,
- actively redress discrimination and disadvantage, and

The developments in Victoria at that time were not unique, as public school systems elsewhere were undergoing similar review, particularly where existing systems were under strain. Harman comments on the common themes of turbulence, conflict and change and indicated that the solutions being explored had a common ring about them, namely: 'greater stress on client and community service, increased parent, community and teacher participation in governance, more effective co-ordination, new forms of review and
accountability, more emphasis on individual differences and on assistance for disadvantaged students, different organisational structures' (Harman, 1985:158). The White Paper, a clear statement of Government policy, was developed through extensive consultation processes with the public. Harman makes the critical point that for many there was a 'pre-occupation with devolution as the single guiding principle' (Harman, 1985:166). As there was a prevailing view that the key characteristic of the reform should be client service, the following nine characteristics were important as well:

- political and administrative decentralisation;
- broader community and professional participation in policy making and control;
- economy and efficiency;
- effective co-ordination of activities;
- institutions and advice;
- effective planning and policy-making capacity;
- consultative and information-sharing mechanisms;
- procedures and mechanisms for review of educational outputs and administrative performance and structures; and;
- increased choice for students, parents and communities (Harman, 1985: 166).

When the Liberal government's White Paper was finally presented in December 1980, it was based on the following themes which under-laid the changes:

- the devolution of functions wherever practicable to regions and to schools, with support services based on regions (Harman, 1985: 167).
- participation - providing opportunity to contribute to policy development and formulation (Harman,1985: 179).
- economy and efficiency - economy refers to non-wastage of expense, and 'efficiency is associated with cost-cutting in an era of economic rationalism and excessive influence on the part of ministers and treasury officials' (Caldwell & Spinks,1992: 77).
- coordination - 'effective coordination of functions and policies' (Harman, 1985:181).
- school review - schools are 'to engage in continuous internal review of aims, objectives, curriculum and achievements' (Harman,1985:167).
In 1982, a Labor government for Victoria came into being. This party had experienced 27 years of being in opposition, and was keen to put into play its own policies and plans. Robert Fordham, the Minister of Education, outlined his new government's policy, which called for 'a genuine devolution of responsibility by Government and the active participation in our educational system of parents, teachers and the wider community' (Fordham, 1985:57). The new Government rejected the centralised control model of organisation, replacing it with a philosophical base of participatory decision making - and a move from individual accountability to group accountability and shared decision making (Fordham, 1985:60). The ministerial statement at the end of the Review paved the way for a set of Ministerial Papers, the first being Decision-Making in Victorian Education (1983), in which the following principles were listed for ongoing consideration:

- genuine devolution of authority and responsibility to the school community
- collaborative decision-making process
- a responsive bureaucracy, the main function of which is to service and assist schools
- effectiveness of educational outcomes
- the active redress of disadvantage and discrimination (Fordham, 1985:68).

Thus the principles of devolution of authority, collaborative decision making, a responsive bureaucracy, effectiveness of educational outcomes, and equity, were the consequences of the Labor government picking 'up the White Paper themes and modifying them according to their philosophies' (Creed, 1991:236). A further example of the move towards devolution of functions to the regions and schools occurred in November 1983, when Senior Education Officer positions were advertised, replacing the previous Board of Inspectors. Regional Offices were established by 1976 and the old divisions of primary, secondary or technical schools were eventually disbanded by March 1983. To give further support to principals, administrative committees were established in schools, so that principals could be advised on general school operation and industrial matters. Watkins and Blackmore (1993) describe the development of school-based representative committees, the Local Administrative Committee and the Curriculum Committee, during the 1980s, as part of the Labor government's rhetoric of democratic and participative
decision-making in the administration of education. A further example of this type of participatory decision-making was the 'program budgeting' introduced in 1984 as a model of collaborative school management. It was 'an integrated approach to school management linking policy-making, planning, budgeting and evaluating in a continuous cycle' (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:28).

Late in 1986 another paper, 'Taking the Schools into the 1990s', became a landmark in the move towards self management. Creed (1991) claims that the paper caused some alarm for it contained radical proposals, such as, 'schools would decide curriculum, select teaching staff, decide on numbers of ancillary staff or additional teaching staff, undertake major and minor building works, allocate all funds obtained through a single grant and administer a range of personnel services' (Creed, 1991:242). As the proposals had been developed within a context of state-wide guidelines of curriculum policy, resource policy, and public accountability, the traditional role of the principal would inevitably alter.

Other restructuring of the system occurred into the 1990s when reforms were related to budget cuts, and reduced resources. In August 1990, Minister Pullen announced that there was need to cut $92.3Millions from expenditure, and to reduce the non-school positions by 1150 full-time, 'a reduction of more than 25 per cent, and of 1600 school teaching positions to be achieved by natural attrition' (Creed, 1991:247).

In October 1992, a change of government occurred in Victoria. After a decade of Labor being in power, a Liberal-National Party government took office, and as a consequence reforms occurred that took into account a change of emphasis and philosophy. Education was not exempted from such reform, one result being that principals were empowered to take action and make decisions that had been previously been made by the central authority, or taken at the regional level. A major reform, in line with an international trend in educational reform, of the new Liberal government was to further decentralise the management of the public education system through the introduction of the SOTF program, where schools would have more autonomy over staffing, finance and curriculum.

B. Creating Schools of the Future

A 21 page document, Schools of the Future - Preliminary Paper, emanating in January 1993, from the DSE was a 'centrepiece for the new directions of the State Liberal Government's education policy' (Brennan,
The mission of the Schools of the Future Program 'is to give students access to a high quality education which will maximise their potential for the future' (Hayward, 1993a:2). The objectives of the program are related to a continuing improvement in the quality and practices in Victorian schools, the fostering of the attributes of good schools (leadership, ethos, planning and accountability processes), the building on a statewide framework of quality curriculum, and an intention to commence immediately a pilot program to develop administrative arrangements.

The pilot program's purpose was 'to develop administrative arrangements and the phased implementation of the Schools of the Future concept' (Hayward, 1993b). An invitation was issued to all government schools to take part in the pilot program. After consultation at the School Council level, the number of schools that accepted and consequently took part in the pilot program, starting in July 1993, was 325 (including 19 clusters, a cluster being a group of schools wanting to cooperate together) with 286 named as 'Associate schools'. An Associate school was one to be involved with the SOTF program at the next stage of implementation, that is, Associate schools' involvement was to begin in 1994. The large number of schools (765) expressing an interest in being part of the SOTF Pilot Program indicated either an understanding of the perceived benefits to be gained from such an act of decentralisation, or, simply, the school felt that it did not want to be left out of what it could envisage as an inevitable future.

A strategy taken by the DSE to institutionalise the SOTF reform was to set up a series of professional training programs, as part of the professional preparation for principals and other school personnel. The targeted programs which were held in October to December 1993, comprised: Collegiate Group Facilitators Training, Charter Development, Clusters, Special Schools and Special Development Schools, Multicampus Colleges, Principal Leadership, Curriculum Leadership in Schools of the Future, School Operations, CASES Training, Health and Safety, Financial Management, Personnel Management, and School Councils. More specific details of the Targeted Programs are given in Chapter Three.

**Arguments for the Reform**

The book *Schooling in Hard Times* was written 'on the premise that, in the context of 'hard times', most Western countries have sought to restructure public schooling, to make it more responsive to the economy' (Lingard, Knight, Porter, 1993:2). The state of the economy has been one of the driving forces behind
moves to self-management. Marginson confirms this in his work *Education and Public Policy in Australia* (1993: xii). He claims that 'economics (economic thinking and economic practices) had seized the role of major discourse in education policy, pushing aside other understandings of education'. Marginson would rather the discourse be about 'human capital, resources and outputs, productivity and efficiency, education and work' (Marginson, 1993:xii). He realises the irony in that he could not escape using what are commonly thought to be economic terms. Other related arguments for restructuring come from Murphy in the United States. He has been able to categorise the arguments in two areas, being 'political theory: in terms of responsiveness and related issues, in terms of participation and involvement, in terms of internal changes in the school, (and) economic arguments: in terms of competition and alternatives, in terms of matching programs with community needs and cost efficiencies' (Murphy, 1991:1).

In writing about economic and political aspects of school reform, Dimmock (1993) draws attention to the fact that

> Politicians see a link between education, economic performance and productivity. Against this background of concerns, politicians and policy makers have become more stringent in allocating resources to education and have exacted top-down policies, such as new accountabilities owed by the school to the centre and local community, based on targets and expected outcomes, student system-wide testing, and monitoring and appraising of school performance (Dimmock, 1993:2).

Hattie (1990:101) takes and extends Dimmock's view by noting that 'associated with trends to decentralise educational decision-making there is a concerted movement towards accountability via school-based management, standardised testing and performance indicators'. Claiming that politicians have been the prime movers for the reforms rather than educators, he writes,

> these politicians are particularly sensitive to financial expenditure and to the votes of their constituents. Politicians are keen to demonstrate that the 'education system' can deliver quality education at a cost that does not involve unreasonably increasing expenditures, while at the same time providing more opportunity, places, and sharing valuable resources. A constant theme accompanying these changes is the desire to hold those spending the money accountable (Hattie, 1990:101).

Codd (1993), commentates on the scene in NZ where reform is in the shape of 'decentralization of certain decision-making functions combined with increased self-management at the school level'.
(Codd, 1993:153). He claims that the reform is 'under the influence of economic rationalism . . . is a concerted effort to impose a managerialist ideology on all schools and other learning institutions' (Codd, 1993:157). The NZ reform came after the Picot Report of May 1988 led to the White Paper, *Tomorrow's Schools* which indicated the reform would be implemented by October 1989. Codd indicates that the main thrusts of the imposed restructuring are centred on the reduction of the size of the central bureaucracy, the abolition of regional education boards, and the conversion of each learning institution into self-managing unit with its own Board of Trustees. What concerns Codd are the influences of 'hierarchical managerialism . . . indirectly from the large corporations, through the 'Business Round Table' and more directly from the control agencies of government, namely the Treasury and State Services Commission' (Codd, 1993:157). Codd argues that the style of hierarchical managerialism is alien to the NZ experience, and as well it is 'a culture that tends to be undemocratic and wasteful of human initiative and capacity' (Codd, 1993:159).

Ramsay (1993), on the other hand, claims that the NZ's Reform had four major goals; a wish to create an administrative system that was more efficient and more responsive to those who use it' (Ramsay, 1993:265), a consideration of devolution, a commitment to principles of equity and fairness, and to make efficiency savings. Ramsay claims that there had been gains in increased flexibility and responsiveness to the needs of students as well as financial independence. He is prepared to admit that there had been some losses since the implementation. The losses relate to 'the maintenance of schools, to confusion amongst the support agencies, to some re-centralization of power and to the changed role of the school principal' (Ramsay, 1993:271).

The literature indicates that when governments were faced with economic dilemmas, cuts to the expenditure on education were common strategies to be followed, and such moves had been accompanied by the development of a stronger central administration. Marginson, for example, commenting on the features of the now dominant style of administration, namely 'corporate managerialism', cites the following features: 'strong central control associated with devolved responsibility for operations; separation of policy determination from the sphere of devolution; focus on outputs within input-output models of production; emphasis on selling the product, market-style competition, distribution and exchange, and closer management and measurement of outputs and performance (Marginson, 1993:57). These ideas of
Marginson are confirmed when some of the key features of the SOTF are examined. The first four features, below, relate to a strong central administration:

1. Distinctive curriculum programs developed to take into account the unique natures of schools. An accreditation framework will be developed by the Board of Studies.

2. The development of a school charter, encapsulating the school's own vision for the future within guidelines provided by the Directorate of School Education.

3. The central body will continue to resource major capital works and some aspects of maintenance.

4. The central office will be progressively reduced in the future so that it becomes a strategic core. As well regional offices will be scaled down as the capacity for self-management is taken up at the school level.

while the remaining three features relate to devolution:

5. Continuation of the power currently held by school councils. In particular self-determining of the educational policies of the school will be enhanced. There will be some extension of power to include employment of non-teaching staff and contracting teachers for special projects.

6. A continuation of the role of the Principal as educational leader.

7. The receiving of a budget fairly determined on a formula basis where the aim is for each School of the Future to have complete control over its financial resources. Support will be given in the form of business managers or access to business management services (based on Hayward:1993a,2-5).

Another view is, that whilst acknowledging it has been the state of the economy which arguably has led the government to question 'the nature and value of the contribution of educational services and provisions to society' (Seddon, Angus, Poole,1990:32), the state of the economy has been 'linked to post-war demographic changes which have put pressure on the provision of post-compulsory education and training... appearing in terms of productivity, quality control, effectiveness, human resource development and worker satisfaction to enhance productivity... such concerns are linked to more broadly based accountability and national productivity factors' (Seddon, Angus, Poole,1990:32). Goldring, writing in an
article on system-wide diversity in Israel, took up this economic theme, as expressed by Seddon and Angus, when she pointed out,

traditionally, the Israeli educational system has been both structurally and procedurally centralized . . . Recently, realizing this centralized system could not meet the diversified needs of an increasingly pluralistic society, educational authorities under pressure from professionals, parents and politicians, began to allow greater decentralization and diversity within the educational system. To create diversity in the system, numerous educational projects and experiments were formally initiated by the Ministry of Education (Goldring,1992:49,51).

The educational projects and experiments included,

drastic cuts in the national education budget have increased the empowerment of parents and local municipalities, and consequently are reducing the control of the central Ministry of Education. In fact, many claim the catalyst for the move towards decentralization and diversity is rooted in the economic depression and large cuts in the national education budget which have characterized the last decade (Goldring,1992:49,51).

A critic of the move towards the self-managing school, Smyth declares, 'in all Western capitalist economies (UK, USA, Australia, New Zealand and . . . Canada too) we are currently experiencing the chilling effects of what might best be described as the New Right dogma of 'free marketing' which has taken strong hold in all of those countries (Smyth, 1993:2). His arguments are based on the fact that 'school self-management has come to mean no more than an opportunity for schools to manage dwindling fiscal resources, within tightened centralist policies over curriculum, evaluation and standards' (Smyth, 1993:3). His further points are in agreement with Dimmock (1993) and Hattie (1990), particularly, when he indicates that 'control of education . . . is shifted away from educationists as 'producers' and towards 'customers' (politicians, the business community and parents). There can be little doubt that making schools compete with one another for customers in the manner implied, and of having individual teachers negotiate salary and working conditions, is aimed at turning every school into a self-managing business or mini-corporation' (Smyth, 1993:6). In Smyth's view one of the drawbacks of the shift towards self-management is that 'schools need to be properly resourced in order to do their crucial work; school-based management is about
cutting resources to schools and getting school communities to own and manage the decline' (Smyth, 1993:8).

Response to the prevailing state of educational offering

The moves towards self-management in Victoria during the early 1980s, emphasised restructuring, so that planned organisational changes were to:

- actively redress discrimination and disadvantage' (Harman, 1985:158);
- place more emphasis on individual differences and on assistance for disadvantaged students' (Harman, 1985:158);
- contain 'procedures and mechanisms for review of educational outputs and administrative performance and structures (Harman, 1985:166).

The premise underlying these statements was that the local school would know best the educational needs of its students. The development of a school charter has allowed schools to set out their educational goals. This premise is not unique to Victoria, for the same sentiments can be followed up elsewhere. For example, this argument was supported by Bennett (1994) in writing about the situation in NZ in an article New Zealand Principal Post-Picot. Johnson (1994) also indicated, in writing about the restructuring of government schools in New South Wales, that two of the five guiding principles for the restructuring are, 'the needs of each school are best determined at the local level, and schools can meet their needs best when they are fundamentally self-determining' (Johnson, 1994:6). An academic emphasis to educational reform is spelt out by Sackney and Dibski (1994), when they report that in the UK the debate surrounding reform has been based on three themes; namely, empowerment, accountability and academic learning. They believe the primary motivation behind the reform is to improve student learning and school productivity. They note that 'students tend to find schooling dull, perfunctory and disconnected from real life' (Sackney & Dibski, 1994:104). This adds weight to the argument that there be input, from the local level, to the academic programs on offer. This is supported by Cohen who asserts that the 'key to improvement is to move political influence closer to those who deliver, support, and receive instruction. The assumption is that such changes will open schooling to more constructive educational influences' (Cohen,
1990:338). However, Elmore states that 'research on centralization and decentralization in American education is characterized by the virtually complete disconnection between structural reform and anything having to do with classroom instruction or the learning of students' (Elmore, 1993:35).

Caldwell and Spinks (1992) support the idea of adapting the curriculum to meet the needs of students in a particular community. They indicate that leaders of school systems should 'work with policy-makers to create the preconditions for self-management'. They should have 'a capacity to adapt curriculum to meet the educational needs of students in a particular community' and there should be 'the appointment of strong educational leaders as principals' (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:136). Duignan (1990) supports this when stating that 'school-based approach to curriculum decision-making enables schools to change more quickly to meet the emerging needs of students' (Duignan, 1990: 342).

From NZ, Rae (1994) believes that a significant shift has taken place in the education debate. He claims that the debate has moved from one of 'issues of technicalities and structures and legislative interventions promoting increased diversity and competition between schools . . . to issues of curriculum and assessment.' Alongside this shift of emphasis is the heightened 'need to devise effective processes for school development for self-managing schools of the newly devolved network . . . to develop teacher development strategies that will enable them to meet the curriculum objectives of their charter.' (Rae, 1994:34). Rae lists the five key components to the school development achieved under 'Achieving Charter Curriculum Objectives' (ACCO) contracts in central New Zealand: Participation, Extra resources, Relevance, Knowledge of a variety of strategies, and, Invoking catalyst skills (Rae, 1994:37). He has read clearly the picture in NZ, where the move to self-management has led to the need for professional development for its principals and teachers. It is reassuring to read, 'underlying much of the emphasis on school-based management and principals' professional development is the belief that improvement in the management of schools will necessarily generate better quality curricula, teaching and learning' (Dimmock, 1993:1). Dimmock (1993), however, is careful to note that school-based management does not by itself automatically improve curriculum quality.
**Response to a desire for participatory action**

Lingard, Knight, and Porter (1993) in writing about the reform of the administration and organisation of public schooling raise a number of sets of arguments for the prevalence of the move towards the self-managing school. The first set of arguments relates to the idea that the 'professional qualities and competencies of teachers and principals . . . are seen as best suited to and most effectively deployed in self-managing and collegial forms of schooling' (Lingard, Knight, Porter, 1993:5). A second compelling set of arguments behind moves towards self-management relate to the commitment of particular governments to 'participatory democracy and localised decision-making', and associated with these reasons are the views that special or minority groups have the right to appropriate forms of schooling. The view of parents as consumers of education gives them rights to freedom of choice 'of educational policies and practices' (Lingard, Knight, Porter, 1993:5).

In supporting the concept of parents having the right to select schools of their choice for their children, Cohen (1990), in referring to schools of the US indicates that public schools deliver:

(a) standard brand of education, which is not adjusted to family preferences or children's needs. Though such schooling is unlikely to be either valued or effective, schools that provide it still prosper under monopoly control. . . . Only a fundamental change could correct this problem: the creation of markets for schooling. Such markets would break the state monopoly. Families would be able to secure education that responded to their educational values and needs, for unresponsive schools would have to either change their tune or go out of business (Cohen, 1990:340).

Another aspect of participatory democracy and localised decision-making is the school council, a collective rather than a market form of participation by consumers. Caldwell and Spinks (1992) explain that parent groups or schools councils, 'by themselves, will not guarantee an improvement in outcomes for students. The work of such bodies must be focused' (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:132). This is relevant for the school councils of the SOTF program, where they have a definite policy-making role, focused on the school. Caldwell and Spinks (1992), in arguing for appropriate structures for parental participation in decision and policy-making areas of the school indicate that parents are able to participate,

in such matters as charter, mission, goals, policies, priorities, strategic plans, budget approval and cyclic evaluation of programs. . . . parents can directly participate as members of working parties, or can provide information as working parties go about their task of generating options for consideration by members of the policy group (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:133).
A third set of views relates the reforms to arguments arising from the literature of effective schools. 'Devolution places the emphasis for success on schools. It recognises that a central authority can no longer quickly or appropriately respond to the changing needs of all communities. It acknowledges that only effective schools can lead to the development of an effective system' (Spinks, 1990:121). From an effective schools perspective, Caldwell and Spinks (1992), in writing about the educational benefits of parental involvement, indicate that 'the key to achieving educational benefits is to secure a synergy of communities: ensuring that the effect of the whole is greater than the effects of each group separately' (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:131).

There are links between effective schools and excellent schools. Caldwell and Spinks (1992) also refer to a 'culture of excellence' in their book *Leading the Self-Managing School*. By this, they infer the culture of excellence is enhanced by 'three key values - quality, effectiveness and equity - (which) are concerned with outcomes or ends. There are two key values concerned with means - efficiency and empowerment' (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:71). They continue to explore this theme by stating that an excellent school will place value on efficiency, and 'equity may be at risk if efficiency is ignored' and that 'an excellent school will place value on empowering its staff, students, parents and the wider community' (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:72).

Caldwell and Spinks (1992) in looking at the culture of moves towards self-management indicate that underlying such moves is a set of assumptions concerned with relationships. The relationships are 'between a school and government, between a school and its community, between the principal and staff of the school, and among all who make up the school community' (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:74). In commenting on the culture and its underpinnings, they develop further the ideas of empowerment, the full development of the individual and participation as attributes of the self-managing system:

"Another underpinning is the notion of empowerment... as an end and as a process... a manifestation of an end in education: the full development of each individual. Participation in decision-making is one tangible manifestation of this element in the core; others include providing people with information and the knowledge and skills so that they can fruitfully and satisfyingly make a contribution (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:74-75)."
On the other hand, a program developed in 1987 called *Better Schools in Western Australia: a Program for Improvement* outlines radical proposals to make Western Australian schools more self-determining and accountable. It argues that throughout the 1980s 'restructuring seemed to make no difference to the ways schools operated. Instead of grabbing hold of devolution and running with it, most schools carried on much as before, particularly at the classroom level where, for teachers, it was business as usual' (Chadbourne, 1992:52). This program had been designed to remove obstacles to devolution and decentralisation, but it transpired that via an investigative project *Managing Change in Schools* there had been a number of barriers to its success, leading to a hold-up in proceedings towards the end of 1987. These issues were grouped as economic, ideological, legal, and industrial factors. One of the outcomes, from the Western Australian experience, was the understanding that there would be 'some constraint upon the freedom of individual schools . . . a more appropriate balance between central control and local autonomy is needed to allow for unity within diversity . . . too much unity will impede attempts to make the school the primary unit of change, too much diversity will fragment the system out of existence' (Chadbourne, 1992:64).

In NZ, certain consequences for schooling developed after the Picot Report of 1988. These consequences involved both the scope - what is considered possible and desirable for the education system to achieve, and the pattern of schooling - the contexts, conditions and resources with which schools operate. Both the scope and pattern of schooling changed, and, as a result, new possibilities for school-centred leadership emerged. The situation leading to these new possibilities is explored by Dale (1993). The points he makes about the changes relate to:

- The effectiveness of the education system as a whole was to become an indirect responsibility of individual schools.
- The reforms appeared not to have had any specific educational agenda, they were managerial.
- What the Boards of Trustees were required to do by the legislation was wholly administrative with little emphasis on curriculum issues.
- Parents and members of the Boards of Trustees did not on the whole have major concerns about what was taught in schools, and how.
- A major consequence of the reforms was the total discrediting of the professional network.
Picot’s fundamental point was, as far as possible decisions should be made at the levels of the education system where they would have greatest relevance. To this end, all intervening tiers of educational administration between central government and individual schools were removed. The Department of Education, in NZ, was broken up into several specialist units, including a new Ministry of Education with a policy brief, and individual schools would be run by elected Boards of Trustees. Following modification of the Picot recommendations in the Tomorrow’s Schools legislation, and especially in the Lough Report (Today’s Schools), which was published within six months of the new system starting, the emphasis of the reforms was on management, rather than on process or content of education.

C. The Budget in Self-Managing Schools

A common trend in the outcomes of the move towards self-managing schools has been the shift of the control over the budget from the central agency to the school. A number of authors: (Davies & Braund, 1989 (UK); Levacic, 1989 (UK); MacPherson, 1989 (NZ); Caldwell & Spinks, 1992 (Australia, Canada); Davies & Anderson, 1992 (UK); Ball, 1993 (UK); Ramsay, 1993 (NZ); Caldwell, 1994a (Canada), Caldwell, 1994b (Canada & England); and Rae, 1994 (NZ), have described this process, in its various forms, and in different parts of the world.

From an analysis of the research, the following aspects of funding within the self-managing schools are held in common. In all of the systems noted there is local management, by personnel of the school, of a bulk grant. In NZ, the School Governors have the right to delegate the handling of the budget to the principal, whereas in the UK, under the provisions of the 1988 Act:

all secondary schools and all primary schools and colleges with rolls of 200 or more must receive delegated budgets by the start of the 1993/4 financial year. Their governing bodies will be responsible for managing a budget, which will cover around 80 per cent of the total resources available to the institution (Levacic, 1989:3).
Davies and Braund (1989:12) believe there are three objectives for the delegated control of the budget. These are: to enable governing bodies and head teachers to direct resources to the needs and priorities of their schools as they see them; to make schools more responsive to their clients - parents, pupils, employers and community; and to improve the quality of teaching and learning within the resources available. As with the case in NZ, the governors delegate the control of the budget to the principal, but it is the governors who have the final responsibility for it. Budget items in the control of the local school in the UK include the salaries of staff employed to work in the schools, the day to day premise's costs, books, equipment and other goods and services. In each system, where bulk-funding exists, a large proportion (up to 80%) of the funding goes towards the salaries of teachers.

Critics of the funding situation in NZ have been eager to point out some of the possible divisive consequences if certain staffing decisions were made in the bulk-funding situation. These staffing decisions relate to the reality that the more experienced teachers command higher salaries than younger teachers - and consequently a difficulty arises when there is a fixed amount of money for salaries.

Bruce (1993), in reporting on the NZ experience of this divisive nature of the funding, describes the scenario where bulk-funding was to have begun from the first day of the Tomorrow's Schools program in 1989, but, because of the public outcry, the government backed off and in 1993 a total of 71 schools took up the bulk-funding model on a voluntary basis. He claims that,

only schools in wealthier areas, with access to significant amounts of locally raised funds, would retain the ability to appoint staff of their choice, regardless of their salary level . . . bulk-funding opponents see it (this way), why not get cheap young staff throughout the school and lay them off when they hit a certain level? Financially, if not educationally, the school would boom (Bruce, 1993).

The other aspect of self-management, in NZ's schools, that has had an effect, is the fact that bulk-funding 'clearly threatens the unions' traditional role of striving for a better-paid workforce with an advanced career structure' (Bruce, 1993). This has undermined much of the attempts to introduce bulk-funding as the model of resourcing.

Descriptions of the scene in the UK centre around the fact that since the 1988 Education Reform Act, schools have been able to opt out of the Local Education Authority control of schools, and take on the status as grant-maintained. This was a radical policy initiative in the education system, and the funding of
Grant-Maintained Schools (GMS) needs to be explained in the context of resource allocation in other systems of education. In describing the financial delegation, Davies and Anderson (1992) explain that self-management allows schools to determine their individual resource needs:

The rationale of delegated school-management, and grant-maintained status in particular, is that the new-found management freedom and responsibility is not an end in itself, but that it should improve not only the learning and teaching process but also the learning outcomes of pupils (Davies & Anderson, 1992:7).

For a school to become grant-maintained there needs to be a ballot of the parents of pupils attending the school. If the ballot is in favour of becoming grant-maintained, then the school governors are required to publish a proposal providing information for the Secretary of State. This information must include details about the school and how the school is to be managed. The funding of a grant-maintained school is through grants received by the school governors from the Department of Education and Science. The grants include a one-off set-up grant (transitional grant), formula funded grants (annual maintenance grant, special purpose grants) and grants for which schools must submit bids (capital grants) (Davies & Anderson, 1992:13-15).

Caldwell (1994b) explains that when a school became grant-maintained, the LEA provided it with funding worth the total allocation to which it would have been formerly entitled, together with an extra amount deemed equivalent to the value of services which would have been provided by the LEA. These two components are known as the 85% and 15% respectively. The 85% funding came from a formula for funding based on student numbers. In 1994, there was no common funding formula in Britain, but an attempt had been made to establish one in the different regions.

The situation in Edmonton, Canada, is one where there has been a student needs-based approach, made, over fifteen years, towards the resource allocation to schools. This had been in response to a fear that earlier resource formulae did not result in equity in allocation of resources. Since equity and quality are two catch words for the Victorian scene, the Edmonton model becomes particularly attractive. The particular resourcing formula attempts to reflect the relative costs of meeting the different educational needs of students, and where 'the focus is on diagnosing educational needs and planning educational programs to meet those needs' (Caldwell, 1994a: 79).
Whatever model of funding is used in self-managing schools, the following list is of guidelines for allocating resources to aid the transformation from a centralised approach to one that is decentralised:

- There should be a clear understanding at the outset that formulae for allocating resources to schools will be continually refined and improved.
- Assurance should be given that 'safety nets' will be provided in the years of transition or whenever there are rapid changes in system priorities or local circumstances.
- There should be an expectation that formulae for allocating resources to schools will reflect a concern for meeting the learning needs of all students.
- The potential for conflict is high when approaches are demonstrably inequitable or when sudden changes to patterns of resource allocation are made. Such conflict has been managed when the transition has involved a series of stages, which have steadily sharpened the focus on the learning needs of the students (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992:165-6).

The encouraging feature about this set of guidelines for a SOTF type of reform in budgeting, is that there is an emphasis on the teaching and learning in the school, as well as an attempt to take into account the needs of the students. These features are not so likely to be present when only an economic view is taken of the trend towards self-management.

D. Self-Management and Leadership

'Leadership in schools is not something that is exercised in a vacuum; it exists in the context and culture of the school and is grounded in instruction and pedagogy' (Smyth,1989:186). As the movement toward self-management brings to the school opportunity for greater control over its future, the role of leadership within the school is crucial for the development of the school. Self-management does not, of itself, guarantee that the school will become an effective organisation, but it is the combination of leadership and the opportunity for self-determination that leads to a situation where the school may be more responsive to the local community and its needs. If, as it is acknowledged, leadership is vital for the success of any organisation to achieve its goals, the question arises, what style of leadership is particularly desirable for the school? In particular, it implies that in times of major reform, changes in style of leadership need to be considered, so that reforms can be incorporated and effective outcomes be maximised. As far as this thesis is concerned,
changes to the role of the principal, brought about by the reform of system, will affect the type of professional development to be offered to school leaders.

A forerunner to the consideration of leadership, in this era of a move towards self-management, is a telling comment from Sergiovanni & Starratt (1988):

Previous theories of leadership tended to be excessively reductionist, in that they reduced leadership to one or to a few variables (decision making, task or relations orientation, etc). They tended to focus on readily observable, short-term, leader-subordinate relationships, the easier to study empirical aspects of leadership. By and large they tended to be culturally barren and politically naive (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988:196).

Writers such as Lakomski (1995) notes that 'restructuring in various shapes and forms has become the norm in almost every education system in the nation. In order to implement change and to continue to offer quality education in both substance and delivery, improved, better, stronger leadership is seen as central' (Lakomski, 1995:211).

To explore current views on school leadership a number of authors in the field are surveyed: Sergiovanni (1984); Sergiovanni and Corbally (1984); Sergiovanni, Burlingame, Coombs, and Thurston (1987); Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988); Smyth (1989); Chapman (1990); Leithwood and Jantzi (1990); Seddon, Angus, and Poole (1990); Caldwell (1992); Caldwell and Spinks (1992); Goldring (1992); Hallinger (1992); Murphy and Hallinger (1992); Weindling (1992); Bass and Avolio (1993); Leithwood (1994); Norris (1994); Evers (1995); Greenfield (1995); Lakomski (1995); Marshall (1995); and, Ogawa and Bossert (1995).

The thrust for looking at styles of leadership is bound up with the fact in the self-managing school, roles, responsibilities and work patterns of teachers and administrators change:

The official expectation is that teachers and administrators will work more closely together, using their collective knowledge and experience, to critically examine their teaching and administrative practices in order to ensure that programs and practices meet the needs, and improve the performance, of all the students in their schools (Marshall, 1995:158).
One source of new ideas on leadership comes from looking at organisations, and in particular, schools, as cultures. Caldwell (1992:17), and, Caldwell and Spinks (1992:53) indicate there are four dimensions of leadership. The four dimensions are:

(a) **Cultural leadership** - which involves the building of a strong culture, creating and sustaining it. ‘Within the school’s culture, leadership is exercised, not in the ways described by scientific management, but by guarding the values and principles for which the school stands’ (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988:197);

(b) **Symbolic leadership** - which is to do with focusing the attention of others on matters of importance to the school through a range of words, actions and rewards that are available;

(c) **Educational leadership** - this is the area where the leader possesses expert knowledge about education, and uses this ability to identify the needs of students as well as develop curriculum, approaches to teaching and learning, and plan for evaluation. This is where the focus is on learning, teaching and outcomes for students;

(d) **Responsive leadership** - which refers to the capacity of the principal to work with others, to demonstrate that the school has indeed been responsive to the needs of the student, the community and society at large taking into account the notion of accountability which goes with being self-managing.

These four dimensions have links with earlier work of Sergiovanni (1984) and later with that of Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988). For Sergiovanni and Starratt, the four dimensions of leadership were, with each one of these dimensions interconnecting with each of the other three:

- The cultural-symbolic force of leadership
- The educational force of leadership
- The human force of leadership
- The technical force of leadership (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1986:213).

In his 1984 article, *Leadership and Excellence in Schooling*, Sergiovanni, defined leadership forces, as ‘the means available to administrators, supervisors, and teachers to bring about or preserve changes
needed to improve schooling.' (Sergiovanni, 1984:6). His contention, at that time (1984), was that there were five leadership forces; Technical, Human, Educational, Symbolic, and Cultural.

One of the difficulties in surveying writing on leadership is that more than one term is used, by different writers, for the same skill or characteristic which they feel should be part of the leader's set of skills. In this era of self-management some of the more frequent terms, descriptors or attributes referring to leaders come from the writings of Caldwell and Spinks (1992), MacPherson (1989), Young (1989), and, Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988). Caldwell and Spinks (1992:49-87) noted that there are leaders’ abilities of having a persistence in the face of complexity and opposition from those who would prefer authority and responsibility to remain centralised, a capacity to take risks, self-confidence, a capacity to work with others in the school community to formulate a vision for the school, school leaders should be able to describe and analyse the culture of their school. MacPherson's contribution to this listing of skills is that a leader should be able to,

> appreciate the relativity of the cultures of the school, the school community, the region and the society; analyse, understand and explain complex policy dilemmas; unravel clashes of values and cultures so that trustees can make ethically sophisticated judgements; use an advanced knowledge of teaching, learning and educative administration when advocating policy; and use an educative approach to leadership and a sophisticated set of methods to implement policy with professional colleagues (MacPherson, 1989:37).

Young would have a leader 'designing structures and procedures which promote a collegial structure culture' (Young, 1989:185). While, Sergiovanni and Starratt maintain that leadership:

> implies a relationship to other people; is exercised over time; takes place in relationship to some organization, institution, agency, or community; is rooted in meaning; leadership emerges out of a vision; emerges out of a dramatic sense; requires the articulation of a vision and building a covenant. (As well) the leader will embody the vision in organizational structures, policies, and procedures. (Lastly), leadership provides mechanisms for the continuous or periodic renewal of the institution (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988).

Having this list of attributes, it is possible to distil the essence of the thinking so as to describe the kind of a leadership required by a contemporary self-managing school. Hallinger (1992:35), in commenting on the scene in the United States, points to the fact that principals can been seen as the 'linchpins in plans
for educational change and as a favoured target for school reforms'. He provides a picture of trends in educational leadership style over the last three decades, where previously the roles played by principals were those of being administrative managers in the 1920s to 1960s. Then followed a time, in the 1960s and 1970s, when principals were seen as program managers. This period led to one with a view of principals as instructional leaders in the 1980s, and now, in the 1990s, the transformational leaders. In the 1980s the instructional leaders were to the forefront of the effective schools movement where there was an emphasis on curricula and classroom practices. At that time, principals were seen as the catalysts for implementing and developing the effective schools model, where policy direction was developed outside the school. The moves towards self-determination of curriculum, and responding to the needs of the local community and students meant that the school initiates change as well as implementing it. Hallinger (1992) observes that teachers are an important source of expertise and that school leadership needs to expand to include teachers and parents. He is clear about this fact when he emphasises that new roles exist for principals, teachers and parents. These are roles of problem finding and problem solving. Hallinger refers to this type of leadership as transformational leadership, and one aspect of the transformational leader is the furtherance of individual and collective problem-solving activities within the school. Other writers also recognise the concept of a transformational leader when it is argued that:

a capacity for leadership emerges as the central requirement for schools and systems as events unfold in the 1990s - leadership should be more transformational (a capacity to engage others in a commitment to change) than transactional (concerned with maintaining the status quo by exchanging an assurance of a secure place of work for a commitment to get the job done) (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992:19).

and that, 'transformational leaders succeed in gaining the commitment of followers to such a degree that these higher levels of accomplishment become virtually a moral imperative' (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992:49).

In support of the concept of a move towards transformational leadership Norris (1994), Leithwood & Jantzi (1990), and Goldring (1992) each comment on the shift from transactional leadership to transformational leadership. Norris, in particular, explains it in this way:

transformational leadership builds on a transactional approach by elevating the organization and its members to higher levels of moral response. Transformational leadership serves as the igniting force, igniting members in a mutually beneficial and
transformational purpose. Transformational leadership/followership operates from the heart as well as the mind and cuts to the core of personal values and character. Transformational leadership in its highest sense moves an organization from its custodial orientation to a climate of creative awareness and response. Transforming leaders reflect upon the reality of current conditions and dare to question existing practices. They consider future trends and conceptualise new pathways (Norris, 1994:69).

These comments on the response of the transformational leader to situations in the school should go some way to dispel a concern expressed by Evers (1995), namely 'the current very strong focus on the principal's leadership role in Victoria's SOTF seems to depend on a view of leadership that is not attentive enough to the frailties of human knowledge' (Evers, 1995:10). Smyth (1989:179) expresses concerns over leadership in schools. He asserts that, 'the notion of one group (the leaders) who exercise hegemony and domination over another (the followers) is, in a sense, an anti-educational one'. He endorses a view of leadership 'that involves aiding or helping others, who have hitherto been denied the opportunity, to comprehend complexity and to make sense of contradiction and ambiguity. This process of making activity meaningful is also reflexive in nature' (Smyth, 1989:183). Smyth is quite adamant that:

the hierarchically organised and sanction-ridden business management notions of leadership that have to do with efficiency, effectiveness, standardisation and quality control have no place in schools. The alternative proposal has been that if there is any meaning attaching at all to the notion of educational leadership, then it lies in teachers making sense of what they do through problematising their teaching in the social and political contexts in which it occurs (Smyth, 1989:199).

Leithwood and Jantzi (1990) considered how leaders had been able to enhance individual and collective problem-solving capacities of organisational members. The results of their research on transformation leadership were linked with the extent to which schools had achieved collaborative cultures. Leithwood's further research (1994) considered how school restructuring created new expectations of the leaders. His major contention is that there needs to be a move away from instructional leadership, which had been heavily classroom focused. His argument for transformational school leadership is based on two assumptions, firstly, that 'leadership only manifests itself in the context of change (Leithwood,1994:499), and, secondly, that 'school restructuring will dominate the change agenda for school leaders for some time to come' (Leithwood,1994:499).
A particularly appealing view of the type of leadership required for a self-managing school is one proposed by Lakomski (1995). She puts forward the proposition that concepts of leadership, both transactional and transformational, are not helpful in meeting the challenges schools are facing. Her view is that 'the transformational leader who is charged, amongst other things, with developing teachers' (and students') potential, altering awareness, introducing vision and mission and generally transforming the organisation and its members, is promising more than it can deliver (Lakomski, 1995:211).

The difficulty for Lakomski appears to be, that in transformational leadership theory, knowledge is concentrated at the top of the organisational hierarchy, and that there is no feedback mechanism in play, whereby the organisation can learn from its errors. Although aspects of transformational leadership such as, the provision of the vision, the redefinition of a problem, the suggestion of alternative answers to problems, and being able to gain a re-examination of position in relation to the ones put forward by the leader, do lead to commitment on behalf of the followers; this style does not go far enough. Lakomski's preferred view of an appropriate style of leadership is a model of organisational learning and cognition, in which schools are seen as learning organisations. In these learning organisations there are maximum opportunities for learning rather than 'putting all our energy into the prevention of error' (Lakomski, 1995:221). This view is premised by the fact that leaders are fallible, they do make errors and learning to be leaders is possible. The recognition of organisational learning means that structures would be in place whereby the double checking of decision-making was possible, as well as 'structures which allow learning from error to flow back into the organisation so that it becomes a learning organisation in its own right' (Lakomski, 1995:221).

Lakomski asserts that 'it is more efficient to create feedback mechanisms for error correction rather than emphasise error prevention at the top. More participative structures which incorporate the knowledge of all may yet make the best sense in terms of facing the challenges posed by an inherently uncertain and unpredictable future' (Lakomski, 1995:221).

E. Summary of Chapter Two

This chapter presented an account of the lead up to SOTF, where there has been a period of at least twenty years in Victoria during which time various government initiatives in education have foreshadowed the current proposal. The key features of a White Paper published in 1980 contained the following main
emphases: devolution, participation, economy and efficiency, co-ordination, consultation and school review. These emphases still remain and the present reform was proposed in a time of economic recession where there was a cutback of public expenditure in education and other services.

In creating SOTF the Liberal Government of Victoria lists the following as its key objectives; a continuing improvement in the quality and practices in Victorian schools, the fostering of the attributes of good schools (leadership, ethos, planning and accountability processes), building on a statewide framework of quality curriculum, and an intention to commence immediately a pilot program to develop administrative arrangements.

A survey of literature related to the move toward self-management was presented. Thrusts towards self-management have come from responses to both the prevailing economy, and to the educational needs of students. The moves towards self-management have resulted in administrative functions being devolved from central agencies to the local level (school) of administration. Arguments were given for a move to a self-managing situation from an economic point of view as well as those arising from a response to the needs of the local community.

A literature survey of self-managing schools handling the budget was also presented. Examples of budgeting models from the Grant Maintained Schools of the UK and from Edmonton, Canada were explained. The last area of survey was that of current views on leadership, and what was appropriate for a leader in a self-managing school. In summary, the transformational leader was a person who had moved from being a leader taking a managerial line of action, to one who was able to provide the vision for followers, could articulate possible solutions to existing problems and encourage others to re-examine their position on matters of contention. Empowerment of others in the organisation is seen to be a key feature of the current leader. An alternative view on leadership, one of organisational learning and cognition is put forward. This model has its merit for the self-managing school, because of the participative nature of the structures, and that fact that knowledge resides with all in the organisation, and not just with the person at the apex of the hierarchy of the organisation.
CHAPTER 3

SCHOOLS OF THE FUTURE

This chapter considers the 'Schools of the Future' pilot program and the significant changes it intended to make to the management of Victoria's schools. The main sources used to provide information about the SOTF were the documents (a) Schools of the Future - Preliminary Paper (Hayward, 1993a), (b) Schools of the Future: (Pilot Program) Working Documents (Hayward, 1993b), and (c) 'School Charters: Information package for consultation and promotion' (Hayward, 1994).

The chapter also clarifies the practices as developed elsewhere, particularly in New Zealand and Canada, which informed the Victorian Directorate of School Education (DSE) in initiating its SOTF program. A consideration of some of the key sections from the Schools of the Future: (Pilot Program) Working Documents (Hayward, 1993b), as listed here and in Chapter One, is made in the light of other evidence. The method used is to provide descriptions of the major aspects of the program, which are:

1. Guidelines for Operation - school curriculum, school charter, school council, and role of the principal,
2. Financial management - school funding, and school-generated funds,
3. Personnel management - selection of staff, improved personnel practices, and professional development performance review,
4. Accountability and School Review,
5. Resource Management.

This strategy informs the reader about the proposed pilot program in the light of practices elsewhere.

A. The Schools of the Future Pilot Program

The document, Schools of the Future - Preliminary Paper, emanated in January 1993 from the Directorate of School Education in Victoria. In his introduction to the document, Minister Hayward, then Minister of Education was eager to spell out the commitment of parents, teachers, principals and DSE to the SOTF. In particular, he wanted each Victorian student to maximise his or her potential, by emphasising that education programs are only to be implemented after an assessment of whether or not they improve the
quality of education for students. Hayward made it clear that there was a well-supported view of a team approach, under gifted inspired leadership, that was the way for students and teachers to 'develop a shared excitement for learning' (Hayward, 1993b: Introduction). Regarding teachers, principals and the community, he notes that it was not only students who were to gain from the SOTF program. Teachers would be enabled to 'better and more freely exercise their professional skills and judgement in the classroom', principals would be enabled 'to become true leaders in their school', and the community was to be given a 'greater say in the present and future progress and direction of the school' (Hayward, 1993b: Introduction).

The objectives of the program were related to a continuing improvement in the quality and practices in Victorian schools. There were to be not only educational merits for schools in the SOTF program, but also gains for school administrators, teachers, school councils and school committees. The SOTF program was to be phased in to eventually encompass all Victorian schools over the next three years. Besides the stated objectives of the program the major features of the proposal pertinent to this thesis include:

1. The development of a school charter, encapsulating the school's own vision for the future within guidelines provided by the Directorate of School Education, and the development of a code of conduct for student behaviour as part of the school charter.

2. Continuation of the power currently held by school councils. In particular, self-determining of the educational policies of the school will be enhanced. There will be some extension of power to include employment of non-teaching staff and contracting teachers for special projects.

3. A continuation of the role of the Principal as educational leader.

4. The receiving of a budget fairly determined on a formula basis where the aim is for each School of the Future to have complete control over its financial resources. Support will be given in the form of business managers or access to business management services.

5. Accountability frameworks will be developed, as each school will be required to be more accountable to the students, staff, parents, the local community, Government and the wider Victorian community for the resources of the school as well as for educational standards.
6. In the fully operational program all selection of staff will occur at the school level. Teachers will continue to be employed by the Directorate of School Education not by school councils.

7. The central body will continue to resource major capital works and some aspects of maintenance, and the central office will be progressively reduced in the future so that it becomes a strategic core. As well, regional offices will be scaled down as the capacity for self-management is taken up at the school level (based on Hayward, 1993a: 2-5).

What follows is a description of the major sections included in the Preliminary Paper and Working Documents of the SOTF pilot program, that is, the ‘Guidelines for Operation’ and the ‘School Curriculum’. A Board of Studies was established in order to provide a curriculum framework for all school education (Preparatory to Year 12). The rationale for this step was twofold. The first was to ensure that a high quality general education would be accessible to all students, and the second was to ensure that Victoria’s curriculum could then be assessed with the assurance that it was ‘consistent with national and international standards’ (Hayward, 1993a:6). As such, accredited courses would be required to be developed in the nationally agreed eight key areas of learning: arts, English, health (including physical education and sport), Languages other than English, mathematics, science, studies of society and the environment, and technology.

In order to prepare for designing curriculum at the local level, the guidelines of SOTF required each school, as part of its curriculum profile, to present a summary of its curriculum, both formal and informal, in reference to three aspects, year level, time allocation, and, special features. It was anticipated that in time some schools, because of the curriculum offerings developed, would become specialist in certain areas such as language, music and sport.

In Victoria, the 1980s had seen developments which had led to a greater centralisation of curriculum. This centralisation of curriculum continues with the newly created Board of Studies which would accredit courses for all schools and it was understood that schools would be able to adopt accredited courses, or they may submit their own courses to the Board of Studies for accreditation. As well, it was intended that Board of Studies courses would occupy 80% of curriculum time allowing flexibility for schools to emphasise curriculum areas appropriate to their school community needs. These developments occurred in a context where, at the federal level, in Australia, there had been talk of a national curriculum. However, the national statements and profiles were rejected by the states in 1993.
Both Beare (1991: 23) and Wirt (1991: 28) indicate that in the restructuring movements elsewhere there had been little curriculum reform. There are examples of returns to core statements, and in particular in the UK a development of a national curriculum, imposed from the central authority, with national testing occurring at ages 7, 11, 14 and 16. Caldwell and Spinks (1992) also commented on the provision of a national curriculum framework and nation-wide testing. The pivotal aspects to the successful implementation of the SOTF are covered in the paragraphs to follow. The sections are headed: School Charter, School Council, Role of Principal, Financial Management, and Personnel Management, Accountability and School Review, and Resource Management.

**School Charter**

The development of a charter for each school was a crucial element of the early phase of being a School of the Future. Spring (1993) indicates there are two parts to a school charter - the government policy and the local element owned and developed by the school within State Guidelines, communicating to the public its intentions, practices and expected outcomes. It is to be a legal undertaking, and form the basis of school accountability, as 'the schools review office would set up a system so that schools can receive an external report on their activities against their school charter' (Spring, 1993:3). Hayward (1993a:7) indicates that the charter, which was a formal agreement between the school council and government, encapsulates the school’s vision for its own future.

In NZ, Macpherson (1989: 34), referring to the 1988 Picot Report, comments that the structural change required to improve effectiveness and educational efficiency comprises eight design principles. He identifies these as, 'simplicity, decisions made at appropriate levels, national objectives, co-ordinated decision making, clear responsibilities and goals, control over resources, accountability and openness and responsiveness.' Each school or teaching institution would have a board of trustees which would negotiate its own Charter of Objectives to reflect local needs within national guidelines. He writes:

such a charter would be a three-party contract between the community, the institution's trustees and the state. The charter would also be a trustworthy basis for more detail planning that would specify outcomes, evaluation criteria and processes, and commit resources to programs and activities; that is, create what in other places would be termed a corporate plan or a school development plan (Macpherson, 1992:35).
A comparison as to the similarity between the charters of the SOTF (Victoria) and Tomorrow's Schools (NZ) can be gauged by the following list of contents for a charter of the SOTF: School profile, Goals, Priorities, Curriculum profile, Codes of Practice for School council, for Principal, for Staff, and for Community, Code of Conduct for Students, Accountability: Monitoring and Reporting, Budget, and Record of Understanding. The elements of the NZ model were: to specify outcomes, to specify evaluation criteria and processes, a commitment of resources to programs and activities, and the creation of a corporate plan.

This set of elements, whilst not described in the form of what constitutes the contents of a charter, does allow for a comparison of the NZ model to be made with the Victorian one. The requirements for charters for schools in the Victorian setting have common elements to those of the NZ model, and at this level more detail was supplied for the Victorian instrument. Mitchell (1992) notes that in NZ, charters are written with a lack of initial clarity as to what was expected. There appears to be a lack of support and changed requirements during the process. He also argues that schools vary in their degree of ownership of their charters. As part of the charter for a SOTF a Code of Conduct, referred to as a student code of conduct, exists. 'School councils . . . will be required to develop and approve a Code of Conduct as part of their school charter' (Hayward, 1993a:7). The student code of behaviour would 'set out the behaviour expected of students and sanctions for dealing with disruptive behaviour' (Spring, 1994).

**School Council**

Under the SOTF program the school council is accountable for the overall governance of the school. To this end it is responsible for:

- Reaching an agreement with the government on the School's charter.
- Determining the policies of the school within the framework of the charter.
- Approving the school development plan (with right of veto).
- Approving the school budget (with power to change it).
- Selecting the principal, within guidelines laid down by the DSE, and being represented on panels that choose deputy principals and vice-principals.
- Authorising the employment of non-teaching staff and short-term teaching staff.
- Approving arrangements for the management of buildings and grounds.
• Approving the code of conduct - the school’s student discipline policy.

• Writing an annual report to the minister and local community.

There is precedence in both the US and UK for such a role for the school council. In the US, ‘governance patterns for schools have been altered to allow for a school-site council of parents, teachers, and parents.’ The targets for upgrading and development were management, organisation, structures and managerial personnel. Whereas in the UK the Education Act of 1980 ‘revised the powers and responsibilities of Boards of Governors’ (Beare, 1991:15). Wirt (1991:29), in commenting on the UK scene indicates that the ‘local management scheme’ involves the following elements:

• open enrolment in every school within the LEA,

• formula-driven resource allocations to each school,

• setting priorities at each school site for spending its allocation - empowering a board of governors at each school to hire and fire staff and teachers, and

• provision of information to parents on the school’s performance (Wirt, 1991:29).

The congruence of these elements from the UK with the responsibilities of the school councils of the SOTF is very close, and should indicate to members of school councils that their role is not singularly peculiar to Victoria, and moreover, has developed and expanded over time.

Role of the Principal

The areas of responsibility for the principal in the SOTF were articulated as: curriculum leadership, resource and personnel management, school organisation, and staff selection. Thus, what are the particular characteristics and talents that a principal must bring to the task? Macpherson (1989) highlights the educative leadership role, where principals are expected to provide in order to improve the quality of teaching. He argues that the principal must be held accountable for the educative leadership of curriculum and staff development. As far as support and professional development activities for principals of the SOTF Pilot Program were concerned, there was a series of briefing sessions and two day residential training conferences. As 1993 progressed there were further professional development activities for principals focussing on school charter development and the role of the principal in a SOTF. Other programs initiated
in late 1993 and early 1994 considered the following: change management, personnel management, managing for quality, communications, employee relations, entrepreneurship, and marketing.

In considering the principal as leader in the school, Caldwell and Spinks (1992:186) look towards a 'transformational leadership picture of enduring vision and strong leadership, highlighted by a capacity to articulate that vision and harness all available leadership forces (technical, human, educational, symbolic and cultural) to mobilise and institutionalise.'

These emphases on educative leadership and transformational leadership, from writers outside the DSE, cannot but have influenced the view of leadership contained in the SOTF documentation. But, whatever particular style of leadership is manifested by the principal much of the success of being a Pilot School depends upon how well the principal communicates to the staff and school council the ideas and aspirations of the program. The principal should to be aware of the need for and how to secure professional development for staff and council alike.

**Financial Management and Personnel Management**

The areas of financial and personnel management, which involve new facets of the principal's role within a SOTF, invite themselves into any program of professional development. Financial Management includes: School Funding, School-Generated Funds, and Managing the School’s Annual Budget, whereas Personnel Management includes: Selection of Staff, Performance Review, Improved Personnel Practices, and Professional Development. Each of these is discussed separately.

**School Funding**

One of the objectives of the SOTF Pilot Program proposal, as listed in Chapter One, called for schools to have complete control over their financial resources. This was the most significant step towards self-management in the proposed reform. Muller (1993) indicates that SOTF funding will cover the following costs:

- Salaries of all staff, including on-costs
- Services used by the school, either provided by the Directorate’s agencies or outside providers
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• Minor works and maintenance
• Costs of services such as water, electricity, gas and council rates
• Supplies, furniture and equipment
• Replacement teachers, including emergency teachers
• Professional Development
• Excursion travel and other transport costs, including transport of disabled students
• Planning and review
• Management and administration, including the operation of the school council. It is not envisaged that councillors will be paid (Muller, 1993).

Capital funding would continue to be controlled centrally, but to fund the items listed above, schools would be provided with a global budget. The global budget would be formula-based, largely student per capita driven, depending on an index of student learning needs and related programs. Bulk funding was one of four models to be trialed in some of the 325 Victorian schools chosen to participate in the SOTF pilot from July 1993.

For administrators in government schools the whole area of funding and resource management was new, and was the one where most change in the role of educators (principals) would be required. Administrators would have to be trained in their use of resources. The role of the principal in particular would need to change and this will be taken into account when considering aspects of the professional development for principals - namely, managing for quality, entrepreneurship, and marketing.

MacPherson (1989:35) informs the reader that the task force proposes a national Audit and Review Authority for Tomorrow's Schools. He writes that 'teams would work with each community to evaluate its institution every second year to make transparent how well funds had been used to meet chartered objectives.' To help school trustees to make right decisions national guidelines are proposed, and this development would also ensure that they were being responsible and accountable for their decisions. Financial and asset management was also one facet of School Accountability developed in the charter for SOTF. Spring's view at the time was that 'if we are going to be serious about self-managing schools the money has to be under the control of the principal and the school council and the elected members of the school council; in other words, the system is the school and that's got to be accountable to the local community' (Spring, 1993:3).
The picture from NZ regarding funding was that schools were to adopt bulk-funding from day one in 1989, but this created such a public outcry that the Lange Government backed off. Some commentators, especially Bruce (1993), claim that the funding of Tomorrow's Schools still bitterly divides the NZ educational community even after four years. Most NZ schools draw the line at a system of 'bulk-funding', in which the government makes over to individual schools all money for running expenses, including teachers' salaries. It is felt by unionists in NZ that bulk-funding threatens the union's traditional role of striving for a better-paid workforce with an advanced career structure. They prefer a centrally controlled staffing system, whereby all schools with the same student needs can be treated to an equal share of the budget. The situation is that in Tomorrow's Schools, bulk-funded institutions can hire as many or as few teachers as they want, pay whatever they want, within union awards, and do what they like with class sizes and teaching hours. Mitchell (1992) in *Hear our Voices*, indicates, that in a second survey of secondary schools in NZ, there is a continuing concern expressed by some respondents about the adequacy of school income received from the Ministry of Education. Comments reveal suspicions that there are cost-cutting intentions behind the education reforms, and overall there is widespread opposition to bulk funding.

In Victoria, unfortunately, the first two years of SOTF coincided with a period in which a further $145 million were cut from the education budget. And, as Bruce writes, if 'Victoria wants to avoid the division and acrimony of the New Zealand bulk-funding debate schools will need to be confident that a lump-sum grant is a necessary part of self-management' (Bruce, 1993).

Caldwell (1994a), makes the point that since there is an emphasis on equity in the SOTF, the funding model should not follow that of the UK or NZ, but that the preferred model is that from Edmonton, where there is a student-centred approach to allocation of resources. He writes:

A preferred model, if international practice is to be our guide, is that in Edmonton, Canada which has had more than a decade of experience with a student-centred approach to allocating resources to schools, with differential grants according to the diagnosed educational need of students, ranging in 1993-94 from $C3 1361 per student in a regular program at any level to $C20 034 per student for students with major physical disability, and a range of allocations between, reflecting the relative costs of meeting the different educational needs of students. The focus is on diagnosing educational needs and planning educational programs to meet those needs (Caldwell, 1994a:79)
It is argued that resource allocation based on a student-centred approach is more equitable than one whereby uniform grants or grants based on student enrolment form the basis for the funding (Caldwell: 1994a). Thus, looking at the scene in Edmonton, where the allocation of resources to the school was needs-based, 'nine levels of per student allocation are defined, with the total of all such allocations to a particular school forming the major part of the school budget. The total allocation constitutes a global budget for the school which can then plan its expenditure to system and school priorities' (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992: 167). Caldwell and Sawatski (1994: 14) indicate that the success of such a funding approach depends on the extent to which clear criteria for the diagnosis of student learning needs can be made.

School-Generated Funds

The Schools of the Future Preliminary Paper (Hayward, 1993a), indicates that schools would be able to generate funds of their own for purposes consistent with the charter. There was a proviso that such funds would be audited and reported on annually. This aspect of funding opened the way for schools and leaders to show entrepreneurship.

Managing the Schools' Annual Budget

The Schools of the Future Preliminary Paper (Hayward, 1993a) indicates that school grant and school-generated funds form the basis of the annual budget, and that such budgets would be presented to school councils for consideration and approval. A crucial point is that at all times the formulation of the budget would have to be in line with the school charter. As staffing was to be locally controlled, and formed a large component of the budget, the approval of the budget by the school council was an authorisation for the staffing proposal by the principal. A second document 'Schools of the Future - School Global Budget 1995' (DSE, 1994b) indicates that the refocussing of the budget would:

allow schools to base resourcing decisions on the learning needs of their students in line with their own School Charter - give schools a one-line budget covering all previously separate resource allocations - give schools effective control over their total budget - remove the restrictions previously imposed by separated funding (DSE, 1994b: 4).
The core funding for 1995 was based on the 1994 staffing and grants formulas, but principals, were to have the opportunity of allocating funds 'according to the learning needs of each student' (DSE, 1994b:4). Also, for 1995, additional funds were to be made available for P-2 students (additional $A30 per student), as well as for additional administrative support.

Selection of Staff

The original SOTF documents indicate that all staff of SOTF would be locally selected. This is reinforced in a further information document to school communities in June 1994 (DSE, 1994a). This document details that all staff, administrative, support and teaching, are to be selected locally as part of the responsibility of the principal, and such 'school-based staff appointments are fundamental to the SOTF. The ability to appoint teachers who are matched to their students' requirements will give Schools of the Future real control over their programs' (DSE, 1994a:5).

Performance Review

This aspect of guidelines for SOTF lays down that all teaching staff as well as principals and vice-principals are subject to a systematic and periodic review (Hayward, 1993a).

Improved Personnel Practices

This section in the Schools of the Future Preliminary Paper (Hayward, 1993a) details strategies whereby excellent teaching could be recognised by salary increases and teacher promotion. As well, it is clear that unsatisfactory teaching could be dealt with by more streamlined tactics than had been used in the past. There is an indication that the Directorate would establish a formal probationary period for teachers entering the profession.

Professional Development

Havard (1992), in writing about issues in management training in Scotland, recognises that development of managerial skills are important aspects of staff development, and such programs should exist in systems and schools. In NZ, Mitchell (1992) claims, as a consequence of Tomorrow's Schools, there is a general
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perception that staff development activities have increased. The implementation of a system-wide teacher
effectiveness program in the Edmonton Public Schools District in Alberta, Canada was seen as a valuable
complement to that system’s pioneering effort in school self-management' (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992:124).

These three pieces of evidence of practice, from Scotland, NZ, and Edmonton, were matched by
the planning of the DSE for the SOTF program with funding for professional development to be given
highest priority. There were to be training programs for principals and school councils, as well as for
business managers and other administrative personnel. The need for professional development was clear
from the start, as is evidenced by the early charter briefings for principals, followed by the training for Pilot
School principals on charter development. The overall professional development for the SOTF program
hinged on four components:

- the induction program
- targeted programs, e.g., training for school councillors, leadership training for principals,
  financial management, and staffing and personnel
- individual school programs - programs to be decided by each school and/or collegiate group
- ongoing professional development

The importance placed on teachers taking charge of their own professional life is highlighted by
Spring (1993), of the DSE, when some views on being a Professional were published:

We will never be a profession until the profession takes hold of the whole process of
standards of entry, induction, probation, assessment for promotion, assessment for
advanced skills teaching and all of the matters that other professions take hold of,
alone.

We need to establish a standards council.

We need to set bench marks.

We need to set procedures.

We have to delegate powers of reward to principals.

We've got to provide funding flexibility to allow them to do it and we have to be
uncompromising about the promotion of the profession (Spring, 1983:3).
These views are relevant to the area of professional development within the SOTF, for Spring's promotion of the profession was part of his rationale for the SOTF program. A number of the tasks of the principal and teachers in the program will demand that these elements of professionalism be explored.

Spring's comments have the support of Beare (1992), who writes, regarding restructuring, the main gain is that it makes possible 'new opportunities for teachers and educators to fashion roles, functions and their distribution, and the shape of educational organisations along lines that are manifestly professional' (Beare, 1992:71). An impression gained from Edmonton was in the self-managing schools there was a maturing profession along with 'high levels of satisfaction with working conditions, fairness of assigned responsibilities, involvement in the budget process, opportunities for professional development' (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992:199).

**Accountability and School Review**

Accountability in a self-managing school is described as, 'when processes have been established to provide information internally, to the local community, and externally, to the school system and others, to enable judgments to be made about the extent to which the school is responsive to the needs of students, the local community and society at large' (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992:139). A list of the key processes of the framework for accountability for the Edmonton Public School District, in Alberta, Canada, are detailed as:

1. All students at grades 3, 6 and 9 levels take district tests in language arts, mathematics, science and social science; students in grade 12 take the Alberta Education Examinations.
2. Each year a panel of experts defines a 'benchmark' for each of the district tests - an attainable target performance on tests is gathered from school, area and the system as a whole.
3. All students, teachers, principals, district staff and a representative sample of parents complete an opinion survey each year.
4. Comparative data are reported each year since 1987 for district tests and since 1981 for opinion surveys.
5. Results of tests and surveys are made public and aggregated by sector for the district as a whole - schools receive detailed analyses of their own tests and surveys - parents can request analyses for a particular school.
6. Other information: retention rates, student attendance rates, achievement levels of students, awards, staff attending in-service and professional activities, cost of capital projects, total budget allocations and actual expenditure, specifying surplus or deficit to be carried forward (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992:149-151).

The SOTF program embeds evaluation and accountability in the culture of the authority and its schools, by including in its charters significant comments about accountability. In the Victorian scene the ‘formal accountability arrangements through a school charter will be a legal undertaking’ (Spring, 1993:3). There are links here with New Zealand, as well, for the charters of the SOTF and Tomorrow's Schools have similar elements relating to accountability. The Edmonton framework for accountability has also informed the SOTF as Caldwell and Spinks (1992:141) write that Edmonton schools are accountable to student and parent, to parents and the local community, and to the school system. The school system is accountable to the government, the state governments to national governments, and in return governments and systems of education to the community. In Victoria, the Schools Review Office would develop a form of accountability framework for a SOTF, and in consultation with the Board of Studies, the framework would include processes for measuring student progress and achievement. The Schools Review Office would: help schools write their charters, approve the charters, receive annual reports from schools, survey levels of satisfaction, nominate at least one member of each school review panel, provide policy advice on accountability criteria and assessment measures in conjunction with the Board of Studies, and prove regular reports on the quality and effectiveness of educational programs in schools.

Writings by Caldwell and Spinks (1988), Dimmock (1991) and Wildy (1991), indicate that investigation of effectiveness in educational settings leads to the knowledge that in situations of school-based management there is close staff coordination, more coordination and control among the elements of the school, and an emphasis on building a supportive climate. The devolution of power and authority to school level is one response to the 'demand for improved efficiency and effectiveness of educational performance and greater accountability in education systems' (Wildy, 1991:168).
Resource Management

The document *Schools of the Future Preliminary Paper* (Hayward, 1993a) highlights areas of resource management that would become the responsibility of the school. The school would be responsible for:

- minor works - costs a charge against the school budget,
- routine maintenance - costs a charge against the school budget,
- contracting for minor works and routine maintenance,
- contracting educational support from public or private sectors,
- acquiring and disposing physical resources.

**B. Assessments of the SOTF Program**

At the time of writing, in 1993-1994, public debate about the SOTF program centred not around educational issues, but largely around issues of budgeting and organisation. These were times of economic restraint, where, in Victoria, reductions of no less than ‘$145 million from the budget by 1995’ were foreseen (Brennan, 1993:3), in addition to earlier cuts. Further to these cuts, threats to reduce entitlements under State superannuation, caused 1000 members of the Victorian Principals Federation to warn the Government that:

> if changes were made in the superannuation scheme, Schools of the Future would be in mortal peril. It was not a threat idly made, and these people are uniquely placed to carry it out . . . The Government should press ahead with Schools of the Future and let the program stand or fall on its educational merits. There are a number of industrial shoals - super, employment contracts, salary scales . . . associated with it. They are more likely to be navigated satisfactorily by use of reason rather than of threats (Editorial Opinion in The Age, 1993:13).

Various newspaper articles written during the time of the pilot program (1993 onwards), gave an indication of educators' interest and the range of argument about and support for the SOTF. A selection of these includes, firstly, a report of a school council meeting held in order to decide whether to accept the invitation, and apply for a place in the SOTF pilot. As the extract indicates, the central concern becomes whether the government would be able to see the program through to completion.
The speaker was enthusiastic about the Schools of the Future. So was the principal, although he acknowledged it would mean more work and the shouldering of far heavier financial responsibility than he was used to. A member of the school council opposed to being in the pilot asserted that there was no real guarantee that the government would properly fund the program. This was a school community familiar with the broken promises of government. It had put a lot of effort into a local school merger, only to see the promised capital works program suspended by the incoming Liberal-National Government at the end of last year. This is where the debate became focused: not on educational issues but, by implication, on trust in politicians and bureaucrats. There wasn't a lot of it about. A strong current in favour of the program was the group's sense of self-reliance: that if Schools of the Future really meant more autonomy and accountability, this was the kind of school that would succeed (Muller, 1993b).

Townsend (1994), on the other hand, is concerned with the introduction of the proposal at a time when there are large cuts to the education budget. In an article 'Slow evolution of education leads to Schools of the Future. Self-management or self-delusion?', he writes, regarding the SOTF:

One of the difficulties for the program is that it has arrived at the same time as substantial cuts have been made to the education budget. It could be argued that the Victorian Government has provided school communities with greater choice, but considerably less scope about what those choices might be. Schools of the Future is a bold and exciting initiative, but to introduce it at a time when the massive cuts to education have created a climate of instability and fear has created some problems (Townsend, 1994).

Continuing in a similar economic vein, the following extract is part of a lengthy report about a confidential State Government document warning of a $43 million blowout in education spending. Questions are raised about the effectiveness of Victoria's education changes. Part of the dissatisfaction at the school level relates to the global budget, and how it would be applied in schools.

The report analysed key achievements in education in the past year and found that: By June 1994, less than half of the state's schools were linked to a central financial, personnel and administrative network critical to the successful implementation of Schools of the Future. The department had not resolved significant industrial relations issues and there were indications of dissatisfaction and low staff morale (Painter, 1994b).
Another area of worry is the possible inequity that would arise between schools, particularly between those that are able to secure greater resources than others. The following comment comes from a concern that the reform would bring about greater inequality between schools of the public sector:

The Schools of the Future program signifies the abandonment of resource equality across the system, and the substitution of corporate forms of devolution for the democratic forms that were traditional in Victorian education. It paves the way for the longer-term transition to market-based schooling in the state sector ... the Government and its key supporters are interested in outcomes: not educational outcomes, so much as social outcomes through education ... The more competitive the education system, the more those with prior advantages will win (Marginson, 1994).

Ellis, expresses a view which indicates that many smaller schools do not share the same enthusiasm, as do larger schools, about the SOTF:

one would have to query a renaissance in the teaching profession due to Schools of the Future. The only addition to the current pool of teachers are those entering on short-term contracts. It is difficult to expect those teachers to achieve the same commitment, concentration and continuity as ongoing staff. Short-term contracts cater best for teachers who are teaching programs, not for children (Ellis, 1994).

Messina (1995a) comments on a report of a survey carried out among primary school principals. He identifies the workload of a primary school principal:

Almost a quarter of Victoria's primary school principals want to quit their jobs and are actively seeking alternative work, a survey has found ... that principals are overworked, undertrained and deeply concerned about their future ... Reflecting the Government's push for self-managed schools under the Schools of the Future reforms, 65 per cent of principals reported a marked increase in time spent liaising with the Directorate of School Education (Messina, 1995a).

Messina (1995b), lastly, writes about an experienced primary school principal who has taken a retirement package. In this extract the writer details many of the new tasks falling to the principal, and of the necessity for principals to be trained in the new areas of leadership demanded by the reform:
the problem was not the Schools of the Future concept of devolving power to individual schools, rather it was the implementation: 'The Government has tried to do far too much, far too quickly.' . . . implementing the school charter was competing with other new and complicated responsibilities that descended almost daily from the ministry. There were programs to deal with Workcover reform, human resources management, hiring of staff and declaring staff in excess, health and safety matters, marketing the school and raising school finances. There were new computer systems to install and people to train, as well as himself. There was endless reading just to keep abreast of the 'information overload. All in a year' (Messina, 1995b).

Given that the role of the principal in the school is crucial for the school in a time of major reform, any changes to the role, practice, behaviour and knowledge on the part of the principal, required for successful implementation of the reform, are to be noted. It is important that funding bodies know the cost of, as well as the extent to which professional development activities have contributed to a successful transition in role, behaviour and knowledge.

C. Professional Development Activities

Since an analysis of the perceived benefits of the professional development activities forms the main part of this research, it is helpful to be aware of the scope of the activities that occurred in the early stages of the pilot program. As well as these programs in the lead up to the pilot program, literature and information about the reform was sent to schools from the DSE, and principals were involved in residential programs for the preparation of the school charter. Other formal scheduled programs, from September to December 1993, for school personnel are listed in Table 1.

When it is taken into account that there were 325 schools in the pilot program, and that at many of the targeted program sessions there was more than one representative from each school present, some indication of the scope of the exercise is evident. Further costs were incurred because five of the programs had a residential component and three had follow-up sessions, using interactive TV. The full list of programs during October - December 1993 included the following

A. Collegiate Group Facilitators Training. This was a training and development program in group leadership with a particular focus on support for the role of the principal in Schools of the Future. The target group was made up of the identified facilitators for each Principal Collegiate Group.
Table 1  Professional Programs October - December 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Number</th>
<th>Targeted Group</th>
<th>No of Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collegiate Group Facilitators Training</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Special Schools and Special Development Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Multicampus Colleges</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Curriculum Leadership in Schools of the Future</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CASES Training</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>School Councils</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES  Programs 1, 3, and 5 had a 2-day residential component, Program 6 had a 3-day component as well as a 2-day residential component, Program 9 had a 2-day non-residential component, and Program 10 had a 1-day residential component, an evening followed by the following day.

B. Charter Development. This was a Review of School Charters prior to signing by the School Council President, Principal and Director of School Education (or nominee). The target group was the principals.

C. Clusters. This was a program which focused on developing a team approach to decision making. It provided an opportunity for each cluster (remote schools were encouraged to join clusters) to clarify purpose/s for clustering, to develop cluster elements of charters, to explore possible organisational and operational structures, to develop strategies for cluster resource management, to develop strategies for monitoring and evaluating cluster goals and priorities, to develop team work. The target group was the cluster management teams.

D. Special Schools and Special Development Schools. This program was to identify and relate implications of the Future Directions in Relation to Educational Opportunities for Students with
Disabilities and Impairments and the Examination of Special School Provision and the Examination of Special School Provision Within the Regions to the development of the School Charter. The target group was the principals and teachers of Special Schools and Special Developmental Schools.

E. Multicampus Colleges. This program comprised a series of seminars and writing workshops based on the unique aspects of a multicampus college. The target group was principals and SOTF Implementation Team for each of the Multicampus Pilot Schools.

F. Principal Leadership. The program focused on the development and enhancement of leadership and management skills required by principals to deliver a SOTF. The program involved participants in real life scenarios and case studies, and was aimed at leading to a preliminary development of key systems for implementation at school level. The target group was the principals.

G. Curriculum Leadership in SOTF. This program focused on the range of roles which could be exercised by Vice-Principals, ASTs and SRPs in each School of the Future. Specifically, the program highlighted the leadership role demanded by the emerging focus on curriculum outcomes and accountability requirements in the SOTF program. The target group was one nominated teacher from each pilot school.

H. School Operations. The program focused on a coordinated approach to organisational management and devolved processes within school administration. Specifically the program covered the changes to school administration and operations, including organisational and workforce management, devolved functions and processes, responsibilities and accountability. The target group was administrative staff in schools, 2 members from each school.

I. CASES (Computerised Administrative Systems Environment for Schools) Training. This was training in all CASES components including finance, student records and assets management. The target group was administrative staff in schools, 2 members from each school.

J. Health and Safety. The program was aimed at reducing the number of Work Cover claims by assisting schools to implement effective self management systems applicable to health, safety and Work Cover. The target group was principals and Health and Safety representatives from schools with high Work Cover claims.

K. Financial Management. This program provided participants with a comprehensive understanding of management and of the global budget. The target group was principals, bursars, and business managers.
L. Personnel Management. The focus of this program was on personnel management rather than on operations. The target group included principals, bursars, and business managers.

M. School Councils. The program was conducted by a team from the Association of Councils of Post Primary Institutions of Victoria supported by specialist input from DSE personnel. The focus was on the responsibilities of SOTF Target Group - Representatives of school councils of pilot SOTF (DSE, Targeted Programs Schedule for Pilot Schools, 1993)

As detailed in chapter one, the following targeted programs were chosen for this research because of the high involvement of principals: Charter Development; Principal Leadership; School Operations; Financial Management; and Personnel Management.

D. Summary of Chapter Three

This chapter employed the use of selected major aspects of the Guidelines for Operation from the Schools of the Future - Preliminary Paper (Hayward: 1993a) in order to consider the implications for action in Victoria, in the light of knowledge coming from a consideration of similar guidelines elsewhere.

A significant lesson to be learnt from the NZ situation is that the moves towards self-management cannot be introduced overnight. In Victoria there exists a phasing-in period, whereas the NZ system-wide introduction of self-management in one phase created enormous pressure and unrest. Mitchell (1992) in Hear our Voices comments that respondents were generally quite critical of the way in which several aspects of the NZ reforms were implemented. The main areas of criticism were centred on inadequacies of information flow, excessive demands on the participants, and poor resourcing of new developments. Muller (1993b) indicates that inequities continued in NZ schools despite significant education reforms, and that Victoria's SOTF travel along the same path and draw on Tomorrow's Schools to a considerable extent. Some shared characteristics are devolution of power over budgets, staffing, curriculum (within centrally controlled guidelines), cuts in the central bureaucracy and extended roles for parents.

From Edmonton, Canada, it appears that one of the major contributions to be recognised by the DSE was related to developing a framework for accountability. Such accountability processes enabled much information to be gleaned about the outcomes of education, and illustrated, how, over time,
benchmarks are developed. Another major area of influence was the development of approaches to resource allocation set in practice throughout the 1980s, which addressed the issues of equity and fairness.

A review of some contemporary assessments of the SOTF program was incorporated and in the main these assessments, which appeared in newspaper articles, were from principals involved with the SOTF pilot program. The chapter concluded with a full description of the targeted professional development programs offered by the DSE from October to December 1993.
CHAPTER 4

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH DESIGN

The aim of this chapter is to discuss the conceptual framework, research design methodology and sampling, together with the questionnaire construction. It will take into account the relevant background to research methods, and assumptions underlying the procedures. As well, analyses of costs, effectiveness and efficiency in educational settings are presented.

A. Development of the Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this thesis consists of two elements, firstly, the development of a procedure that will allow the researcher to assess costs and effectiveness of selected targeted professional development programs of the SOTF pilot. Five programs were selected as outlined in Chapters One and Three. Decisions about what was appropriate data to gather and how it was to be collected needed to be made, as well as a process by which the procedure could be applied so that the data could be analysed and the outcomes evaluated. Secondly, there was the understanding of what is meant by the terms cost, effectiveness and efficiency as applied to educational settings.

Miles and Huberman (1994:20) describe conceptual frameworks as being 'simply the current version of the researcher's map of the territory being investigated'. The development of a conceptual framework for this study primarily depended on a knowledge of the goals of the SOTF program and the aims of the professional development programs, as explored in Chapters One and Three, together with the definitions and understandings associated with the concepts of 'cost', 'effectiveness' and 'efficiency' on the one hand, and 'approaches to cost analysis' on the other. Definitions of these terms appear in the List of Abbreviations on page v. The concepts of cost, effectiveness and efficiency in educational settings will be explored further in this chapter. This conceptual framework also required an understanding of the two stages of the implementation of the SOTF:

- Prepilot - the lead up to the SOTF Pilot program.
- Pilot - the development of the Pilot program which included the targeted professional development activities and presentation of information to participating schools.
The period under consideration for this research was from October to December 1993, and stages in the development of the SOTF were:

1. preparation of the SOTF program up to the end of September 1993.
2. the establishment period - October 1993 to December 1993 - during this period the targeted professional programs were held.
3. the period of the second type of funding - January to December 1994. During this second period it was proposed that global funds be distributed to SOTF in order to meet a range of expenses.

Quantitative data, relating to costs expended in the targeted professional development activities, were obtained from the DSE. To ascertain the impact of the targeted professional development programs interviews with a number of principals were carried out. The main purpose of the interviews was to inform the development of the research instrument.

Overall, the development of the analysis took into account that there were to be both quantitative and qualitative aspects of data collection. The design of the research instrument was to obtain both quantitative and qualitative data. The instrument was also geared towards investigating the perceived benefits of the selected development programs to the participants, and interpreting the extent to which the goals of the programs were met. The professional development programs were funded deliberately, as part of the implementation of the SOTF program. The outcomes of this aspect of the study were, firstly, in the form of quantified responses to parts of the research instrument, and, secondly, extended responses to other parts of the instrument, which form the qualitative aspect of the study.

This conceptual framework contains, as a first element, a linking of an understanding of the objectives of the SOTF and the goals of the professional development programs, with the costs (including money, time and effort) for creating, training, and implementing the targeted professional development programs for SOTF pilot program. All of these comprise the inputs. The outputs are to be looked at in terms of effectiveness, and the increased skills and knowledge of principals and other school personnel. The second element of the conceptual framework, the method by which the analysis can be applied for evaluation purposes, is related to cost analysis. Cost analysis, in this study, is related to interpreting data provided by the DSE for the cost of running each targeted program. This data can be used to determine an estimate of direct cost per participant. These sets of calculations allow for a comparison across the programs
to be made. As well opportunity costs will be taken into account, and these are calculated by the following:
estimated opportunity cost = pro rata daily salary x number of participants x number of days. The third
element of the conceptual framework is the Bolman and Deal Theory of Frames, which gives a distillation
of major schools of organisational thought. The Bolman and Deal Frames are explored more fully in section
E of this Chapter.

B. Cost, Efficiency, and Effectiveness.

The development of an understanding of the concepts of 'cost', 'efficiency' and 'effectiveness', underpin the
theoretical basis to this research on the one side, and an understanding of the approaches to 'cost analysis' on
the other. The approaches to 'cost analysis' include 'production function', 'cost-effectiveness analysis', and
'cost-benefit analysis'. Each of these definitions and approaches is reviewed in turn.

Costs

Woodhall (1987) gives a clear understanding of the following uses of 'cost'. Firstly, there is the distinction
between money costs and opportunity costs. Money costs relate to the amounts of money that are used in
the educational process, whereas opportunity costs relate to the value of the resources that have alternative
uses. For example, such resources would include:

the time of teachers, students, and other staff, and books, materials, equipment, and
building. All these resources have alternative uses. If they were not used for
educational purposes they could be devoted to some other activity, and since
resources are limited this means that alternative opportunities for using these
resources must be sacrificed, or forgone (Woodhall, 1987b:393).

The concept of opportunity costs, therefore, is a wider one than that of simply money costs, for
opportunity costs include not only resources that can be measured in money terms, but also those, like the
loss of leisure time of staff, where they can neither be bought or sold. Woodhall points out that such
opportunity costs can be divided into two classes. There are those where the cost is to the individual
(private), and there are those where there is a cost to society (public). Individual opportunity costs include
earnings forgone (after taxes have been exacted) fees paid, books and equipment paid, time spent travelling,
time lost from work, and loss of leisure. Hence, opportunity cost of staff participating in courses can be measured in money terms by their salaries expressed as a daily or hourly rate of pay. These are the private costs, which also include foregone leisure time. This can also be proxied by the hourly rate of pay. The costs to society as a whole may include such items as earnings paid (before taxes), expenditure on equipment and buildings. These are the social costs.

Secondly, the interpretation of what is meant by capital and recurrent costs are given by Woodhall: 'capital costs or expenditure . . . include the purchase of durable assets such as buildings or equipment which are expected to yield benefits over a longer period. The purchase of capital goods may be described as investment' (Woodhall, 1987b:393). Recurrent costs on the other hand refers to expenditure on goods and services which needs to be renewed on a regular basis.

Thirdly, there is a consideration of the difference between average and marginal costs. For example, marginal costs are those involved when taking into account the extra cost incurred when one more student is enrolled in a school, or when one more school is involved in the process, or when one more staff member is employed by a school. This particular distinction comes into its own when an analysis of costs is being made, for the analysis may be concerned with either the total costs of education or with an average cost per educational unit, which is calculated in the following way.

\[
\text{Average cost per unit} = \frac{\text{Sum of total costs}}{\text{Total number of units}}
\]

The educational unit is a variable quantity and in this research the intention is to take into account various educational units. For example, this research examines:

1. Cost per targeted professional development program.
2. Average cost per participant for each of five selected targeted professional development programs.

The relationship between 'average and marginal costs varies between different institutions and depends on the form of the cost function, that is, the relationship between cost and size' (Woodhall, 1987b:394). Verry (1987) makes the same point but expresses it in a series of mathematical expressions. Firstly, the total cost of an educational enterprise is a function of the number of students or participants or units served. This is represented by the first two equations.
1 \[ TC = f(S) \] TC represents total cost
S represents number of units served.

2 \[ TC = A + B \times S \] A, B are constants.
A represents the cost incurred irrespective of number of units
(a fixed cost), which is the value of TC when S = 0.
BxS represents variable total costs, depending on the scale of
operation.

For equation 2, when S = 0, TC = A (the fixed cost), and hence total costs increase linearly at the rate of B
per extra unit. A more sophisticated, and possibly more realistic, cost function equation is represented by the
following,

3 \[ TC = A + B \times S + C \times S^2 + D \times S^3 + E \times S^4. \]
Where, the constants A, B, C, D and E may take any value resulting in a nonlinear expression of the cost
function (Verry, 1987: 401-403).

**Efficiency**

Efficiency as understood in the context of this research is a measure of the comparison of outputs
(outcomes, benefits, impacts) of a program for given resources. Generally, the exercise is to maximise
outputs for a limited input. On the one hand, there is internal efficiency, which is a consideration of what
happens inside an educational institution, and is concerned with the amount and utilisation of resources to
achieve goals. Increased internal efficiency in a school may be measured by a drop in the unit cost per
student, given that output per student remains constant. On the other hand, there is external efficiency. An
example is 'how well its (the schools') graduates fit in the social setting after they leave school, in
comparison with the resources used while in school' (Psacharopoulos: 1980:14). The external efficiency of
an educational institution is concerned with the impact that the institution has on the economy and society as
a whole. Amongst the other forms of efficiency relevant to this study there is 'price efficiency'. Levin
indicates that 'in the context of resource allocation, the notion of efficiency is known as "allocative or price
efficiency", which refers "to the use of the budget in such a way that, given relative prices, the most
productive combination of resources is obtained" ’ (Levin, 1976 as cited in Abu-Dhou, 1987:103).
Effectiveness

Effectiveness, as understood in this research, is an assessment of how well a program measures up to its objectives. For this reason, the objectives of the professional development programs are required to be understood. An example of effectiveness could be in considering a school situation where the objective of a program is to increase the literacy level of the students of a certain age. The effectiveness of this program could then be interpreted in terms of the number of students who attain a certain level of achievement (that is, to achieve the objective). Efficiency and effectiveness can be conflicting objectives for educational institutions. For example, to increase the effectiveness of a program (that is, to raise the level of achievement of objectives) more resources may have to be supplied. The effect of requiring more resources is likely to decrease the efficiency of the program, as although costs will increase, outputs are not likely to increase in the same proportion.

C. Approaches to Cost Analysis

A fourth aspect for consideration in the theoretical background to the research is also related to definition - what interpretations are given to the term 'cost analysis' and what are the approaches used? In brief, a cost analysis exercise is not only concerned with the costs, or inputs, but with some measure of the outputs. Woodhall (1987b) is careful to point out that there are various ways of making comparisons of the inputs and outputs of education. Several approaches have been developed and applied to examine the relationship between inputs and outputs. The first is the production function, which is the relationship between inputs and outputs measured in physical terms. 'The problems of analysing educational production functions centre on the difficulty of measuring these in physical terms, taking into account variations in quality' (Woodhall, 1987: 397). The main difficulty with educational analyses is that associated with the problems in defining and measuring output.

Besides a consideration of a production function, there is cost-effectiveness analysis, where the inputs and outputs are analysed from a basis of comparing costs of inputs with 'the achievement of objectives, measured in terms of achievement tests, examination results, or some other measure of output and quality' (Woodhall, 1987b:397). For cost-effectiveness analyses both inputs and outputs need to be
measured in quantitative terms. Put in another way 'the concern is to establish the cost of the operation so that one can make some sort of measurement of the cost-effectiveness of the process by relating the extent of product success to the cost of achieving it' (Jones, 1989:102). Cost-effectiveness analysis is a technique for comparing the costs of alternative ways of achieving the objective. It is primarily a decision making tool, and can be used in planning or in evaluation. Reynolds and Gaspari (1985) indicate there are various uses of cost-effectiveness analysis. These are:

- In evaluation studies it can evaluate various alternative programs designed to achieve the same goal.
- It may evaluate alternative means for a given program to achieve its objectives . . . . The planner may have to decide which is the most cost-effective way to implement a given program.
- It may be used to evaluate the trade-offs in varying the size, scope or composition of a given strategy.
- Cost-effective analysis can also be used to compute which of many possible alternatives is the most cost-effective when alternatives are neither discrete or known, that is, when the variable is a continuous one and the objective is to find the best value for the variable. This is an identification of the optimum alternative (Reynolds and Gaspari, 1985: 9-12).

The steps in a cost-effectiveness analysis must include firstly, an analysis of costs for each alternative, secondly, an analysis of each alternative's effectiveness, and thirdly, an analysis of the relationship between the costs and effectiveness. The limitations of cost-effectiveness analysis as an analytical tool, in this study, are related to the decision of what are the alternatives, being clear about the effects of the program and how are they measured, and, which costs and effects should be measured.

It has been suggested that there is a sequence of steps that educational institutions use when cost-effectiveness methods are being applied to examine a program. The steps are:

1. How well is program X doing now? (evaluation)
2. What is wrong with program X? (relevance)
3. What else may be done? (options or alternatives)
4. What will be the cost? (cost)
5. What will it contribute? (effectiveness)
6. What support and what opposition to this change would emerge? (feasibility)
7. Who could do it? (feasibility)

These sequential steps in a cost-effectiveness analysis are appropriate to this current study’s overview of costs and effectiveness, with the first six steps being the most crucial, 4 and 5 in particular.

Besides cost-effectiveness analysis, cost-benefit analysis is another form of economic efficiency analysis. Cost-benefit analysis is used to evaluate the external efficiency in terms of the economic returns for the costs incurred. For cost-benefit analysis both inputs and outputs need to be expressed in monetary terms. This technique is particularly useful when making investment appraisals. Generally, the method involves a comparison of the opportunity costs of a project with expected benefits. The expected benefits are often measured in terms of the additions to income that accrue out of investment. Cost-benefit analysis is not appropriate for this study since the outputs cannot be measured in monetary terms. The outputs are the principals’ perceptions of the effectiveness (not monetary) of the professional development programs as reported in a questionnaire. Hence, it is not appropriate to consider a cost-benefit analysis. Therefore, as the approach to analysis taken in this research involves the making of comparisons of costs with outputs, the appropriate method of analysis is that of cost and effectiveness evaluation.

D. Criteria for Cost and Effectiveness Comparison

Two criteria are required, one for the input (costs) and one for the outputs (effectiveness). For this research the inputs will be the total money outlays during the pilot program for the five chosen targeted professional development programs, and the opportunity costs which will include the time of participants devoted to PD courses, measured in terms of pro rata of their salaries. Cash grants for special programs will not be included. The outputs, which will form the effectiveness data for analysis will be the quantitative expression of the effectiveness of programs as perceived by principals. Input data (costs) will be obtained from the DSE, including salary scales, and output data (participants’ perceptions of effectiveness of PD programs) will be obtained from quantifying responses to items on a questionnaire. Programs can only be compared in terms of their cost-effectiveness if there is a common unit in which effectiveness can be
measured across all the programs in the study, and when all the inputs can be identified and costed in terms of a monetary value. In the case of the PD programs evaluated here, effectiveness is not measured in a common set of units, but only relative to the objectives of each program. Hence, it is only when programees cost the same that their cost-effectiveness ratings can be compared, or where a more costly program has a lower effectiveness rating than a less costly program.

There are difficulties in applying cost-effectiveness methods to education, as noted by Woodhall (1987) 'because of the difficulties of identifying and measuring the output or objectives of education it is difficult to apply cost-effectiveness analysis to education as thoroughly and satisfactorily as to some other activities' (Woodhall, 1987a:348). In this thesis, the cost analysis revolves around, firstly, the cost of achieving the objectives and secondly, the outputs (effectiveness) of the professional development program. Though cost-effectiveness analysis may be an appropriate method for the evaluation of targeted professional development programs, a straightforward cost-effectiveness analysis was not employed. There are two reasons for not applying a straightforward cost-effectiveness analysis in this research. Firstly, there is a difficulty in capturing all aspects of costs in one survey, especially since the research is a year after the pilot program. Secondly, there is the problem of measuring effectiveness, even though items in the questionnaire relating to achieving goals and perceived effectiveness were responded to on a 1 - 5 scale. Perceived effectiveness is of a subjective nature and often expressed in non-quantitative terms. Associated with the subjective nature of effectiveness is the wide set of attributes that contribute to the notion of effectiveness. Terms such as quality, benefit, success, improvement, and productivity can all be argued to be elements of effectiveness. But, as effectiveness is the relationship between outputs and objectives, and since these are 'difficult to quantify, measures of effectiveness are just as difficult to come by (Anthony and Herzlinger, 1989:20). Also, drawing on Woodhall's comment, there was difficulty with determining an effectiveness measure which allows for a comparison to be made across programs, particularly when there are programs of different lengths.

Fielden and Pearson (1989) claim that it is 'not the function of the cost analyst to measure all educational benefits or qualitative changes - (the researcher) must be prepared, however, to identify what has happened and to summarise the outcomes in those cases where they are measurable' (Fielden and Pearson, 1989:98). If the program is one where the objectives are achieved with the least possible use of resources, or when there is a maximum output for a given input, then it is an efficient one. In this research
the process of cost analysis will comment on the inputs (measures of costs) and the outputs (measures of
effectiveness).

The conceptual framework for this research is based on the assumption that research findings, both
quantitative and qualitative, will lead to an understanding of the resourcing of the targeted professional
development programs. There are quantitative and qualitative outcomes of the analyses, of questionnaire
items relating to the programs, which will indicate a measure of effectiveness. These figures together with
analyses of average costs per participant will assist in answering the research questions, and help in
shedding light on the relationship between costs and effectiveness of the targeted programs.

E. Reframing Organisations

This aspect of the conceptual framework is introduced as a basis for linking the two types of outputs
(effectiveness measures), quantitative and qualitative, that will arise from an analysis of items on a
questionnaire to be completed by participants at Targeted Professional Development Programs. The
theoretical aspects come from organisational theory as developed by Bolman and Deal (1991). These two
writers, having surveyed the field of organisational theory, distilled major schools of organisational thought
into four perspectives, called frames. ‘Frames are both windows on the world and lenses that bring the
world into focus. Frames filter out some things while allowing others to pass through easily. Frames help us
to order experience and decide what action to take. Frames are also tools for action, and every tool has its
strengths and limitations’ (Bolman and Deal, 1991:11). The frames identified by Bolman and Deal are the
structural; human resource; political; and symbolic frames. The characteristics of each school of
organisational thought were highlighted by these authors as follows:

a. Rational systems theorists emphasize organizational goals, roles, and technology, and look for ways to develop structures that best fit organizational purposes and environmental demands.

b. Human resource theorists emphasize the interdependence between people and organizations. They focus on ways to develop a better fit between peoples’ needs, skills, and values, on the one hand, and their formal roles and relationships, on the other.

c. Political theorists see power, conflict, and the distribution of scarce resources as the central issue. They argue that organizations are like jungles in which cooperation is
achieved by managers who understand the uses of power, coalitions, bargaining, and conflict.

d. Symbolic theorists focus on problems of meaning (Bolman and Deal, 1991:9).

Further, the authors claim that 'the truly effective manager and leader will need multiple tools, the skill to use each of them, and the wisdom to match frames to situations' (Bolman and Deal, 1991:12). They detail the following aspects about the frames of leadership. The first two frames are the structural frame and human resource frame:

The structural frame emphasizes the importance of formal roles and relationships ... Organizations allocate responsibilities to participants and create rules, policies, and management hierarchies to coordinate diverse activities ... The human resource frame ... starts with the fundamental premise that organizations are inhabited by individuals who have needs, feelings, and prejudices ... the key to effectiveness is to tailor organizations to people - to find an organizational form that enables people to get the job done while feeling good about what they are doing (Bolman and Deal, 1991:15).

The next two frames are the political frame and the symbolic frame. The political frame views organizations as arenas in which different interest groups compete for power and scarce resources ... Conflict is everywhere because of the differences in needs, perspectives, and lifestyles among various individuals and groups. Bargaining, negotiation, coercion, and compromise are all part of everyday organizational life (p.15).

The symbolic frame 'abandons the assumptions of rationality that appear in the other frames. It treats organizations as tribes, theater, or carnivals. In this view, organizations are cultures that are propelled more by rituals, ceremonies, stories, heroes, and myths than by rules, policies, and managerial authority' (Bolman and Deal, 1991:15). The approach used in this thesis is to link the findings of the quantitative and qualitative analyses by classifying them according to the characteristics of the four frames. This procedure will identify the Bolman and Deal Frames in which principals see themselves operating, and helps to address the problem of identifying which aspects of professional needs of principals have still to be met by development programs.
F. Research Design

As noted earlier, the research design consists of both quantitative and qualitative aspects. It is quantitative in the first instance, for it examines the cost to the DSE of implementing the targeted professional development programs. The data on costs was in monetary terms and subsequent calculations of cost per unit were used in the cost analysis. In the second instance, the research contains a qualitative aspect, for it reports on the written experience of those who took part in the selected professional development programs.

It is possible to view this research as the linking of two equations:

\[ \text{data on costs} = \text{input}, \quad \text{and} \]

\[ \text{quantitative and qualitative data from questionnaire items} = \text{output} \quad (\text{effectiveness of programs}). \]

Principals were asked to respond to a series of items about the selected programs, ranging from prior knowledge about each program, to prior training, to the relationship between the programs' inputs and their expected outputs, and indicators of usefulness. Each of these items was scored in order that a numerical result was obtained, with means and standard deviations eventually produced for tests of significance between mean scores to be applied. The outcomes became an effectiveness measure.

The elements of the conceptual framework which impacted on the methods and procedures of the research design included the following steps: A specification of the goals of the SOTF and the professional development programs, the linking inputs with outputs, and the use of the Bolman and Deal Frames as a basis for teasing out the relationship between the quantitative and qualitative analyses of effectiveness.

G. Data Sources

Information on costs was obtained from the DSE. A consideration was made of the DSE input for the targeted professional development programs from October 1993 - to December 1993. Total costs (direct costs and opportunity costs) attributed to the DSE were determined. Information on salary scales for teachers and primary school principals in Victorian government schools, for the period of the pilot program, was provided by the Association of Independent Schools of Victoria (AISV, 1996).

For the overall development of the questionnaire, as a data source, a small group of principals agreed to be interviewed as a pilot group for the research. This group of principals had been identified as favourable to SOTF, and had been part of the pilot program. The intention was that the results of the
interviews would give an indication as to what items would be suitable for including in a questionnaire. Thus, this series of interviews was to act as a pilot for the research instrument. Each principal had a copy of the questions for the semi-structured interview. The full set of questions is contained in Appendix II, where background, targeted program, and effectiveness information was gathered.

The results of this small number of interviews provided an indication of the type of questions it would be useful to include in the full questionnaire. However, the development of the questionnaire was based on other sources, rather than solely on these interviews. Other sources were:

1. Knowledge of objectives of the SOTF program which were translated into issues addressed in the questionnaire.
2. The Cooperative Research Project: its questionnaire and research outcomes, leading to the First Report.
3. Discussions with faculty of the University of Melbourne, including supervisor and internal panel for the Defence of the Thesis Proposal.
4. Literature Review with particular reference to costs, efficiency, and leadership.

Information on professional development needs of principals was obtained from Reports of the Cooperative Research Project - Leading Victoria's Schools of the Future. The Cooperative Research Project was described in Chapter One, under the heading Rationale for the Research, as a joint initiative of the Victorian Primary Principals' Association (VPPA), the Victorian Association of Secondary Schools Principals (VASSP), the Directorate of School Education (DSE), and the Institute of Education (now the Faculty of Education) at the University of Melbourne. The Cooperative Research Project was established to investigate the purpose, processes and outcomes of SOTF, by giving particular attention to the role of the principal. In September 1993 all principals/head teachers in the SOTF Pilot Program were sent a questionnaire which constituted the first survey of the principals. The analyses of the questionnaire led to the First Report - Base-Line Survey of Principals which was produced in December 1993. Section E of the 1993 questionnaire was concerned with professional development for school leaders. Respondents were asked to indicate five from a list of seventeen characteristics they would give highest priority to for the development of an induction program for the leaders of a SOTF. Table 19 of the First Report - Base-Line Survey of Principals (See Appendix I) provided a list of these characteristics in order of preference, which
was then used to inform the preparation of the section Future Professional Development Programs for Principals in the questionnaire used in this research.

**Sampling**

The sample of principals used for this research was the group of 121–principals who responded favourably to an item in the first questionnaire of the Cooperative Research Project - Leading Victoria's Schools of the Future in 1993. Principals were required to indicate their further interest in the Project by responding to the following: 'We are interested in participating in the case study phase of the project. Please send more details'. It seemed that the best way to proceed in this research was to have principals, who were basically favourable to responding, to constitute the sample. But, it is acknowledged that the type of sampling used can place limits on the final conclusions and the inferences that can be drawn from them. Thus, there is possible bias in having a sample of principals who were willing to participate in the case study phase, and who may therefore be more positively inclined to SOTF and/or coping better with the changes.

**Effectiveness Measurement**

The aim of the full questionnaire is to determine the impact of five selected development activities, as provided by the DSE, on school leaders, at the pilot program stage of the implementation of the SOTF. The qualitative data, which comes from extended responses to a number of items on the questionnaire, helps to describe the context of the research project as well as assisting in providing a measure of the effectiveness of the programs.

The general objective of the research is to examine the five selected targeted professional development programs, where the overriding concern is the question, 'To what extent have the participants benefited from the selected programs?'. Associated with that general objective the research is to produce cost and effectiveness indicators of the programs. Using a guideline suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994:18), in their book *Qualitative Data Analysis*, the framework is firstly, a catalogue of professional development programs to be studied, followed by a description of the aims of the programs. Secondly, there are reflections of these selected development programs, by the principals who attended them, and thirdly, a consideration of these reflections of the principals in terms of improvement and change. An assumption is
made that there is a connection between attendance at the development programs and changes in knowledge, behaviour and everyday practice on the part of principals.

The development of the questionnaire was informed by a knowledge of the advantages of using questionnaires. 'Questionnaires can provide an overview - to reveal broad span of opinion, they enable (respondents) to feel their opinion has been sought, they enable comparisons between groups and individuals, they can be anonymous, they are flexible, they can provide quantifiable data' (Aspinall, Simkin, and Wilkins, 1992: 173).

The process of formulating the questionnaire began by making a decision about the information required. This was followed by deciding on the way in which the questions were to be put so that the manner of responding would be straightforward and unambiguous for the respondents. The questionnaire (see Appendix III for the full questionnaire) is restricted to the following ten areas of investigation:

A  Background of respondents (principals)
B  Targeted Programs - Term 4 1993
C  Selected Program 1  Charter Development
D  Selected Program 2  Principal Leadership
E  Selected Program 3  School Operations
F  Selected Program 4  Financial management
G  Selected Program 5  Personnel management
H  Effect of absences of personnel, at programs, on cost to schools
I  Impact of targeted programs on day-to-day practice
J  Future professional development programs for principals

For each of the above sections, information is collected. In Section A, principals provide some background on themselves and their schools. While in Sections B to G, respondents indicate which of the five identified targeted programs had been attended. This is the section where the items on prior knowledge, prior training, relationship between the program's inputs and expected outputs, usefulness, and, effectiveness are located.

In Section H, respondents are asked to reflect on costs to the school, and the situation when personnel from the school were absent, because they were attending the development programs. In Section I, respondents supply information about the perceived impact of the targeted programs on day-to-day practice. And in Section J, they indicate what possible future professional programs would be suitable for a principal of a
SOTF. To conclude the questionnaire, there are three open ended questions, relating to the effectiveness of programs in this section, and give respondents an opportunity for further reflection and consideration.

In summary, the questionnaire, apart from providing a profile of principals and schools, attempts to ascertain the extent to which the respondent benefited from attending particular training activities. The items on the questionnaire relate to the amount of pre-knowledge acknowledged by the respondent, the knowledge gained, the usefulness of the information gained, and the overall worth of the activity. There are two items, which specifically relate to the effectiveness of each program: the first is item two which is specific about the program measuring up to its goals, and the second is item five where participants comment, from their own perceptions, on the effectiveness of the program. As has been indicated earlier, data of both a quantitative and qualitative nature arise from analyses of the responses to the questionnaire. As a measure of effectiveness, information gained from an analysis of the responses to the questionnaire items two and five will be analysed from the point of view of comparing mean scores across the programs. Both qualitative and quantitative data will result from analyses of the items on effectiveness of each selected program. Section I, relating to the impact of the selected targeted programs on day-to-day practice, will be interpreted from an effectiveness point of view, and responses to Item J10, about alterations to leadership style, will be considered, also from point of view of effectiveness. Overall, the research instrument (questionnaire) is the vehicle by which the effectiveness of the targeted programs will be measured.

H. Summary Of Chapter Four

This chapter has described the development of the conceptual framework. The first aspect of the chapter was a consideration of the set of elements making up the conceptual framework. They were: the linking together of an understanding of the objectives of the SOTF and the goals of the Professional Development programs with the costs (including both money and time) for creating, training and implementing the targeted professional development programs for SOTF pilot program, the stages of the implementation of the SOTF, and knowledge of the Bolman and Deal Frames of leadership behaviour as a basis for linking the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the output (effectiveness measures).

A second aspect was the discussion of the technical terms relating to cost analysis. It was indicated that for this research the cost analysis revolved around firstly, the cost of achieving the objectives and
secondly the effectiveness of the professional development program. It was suggested that methods of analysing costs and effectiveness were appropriate for the evaluation of the programs. However, it was acknowledged that there were considerable difficulties in attempting to apply cost-effectiveness techniques to programs in the educational setting, and this study in particular. The third aspect of the chapter was an explanation of the research design whereby the development of the questionnaire as a measure of effectiveness, and the sampling of principals selected to respond to the questionnaire were explained. The questionnaire allowed for both quantitative and qualitative data to be extracted for analysis.
CHAPTER 5

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

This chapter covers both the data management and data analysis, and is divided into three major sections. The first deals with managing the data obtained from the principals' responses to the questionnaire items, and details how the items of the questionnaire were coded, responses recorded, and subsequent calculations of statistics and tests of significance carried out. The second section is concerned with managing cost data coming from the DSE. In the third section, the results of the statistical analyses are summarised. Included throughout are interpretations of tables summarising the results of data manipulation.

A. Data Management

The data-gathering instrument (questionnaire) was described in detail in Chapter Four, in the section Development of the Effectiveness Measure. The quantitative data arising from responses to the questionnaire was coded and stored in numerical form, on a spreadsheet, using Excel version 5.0. On an examination of the questionnaire it was decided that there needed to be provision for 98 variables requiring 125 spreadsheet columns. These decisions were made on the basis of giving different responses to an item on the questionnaire a numerical value, which was then entered in the spreadsheet. All data were entered in the spreadsheet in numerical form so that calculations of sums, means and standard deviations of the columns of data could be completed. The data was analysed by the following categories, gender, region, school type, school size and years of experience of the principal. This was done in order that comparisons of means and standard deviations of the various subsets could be made.

B. Respondents' Profile

The profile of respondents and schools were developed from the responses to items in Section A of the questionnaire. However, four of the returned questionnaires contained no useable data and therefore were rejected. Table 2 illustrates background variables for the respondents. As shown, 71.6% of respondents were males, and 28.4% were females. By comparison, the percentage of male respondents to the First
Base-Line Survey of Principals in 1993 was 77.8% with 22.2% of respondents, female (Thomas, 1993b:4). That is, this sample is a representative sample of those participating in the Pilot program.

Table 2 Profile of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Variables</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires issued</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires returned</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals of school</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>97.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other positions in school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number years of experience in present position</td>
<td>x =5.33</td>
<td>n=67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample contained schools from each of the seven educational regions in Victoria. Table 3 illustrates the distribution of schools across the regions as well as a description of the type of schools. Although there were 325 schools in the pilot phase of the SOTF, only 69.2% participated in the Base-Line Survey. Again, 58.7% had participated in the current research, and the percentage participation in this research is compared with percentage participation in the pilot program. The self selection of respondents, on a regional basis, has matched well the proportional representation from the regions of all schools of the pilot program. In determining the percentage representation of school type in the pilot program, the schools were identified as secondary, primary, special or other. In this research and the first Survey, the secondary 7-12 single campus had been differentiated from the secondary 7-12 multi campus. The P-12 school was classified as 'other'.
### Table 3  Profile of Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Research Sample</th>
<th>Pilot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan North-West</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan South-East</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barwon-South West</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Highlands-Wimmera</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gippsland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn-North East</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loddon Campaspe-Mallee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n=67</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Research Sample</th>
<th>Pilot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary P-6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 7 –12 Single Campus</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 7 –12 Multi Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Development School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n=67</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>Research Sample</th>
<th>Pilot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 400</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 – 800</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 - 1200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201 – 1600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n=64</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern of attendance at the targeted professional development programs was obtained from the section, Targeted Programs - Term 4 1993, on the questionnaire. Respondents indicated which programs they attended. The results are listed in Table 4. It can be observed that in each of the five programs more
than 50% attended, and more attended the programs on Charter Development (CD) than any other program. Since the preparation of the school charter was one of the first tasks to be completed by a pilot school, advice and help in the preparation was uppermost in the minds of principals at the time of the targeted programs. This is indicated by 95.5% of principals attending. In order of popularity, the order of these programs after CD was Principal Leadership (PL), Financial Management (FM), Personnel Management (PM), and lastly, School Operations (SO).

Table 4 Attendance by Principals at Targeted Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended</td>
<td>64 = 95.5%</td>
<td>57 = 85.1%</td>
<td>42 = 62.7%</td>
<td>55 = 82.1%</td>
<td>47 = 70.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Attend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


n=67

It is likely that the high attendance of principals at programs relating to charters and leadership indicates that principals saw those programs impinging on day-to-day practice. As the target group for the programs on school operations, financial and personnel management included business managers or bursars, as well as principals, it is more than likely that principals ensured their business managers attended.

Profile by Gender

In the sample of 67 principals, there were 19 women and 48 men. Four profiles are presented with a gender breakdown of years of experience as a principal, regional representation, school type and finally, school size. The first of these shows the breakdown of years of experience into categories of men and women. The mean value for experience for men was 5.52 years and that for women was 4.84 years (refer to Table 5). The data indicate that two men were in their first year in the position as principals at the time, but there were no women in that category. At the other end of the spectrum no woman had more than ten years experience, whilst there were four men.
Table 5  Years of Experience by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 48</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 19</td>
<td>n = 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.52$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 4.84$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 5.33$ yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6  Regional Representation by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 48</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 19</td>
<td>n = 67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 gives the distribution of respondents by gender and region. Regions one and two are in metropolitan Melbourne, region three refers to south west and west of the State, region four is the west and north west, whereas region five is the east and six to the north east and lastly, seven is in the north and central areas of Victoria. The women in the sample came from three regions only, and they were country regions, Gippsland, Goulburn-North East and Loddon Campaspe-Murray. Men, on the other hand, represented five of the seven regions, they did not come from Goulburn-North East or Loddon Campaspe-Murray. Not all men and women responded to all sections of the questionnaire, which explains why the sample size will change for each set of responses to the items on the selected targeted programs.
Table 7 reports on the spread of women and men across the various types of schools in the sample. This table uses the same division of school type as Table 3. The two main types of schools to be considered, primary P - 6, and secondary 7 - 12 single campus, have a slightly larger proportion of men as principals (72.7% and 73.3%), compared with the proportion of men in the sample (71.6%). There are only three schools in the Other category (secondary 7 - 12 multi campus, P -12 and secondary school camps), where all principals are men. Across the six categories of school type women are represented in four, primary P - 6, secondary 7 - 12 single campus, special schools, and special development schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary P - 6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 7 - 12 Single C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 7 - 12 Multi C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec Dev School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 48 71.6%  n = 19 28.4%  n = 67

Table 8  School Size and Gender of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 400</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 - 800</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 - 1600</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses (number)  n = 47  73.4%  n = 17  26.6%  n = 64

School size  \[ x = 470 \]  \[ x = 367 \]  \[ x = 445 \]

The school size and gender of respondents is reported in Table 8. Three principals were removed from the sample because of a 'no' response to the question asking for school size. As with Table 6, the
proportions of both men and women leading schools of the two major school size categories, 1 - 400 and 401 - 800, differ very little from the proportions of men and women in the sample. However, in this sample all the principals of the seven largest schools were men.

Profile by Targeted Programs (Irrespective of any categorical variables)

Sections C, D, E, F and G, of the questionnaire provided quantitative data on each of the targeted programs. These five sections were constructed in the same manner with five items in each. The items addressed the following:

1  Prior Knowledge of program material
2  Addressing of goals
3  Usefulness
4  Knowledge gained
5  Effectiveness

Responses to items 1, 2, 3, and 5 were given on a five-point scale which ranged from 1 ‘none at all’ to 5 ‘very much’, while item 4 was an open-ended question. For each set of data, means and standard deviations were calculated, and the results tabulated. Table 9 lists the means and standard deviations for all the principals' responses, calculated for each of the targeted programs, where the same questions had been asked for each program. From Table 9 the following general observations are made:

Overall weighted mean for Charter Development is 3.102
Overall weighted mean for Principal Leadership is 4.063
Overall weighted mean for School Organisation is 3.263
Overall weighted mean for Financial Management is 3.255
Overall weighted mean for Personnel Management is 2.966
Table 9  Means and Standard Deviations of all Responses to Items on Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2.547</td>
<td>3.559</td>
<td>3.478</td>
<td>3.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>sd</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2.919</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.319</td>
<td>3.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goals</td>
<td>sd</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>0.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3.508</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.152</td>
<td>3.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3.444</td>
<td>4.254</td>
<td>3.106</td>
<td>3.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective?</td>
<td>sd</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>0.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An overall weighted mean is the average score across the four questions in each program. The average is weighted to take into account the different numbers of principals who responded to the questions. A score close to five may be interpreted as a set of very positive perceptions about the program. One reason behind the highest overall mean score of 4.063, on a 1 - 5 scale for Principal Leadership, is that it was the area that all principals were most familiar with, even though aspects of the role would change as the school moved towards a self-managing state.

The highest mean (4.254 on a 1 to 5 scale) for individual responses arose from the question on the effectiveness of the Principal Leadership program. It is interesting to note that the next two highest mean scores (both 4.22) are the extent to which Principal Leadership was seen to be ‘useful’, and, equally, the extent to which the Principal Leadership program addressed the stated goals for quality leadership. For each question, across the programs, responses from the Principal Leadership program yielded the highest mean score. However, it must be recognised that as well as the Targeted Program on Leadership some 200 principals had, after Term 4 1993, attended, a Leadership development program led by Caldwell and
Sawatzki (see Table 34, item 3). This later program has influenced (favourably) the general response to these questions on Principal Leadership. Two sets of trends are seen in Table 9. The first is that for Charter Development and Principal Leadership, the mean scores continually increase through the four responses for each program. That is, to begin with, the average score for prior knowledge is the least valued by principals, then next in order is the mean score for the extent to which the program addressed the stated goals, then comes the mean score for the usefulness of the program, and finally with the highest mean score is the measure of the program’s effectiveness. It would appear that there had been a developing appreciation of the programs, their aims, usefulness and overall effectiveness as the training continued. The second trend is seen for the remaining three programs, School Operations, Financial Management and Personnel Management. Here the trend is the reverse of the observations made for first two programs. The extent to which the participants claimed they possessed appropriate prior knowledge is the highest mean score of the four. The mean then falls when the next question about the programs addressing their stated goals was examined, it continues to fall at the next stage when the usefulness of the programs was taken into account, and finally, falls even further when effectiveness was considered. Apart from School Operations, the areas covered by the programs on Financial and Personnel Management do not belong to the traditional areas of concern for a principal. A review of comments expressed by principals who attended these programs will appear in Chapter Six, involving the qualitative analysis of the research.

On an investigation of Table 9 the lowest mean on the 1 - 5 scale for Prior Knowledge is 2.547 for the program on Charter Development, for Addressing Goals it is 2.919, for the program on Charter Development, for Usefulness it is 2.824 for the program on Personnel Management and for Effectiveness it is 2.727, for the program on Personnel Management. Each of these lowest mean scores is above halfway on the 1 to 5 scale presented.

C. Statistical Testing

The following is a summary of the statistical testing of the level of significance of the difference in mean scores for each of the programs across the four questions. The calculations were carried out on the assumption that the sample had come from a normal population, and the one-tailed t-test was used to test for significant differences between means. In order to decide which of case one or case two to use in the t-test,
the $F$ test was employed (Johnson, 1976:371-376). Case one is where the two sample variances are used in a two-tailed test of the null hypothesis $H_0: \sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2$, and case two is where the null hypothesis is rejected. The $t$ test is based on formula that involves 'three factors, the size of the mean difference between the two groups, the amount of variation present within the two groups, and the number of subjects in the two groups' (Popham, 1993:269). As a result of the calculations, the following tables include means, standard deviations, and indicators of level of significance of the difference between the means, where there is a significant degree of difference between the mean scores. When examining the results for differences between the two sets of variables (e.g., 'prior knowledge' for Charter Development and Financial Management), it was determined that these would have to be demonstrated at least at the $p<0.01$ level in order to qualify as statistically significant results. Tables 10 to 13 were set up, so that for each item, the program with the highest mean score was compared with each of the other scores, from the remaining programs, arranged in ascending order. As a consequence, all combinations of a higher mean with a lower one were compared. Only when $p=0.005$ is the level of significance indicated. This method of display will be applied consistently to all tables reporting on a comparison of means.

Table 10  Comparison of Means across Programs on Prior Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>SO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}=3.559$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}=2.547$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}=3.288$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}=3.368$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}=3.478$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*$p=0.005$</td>
<td>not sig</td>
<td>not sig</td>
<td>not sig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}=3.478$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}=2.547$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}=3.288$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}=3.368$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*$p=0.005$</td>
<td>not sig</td>
<td>not sig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}=3.368$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}=2.547$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}=3.288$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*$p=0.005$</td>
<td>not sig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}=3.288$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}=2.547$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*$p=0.005$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The focus in Table 10 was on the questionnaire item of prior knowledge of the program. The statistically significant results from Table 10 (where \( p = 0.005 \)) indicates that on 'prior knowledge' the mean score from the program on Principal Leadership is statistically different from the score from Charter Development. This result may be interpreted as there is a difference in mean scores in favour of the Principal Leadership program that has not happened just by chance. For the same item, the mean scores from School Operations, Financial Management and Personnel Management are all statistically significant compared to the mean score coming from Charter Development.

| Table 11 | Comparison of Means across Programs on Addressing Goals |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| PL | CD | PM | SO | FM |
| \( \bar{x} = 4.22 \) | \( \bar{x} = 2.919 \) | \( \bar{x} = 3.02 \) | \( \bar{x} = 3.319 \) | \( \bar{x} = 3.321 \) |
| \( *p = 0.005 \) | \( *p = 0.005 \) | \( *p = 0.005 \) | \( *p = 0.005 \) |
| FM | CD | PM | SO |
| \( \bar{x} = 3.321 \) | \( \bar{x} = 2.919 \) | \( \bar{x} = 3.02 \) | \( \bar{x} = 3.319 \) |
| not sig | not sig | not sig |
| SO | CD | PM |
| \( \bar{x} = 3.319 \) | \( \bar{x} = 2.919 \) | \( \bar{x} = 3.02 \) |
| not sig | not sig |
| PM | CD |
| \( \bar{x} = 3.288 \) | \( \bar{x} = 2.919 \) |
| not sig |

The focus in Table 11 was on the questionnaire item of addressing goals of the program. This is an effectiveness measure, that is, by definition, it is the measure of how well a program measures up to its objectives. The results of this analysis become an essential part of the effectiveness measure of the selected targeted programs. The statistically significant (\( p = 0.005 \)) results from Table 11 were those arising from the comparison of the mean on the item 'addressing goals' from the program on Principal Leadership with the means coming from all other programs. This conclusion may be interpreted as there is a difference in mean scores in favour of the Principal Leadership program compared to each of the other programs that has not
happened just by chance. In other words, principals perceived the Principal Leadership program to be one where the goals had been addressed to a higher degree than other programs, and therefore deemed to be the most effective. This measure of effectiveness allows for a comparison to be made across programs, and is not dependent on the duration of programs. The order of perceived effectiveness, from most to least, can be argued to be PL, FM, SO, PM, and CD.

The focus in Table 12 was on the questionnaire item of usefulness of the program for the attendees. The statistically significant results, (p=0.005), from Table 12 were those arising from the comparison of the mean on the item 'usefulness' from the program on Principal Leadership with the means coming from all other programs. As well, the mean score for this item from the Charter Development program is significantly different from the mean score from the Personnel Management program, but not from the scores from the programs on School Operations and Financial Management. It is possible to conclude, at this point, that principals regarded the program on Principal Leadership to be more 'useful' than any other targeted program attended. This could be regarded as another measure of effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12</th>
<th>Comparison of Means across Programs on Usefulness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x = 4.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x = 2.824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*p = 0.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x = 3.508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x = 2.824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*p = 0.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x = 3.193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x = 2.824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x = 3.152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x = 2.824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not sig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 4.254$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 2.725$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 3.106$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 3.140$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 3.444$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>$*p = 0.005$</td>
<td>$*p = 0.005$</td>
<td>$*p = 0.005$</td>
<td>$*p = 0.005$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 3.444$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 2.725$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 3.106$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 3.140$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$*p = 0.005$</td>
<td>not sig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 3.140$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 2.725$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 3.106$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not sig</td>
<td>not sig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 3.106$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 2.725$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not sig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The focus in Table 13 was on the effectiveness of each program. This is a different form of effectiveness, for here it is a measure from the perspective of the principals and their own objectives, and not in relation to addressing program goals. The statistically significant results, ($p < 0.01$), from Table 13 are those coming from the comparison of the mean score on the item 'how effective' from the program on Principal Leadership with the means coming from all other programs. That is, the Principal Leadership program was perceived by the principals to be more effective than any of the other targeted programs. As well, the mean score for this item from the Charter Development program is significantly different (higher) to the mean score from the Personnel Management program.

A consequence arising from the above statistical analyses is, that in making a comparison of the program on Principal Leadership with each other selected development programs, there were statistically significant higher means for the Principal Leadership program on each of the items 'addressing goals', 'usefulness' and 'effectiveness'.

Further analyses of the data coming from responses to the items on each of the selected programs were carried out according to the categories (a) gender, (b) region, (c) school type and (d) years of
experience of principals. In each of the following sections there is a table reporting the results of the analysis of the difference between means for the subsets of the sample.

### Analysis of Effectiveness by Gender

Table 14 *Means and Standard Deviations of Responses to Items on All Programs by Gender*, tabulates the results on the comparison of the difference of means, by gender, relating to the information about the targeted programs. An analysis of the table indicates there were no statistically significant differences, (p=0.005) for any items, in means between men and women.

**Table 14  Means and Standard Deviations of Responses to Items on All Programs by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior</strong> W</td>
<td>2.578 (n=45)</td>
<td>3.477 (40)</td>
<td>3.6 (30)</td>
<td>3.475 (40)</td>
<td>3.25 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd M</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong> W</td>
<td>2.886 (n=44)</td>
<td>4.175 (40)</td>
<td>3.425 (31)</td>
<td>3.359 (39)</td>
<td>3.147 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd M</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>0.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>1.283</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>1.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usefulness</strong> W</td>
<td>3.477 (n=44)</td>
<td>4.2 (40)</td>
<td>3.267 (30)</td>
<td>3.125 (40)</td>
<td>2.914 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd M</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong> W</td>
<td>3.454 (n=44)</td>
<td>4.325 (40)</td>
<td>3.194 (31)</td>
<td>3.125 (40)</td>
<td>2.826 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd M</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>1.154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Male principals</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Female principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Some trends of responses between men and women are observable from this display of data. For the program on School Organisation, men scored a higher mean on all categories of the questions than did women. Another observable trend was, that for the programs on Charter Development and Principal Leadership, women had a higher mean than did men for the question on whether the program addressed the stated goals, whereas they had a lower mean than did the men for the same question on each of the other three programs. It is noted that for the program on Financial Management women had a lower mean score, at the 0.1 level of significance, for their prior knowledge than did men, but, when the question of the usefulness of the program was posed, the mean from women was greater than that for the men. The same trend was noticed for the following question which related to the effectiveness of the program as perceived by principals of both genders.

**Analysis of Effectiveness by Region**

Table 15 gives a breakdown of responses to items about the targeted programs on the questionnaire, sorted on a regional basis. For the analysis of difference between means, it was decided to compare only the two metropolitan regions: north-west and south-east. Thirty five of the principals in the sample came from those two regions, whereas the numbers coming from each of the remaining five regions were all fewer than eight.

Using the methods described earlier for determining the level of significance of the difference between the means, the results from Table 15 indicate there are no statistically significant differences (p=0.005), for any items, in means between principals from the two regions. In each of the Personnel Management items the mean for principals of the north-west region was less than the mean for principals from the south-east region, however, in the Principal Leadership ‘prior knowledge’ item the north-west principals recorded a greater mean than those from the south-east region.

Whilst not statistically significant, one noticeable trend is that for each item of Charter Development questions, principals from the south-east region schools had a higher mean score compared to principals from the north-west region schools. The same picture emerged for the outcome of the results for the program on Personnel Management.
### Table 15 Means and Standard Deviations of Responses to Items on Programs by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior knowledge</td>
<td>2.591 (n=22)</td>
<td>3.25 (20)</td>
<td>3.667 (15)</td>
<td>3.476 (21)</td>
<td>3.333 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address goals</td>
<td>3.045 (n=22)</td>
<td>4.421 (19)</td>
<td>3.625 (16)</td>
<td>3.286 (21)</td>
<td>3.375 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>1.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>3.3 (n=10)</td>
<td>4.222 (9)</td>
<td>3.333 (6)</td>
<td>2.714 (7)</td>
<td>2.857 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.545 (n=22)</td>
<td>4.526 (19)</td>
<td>3.125 (16)</td>
<td>3.048 (21)</td>
<td>3 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>1.395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 1 North-West Metropolitan 2 South-East Metropolitan

It appeared that for prior knowledge on Principal Leadership the mean for north-west region principals was greater than that for south-east region principals. However, for the other three questions on Principal Leadership the outcomes were reversed, that is the means from north-west region principals were less than that for south-east region principals. For the program on Financial Management the mean scores from the south-east region principals were greater on three of the four questions, apart from the question addressing the extent to which the program had addressed the stated goals. In that case both sets of principals recorded the same mean of 3.286. In that particular item the number of principals from the north-west region was 7, whereas the number from the south-east region was 21. A consequence of this
comparison of means by region was that there were no statistically significant differences of means on any items from the two metropolitan regions of Victoria.

**Analysis of Effectiveness by School Type**

Table 16 *Means and Standard Deviations of Responses to Items on Prior Knowledge of Programs by School Type*, displays the calculations that resulted from working with the original data when it had been sorted according to the school type. Since 88% of the schools in the sample were represented by primary P-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x 1</td>
<td>2.429 (n=42)</td>
<td>3.583 (37)</td>
<td>3.469 (32)</td>
<td>3.429 (35)</td>
<td>3.344 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd 1</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.7445</td>
<td>0.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x 1</td>
<td>2.756 (n=41)</td>
<td>4.222 (36)</td>
<td>3.182 (33)</td>
<td>3.343 (35)</td>
<td>2.867 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.267 (n=15)</td>
<td>4.4 (15)</td>
<td>3.8 (10)</td>
<td>3.231 (13)</td>
<td>3.154 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd 1</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>1.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usefulness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x 1</td>
<td>2.463(n=41)</td>
<td>4.139 (36)</td>
<td>3.094 (33)</td>
<td>3.286 (35)</td>
<td>2.742 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6 (n=15)</td>
<td>4.4 (15)</td>
<td>3.5 (10)</td>
<td>3 (14)</td>
<td>3 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>p=0.005</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd 1</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>0.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x 1</td>
<td>3.463 (n=41)</td>
<td>4.083 (36)</td>
<td>3.061 (33)</td>
<td>3.257 (35)</td>
<td>2.645 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4 (n=15)</td>
<td>4.533 (15)</td>
<td>2.733 (10)</td>
<td>2.929 (14)</td>
<td>2.846 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd 1</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>1.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>1.143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
1 Principals of primary P-6 schools. 2 Principals of secondary 7-12 single campus schools
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6, and secondary 7-12 single campus schools, these two groups were used for a comparison of means on the responses to the set of items relating to the programs.

The results listed in Table 16 came from 44 primary and 15 secondary principals. From the calculation of levels of significance of the differences between the means of scores on all items in this section of the questionnaire, there was only one item where there was a statistically significant difference in means between primary and secondary principals. The responses from the secondary principals indicate that their mean score of 3.6 was significantly greater than the mean score of 2.463 from the primary principals on the item to do with the 'usefulness' of the Charter Development program.

Overall, consistently high mean scores were recorded from both sets of principals on the Principal Leadership items. On 'addressing goals', 'usefulness', and 'effectiveness', the primary principals' means, on a scale 1 - 5, were 4.2, 4.1, and 4.08 respectively. On the same items the scores from the secondary principals were 4.4, 4.4, and 4.5 respectively. As with the other areas of analysis some general trends in results were noticed. The first of these trends concerned the Charter Development program where the means for secondary principals on the first three items were greater than those coming from primary principals. The same trend was observed with the program on School Operations. In both these programs the consideration of 'effectiveness' resulted in the mean score from the primary principals being the greater. Secondly, for both the programs, Principal Leadership and Personnel Management, the primary principal's mean on 'prior knowledge' was the greater, but for the remaining three items the secondary principals' mean was the greater. Lastly, for the Financial Management program all items yielded a greater mean score from the primary principals than from secondary principals.

**Analysis of Effectiveness by Years of Experience**

Table 17 shows the outcome of the calculations of means, standard deviations and the one result of the $t$-test of the level of significance, where there was a statistically significant difference between pairs of means based on years of experience of principals. The principals were divided into two groups, the first group contained those with less than or equal to five years experience in the principal position, and the second group contained those with more than five years experience. From the original survey of collected data, no
principal had more than 13 years experience. This division also yielded roughly equal subsets, with 37 principals in the first group and 30 in the second.

The item of 'prior knowledge' of the Financial Management program, yielded a result where the score of the less experienced principals was significantly greater (p=0.005) than the mean score of the more experienced principals.

Table 17  Means and Standard Deviations of Responses to Items on Programs by Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$ (n=34)</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.452 (31)</td>
<td>3.391 (23)</td>
<td>3.133 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge2</td>
<td>2.633 (n=30)</td>
<td>3.679 (28)</td>
<td>3.565 (23)</td>
<td>2.633 (27)</td>
<td>3.36 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*p=0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd1</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>0.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$ (n=33)</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>4.194 (31)</td>
<td>3.167 (24)</td>
<td>3.367 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.207 (n=29)</td>
<td>4.25 (28)</td>
<td>3.478 (23)</td>
<td>3.269 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd1</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$ (n=33)</td>
<td>3.235</td>
<td>4.129 (31)</td>
<td>3.167 (24)</td>
<td>3.233 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.733 (n=30)</td>
<td>4.321 (28)</td>
<td>3.136 (22)</td>
<td>3.148 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd1</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$ (n=33)</td>
<td>3.303</td>
<td>4.194 (31)</td>
<td>3.083 (24)</td>
<td>3.2 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.567 (n=30)</td>
<td>4.321 (28)</td>
<td>3.120 (23)</td>
<td>3.074 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sd1</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>1.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>1.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  
1 = Less than or equal to 5 years experience as a principal, n=37  
2 = More than 5 years and less than 14 years experience as a principal, n=30

Some general trends from Table 17 include the fact that the more experience principals have, the higher the mean scores on all items for both Charter Development and Principal Leadership programs.
Taking into account the program School Operations, the more experience the principals have, the higher the mean scores for all items except the one on 'usefulness'. In contrast, the less experienced principals had higher means for the items on 'prior knowledge', and 'addressing goals' for the programs on Financial and Personnel Management. This could be due to the fact that the areas of financial and personnel management form have become already part of the developing body of knowledge for a less experienced principal.

D. Effect Of Absences Of Personnel On Costs

The aim of this section of the questionnaire was, firstly, to determine which members of staff attended the targeted programs. Secondly, principals were asked to describe how the absent members of the staff were replaced, and what costs to the school were involved. As part of this section of the questionnaire included a qualitative response in describing costs to the school, a summary of responses is incorporated, for the purpose of elaborating the figures. The item on attendance required the respondents to indicate the number of people who attended each program. Principals were also asked to indicate by title (e.g., bursar) those who attended. Table 18 gives a summary of the data collected from the first items in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>62 = 44.6%</td>
<td>63 = 80.8%</td>
<td>44 = 45.4%</td>
<td>54 = 42.9%</td>
<td>54 = 49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curric Coord</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Principal</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 shows the representation of the various interested parties within a school that have a stake in different areas of the professional development. The table shows that for all programs, principals formed the main body of attendees. Deputy principals and curriculum coordinators were two other large groups who attended the Charter Development programs, besides others (parents, teachers and clerical
assistants). Clearly, the program on Principal Leadership was attended in the main by principals (80.8%). For School Operations, deputy principals, bursars and clerical assistants together formed a group larger than the principals. Bursars, principals, deputy principals and clerical assistants were identifiable groups for the programs on Financial and Personnel Management. As a part of the ‘others’ category the school council president was present at Charter Development (n=3) and Financial Management (n=1) programs.

Table 19 gives the numbers of people from each of the 67 schools in the sample who attended the programs. The figures in the left column indicate how many went to the programs from the schools. The program for Charter Development involved the most people. Probably this was due to the fact that the development of the school charter was the first task of being a pilot school, and demanded input from various constituents of the school community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=67</td>
<td>n=67</td>
<td>n=67</td>
<td>n=67</td>
<td>n=67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3 cases</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 attended</td>
<td>27 cases</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 attended</td>
<td>14 cases (28)</td>
<td>7 (14)</td>
<td>39 (78)</td>
<td>46 (92)</td>
<td>35 (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 attended</td>
<td>10 cases (30)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (12)</td>
<td>8 (24)</td>
<td>6 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 attended</td>
<td>9 cases (36)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;4 attended</td>
<td>4 (&gt;20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>at least 141</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the fact that some principals were not consistent in answering items H1 and H2 of the questionnaire, there are some discrepancies between the figures in Table 18 and Table 19. These discrepancies do not affect the overall view as put forward in the discussion of Table 18.

Table 20, Methods of Replacing Absent Staff summarises the responses from the principals for the item about the methods of replacing absent staff. Principals were given the choice of indicating: whether there had been no replacement; a deputy replacing a principal; the use of emergency replacement staff; employment of staff to replace bursar; or other strategies. The table must be interpreted as, firstly, the
response 'No replacement', occurred in 64.2% of total absences. A deputy replaced a principal in 44.8% of cases, and relief staff were used in 43.3% of absences. Staff were employed to cover the absence of a bursar in 50.7% of cases, and other strategies were employed for 7.5% of absences. Direct payment of staff employed to cover absent personnel would have occurred in the case of using relief teachers. However, when the deputy replaced the principal and other staff replaced the bursar there would have been an increase in the backlog of work left by the deputy or replacement, unless a relief teacher had been employed to do the work of a deputy. In that situation a direct payment would have been made. It is noted here that the opportunity cost of all staff, whether replaced or not, will be included in the overview of the cost involved with the programs, and calculated on a pro rata basis.

In summary, no more than half of any absences were covered by the school using strategies where the school would have to pay for the services of other staff. This is not to say that there were no other costs to the schools for having staff absent at professional development training. In particular opportunity costs, such as time spent in travelling, had to be borne by the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of replacement</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No replacement</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy replacing principal</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief teacher</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other staff for Bursar</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the principal had identified other staff had been employed to cover absences, they were then asked to describe the method of payment. The method is described in the Key to Table 21. The SOTF grant was employed for this purpose (see method 1) in the majority of cases. Table 22 indicates the principals' responses to the item: 'Were there any other costs to your school?'
Table 21 How the School Paid for the Costs Associated with Absent Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No replacement</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy replacing principal</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency teacher</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other staff for Bursar</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to method of paying for replacement:
0 = no response
1 = SOTF grant
2 = no payment
3 = from reserve funds
4 = other sources

Table 22 Other costs to school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=67

Those who responded 'Yes' were then asked to state what were the costs. This qualitative data was reported with the major category of costs being associated with travel expenses (22 comments). Typical comments reveal the excessive travel costs and that the SOTF grant was used for that purpose:

- **Travel - paid for out of SOTF budget - personal costs involved many hours of extensive travel because of distance from all venues.**

- **Excessive travel costs even at 10c/km. Running two hour programs for people who drive four hours (no stops) each way is ludicrous. Total travel time for all involved, including presenters, should determine locations.**

- **Travel costs were excessive. SOTF grant was used for this but same grant was given to schools in Ballarat and city where most of programs were held. This travel quickly depleted the grant.**

These types of comments reveal the concern for the location of the program, especially from principals of remote schools, or from schools in provincial areas of Victoria. The comments also allude to
the opportunity costs, in this case, the cost of time to the school. It is the loss of time for the regular school day that creates the tension. Comments relating to these areas of cost were:

- The stress and strain and picking up the work not done whilst away on PD.
- Disruptions, extra workloads for senior and admin staff.
- Only doubling programs or cancelling school/curriculum programs. Plenty of overtime for principal.
- All work not carried out during absence had to be carried out at other times usually after normal hours.

It is clear that work was not put aside, but time was found from elsewhere when absences had occurred. Cost to the school was identified as being the increase of stress, strain, and workload of taking up someone else's work; disruptions to the working habit of senior staff; and the possibility of cancelling school or curriculum programs.

Less tangible costs were also acknowledged by some principals. These included the following, where it would have been difficult to quantify such costs:

- Loss of momentum.
- Nervous energy! Seriously there was additional pressure on organisers such as Daily Program Coordinator and other General Office Staff.
- Enormous cost to workload and pressure for some staff.

In summary, a review of these comments makes it clear that travelling to programs took time, and, for many principals from remote areas, the question arose as to whether the excessive time spent travelling was worth the effort. Another effect of time lost was when principals had to catch up on work, not done, often in time outside normal working hours. The acknowledgment of the less tangible costs such as the loss of momentum, and additional pressure on organisers, creates a problem, particularly if there is an attempt to quantify these costs.

Overall, a consideration of Tables 18 to 22 point to the complication of determining costs to the school at the time of professional development. It is acknowledged that this difficulty is related to having incomplete documentation of details of payment for absent staff. Tables 18 and 19 provide information about the roles and numbers of personnel attending programs, whereas Tables 20 and 21 relate to the strategies and costs associated with replacing staff. A consideration of Table 21 indicates payment was
made in a number of cases, but no indication of payment is gained from the 'no' responses in each category. The presence of a relatively high number of 'no' responses adds to the difficulty of determining costs. Information from Table 22 shows principals were aware of other costs to the school, and it is clear from the comments that the notion of foregone costs was understood by principals. The calculation of these cannot be made from the present data.

E. Cost Analysis

The other side of the quantitative analysis is the analysis of costs, as outlaid by the DSE in running the targeted professional development programs in Term 4, 1993, and the opportunity cost of staff time in attending programs. The DSE made direct outlays in order to run the programs, and made direct outlays (grants) to schools to facilitate attendance at programs, or to aid the development of collegiate structures, or to help with activities associated with the induction program. The first request to the DSE from the researcher for such costs was in mid 1994. When the information finally arrived in March 1995 the delay had been as a result of difficulty on part of the DSE in isolating the costs from other expenditure in 1993. The SOTF budget, costing and spending had been in the hands of various sections, and no single person had the separate figures for the exercise. Another fact behind this delay was that with reduction in staff, as part of the restructuring of the administration at the central government agency, only one person who had been employed in the SOTF area at the time of the targeted programs remained on staff. This person had not been part of the financial planning for the targeted programs, although she had been part of the pilot program task force deliberations on policy development.

When the figures came from the DSE they were an 'estimated breakdown of funding for the targeted professional development programs for Intake 1 in the Schools of the Future program'. It was further explained that 'the estimates are based on spending in later intakes which can be a reasonable conduit for Intake 1'. The data have been separated into two sections, firstly, amounts which relate specifically to targeted programs, and, secondly, direct grants to schools. Targeted programs formed one part of the overall professional development program. Table 23 provides this information for direct expenditure on Targeted Programs, and Table 24 provides it for grants to schools.
### Table 23 Estimate of Direct Expenditure for Induction Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>$264,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Personal Management</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*figure given by the DSE for 200 principals attending a program in Phase 1 of the SOTF.

---

### Table 24 Estimate of Direct Expenditure of Grants for Pilot Schools

1. Collegiate groups - grants to schools ($250 non-metropolitan, $170 metropolitan) were made to facilitate the collegiate group structure to have groups of principals meet together to assist in charter development process in particular. A training program for facilitators of these groups was also provided. $65,000

2. Professional development grants ($525) per school were paid as a one off grant to facilitate attendance at the various activities in the induction program. $170,625

An implementation grant was also provided to each school as a one off grant to assist with all the activities associated with the induction program. These grants were made on the basis of size of school and totalled $2.3 million. It is not possible to say how much of these grants were used by schools for professional development or its facilitation (e.g. time release to attend CASES programs) $2,300,000

Notes for Table 23 and Table 24

1. Three hundred and twenty five schools (325) participated in the program.
2. There was no formal evaluation by the DSE for Intake 1.
Any analysis of costs to the DSE must take into account two aspects; the amount of money expended, and the number of schools involved. Hayward (1993b), published the following information about the composition of the pilot schools in the *Working Documents for the Schools of the Future*. He indicates there were: 198 primary schools, 101 secondary schools, 14 special schools, 12 other providers, and 21 clusters. Overall there were 325 schools in the pilot program. ‘The pilot schools were involved from the outset with the Directorate of School Education in translating the preliminary paper into policy’ (Hayward, 1993b updated Speaking Notes Feb 1994). Hayward, in the same document, explained further that ‘a comprehensive six month professional development program for principals, teachers school councillors and administrative staff took place prior to these schools becoming operational as self managing schools from 1 January, 1994’. The targeted programs for this research were part of the 'comprehensive six month professional development program', and occurred during Term 4, 1993.

**Direct Costs of Targeted Programs per Participant**

From the information supplied from the DSE, the estimated costs of each of the five targeted programs per participant were determined as below. The assumption is made that for PL there was one participant from each of the 325 schools in the SOTF pilot at the targeted program, and for CD, SO, FM, and PM there were, on average two participants from each school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Cost Description</th>
<th>Cost per Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>$65 000 for 650 participants = $100 per participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>$429 000 for 325 participants = $1 320 per participant*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>$65 000 for 650 participants = $100 per participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>$32 500 for 650 participants = $50 per participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>$32 500 for 650 participants = $50 per participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$624 000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 18 and Table *figure extrapolated from $264 000 for 200 participants.*

19 participants other than just the principal were present. Principals formed the target group for Charter Development and Principal Leadership. However, for School Operations two administrative staff were targeted, although principals and head teachers from smaller schools could have been included. Principals, bursars and business managers were invited to attend the programs on Financial Management and
Personnel Management. In many schools the position of bursar is synonymous with that of business manager.

**Opportunity Costs associated with participants at Targeted Programs**

Opportunity costs are calculated on the basis of a pro rata daily salary. The daily salary is calculated by using data on salaries of government school teachers for the period of the SOTF pilot program (AISV, 1996). The structure of salaries in existence was, that below the rank of principal there were three levels of Advanced Skills Teachers, and 12 levels of trained teachers. Assuming that personnel who attended training programs were principals and others holding responsibilities in the school, an average annual salary of $42,374 was used together with an estimated $10,000pa to account for special higher duties allowances. These figures provide an estimated pro rata daily salary of $144. Again, it was assumed that there was one participant from each of the 325 school at PL, and, on average, two participants at each of the other programs.

| Table 25 Opportunity Costs Associated with Attendance at the Targeted programs |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Charter Development             | Cost = $144 \times 650 \times 1 |
| Principal Leadership            | *Cost = $144 \times 325 \times 5 |
| School Operation                | Cost = *$144 \times 650 \times 1 |
| Personnel Management            | Cost = *$144 \times 650 \times 1 |
| Financial Management            | Cost = *$144 \times 650 \times 1 |
| Total                           | $=608,400                       |

Estimated opportunity cost = pro rata daily salary \times number of participants \times number of days.

* To account for a 3-day component as well as a 2-day residential component (5 days overall).

The data collected from principals did not contain information on travel time so that opportunity costs associated with travelling to the venues for day and residential programs could not be calculated. Furthermore, as Table 19 indicates, some schools have sent more than 2 participants to SO, FM, PM and up to more than 4 for CD. Therefore, total opportunity costs are greater than the figures given above. As a consequence of the above calculations the total cost per participant (direct and opportunity) expended by the
DSE in providing these targeted programs is listed in Table 26. Alongside these figures on costs to the DSE, are listed the mean scores from principals' responses, on a 1 - 5 scale, to the questionnaire item on effectiveness, as from the perspective of principals, for each program. The number of principals in the sample who had attended each program is also noted.

Table 26  Total Costs per Participant and Effectiveness Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cost per Participant</th>
<th>Mean Score (x)</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>$2040</td>
<td>4.254</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($1320 + $144 x 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>$244</td>
<td>3.444</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($100 + $144)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>$194</td>
<td>3.140</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($50 + $144)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>$244</td>
<td>3.106</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($100 + $144)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>$194</td>
<td>2.725</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($50 + $144)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Estimated total cost = cost of program per participant + estimated daily opportunity cost per participant x number of days.

The information displayed shows that the leadership activities were the most expensive for the DSE to run, but, on the other hand the leadership program had the highest mean on the questionnaire rating. Overall, the program on principal leadership was well received, especially in respect of its 'addressing goals', 'usefulness' and 'effectiveness' (see Tables 11 to 13). Factors like the immediacy and general relevance of the topic would have made it an attractive option for principals, but, on the other hand, the 2-day residential component would have raised the direct costs to the DSE. In the eyes of the principals it was the most effective targeted program. Even though Principal Leadership had the highest mean response to item 5 ('effectiveness') than any other program and was the most expensive for the DSE to run, it is clear that there is no simple proportional relationship between increases in costs and an increase in the mean score,
otherwise doubling the cost would infer a doubling of this measure of effectiveness. In Table 26 the programs are listed in decreasing order of mean score on item 5 of the questionnaire.

For FM and PM, and CD and SO where for both pairs of programs the costs are equal, comparing the mean scores for 'effectiveness of the program' leads to the conclusion that CD was more effective than SO, and FM more effective than PM. Thus, for programs where there is the same cost per participant, the mean score on 'effectiveness of the program' yields a relative comparison of overall effectiveness. Therefore, the statistical summary is being used, in this instance, to give an estimate of the order of effectiveness for programs where the unit cost is the same.

To decide whether the program on Principal Leadership was the most effective, when it was the most costly, remains a difficulty. It becomes a problem of a distinction between effectiveness and efficiency. Was it an efficient strategy for large scale professional development? Could the same outcomes have resulted had the costs been less? Tables 11 to 13 should be consulted for the comparison of mean scores across all items of the questionnaire relating to programs. One conclusion from observing those tables is, in making a comparison of the program on Principal Leadership with other selected development programs, there were statistically significant higher means for the Principal Leadership program on each of the items 'addressing goals', 'usefulness' and 'effectiveness'. It has been noted earlier, in this chapter, that the item on 'addressing goals' (item 2) is a measure of effectiveness as is the item 'effectiveness of the program' (item 5).

It is important to note that the costs per participant for Principal Leadership were extrapolated from information provided by the DSE for the Principal Leadership program, for phase 1 schools, with outside presenters. This had cost the DSE $264 000 for an estimated 200 principals (Table 23). For 325 principals this extrapolated to a total cost of $429 000 and a unit cost of $1 320

**Total Costs across all schools**

When extrapolations are made as to total costs (to the nearest dollar), if all Victorian schools (2106) had taken part in the targeted professional development programs, and based on one participant from each school, they would have been:

Charter Development \[ \$244 \times 2106 = \$513\,864 \]
Principal Leadership  $2040 \times 2106 = $4296240
School Operations  $244 \times 2106 = $513864
Financial Management  $194 \times 2106 = $408564
Personnel Management  $194 \times 2106 = $408564
Total = $6141096

These figures are based on the fact that after the Pilot Schools (n=325) and the Associate Schools (n=281) had entered the SOTF program, there were to be three further intakes of about 500 schools in each of February 1994, July 1994, and January 1995 (Hayward, 1993b). The total number of schools was 2106. These figures for running programs are estimates, not taking into account costs of setting up, which might be constant, even though the numbers attending could have increased. These estimates provide part of the answer for Research Question 4, as stated in Chapter One: What can be done to improve the efficiency of providing further professional development programs for all principals of Victorian primary and secondary schools taking part in the SOTF program?

An injection of at least $6200000 could provide professional development for all Victorian schools, along similar lines to the five targeted programs in this survey. The costs would be less if the same presenters were used, thereby cutting down on training costs.

**DSE Grants per Pilot School**

As well as the direct and opportunity costs tabulated earlier there were other costs to the DSE. Direct Grants were supplied by the DSE for pilot schools. Information on these grants is tabulated in Table 24. The figures on Direct Grants are expressed as unit costs in Table 27. Since the grants went to individual schools the figures are cost per school.

| Grants for Collegiate groups | $250 per non-metropolitan school  
|                            | $170 per metropolitan school      |
| Grants for professional development | $525 per pilot school          |
| Implementation Grant       | $2300000 for 325 schools         |

Table 27  Direct Grants for Pilot Schools
The total of these Direct Grants is $2,542,625 (Table 24). $2,300,000 of this total was for implementation purposes and activities associated with the induction program. The remainder was used specifically for pilot program purposes — for facilitating collegiate groups and for professional development. From the analysis of written comments from principals, included in section D: effect of absences of personnel on costs to schools, earlier in this chapter, it is evident that the DSE grants to schools were used for travel and other expenses. In particular, this research has revealed that schools used their SOTF grants for employing casual relief teachers (CRTs), other staff to replace bursars, and for deputies replacing principals. Indirect DSE grants were often used for covering other costs to the school during the pilot phase, such as replacing staff, travel expenses, and communication and publication of written material. This information on Direct Grants is not directly related to this study, but adds to knowledge about the type of financial aid the DSE was providing for schools involved in the reform.

**Impact of Total Costs on the DSE**

In an attempt to comment on the impact of the costs to the DSE, as a result of the implementation of the reform, a comparison can be made with the salary of a primary school principal in a Victorian government school during that time. For a 3 & 4 year trained teacher, primary or secondary, there was a 1 - 12 year scale, with a salary range of $25,654 to $38,950. This was increased to $26,070 to $39,266 during the period under investigation. The salary of a primary school principal was $43,455 (Source: *Salary History - Teachers 1985 - 95*, Association of Independent Teachers of Victoria (AISV, 1996). It is noted that for $65,000 each of CD and SO (see Table 23) was able to be mounted for professional development activities. $65,000 was about one and a half times the salary of one primary school principal (level 1 - $43,954). The cost of mounting all targeted programs was about $850,000 (based on figures from Table 23, in conjunction with Table 1). This cost together with Direct Grants of about $2,500,000 (Table 24), and estimated opportunity costs of about $1,000,000 yields a total of approximately $4,350,000. As a measure of impact on the DSE, this amount is roughly 100 times the annual salary of a primary school principal ($43,455).
F. Summary of Chapter Five

A. Summary of Analysis by Gender, Region, Type of School and Years of Experience

The analysis of the profile according to a gender breakdown of the sample indicated that men (73%) and women (27%) were principals of primary P-6 schools, with men (73%) and women (27%) principals of Secondary 7-12 Single Campus schools. Men (n=7) were principals of the largest schools in the sample (801 - 1600). Differences of means on the items relating to the programs, showed that there were no statistically significant differences between the responses coming from women compared to those coming from men. A statistical analysis was made of responses to questionnaire items for comparing two metropolitan regions of Victoria. From the statistical analysis of the differences of means on the items relating to the programs, there were no items where there was a statistically significant difference between the responses coming from the north-west region compared to those coming from the south-east region.

Since 59 of the 67 schools in the sample were represented by Primary P-6, and Secondary 7-12 Single campus schools, an analysis was made of the difference of means from principals of these two groups of schools. The analysis produced one item where there was statistically significant (p=0.005) difference, that was a statistically significant higher mean for principals of secondary schools than for principals of primary schools in respect of the 'usefulness' of the program on Charter Development.

The analysis by years of experience produced one item where there was a statistically significant (p=0.005) difference between responses from the two sets of principals involved. This result was, that the less experienced principals had a statistically significant higher result on 'prior knowledge' of Financial Management than the set of more experienced principals.

B. Analysis of Responses to the Targeted programs

Considerations of responses, on a 1 - 5 scale, to the items in the questionnaire led to the first general observation that there were differences in overall weighted means (used when different numbers of people responded to the items) for the different programs. The results suggested that the program on Principal Leadership would have made it an attractive option, because of factors like the immediacy and relevancy of the program. The highest mean for individual responses relates to the effectiveness, from the
perceptions of principals, rating for the program on Principal Leadership (4.254), whereas the lowest mean (2.547) was for prior knowledge on Charter Development.

Two sets of trends were observed. The first was that for Charter Development and Principal Leadership the mean scores continually increase through the four responses for each program. It would appear, from the perspectives of the principals, there was a developing appreciation of each program, its aims, its usefulness and overall, its effectiveness. The second trend is seen for the remaining three programs, School Operations, Financial Management and Personnel Management. Here the trend was the reverse of the observations made for first two programs. A conclusion is that the participants' expectations fell as the program continued, perhaps, partly, because of the considerable extent of the prior knowledge.

In comparing the differences between means for the programs on 'prior knowledge', the statistically significant differences were for Principal Leadership compared with Charter Development for School Operations with Charter Development, for Financial Management with Charter Development, and for Personnel Management with Charter Development. A difference being statistically significant indicated that the results did not occur just by chance, but because of some specific factor or condition. In comparing the differences between means for the programs on effectiveness, 'addressing goals', the statistically significant differences were for Principal Leadership with each of the other programs ($p=0.005$). The measure of effectiveness from this item indicates the order of effectiveness for the programs, from greatest to least is PL, FM, SO, PM, and CD.

In comparing the differences between means for the programs on 'usefulness' the statistically significant differences were for Principal Leadership with each of the other programs, and for Charter Development with Personnel Management. In comparing the differences between means for the programs on effectiveness, from the perceptions of principals, the statistically significant differences were for Principal Leadership with all other programs, and for Charter Development with Personnel Management. This indicator of effectiveness resulted in the order of effectiveness of the programs being PL, CD, FM, SO, and PM.

In making a comparison of the program on Principal Leadership with the other development programs, there were statistically significant higher means for the Principal Leadership program on each of the items 'prior knowledge', 'usefulness' and 'how effective'. The Principal Leadership program contained components that made it, in the view of the respondents, significantly 'better' in each aspect being surveyed.
C. Summary of Results of Analysis of Effect of Absences of Personnel on Costs to Schools

The analysis of the data relating to the people present at the programs shows that the following numbers attended the programs: CD (139), PL (70), SO (97), FM (126), and FM (110). From this sample of 67 schools a conclusion is that there were many occasions when personnel were absent from their schools. This research is concerned with only five out of 13 targeted programs, and thus the overall effect of such absences on schools through Victoria cannot be underestimated. The absences affected the following: staff who remained; replacement staff who may have been employed; disruptions to programs; programs either being curtailed or cancelled. Principals indicated that schools met costs involved either by using SOTF grants, or reserved funds. In many cases there were situations where principals had to work overtime to make up for lost time due to absences on development programs.

Opportunity costs were calculated for participants at the five selected targeted programs, with the conclusion that the value of such costs was no less than about $875,000.
CHAPTER 6
QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

The focus of this chapter is on the targeted programs and how principals responded, in writing, to particular items of the questionnaire about the programs. It is claimed that ‘the underlying assumptions of qualitative evaluation is that the perspectives and actions of all participants or stakeholders in a program are important’ (Payne, 1993:122). The reflections of the principals yield a rich source of information about how they responded to the reform and to the attempts of the DSE to provide professional training at the time of the reform.

The first section describes how the qualitative data was generated and managed for analysis, and how the items were sorted and sifted in order to identify similar phrases. The first part of the analysis is reported in section two. This is followed by an analysis of the responses to the request for principals to describe any changes in day-to-day practice. Principals were asked to reflect upon changes in leadership style, as a consequence of attending professional development programs. An analysis of this is presented first before a discussion of what professional development remains to be provided for principals.

A. The Source of Qualitative Data

The questionnaire For Principals of the Pilot Schools of the Future contained 33 items. The first set of 25 items related to each of the five chosen targeted programs. For each program questions were asked relating to (a) prior knowledge, (b) addressing of goals, (c) usefulness, (d) knowledge gained, and (e) effectiveness.

A second set of five items generated written responses to the request 'Describe the extent to which there has been an improvement of day-to-day practice in your school as a result of personnel attending the following targeted programs.' Provision was made for comments to be written about each of the targeted programs under survey.

The third set of three items contained open-ended questions about how one’s leadership style may have altered as a result of attending professional development programs relating to the SOF, and what professional development is there still to be done for a principal in a School of the Future? There was a high response rate for all three items (Item J10, 62 (92.5%), Item J11, 65 (97%), and Item J12, 40 (59.7%)).

118
For analysis purposes all written comments were stored in a computer file, coded with question number and respondent's number so that easy retrieval of the original responses was possible. The method of analysis followed a pattern described by Miles and Huberman in their book *Qualitative Data Analysis* (1994). These authors indicated steps in analytic moves:

- Affixing codes to a set of field notes drawn from observations or interviews
- Noting reflections or other remarks in the margins
- Sorting and sifting through these materials to identify similar phrases, relationships between variables, patterns, themes, distinct differences between subgroups, and common sequences.
- Isolating these patterns and processes, commonalities and differences, and taking them out to the field in the next wave of data collection
- Gradually elaborating a small set of generalizations that cover the consistencies discerned in the database
- Confronting those generalizations with a formalized body of knowledge in the form of constructs or theories (Miles & Huberman, 1994:9).

Associated with analytic moves is the concept of data reduction. Miles and Huberman write that data reduction 'is a form of analysis that sharpens, sorts, focuses, discards, and organizes data in such a way that "final" conclusions can be drawn and verified' (Miles & Huberman, 1994:11). Analytic choices result in what is discarded, and what is selected through summary or paraphrase to best illustrate the overall scene. Another aspect of the analytic process is data display, where the display 'is an organized, compressed assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing and action' (Miles & Huberman, 1994:11). Data display is seen as part of analysis, for the decisions as to how the display is to be organised, what information is to be represented, and what is to be the format of the display are all analytic activities.

The first part of the chapter is concerned with the written comments on 25 items related to the targeted programs. Each of the five programs is considered separately. However, the item on prior knowledge is treated across all programs.
Prior Knowledge for all programs

An analysis of the responses suggests they fall into one of three areas: prior knowledge through personal experience; prior knowledge through previous attendance at seminars or readings in the area; or prior knowledge through previous courses of study. Overall, there were 55 responses across the programs for this item. Examples of Prior Knowledge through personal experience indicate that previous experience has been a significant aspect in the build up of prior knowledge for the specific targeted programs. It is noted that principals did not underestimate the value of past experience as a crucial component of the prior knowledge:

I had extensive leadership training in prior employment and had been a principal previously.

As an 'ex Technical School' person have had some experience in financial management in true sense.

The selected comments on prior knowledge through previous attendance at seminars or readings in the area, indicate that courses attended cover a number of areas that relate to the targeted programs:

I had intensive leadership training as a Country Education Project coordinator in the previous 4 years and found the skills transferable.

Had excellent personnel management training with Country Access Program prior to this program.

Comments on prior knowledge through previous courses of study, indicate that some principals have undertaken courses in educational administration, as well as other tertiary courses. On the other hand not all principals have a great deal of prior understanding as the following comments indicate, especially when related to Charter Development:

I thought I knew a lot until all the responsibilities about to be devolved were made known.

The themes covered were mostly new to me.

Charter Development - Analysis of Responses

The following number of responses to each item, where the sample size was 67, was recorded. Item C1 (n=19), Item C2 (n=14), Item C3 (n=10), Item C4 (n=53), Item C5 (n=20). For Charter Development 61 principals (91.0%) provided at least one response.

The second item to be considered by respondents for this program was, 'To what extent did the training program on Charter Development address the following goal?' Review of School charters prior to
signing by the School Council President, principal and Director of School Education (or nominee). An analysis of comments firstly indicates confusion about what the program was trying to achieve, and there exist comments which indicate little satisfaction with the program:

*I think I've missed the point. The Charter Development program was surely a focus on content and process with a view to collaborative development within school & community.*

*Presenters appeared to lack detailed knowledge of requirements.*

However, there were supportive comments that indicated an understanding and appreciation from principals to review the development of the Charter:

*It gave me a great opportunity to share ideas and to fine tune our own Charter.*

*Program gave guidelines utilising the collective experiences of principals - not prescriptive almost action research.*

The third item was, 'Indicate how useful the program was in improving your knowledge of Charters. This led to a collection of responses that showed the extent to which principals perceived there to have been benefits:

*Gained useful ideas on Indication of Progress and layout of goals and priorities. Showed the link between the Charter and the Self-managing School.*

The fourth item was, 'Indicate what knowledge was gained.' Here, a consideration of the comments shows that the responses fall into more than one category. Firstly, there was a cluster of comments related to the understanding of the charter and the process of its development:

*I gained a very good understanding of the processes used in developing a charter relevant to both our school & the cluster.*

*Structure and framework for charter developments of importance, value of team approach to development.*

Secondly, there was a cluster of comments related to knowledge learnt about the structure of the charter:

*What needs to be in a charter, how to evaluate goals, wording needed.*

*Developing charter priorities focusing on student learning outcomes.*

Thirdly, there was a cluster of comments about the value of gaining information from other schools and their experiences with charters:

*It was useful to exchange information with other schools.*

*A clear understanding of DSE expectations and other schools' experiences.*
Some respondents took this opportunity to indicate what they perceived to be unfavourable aspects of the program:

*I began to doubt whether it was for the school and community.*

*Very little—a team of people from each school would have been better way to go i.e., administrator, AST teacher, Parent/School Council Member.*

The last item on Charter Development was, "Taking into account your individual needs, how effective was the Charter Development program?" Here the comments divide into two groups: (a) favourable statements, and (b) aspects of criticism:

(a) *I felt our school and cluster was given a common starting point by being able to be trained together. I really gained an understanding of process. However, some of the trial samples used for reference were too narrow.*

It provided direction/information to assist in 'training' school community members who participated in school Charter development.  

*Allowed me to feel confident in implementing charter development processes.*

(b) *In our intake, the points of entry were so diverse, and perspectives from which the schools were coming so varied it was difficult to meet all needs.*

*We drove for 2 hours to get there and 2 hours back again . . . (The review seemed to be the objective of cleaning them (charters) up to be politically 'nice').*

*I attended the very first program - (named person) was not available - the paper was not available - the seconded staff did not really know what they were on about - the blind leading the blind - I believe they eventually improved.*

**Principal Leadership - Analysis of Responses**

The following numbers of responses to each item, where the sample size was 67, were recorded. Item D1(n=17), Item D2(n=18), Item D3(n=11), Item D4(n=49), and Item D5(n=12). Fifty-eight principals (86.6%) provided at least one response for Principal Leadership.

The second item considered for this program was, "To what extent did the training program on Principal Leadership address the following goal Development and enhancement of leadership and
management skills required by principals to deliver a School of the Future’. What is striking about the set of responses is the overwhelming praise and regard for the program. A sample consists of:

Excellent training program— the best in-service in 30+ years of teaching.

Opened up my eyes to new areas — e.g., Managing Change, Management of Performance, Situation Decision-making, Benchmarking.

Made me critically look at performance, especially in the consultative field.

The most inspirational professional development I have ever attended.

I have been able to relate to the program almost daily and reflect on the program info when analysing concerns with leadership.

Opened up my perspective re just what ‘self-managing’ can achieve with effective leadership.

Others, however, were critical about the presentation. Their responses were

Disliked presenter and found his style very off-putting i.e., used car salesman. Content poor.

Not enough emphasis was given to the fact the Principals were now going to pick up a huge amount of administrative detail which was completely unknown to them previously. How does one ‘lead’ when overloaded with details?

The third item was, ‘Indicate how useful the program was in enhancing your leadership and management skills’. Two comments are reported here, one relating to skills and ideas developed about staff appraisal, and the other relates to the provision of optimistic approaches to leadership after administrative details had been dealt with.

Staff appraisal ideas on teacher performance.

Provided some optimistic approaches which are not able to be employed until details of administration are out of the way.

The fourth item was, ‘Indicate what knowledge was gained’. For principal leadership there is a large collection of responses. There was a group of comments that refer to the large picture of theory and current knowledge of leadership. This group includes:

Practical & philosophical help, coping with stress, sharing ideas with colleagues, leading self-managing schools.

Global view. Developing ideas into broader concepts.

Significant information about leadership in business, industry and education.
Refinement & ordering of leadership skills so that I clarified my thoughts and actions.

Another aspect noted by a number of principals relates to the awareness of the value of teamwork.

Some comments include:

Value of teamwork in achieving outcomes, process for teams building, Strategies for development of generic skills of leadership, management of change and of performance.

Teaming/working with people/establishing priorities/generic skills of a leader/learning how to 'sharpen the saw' developing 'synergy'.

How to establish high performance teams, empowering staff to become self-motivating.

Leadership, management, decision-making, teams - what makes effective communication, benchmarking, performance review etc.

Importance and effectiveness of communication. Confidence gained is empowering.

A further aspect, noted by principals related to the knowledge of management, whether it was personnel management or management of performance, as indicated in the following comments:

The most important knowledge was in personnel management.

Difference between leadership & management, transformation leadership, building a high performance team, management of performance/individual development plans, negotiation skills.

Knowledge of working with others to facilitate specific personnel techniques was commented upon in the selection of responses:

Working with school council, program establishment, peer assessment, staff appraisal, staff selection.

Recognising different 'characters' that exist within a group of peers

Staff Appraisal - Appreciation of the Big Picture - Self Development, Conflict resolution etc.

Analysis of responses to the fifth item, 'taking into account your individual needs, how effective was the Principal Leadership program?' led to the following responses selected as representing general perceptions about the program:

Not only did the program give me skills but the whole professionalism of the in-service & the quality of delivery gave confidence to apply skills and information (reaffirmed good practice).

Valuable in that the documentation was excellent and will form the basis of a data bank for future reference.
School Operations - Analysis of Responses

The following numbers of responses to each item, where the sample size was 67, were recorded. Item E1 (n=4), Item E2 (n=15), Item E3 (n=8), Item E4 (n=36), and Item E5 (n=6). For School Operations, 43 principals (64%) recorded at least one response.

The second item to be considered by respondents for this program was, “To what extent did the training program on School Operations address the following goal: The focus will be on a coordinated approach to organisational management and devolved processes within school administration. Specifically the program will cover the changes to school administration and operations, including organisational and workforce management, devolved functions and processes, responsibilities and accountability.”

For this item, confusion over the objectives appeared to be the case when responses such as the next two appeared:

*Constant use of CASES through the computer.*

*Exchanged management & organisational strategies. Diversity of options.*

Yet, there were others who appeared to have been satisfied that the program had met its stated goals:

*Focus above - reasonably achieved. But operations through CASES leaves a lot to be desired.*

*Yes, it achieved its aim.*

As with the other programs surveyed so far, there were some responses that indicate difficulties with the presentations:

*The timing was out of kilter with our needs, that is, it was a good introduction but now we are doing it. I need the info again.*

*It was too short and not broad enough.*

*Mood of the session was very cynical. Content could have easily been read and absorbed in half the time (or less) of the presentation.*

*Lack of expertise by presenters - often policy and procedures not formulated/decided. No follow up manuals/documentation poor or not produced.*

The third item was, 'Indicate how useful the program was in improving your skills in this area.' The responses chosen for this item reveal what principals think they were gaining:

*Mainly on setting benchmarks, using best practice, importance of clear processes.*
Greater awareness although being a Pilot the goal posts were constantly shifting - policy changes.

Others were critical of the program, and stated:

*Early stages - new area to presenters. Very quick overview - not sure if anyone really grasped functions and process.*

For the fourth item, the program on school operations yielded a further picture of what the principals perceived as gained knowledge. The comments have been collated into the following categories (a) overview of proposed changes in school operations, (b) identification of new procedures, (c) flexibility and devolution of responsibilities on the part of principals, and (d) specific items of new areas of change in the role of the principal relating to school operations.

(a) **Overview of proposed changes in school operations:**

*In general terms - a deeper understanding of changes & an appreciation of the links and importance of accountability/goal setting to outcomes or achievements.*

*Knowing the importance of a big picture view, value of balancing workforce management.*

(b) **Identification of new procedures:**

*Identifying and incorporating new procedures, processes, technologies, staffing arrangements.*

*Changed function - notice that we would have less or smaller budget to work with.*

(c) **Flexibility and devolution of responsibilities on the part of principals:**

*That flexibility was limited due to industrial & financial constraints.*

*Taught me to devolve decision & functions*  

*The need for greater accountability. The balance between devolution/accountability*  

(d) **Specific items of new areas of changes in the role of the principal, that relate to school operations:**

*The importance of the accountability framework.*

*CASES, Personnel knowledge*  

*Personnel functions, taxation requirements on travel.*

Principals took the opportunity to indicate what they saw as unfavourable aspects of the program. Some being:

*Still hit and miss with a lot of the processes as we were trialing them.*

*Vague concepts/policies not finalised, lack of detail. Presenters were ill-informed often - not their fault.*
Regarding the fifth item on perceived effectiveness there was a lack of response.

**Financial Management - Analysis of Responses**

The following numbers of responses to each item, where the sample size was 67, were recorded. Item F1(n=9), Item F2(n=16), Item F3(n=10), Item F4(n=50), and Item F5(n=12). For Financial Management, 55 principals (82%) provided at least one response.

The second item to be considered by respondents for this program was, 'To what extent did the training program on Financial Management address the following goal *To provide a comprehensive understanding of management and of the global budget.*' One comment pointed out that the SOTF details were still being evolved at the time of the program:

*Management of Global Budget is still evolving.*

There were a few supportive comments from the responses in this area:

*Good, clear information and good to have clerical assistants together with Principals.*

*Global Budget sessions ran by budget management were excellent on concepts and policy.*

Comments indicated that there were problems with presentation:

*Ground seemed to be shifting all time.*

*Too much too quickly.*

The third item, 'Indicate how useful the program was in improving your skills in this area', led to a collection of responses, with no common thread:

*Of some value to Bursar.*

*Global Budget - very good, management - just satisfactory.*

There were some critical comments which indicate that principals were faced with new roles and knowledge:

*As far as finance - still many things being determined when PD was being presented.*

*Too many facets of budgeting were still under review by the LSE.*

*I am still learning so the application of the system lags behind the theory.*

The fourth item on Financial Management presented another view of what the principals perceived as specific gained knowledge. The comments were grouped into the following categories, (a) overview of the
area, (b) knowledge of CASES (Computerised Administrative System for Schools) operations, and (c) knowledge of specific financial matters.

(a) Overview of the area:

Broader view of budget and relationship to overall school management.

An appreciation of the theory of global budgeting.

(b) Knowledge of CASES (Computerised Administrative System for Schools) operations:

Practical aspects of budgeting & the operations relating to CASES etc

A better understanding of an overall budget/computer control of the budget

(c) Knowledge of specific financial matters:

Relationship of cash & credit funding, ways to use finance more flexibly.

Wages, budgets, organisational skills.

A lack of knowledge appeared in the following collection of responses:

Very hazy - felt like we were drowning - too much, too quick.

Much information 'on the run' and contradictory - confusing.

The fifth item on effectiveness was responded to in the following responses:

This opened up a lot of new ideas.

Each school has a particular set of circumstances. Addressing these provides proper understanding of GB operations.

A set of critical comments was isolated, and sample comments were:

Once again we were in the first group and some aspects not fully evolved, hence could not be presented easily.

Very little in developing effective Financial Management.

I felt alone in a very complex change.

As issues arise in a practical context, I need solutions.

Personnel Management - Analysis of Responses

The following numbers of responses to each item, where the sample size was 67, were recorded, Item G1(n=5), Item G2(n=10), Item G3(n=9), Item G4(n=34), and Item G5(n=8). For Personnel Management, 50 principals (74.6%) provided at least one response. The second item to be considered by respondents for
this program was, 'To what extent did the training program on Personnel Management address the following goal The focus will be on personnel management rather than operations - covering, budget management, personnel management, responsibilities re school operations, delegation, legalities.' One comment told of a general approval of the program:

I enjoyed this new area and the need to increase my expertise.

As with other programs some difficulties were enumerated:

Again information overload. Not a lot of answers especially in the non-teaching areas.

It was extremely poor - lacked cohesion and coherence.

Unfortunately this is another area where the ground kept moving and info provided did not match reality!

The third item was, 'Indicate how useful the program was in improving your personnel management skills.'

Responses identified areas of development:

Encouraged me to be a better listener. Have established a Leadership Management Group.

Gained a stronger insight into my responsibility.

The learning of CASES personnel system was important.

This item still brought forward critical comments such as:

No opportunity to practice.

This program did little to improve my personnel management skills in the sense that the procedures used to implement decisions are not clear/lacking in detail.

Analysis of responses to the item, 'Indicate what knowledge was gained', led to comments being sifted into the following groups.

(a) General overview of learning:

In general terms - a deeper understanding of responsibilities in this area.

Management and Leadership and their importance.

Reinforcement of current thoughts & directions.

Team work importance, staff welfare must have a high priority, wage structuring and use of non teaching personnel.

(b) Technical knowledge:

Mainly technical-e.g., using CASES.

Computer skills.
Knowledge of specific personnel strategies and matters:

Planning for future staffing.
Leave, payroll, super details etc.

The set of critical comments from this item included:

Not a lot that wasn’t already known.
Again CASES is a problem in this area, still tied by other schools excesses.
- nothing – they couldn’t answer the relevant questions on Taxation, workcover etc.
Presentation of the program was pathetic, I left early in disgust as did many others.
Very little. Poor presentation, no new information, no enlightening, no motivating still had no ideas to where
they (facilitators) were heading.

The analysis of responses to the fifth item, ‘taking into account your individual needs, how effective was the
program?’ led to the following types of responses being recorded:

Clarified issues. Able to relate to specific incidents.
This was worthwhile.

Besides the favourable comments relating to effectiveness, there was also a set of comments which
indicated what was not effective. The following responses fall into that category:

Really only concentrated on computer operations.
As a Pilot- some guidelines kept changing & evolving - communication delay annoying at times.
Restrictions on personnel management in reality in terms of staffing processes and industrial restrictions were
a little limiting.

B. Impact of Targeted Programs

Part 1 of the questionnaire contained the following 'Describe the extent to which there has been an
improvement of day-to-day practice in your school as a result of personnel attending the following targeted
programs.' Each of the five programs was listed. This analysis is reported on under the headings of the
programs. Comments were selected for their contribution to a focus. The determination of a focus was an
outcome of the data reduction performed on the responses to the item. A description of the focus is provided
at the start of each section.
1. Charter Development  *(56 (83.6%) responses)*

**Focus 1.1** Charter is a useful guiding document - giving direction to the school. The formulation of a charter was an outcome of the training program on Charter Development. Focus 1.1 is directed at that charter itself. The following selection of comments relate to this focus:

*Charter has been successfully developed and is seen as a useful guiding document throughout the college.*

*Charter Goals and Priorities provide direction in Curriculum, Professional Development, Accountability, Budgeting, Codes of behaviour. Practice are clarified, understood and serve as a bonding element in school community and provide a 'continuum' to adhere to during change.*

*Completed Charter and now use it as the 'guiding light' - often refer to it in dealing with issues - valuable for people who wish to find out about the school.*

*We have a clear goal. The Charter provides us with a control we have never had before.*

*Very good improvement - gave a clear insight into the philosophy and purpose of STF. Our school had several strong planning strategies in place - the charter enriched our process.*

**Focus 1.2** Influence on day-to-day operation. This focus, like 1.1, relates to the charter itself. The following two comments support this focus:

*Following a whole school approach to developing the Charter the document has provided principal, staff and parents with a reference for a number of day to day situations e.g., discipline, contracted work, priorities, accountability. Essentially it provides direction.*

*While the school has set goals and developed an overall structure, day to day practice is still driven ahead by reacting to continual change and daily needs of people.*

**Focus 1.3** A sense of team work and staff commitment. This focus is a consequence of the Charter development program providing opportunities for people to work together. The following selection of comments relate to this focus:

*Ended up with a Cluster and School Charter which has focussed all schools in the Cluster on common goals, priorities. Staff display commitment to school goals and priorities as well.*

*Staff are more conscious of accountability and goals as well as time spent on task and curriculum programs.*

*The process helped develop stronger collegial relationships.*
Sense of teamwork. Sense of accountability. Sense of unity in community.

School staff regarded the writing the Charter as a challenge, which brought about a greater team spirit, and in turn improved staff morale.

Focus 1.4 Providing a more focused approach to the goals and work of the school. As for focus 1.3 focus 1.4 emphasises the impact of having developed a charter. The following comments are pertinent to this focus:

More focus on priority area with commensurate allocation of human and financial resources.

Charter has set up a focus for the school and we are more conscious of our achievements.

Articulation of best practices. - Identification of needs focuses - goals and priorities further clarified. - Positive feedback about what we currently do. - Reasonable and meaningful operating boundaries from our school community practices, for all members of our school community.

Charter has definitely provided a focus and direction for school improvement. It has also provided an accountability framework. Definitely a positive influence.

2. Principal Leadership (53 (79.1%) responses)

Focus 2.1 Renewed practice and morale of staff. This focus suggests an area of empowerment for the people involved, and the following comments sustain it.

Sense of teamwork, shared leadership, accountability, professionalism, performance improvement are more appreciated on an individual and collective basis, are more accepted and are becoming more the routine practice.

Enhancement of existing skills. Introduction of new strategies to achieve new directions and goals. Increased application to focused tasks. Greater personnel management roles.

Greater personal knowledge of oneself and the importance of positive constructive and supportive leadership management style.

Able to maintain morale of staff and convince them that change is part of growth and development and to look at it in a positive manner. Able to develop the key generic skills for the high performance era, and develop high performing teams. Assisting in improving my negotiation skills.
Focus 2.2  The use of teams and the effect on day-to-day practice. The two comments selected emphasise establishment of teams and delegation.


I think I am more effective as a leader. I have learnt to delegate more.

Focus 2.3  Clearer view of theories of leadership. This focus points to a greater understanding of the underpinning theories of leadership. The following comments reinforce this focus:

I have a more comprehensive view of the requirements for a leader in SOF. The program confirmed a lot of issues I have felt about leadership for a long time.

Made me more aware of the various leadership styles and how important it is to have a balanced spread.

Many new skills and insight on school leadership management.

I now see my role as Principal more clearly defined, and have a greater awareness of the importance of positive and effective leadership.

Focus 2.4  Development of personal skills. This focus endorses the idea that principals have gained personally from attending the Principal Leadership program. Four comments germane to this focus are:

Improvement in confidence and skills in coping.

I have instituted changes processes and I am more aware of alternative ways of achieving goals.

This program has provided me with many skills in negotiation and staff co-ordination.

Constant self evaluation and re setting of professional and personal goals.

Not only do principals looked for positive attributes in completing this item, but a few critical comments were recorded. These comments relate to the change in a principal's role in an emerging self managing school. There was a sense of disappointment about the decrease in opportunities for educational leadership on the part of few principals, as the following comment indicates:

My work in administration has no doubt improved but my productivity in Curriculum has crashed.

3. School Operations   (43 (64.2%) responses)

Focus 3.1  Understanding of changes to school operations. Here is an acknowledgement of changes to ways in which schools will operate. This set of comments supports this focus:
Restructured AST responsibilities... renewed descriptions, wider responsibility.

Developed a set of 'operational' rules/strategies to suit this school.


Focus 3.2 Effect on day-to-day practice. In particular, this focus is closely related to the efficiency of the school. The set of comments supporting this view contains the following:

Policies now put into practice. Goals and priorities now being reached.

- more streamlined approach to procedures - better job descriptions - office organization much improved.
- annual report too time consuming and a waste of own very tight monies.

Changes in processes has meant less red tape and more efficient operations.

Focus 3.3 Accountability to local community. The emphasis that this focus brings is the concept that the school reacts to and is accountable to groups of people within its community.

The following two comments support this point:

A much more co-ordinated approach of management between teachers and office staff. Greater accountability. Staff becoming multi-skilled with new responsibilities.

While the school has set goals and developed an overall structure, day to day practice is still driven ahead by reacting to continual change and daily needs of people.

Focus 3.4 Changes in structuring of administrative practices. Each of the following comments attest to this view:

We have made critical decisions re office personnel, their on-going training and improvements to the work environment.

Redesigning of the college management structure with a significant emphasis on team building and development. Team leaders of programs seek quantitative indicators of performance.

Critical comments in this area of school operations are concerned with the volume of work and the seemingly poor communication of information.

I had hoped for more control and a better level of resourcing through this aspect.
We are still struggling with this lack of clear manuals. Erratic advice and understanding by DSE personnel. Divisions of the DSE give conflicting advice. An area which needs immediate and intensive attention. Insufficient training and support for administration staff.

4. Financial Management (55 (82.1%) responses)

Focus 4.1 General understanding of arrangements - relationship of financial aspects of charter with goals. This focus reinforces the goals of the program in Financial management which was 'to provide a comprehensive understanding of management and of the budget'. The following comments illustrate this focus:

Decision making easier, more appropriate, management being tied more strongly to achieving desired outcomes - goals, priorities.

Practices becoming better, real understanding by School Council.

A greater awareness of budgeting process by all staff - particularly in the area of prioritising special projects, accountability procedures have been improved also.

More $ channelled into areas where there is more need. Better use of $ and a little wastage. More flexibility.

Better local decision making.

Focus 4.2 Global budget. Knowledge of the global budget is supported by the following comment:

Useful explanation of global budget and the various elements. No real effect on day-to-day management.

Focus 4.3 Teamwork - knowledge of responsibilities and efficiency. The concepts of responsibilities and efficiency are highlighted by:

Shared responsibility of knowledge takes much of the pressure off individuals.

Better allocation of funding. More efficient costing.

Can make a more effective financial management team.

Focus 4.4 Principal, bursar and staff knowledge. This focus indicates that knowledge of financial management is required by principals and bursars in particular. Comments supporting this focus are:

Certainly the bursar gained a great deal, however a lot more input is required for principal and other staff.
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Initially the Bursar felt quite threatened by the changes to her role, but she is now used as a resource by many Bursars in subsequent SOTF intakes.

Critical comments in this area of financial management are concerned with reduced resources, linking budget to declining school enrolment, computer problems and the fact that better information comes from informal communication with colleagues. Two of these are:

Greater consideration to flexibility - however generally working with reduced resources and this has impeded the effectiveness of Schools of the Future.

Very little as linking of budget to student enrolment makes management of cleaning, maintenance and grounds improvement very difficult especially if you are in a school with declining enrolments.

5. Personnel Management (52 (77.6%) responses)

Focus 5.1 Decisions at the local level. This focus acknowledges the fact that personnel decisions will be made at the local level. This focus is illustrated by

School based selection a definite improvement.

Better management with decisions being made close to point of delivery.

Focus 5.2 Staff and their involvement in decision making. This focus is related to decision making by staff, and the selected comments which include expressions such as ‘shared responsibility’ and ‘cohesive unit’ reflect the contribution made by individuals within the school.

More confident in handling staff concerns and issues. More able to give staff responsibility for being involved in decision making process and more accepting of outcomes.

Shared responsibility of knowledge takes much of the pressure off individuals.

Staff morale has improved greatly, and the staff is interested and responding well to SOTF challenge. The staff now works as a cohesive unit, and communication is much improved.

Because staff have a better understanding of school priorities, they (staff) have felt motivated to contribute more positively to curriculum development (particularly for Charter priorities) - positive outcomes for students and staff.
Focus 5.3 Efficiency. Other foci to comment on the concept of efficiency were 3.2 (SO) and 4.3 (FM). For Personnel Management this focus is endorsed by:

*Much quicker processing of personnel matters. Major impact.*

*Systems are much more streamlined and we are able to be a lot more responsive to staff requests.*

Focus 5.4 Change of day-to-day practice. The idea of change of regular practice within a SOTF pilot school is strengthened by each of the following comments:

*Slight refinement of practice. Biggest change - Curriculum Delivery.*


Critical comments in this area of personnel management were varied and were concerned with a supposed lack of support from the DSE, and with learning on the job being a common experience for a number of schools. Some changes were difficult to recognise and were not happening quickly enough. There was a plea for more professional development in this area. Two typical comments are:

*Program of little value to our school - nothing new that could not have been changed at the local level.*

*Of some value but policy is still made on the run and therefore is inconsistent. Not enough PD in this area for admin staff.*

6. Change in Leadership Style (62 (92.5%) responses)

Item J10 on the questionnaire was, ‘How do you think your leadership style has altered as a result of attending professional development programs relating to the SOF?’ Four distinct themes were extracted from the set of responses to item J10.

Theme 1 is related to a general overall knowledge of current leadership strategies and theories, as well as some knowledge of what principals were doing. The following illustrate this theme:

- Planning in terms of goals and priorities in the sense a lot more/better organised. Looking to successful delegation of responsibilities and how to achieve this. Able to benchmark for the Charter.

- I now have a better balance of styles of leadership. I now have a better understanding of how to build a higher performance team. I now have a better grasp of management of performance.

- Accountability and focus upon the School Charter - its goals and priorities has meant that my role has taken on a more supervisory aspect - building collegial teams that monitor outcomes. Some staff find the 'accountability' aspect
disturbing, therefore I have to be very careful in the strategies I utilise and recognise the personalities and concerns of all members and implement change in a non-threatening climate.

- More aware of my role in setting the organisational climate and greater need to address some areas of my management dominant style.
- I have really changed in the last two years... I am now more aware and in many cases, more tolerant.
- I have learned the importance of maintaining a 'global' perspective of the total school operations- identifying key personnel to consult for particular information, delegating responsibility/authority, ensuring 'open' communication.
- I believe I am more receptive to ideas for changes and am better prepared to follow processes through from beginning to end in development and approval of an idea... I am much better equipped to understand the resource allocation process.

Theme 2 is dependent on the terms 'team' and 'delegation'. The following illustrate this theme:

- I have become even more team oriented and at the same time, being personally driven by need for whole school outcomes to be achieved. I think I have developed more of the 'driver' in my leadership.
- More likely to make an independent decision - more team oriented - more commitment to developing a school ethos.
- I have devolved significant authority responsibility and accountability. I have greater confidence in teams. I am more focused on value for dollars, outcomes and performance measures.
- More a team builder than I ever was. Conscious of different leadership styles in school - more tolerant - hopefully more efficient.
- I think I have become a better leader through learning about (1) delegation (2) the type of people who make up groups.
- I have delegated significant sections of my principal's role to Assistant Principal and other senior staff. I have become more consultative and less collaborative. I believe that I am more focused on student outcomes.
- Devolution. Teams. Less time with teachers as tied to office routines. Better reporting to parents.
- Old habits die hard. I have however attempted to focus on team building, delegation and accountability more than I have in the past. I have had to become more aware of the implications of global budget funding.

Theme 3 is to do with 'confidence', and 'efficient', as recurring expressions. The following illustrate this theme:
• My leadership style has become more 'direct' as a result of having to focus more on outcomes and accountability. Although I had a reasonable understanding of leadership long before SOF, adjustments have been made to practice because of new aspects within the principal's role requiring more specific evidence of competence and performance.

• I believe that as my confidence has grown my leadership has become more assertive therefore more effective.

• Has just reinforced my methods/beliefs; re-energised me and re-motivated me. Perhaps I have understood the empowering benefits of team building better. Helped me to manage myself better - in personal planning and goal setting - in self image and self esteem.

• I am more confident, more informed and have an understanding of self-management in broad terms. There are gaps in my knowledge. Sometimes I'm concerned about the time frames given. Expectations by DSE can be unrealistic. I am protective of staff (supportive) but adapting to the demands, i.e., pragmatic and committed to ensuring that students don't suffer as a consequence of uncertainty, confusion change being experienced by staff.

• I believe I am much more efficient and use my time more wisely. I have a better understanding of the Principal's role and feel more comfortable in that role. I also believe I am more focused, and a better leader.

Theme 4 in this section is one which indicated there was little or no learning, or that there was some other significant statement worth noting. The following are examples:

• The intent is the same, but the demands of the job have caused me to become more remote from daily school based activities. Financial constraints have made me more of a business manager which staff 'resent' - they know why but are concerned nevertheless.

• Not a great deal as any leadership style seems not too far different from those needed to keep this school healthy, happy and operating. However picked up a great deal of information which allowed us to take on board many new practices.

• Has not altered a great deal - It seems to have reinforced my existing style.

7. Future Professional Development for the Principal of a School of the Future (65 (97.0%) responses)

Item J11 on the questionnaire was, 'What professional development is there still to be done for a principal in a SOTF?' An analysis of the set of responses leads to the identification of six discernible themes: (1) financial or business, CASES; (2) managing time, strategic planning, personnel management; (3) current
trends and developments; (4) future work place matters; (5) organisational development and observation of best practice; and, (6) curriculum and teaching matters.

Theme 1 is financial or business, CASES. The need for further development work in these area is endorsed by:

- **Financial management** including ability to access the resources of the business community. - Industrial negotiation.
- **Marketing, Salary Charging, Time Management, Curriculum.**
- **Business management skills. Team development. Fostering and mentoring fellow Principals / Administrators.**
- **For me (CASES) Finance - personnel Management present the biggest day to day challenge (given I was in Intake 1 where so much energy went into creating a Charter without exemplars . . .) I'd like a 2nd program on the above.**
- **I will need more in the areas of workforce planning and budget management. Personnel procedures need to be enhanced - present messages for example are totally confusing.**
- **Make the administrative information re personnel, CASES etc as concise as possible. Computer training to access this information on CD ROM. Some accountancy training on budgeting and monitoring finances. Workcare /superannuation. PD re leadership - time management / organisational skills.**
- **Strategies for developing ongoing planning, especially financial. Mechanisms for monitoring and checking the accuracy and competence of business manager.**

Theme 2 is concerned with managing time, strategic planning, and personnel management. The evidence for this theme is:

- **More attention needs to be given to 'Management of Performance' - mentor/coach (teacher/principal): providing positive feedback, peer appraisal, voluntary appraisal. Major shift to local accountability and how best this is managed.**
- **Planning beyond three years. Sustaining motivation and work satisfaction given the long hours involved. Maintaining a challenge.**
- **Follow up sessions and revisiting some areas after 1 year/ 2 years into new SOF situations. Much more on time management/prioritising tasks/financial planning for long term major projects. Flexible staff use.**
- **Management of total school operations with consideration of industrial issues etc. Flexibility in management of resources availability. Legality and liability issues.**
- **Personnel Management - involving much of the staff selection, welfare, negotiating/bargaining activities need to be addressed. Business Management - putting it all together.**
Theme 3 is to do with current trends and developments. The following comments indicate that principals have become aware of current issues confronting them as schools move into a self-determining phase.

- **Leading School Council through change. Technology 'inroads'. Writing the second Charter' changes.**
- **Depends on the degree of devolution that will really occur if self - management does really happen then work needed in (i) Data collection/Analysis (ii) Marketing (iii) Senior Staff Management.**
- **Heaps of support required , specifically geared at linking educational leadership and business management. A very difficult area!!**
- **Some directions on the principal as an educational leader especially with a core curriculum CSF, LAP greater accountability, improved learning outcomes.**
- **Updating to address developments that have/are occurring through the experiences of Intakes 2 - 4.**

**Theme 4** is to do with looking at organisational development and the observation of best practice. The following comments support this theme:

- **You could almost repeat the 'dose' due to the changes that have occurred in the past 18 months. I would appreciate OD in school operations area. Many management programs are generic/universal rather than focusing on school based situations, e.g., marketing, School Council organisation, financial management (requirements), staff selection procedures, appraisal.**
- **I would like to meet with other pilot principals across the state to discuss where we are at - look at best practice in these schools - problems and ways to overcome them.**
- **Opportunities to observe 'best practice' in schools, programs / opportunities to mix with managers in the 'private' sector.**

**Theme 5** is curriculum and teaching matters. This theme indicates the relevance, to principals, of teaching/curriculum concerns.

- **Team building programs. Curriculum leadership programs. Middle management' programs.**
- **There needs to be a huge shift towards curriculum, Kidmap, SOF and curriculum, Curriculum and Standards Framework, teacher appraisal.**

Lastly, there are three other comments not gathered up by the above six themes, these are:

- **Continued PD is essential, perhaps not for the principal but for the key people in a school - support staff AP's and teachers with key areas of responsibility.**
- **How to cope with stress. How to marry the demands of reality with the expectations of the 'shiny bums'.**
• We need to monitor the process and develop the accountability.

8. Further Comments (40 (59.7%) responses)

At Item J12, 'Further Comments', Principals had the opportunity to add further comments. Responses related to professional development were reviewed to identify any common trends of thought. Four categories have been isolated: (1) Management (including self-management); (2) Value of being in at the start; (3) Style of Professional development; and, (4) other.

1 Management (including self-management). For each category supporting comments are included.

• One thing that has happened is that I am more aware of the things that should be done at all levels of management - financial, personnel operations etc. and frustrated that the staff cuts have made my size school, and no doubt many others, unable to fulfil tasks and obligations to staff and students that should be done.

• 'Managing self' is a vital area that really needs highlighting and more attention paid too, so Principals don’t ‘burn out’ and they remain positive people. We need to acknowledge and be acknowledged in our strengths so we don’t concentrate on our inadequacies in this era of rapid change. SOTF program has enhanced the leadership of Principals which is appropriate and appreciated.

• Self management brings with it the need for improvement in performance management. We need more intensive training in this area. Self management introduces a new culture with a major shift to local accountability. We need assistance to help manage this better.

2 Value of being in at the start.

• I believe greater refinements have been made to programs since the Pilot phase. The Pilot phase colleagues were an exciting group to work with because of their energy, enthusiasm and ability to take risks. Being with energised people helps the 'learner' because the enrichment is so positive.

• The impetus gained must not be lost as all schools become Schools of the Future. Principals now, I feel, are much more prepared to accept PD as an extensive part of their total program and commitment.
3 Style of Professional development.

- In general terms the programs were presented to large groups with little opportunity to discuss in details aspects of school operations. If presented to small collegiate groups, programs would have been more specific and relevant to those attending.

- Well spaced, well planned programs are great value. Well conceived directives that hit the base first time enhance stability and forward planning.

- Many times we are dealing with people with little or no knowledge. Quality time needs to be provided for us administrators. Send me and my colleagues to a quality venue during several vacation times is quite OK, and allow us time to look, grow, and recuperate.

4 Other general comments.

- The SOTF experience and the associated professional development has been great for this school. It has given the school a much needed sense of direction, and forced us to re-appraisal our goals and objectives.

- Principals have benefited from very effective PD, perhaps the DSE focus should shift to the teachers.

- The training programs have been excellent. The overall resourcing in schools is insufficient to achieve the high goals espoused in the training. We are well trained administrators but still have to be Jacks and Jills of all trades.

- It seems that I have less time to deal with children, learning, teaching practice, staff appraisal, evaluation of learning, professional development of staff, etc. I am bogged down by administration such as tax rates, calculating excess cash amounts in the Global Budget, reading contracts from TAS, running support groups for Integration etc.

C. Summary of Chapter Six

Tables 28, 29 and 30 display the summaries of the qualitative analyses. Table 28 takes the questionnaire items: 'prior knowledge', 'addressing goals', 'usefulness', and 'gained knowledge', and lists these against detected recurrent themes. In summary, the themes for the items, across all programs, are centred around the specific knowledge gained, how and when it was gained, and a dependence on the principals' understanding of goals of the programs. Table 29, on the other hand, takes the same approach, except this time it is the Targeted Program that is set against theme. Themes for all programs relate to benefits of each program except that for the program, School Operations, there are no comments, this is consistent with a low result
on effectiveness, from the perspective of the principals, from the quantitative analysis (see Table 13). As well as the principals' perceptions of benefits, a set of identified criticisms are noted.

Finally, Table 30 lists the findings of the analysis of the comments regarding the impact of targeted programs on day-to-day practice. For each program the identified foci of comments are listed, together, where it exists, any statement of perceived disappointments with each program. Incorporated into this table are statements of recurrent themes related to Item J10 'Change in leadership style', J11 'Future professional development' for principals in SOTF, and J12 'Further comments'.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Recurrent themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior Knowledge</td>
<td>1 personal experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 attendance at seminars, or readings in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 previous courses of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which program addressed Goals</td>
<td>1 confusion over the goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 clarification of objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 difficulties, problems with presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which program was useful in improving Knowledge</td>
<td>1 providing strategies for success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 providing specific knowledge of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Criticism of poor presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of too much information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of 'rules of the game' undetermined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge gained</td>
<td>CD1 understanding charter and process of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 knowledge about structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 knowledge of relationship between school/charter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 knowledge gained from other schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL1 larger picture of theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 knowledge of team-work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 knowledge of management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO1 overview of proposed changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 identification of new procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
devolution of responsibilities.

FM1 General overview.

2 financial management.

3 CASES.

PM1 General overview.

2 personnel strategies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Recurrent themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>1 Understanding of process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Provided direction/information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Collective support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>1 Value of team work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Developed confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Excellent documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>No comments provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>1 Practical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Global budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>1 Clarification of issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticisms:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>1 Diverse backgrounds of participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Long time spent in travelling to venue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Experimental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>1 Little time to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>1 Should have been run at a later date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Difficulties with presenters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Poor presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>1 Aspects not fully developed at time of program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Solutions to problems needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>1 Changes to rules and guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Limited scope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School operations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel management.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change of day-to-day practice.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>little value to our school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>too much work with too little support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>results are slow to emerge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disappointments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes in leadership style</th>
<th>Item J10 themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General overall knowledge of current writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team work or delegation of tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Confidence or Efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Little or No learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future professional development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item J11 themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Further comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item J12 themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 7

LINKING THE QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE ANALYSES

There are three aims of this chapter: firstly, to present the quantitative analyses of the items on the questionnaire relating to future professional development programs for principals, secondly, to provide descriptions of the links between the quantitative and qualitative analysis, and thirdly, to provide an explanation for the relative effectiveness of the professional development programs as perceived by the principals. The analysis conducted in the previous chapters was of both a quantitative and qualitative nature, which should be linked. The interpretation is an important part of this study. It is the interaction of variables that provides the keys to the interpretation of the principals' responses to questions relating to professional training. Miles and Huberman (1994:41) cite Salomon (1991) as pointing out 'the issue is not quantitative-qualitative at all, but whether we are taking an "analytic" approach to understanding a few controlled variables, or a "systemic" approach to understanding the interaction of variables in a complex environment.' Payne (1994:122) takes the view that the term 'interpretative inquiry' is a preferred term for it avoids the connotation that quantification is not used in interpretative research.

A. Future Professional Development - Quantitative Analysis

Research (Thomas, 1993b:16) has indicated that the following issues (listed as headings for tables 31 to 39) are the nine most important to be addressed in future professional development programs. Principals were asked in the questionnaire (items J1 - J9) to indicate whether the stated issue was touched upon at any of the five targeted programs. This was to determine if aspects of any of the 'nine most important issues' had been incorporated into the targeted programs. The results are displayed in tables 31 to 39, where percentage responses for Yes and No are included for the sake of comparison.
Table 31  Personnel Management (Includes Industrial Relations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>19 = 32.2%</td>
<td>35 = 59.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>51 = 83.6%</td>
<td>8 = 13.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>45 = 73.8%</td>
<td>11 = 18.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>38 = 67.9%</td>
<td>17 = 30.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31 indicates that the consideration of whether ‘personnel management, including industrial relations’, was included in other targeted programs shows that this area was present to a considerable extent in the programs on Principal Leadership, School Operations and Financial Management, with at least 68% giving a positive response.

Table 32  Leadership Skills, Management Strategies, and the Balance between Them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>28 = 49.1%</td>
<td>24 = 42.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>57 = 98.3%</td>
<td>0 = 0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>28 = 50.9%</td>
<td>23 = 41.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>42 = 75.0%</td>
<td>10 = 17.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results coming from Table 32 indicate the issue of ‘leadership skills, management strategies, and the balance between them’ was covered to a very high degree in the program on Principal Leadership (98.3%), and to a lesser extent in the program on Personnel Management (75.0%). There was agreement from the principals, who responded to this item, that all programs contained aspects of the issue.

The issue of ‘Resource allocation, management and security’ was an issue from the principals’s perspectives that warranted further professional development programs. This occurred in spite of a high proportion of respondents indicating that aspects of the issue already had been included in each of the targeted programs. It was noted in Table 33 that 82.3% of principals indicated that the program on Financial Management took into account features of the issue, and more than 64% perceived that each of the other four programs also contained aspects of this issue of ‘Resource allocation, management and security’.
Table 33 Resource Allocation, Management and Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>36 = 64.3%</td>
<td>18 = 32.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>37 = 66.1%</td>
<td>16 = 28.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>41 = 74.5%</td>
<td>9 = 16.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>51 = 82.3%</td>
<td>6 = 9.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>40 = 74.1%</td>
<td>11 = 20.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34 Process: All information in advance and more time to implement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>17 = 34.7%</td>
<td>25 = 51.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>23 = 47.9%</td>
<td>19 = 39.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>17 = 36.2%</td>
<td>22 = 46.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>19 = 40.4%</td>
<td>22 = 46.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>16 = 34.8%</td>
<td>21 = 45.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34 indicates the perceptions of the principals as to whether the targeted programs dealt with the issue of the 'process: that all information be given in advance and with more time to implement'. The results are, apart from the program on Principal Leadership where the proportion of principals was 47.9%, at most 40% of principals thought that the other programs came to terms with aspects of the issue. The issue of timing and advance notice, when introducing system-wide changes, is crucial for success when people, who are to be the leaders in the change, and already see themselves as over burdened, are concerned. A number of principals thought that the issue was not applicable for any of the programs.

The issue of 'implementing and managing change' would have been an issue for all principals in the pilot program. They were being prepared for leading a school that was a component of a system-wide change in administrative practices. The principals who responded to the item have pointed towards the fact that the issue was present in all targeted programs, but the program with the largest component was that of Principal Leadership (94.8%). Although the development of a school charter was a new area for SOTF, the program on Charter Development also took up the issue according to 75.9% of those who responded. The
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programs on Financial and Personnel Management, dealing with other new aspects of a principal's role, were seen to consider aspects of the issue by 69.6% and 72.2% respectively, of principals for each program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 35 Implementing and Managing Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 36 Workload/Time Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36 records that the issue of ‘workload and time management’ was seen to be touched on in the Principal Leadership program by 83.9% of principals attending the program. This issue is an important component of the principal's role. A small proportion, 33.3%, of principals thought that it was touched on in the Personnel Management program and lower proportions for the other three programs.

The issue of ‘more comprehensive global funding and budget information’ is directly related to the financial management of the SOTF, and so the result coming from Table 37 indicates that the principals who responded to this item were aware that more specific information would be needed. The proportion of principals who saw that this issue, of further information about global funding and the budget, had been acknowledged during the program Financial Management was 78.6%. It is to be noted that 52% realised that the program on Personnel Management contained aspects of the issue, whereas approximately 30% of principals saw that there had been suitable reference made in each of the other three programs.
Table 37  More Comprehensive Global Funding & Budget information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>16 = 27.6%</td>
<td>37 = 63.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>19 = 33.3%</td>
<td>33 = 57.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>19 = 36.5%</td>
<td>27 = 51.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>44 = 78.6%</td>
<td>10 = 17.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>28 = 51.9%</td>
<td>21 = 38.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38  Business Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>13 = 23.2%</td>
<td>40 = 71.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>36 = 67.9%</td>
<td>15 = 28.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>28 = 52.8%</td>
<td>19 = 35.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>37 = 67.3%</td>
<td>16 = 29.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>29 = 55.8%</td>
<td>18 = 34.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The issue of 'business management' was seen by the principals to have been referred to in all programs to a reasonable extent except that of Charter Development. Just over 67% of principals saw this issue covered to some extent in each of the programs on Principal Leadership and Financial Management, while just over 50% recognised its presence in the programs on School Operations and Personnel Management. It is interesting to note that aspects of business management were seen by the principals to have been almost equally considered by Principal Leadership and Financial Management. It would seem that the principals were cognisant of the fact that the issue of business management was to become part of their role as a principal of a SOTF.

The ninth issue 'professional development for the total school community' was seen by the principals to have been given due recognition in the program on Charter Development (64.4%). A slightly smaller proportion, (56.4%), felt that aspects of it had been touched on in Principal Leadership. A higher proportion (close to 70%) thought that the issue had not been as relevant for programs on school operations, financial and personnel management.
Table 39  Professional Development for the total school community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>38 = 64.4%</td>
<td>19 = 32.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>31 = 56.4%</td>
<td>22 = 40.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>8 = 14.8%</td>
<td>38 = 70.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>10 = 17.5%</td>
<td>43 = 75.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>11 = 20.0%</td>
<td>39 = 70.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Comments on Responses

The conclusion reached in the examination of principals' responses to items about the issues to be addressed in future professional development programs for principals, was that even though some aspects were present in the programs under consideration they still remain as issues to be considered in future programs. Table 40 provides a summary of the issues to be addressed in future professional development programs for principals together with the percentage of respondents who indicated the issue had been touched on in the particular program. Only percentages greater than 50% are listed, and are given to the nearest whole number.

An observation is that Principal Leadership is listed for seven of the nine issues, when more than 50% of principals perceive that the issue has been touched upon. The SO, FM and PM programs are each listed for five of the nine issues, and CD for three. PL was the program that dealt with major change in the role of the principal. As the program had as its goal the ‘development and enhancement of leadership and management skills required by principals to deliver a SOTF’, some needs were met but there was a general desire to have further programs. Another observation is that all five programs were listed against two issues, namely, ‘resource allocation, management and security’, and ‘implementing and managing change’, thus indicating the ability of different programs to address varying aspects of issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Targeted Program</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Management (including industrial relations)</td>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Skills, management strategies and the balance between them</td>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource allocation, management and security</td>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All information in advance and more time to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing and managing change</td>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload/time management</td>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More comprehensive global funding and budget information</td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business management</td>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development for the total school community</td>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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C. Classification of Results in Terms of Frames

The cement for linking the quantitative and qualitative analyses of the effectiveness of the programs comes from the theoretical aspects of organisations as developed by Bolman and Deal (1991), and discussed in Chapter Four (Conceptual Framework and Research Design). The approach to be used to link the findings of the quantitative and qualitative analyses, will involve considering these findings and classifying them according to characteristics of each frame (Bolman and Deal, 1991:15). This procedure will identify the Bolman and Deal Frames in which principals see themselves operating, and provide an explanation for the relative effectiveness of the professional development programs. A similar classification of the future professional development needs of principals in the SOTF program, will also lead to an identification of the frames in which principals see themselves operating. Bolman and Deal (1991:325) in considering how to match a frame to a situation claim that ‘choosing a frame . . . involves a combination of analysis and intuition, and artistry’. The authors give some help with the analysis, by providing questions that might stimulate intuition as well. The questions employed are: ‘How important are commitment and motivation? How important is the technical quality of the decision? How much ambiguity and uncertainty is present? How scarce are resources? How much conflict and diversity is present? Are we working top down or bottom up?’ (Bolman and Deal, 1991:326). The discussion about each question is centred around examples where different frames might be chosen depending on the circumstances and the people involved. For example, when discussing successful implementation of a new curriculum in a school district it is suggested that managers might ‘employ strategies of support and participation from the human resource frame, or they might try to link the new curriculum to important symbols and meanings in the culture of the district’ (Bolman and Deal, 1991:326)

Table 41 records the targeted programs and the frames into which they have been classified, according to goal, content and emphasis. The suggestion is made that there can be combinations of frames involved in the selected targeted programs is given support by Bolman and Deal (1991:331) when they pose the question ‘Is effectiveness really related to the ability to use multiple frames?’ The answer is provided by the authors when they claim that ‘several lines of recent research support the view that effective leaders and effective organizations rely on multiple frames’ (Bolman and Deal, 1991:342). The classification of targeted programs into the various frames, as shown in Table 41, are justified as follows.
Table 41  Targeted Programs and Frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel management</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Frames
  - 1 Structural Frame
  - 2 Human Resource Frame
  - 3 Political Frame
  - 4 Symbolic Frame

Charter Development: It fits in the structural frame as the program contained a review of Charters and the guidelines the school was setting itself.

Principal Leadership: The researcher argues that aspects of each frame are inherent in all that a principal does.

School Operations: As the aims of this program involved aspects of school administration, operation, workforce management, devolved functions and processes, responsibilities and accountability, each frame apart from the symbolic frame is involved.

Financial Management: When rules and policies are being formulated as well as the occurrence of negotiations and bargaining, it would appear that aspects of the structural frame and political frame are involved.

Personnel Management: As the focus of the program was on personnel management, budget management, responsibilities re school operations, delegation, and legalities, there are aspects of the structural frame, the human resource frame and the political frame.

It can be seen that each of the Targeted Programs covered aspects of at least one frame, particularly the program on principal leadership. Linking these classifications to earlier discussion, it should be noted that Tables 11, 12, and 13 (Chapter Five) displayed results whereby the mean scores from the principal leadership program were significantly different from the mean scores on all other programs. Principals had scored the program on PL significantly higher on each of ‘addressing goals’, ‘usefulness of program’, and ‘effectiveness’, than they had on the other four programs.

A possible reason for principals scoring the principal leadership program higher than any of the other programs on the three aspects - ‘addressing goals', 'usefulness of programs', and the 'effectiveness', is that the principal leadership program contained elements of each of the five frames.
Contained in Tables 12 and 13 (Chapter Five), there were two other differences in mean scores that were statistically significant. Program CD scored significantly higher means than PM on ‘usefulness of program’, and on ‘effectiveness’, in this instance it is the effectiveness from the point of view of the respondent being scored. It has been argued that the Charter Development program contained aspects of the structural frame, whereas Personnel Management contained elements of human resource, political, and structural frames. It is suggested principals place more emphasis on the structural frame than on others when it comes to making comparisons, thus increasing the mean score on the Charter Development program compared with the Personnel Management program on the aspects ‘usefulness’ and ‘effectiveness’.

On the other hand, the analysis of qualitative data was reported in Chapter Six. In making links with the outcomes from that analysis with the frames, it is sufficient to consider the last part of Table 29 Summary of Qualitative Analysis by Item across the Targeted Programs. This section of the table lists recurrent themes under the general classification of ‘knowledge gained’. These recurrent themes are categorised according to Bolman and Deal frames. Is noted that the symbolic frame is the only frame not listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Recurrent Themes</th>
<th>Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge gained</td>
<td>CD1 understanding Charter and process of development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 structure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 relationship between school/charter</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 information from other schools</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL1</td>
<td>larger picture of theory</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 team-work</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 management</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO1</td>
<td>Overview of proposed changes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 identification of new procedures</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 devolution of responsibilities</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM1</td>
<td>General overview</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 financial management/matters</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 CASES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM1</td>
<td>General Overview</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 -personnel strategies</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The justification for the Bolman and Deal Frames classification is the same as for classifying the targeted programs (see Table 41). For the above cases further specific attributes of the programs require classification. For Charter Development, the structural frame is common to all themes, but the knowledge about the relationship between the school and charter is deemed to be contained in the political frame as well, for it requires a knowledge of who the competing groups are, what bargaining and negotiation is required. Whereas knowledge gained from other schools would appear to have attributes from all frames apart from the symbolic one. For each theme under Principal Leadership all frames apart from the symbolic one are present. For School Operations the themes are centred in the structural, human resource and political frames, for the themes are to do with how the personnel are deployed as well as an identification of new procedures. For the program Financial Management, apart from the structural frame for aspects of roles, responsibilities, and specific knowledge there is the political frame for aspects of bargaining and negotiation. The Personnel Management themes of a general overview and knowledge of personnel strategies appear to lie in the structural, human resource and political frames for reasons of knowing roles, responsibilities and responsibilities; tailoring individuals to the organisation; and arenas in which different groups compete, bargain and negotiate.

A second area, from Chapter Six, for considering the frames is taken from Table 30. *Impact Of Targeted Programs on day-to-day Practice*, where there is a summary of the foci of principals under a targeted program heading, together with a classification as to which Bolman and Deal frame the focus belongs.

The justification for the Bolman and Deal classification follows similar lines to earlier classifications. For Charter Development, the foci of, 'a guiding document', a 'more focussed approach to goals' and 'an influence on day-to-day operation' are sited in the structural frame, for they are to do with roles, responsibilities, policies and rules, whereas a 'sense of team work' belongs to the human resource frame. For the program Principal Leadership, the focus of the 'use of teams' sits in the human resource frame, as does the focus of 'renewed practice and morale of staff'. 'Theories of leadership', and 'personal skills' have attributes coming from both the human resource and political frames. All foci of the School Operations include aspects of the structural frame. The political frame is also present when considering 'understanding of changes', 'every day practice and efficiency', and 'accountability to local communities'. When considering the foci of Financial Management the structural frame is common, but 'team work,
efficiency' and 'principal/bursar and staff knowledge' also belong to the human resource and political frames, for they depend on the knowledge of individuals and the arenas in which different groups operate.

The last program, Personnel Management has four foci, all being part of the human resource frame. 'Decisions at the local level' lies in the structural and political frames as well. The focus on 'efficiency' is part of the political frame also, and 'change of day-to-day practice' is in the structural frame. Table 31 also included a summary of themes identified from Item J11 on the questionnaire, relating to future Professional Development. The five themes identified relate to the structural frame in all cases for they are involved with roles and responsibilities. There are three foci, 'management of time, strategic planning', current trends/development', and 'future workplace matters' that involve aspects of the human resource and political frames.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Foci</th>
<th>Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Useful guiding document. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Influence on day-to-day operation. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sense of team work. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A more focused approach to goals. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Renewed practice and morale of staff 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The use of teams 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Theories of leadership 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Development of personal skills 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Understanding of changes. 1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Every-day practice, efficiency 1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accountable to local communities 1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Changes in structuring of admin practices. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>General understanding. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Global Budget. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teamwork, efficiency. 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CASES. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Principal/Bursar and Staff knowledge 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Decisions at local level. 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future professional development</td>
<td>Item J11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Staff 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Efficiency 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Change of day-to-day practice. 1, 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bolman and Deal take the view that managers in effective organizations are able to integrate frames, 'managers need multiple frames to survive. They need to understand that any event or process can
serve multiple purposes and that different participants are often operating in different frames’ (Bolman and Deal, 1991:341). The classification of frames associated with the identified foci of the impact of targeted programs on principals’ day-to-day practice gives support to the concept of the coexistence of multiple frames. It is noted that the classification given above is that of this researcher, and that others may have other preferred frames.

In Chapter Four, nine issues were raised as important for future professional development. These have been assigned Bolman and Deal Frames along similar lines to the above classification, and the results are listed as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important Issues for Future Professional Development</th>
<th>Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Personnel Management (includes Industrial Relations)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Leadership Skills, Management Strategies, and the Balance between them</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Resource Allocation, Management and Security</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Process: All information in advance and more time to implement</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Implementing and Managing Change</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Workload/Time Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 More Comprehensive Global Funding &amp; Budget information</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Business Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Professional Development for the total school community</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this interpretation, it appears that principals are acknowledging a need for more professional development in the area of the structural frame, since it occurs in seven of the nine issues. This is likely to have been an unconscious response on principals’ part, but may reflect their concern about roles, relationships, and responsibilities in a SOTF. By its absence, the Bolman and Deal symbolic frame, would appear to be the least preferred or understood or even acknowledged by principals.

The results of the analysis of the quantitative data when compared to the Bolman and Deal Frames, show principals currently place importance on the structural frame which ‘emphasizes the importance of formal roles and relationships . . . Organizations allocate responsibilities to participants and create rules, policies, and management hierarchies to coordinate diverse activities’ (Bolman and
Deal, 1991:15). This shows a leaning towards an affinity with the role of a principal prior to the move towards self-management.

The results of the analysis of the qualitative data when compared to the Bolman and Deal Frames, show principals place importance on the structural frame when it comes to proposing future professional development programs for a leader in a SOTF. A conclusion is that both the structural frame and symbolic frame (by its absence) should be considered when planning future development activities for principals.

D. Summary Of Chapter Seven

The last section from the questionnaire which is reported in this chapter is a summary of principals' responses to items, gained from other research (Thomas, 1993b:16), which identified the nine most important issues to be addressed in future professional development programs. The analysis reports on the responses from principals where they had been asked to indicate whether the stated issue had been incorporated into any of the five targeted programs. The results of this section are reported in nine tables (one for each issue). The relevance of this section is, even though a particular issue was seen to have been referred in individual programs, there was still a need, in the view of principals, in the pilot program, that further professional development was required in order to deal with those issues.

This chapter includes an attempt to describe the links between the Quantitative Analysis of Chapter Five and the Qualitative Analysis of Chapter Six. The linking of the quantitative and qualitative analyses arose by using the theoretical aspects of organisations as developed by Bolman and Deal (1991). The approach used was to link the findings of the quantitative and qualitative analyses with classifications according to the Bolman and Deal Frames. This procedure was able to highlight which of the frames principals saw themselves operating within. A similar method of classification of the nine most important future professional development needs, from Chapter Four, of principals in the SOTF program led to a similar outcome. Two conclusions were reached.

- The results of the analysis of the quantitative data, when compared to the Bolman and Deal Frames, showed that principals currently place importance on the structural frame.
- The results of the analysis of the qualitative data, when compared to the Bolman and Deal Frames, showed that principals place importance on the structural frame when it comes to thinking about future
professional development programs for a leader in a SOTF. Principals have identified that this frame remains an area where knowledge needs to be gained and the ground explored further.
CHAPTER 8

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This chapter presents a summary of findings and conclusions of the research, together with recommendations for central agencies' funding of professional development programs in times of major reform. These recommendations result from a consideration of the responses to the survey, and the analysis of costs. Proposals for further research are also indicated.

The moves in Australia towards self-management are occurring amidst the re-structuring of systems of education. It is being felt by all States where 'the major purpose of these changes (does) not relate to schools, but to the locus of control of systems' (Harman, 1991:51). However, for Victoria, there has been a long history of moving into the devolutionary mode, particularly with the growing responsibilities of School Councils, so that the move towards the Schools of the Future has been an evolutionary one. The SOTF is a program coming out of the Victorian culture and experience.

At the school level, there has been a responsiveness to the client in setting up decision making strategies. It has been argued that handing responsibilities to the schools, together with development of professionalism, will result in greater outcomes in learning. The development of professional integrity of principals and teachers will provide for a more responsible professionalism - lifting the profile of educators and enhancing professional life. With right leaders, schools will be in a position to develop a vision of how they can use the freedom coming to them - in order to achieve positive gains in learning. Schools will be in a position to solve their own problems, for they will have freedom of choice of action at the point of contact with clients.

Of interest in this move towards self-management in Victorian schools were the professional training programs established for principals. Since it was the DSE that had proposed the SOTF, and funded the professional development, four research questions related to funding and training were proposed. At the same time, five professional development programs were selected for evaluation. These were the Principal Leadership, the Charter Development, the Financial Management, the Personal Management, and School Operations.
This study has taken up the direction set by the research questions, but it was limited firstly, in that it only covered the first year of the SOTF program (the pilot program). The DSE had only rough records of expenses for professional development programs during the Pilot Phase, and peoples' memories about some of the specifics of the programs had become blurred during the following year. Secondly, all figures and determinations relating to cost were only as reliable as the elements of the data obtained from the DSE. Thirdly, given the restricted size of the sample used for data collection, the findings and conclusions can only be viewed as suggestive rather than definitive. Finally, due to the unique nature of this reform, that is, from a centralised budgeting model of resourcing of schools to the self-management model there is no Australian or other study, which can be used for a comparison. In the following, the research questions are addressed and outcomes of the research are presented.

Question 1  
What are the intended objectives and perceived benefits, when considering the system as a whole, of the professional development programs for Principals of Victorian Primary and Secondary schools taking part in the SOTF pilot program?

The intended objectives of the targeted programs are directly related to the objectives of each program. Each professional development program had one objective focus. For Charter Development it was the development of skills for writing a school charter, for Principal Leadership, the development and enhancement of leadership and management skills, for School Operations developing a coordinated approach to organisational development and devolved processes within school administration and operations, for Financial Management, the provision of a comprehensive understanding of management and the global budget, and for Personnel Management it was a focus on personnel management rather than operations. These findings were based on the analysis of the documents provided by the DSE on these professional development programs.

The benefits ranged from a philosophical understanding of charter processes and personnel management through to such practical issues as how to deal with the global budget and the provision of information for charter development. In considering the lists of intended objectives and perceived benefits (Table 30), there exist instances where the intended objectives match the perceived benefits. For example, for PL there is congruence between ‘development and enhancement of leadership and management skills’, with ‘value of team-work’, and ‘developed confidence’. For FM there is the intended objective of ‘provision of a comprehensive understanding of management and the global budget,’ compared to
perceived benefits of 'practical', and 'global budget'. The objective and matching benefit for PM were 'a focus on personnel management rather than operations', and 'clarification of issues'. CD provided a consistency with 'review of school charters', with 'understanding of process', and 'provision of direction/information'.

**Question 2** What is the perceived effectiveness of the professional development programs for Principals of Victorian Primary and Secondary schools taking part in the SOTF pilot program?

The five targeted professional development programs were deemed to be effective in the following order from most effective to least effective: Principal Leadership, Financial Management, School Operations, Personnel Management, and Charter Development. This ranking was the outcome of an analysis of responses to the questionnaire item relating to 'the extent to which the program addressed its goals'. This made use of the definition given for effectiveness - a measure of how well a program measures up to its objectives. Principals in this research were strongly supportive of the principal leadership training program. A second form of effectiveness rating was achieved when responses to the questionnaire item on 'how effective was the program?' were analysed. It was explained in Chapter Five that this 'effectiveness' could have depended on the duration of the program, and is in effect a measure from the perspective of the principal and his/her objectives. In this case, as in the first case, the 'effectiveness' order for targeted programs was determined by the mean scores (on a 1 - 5 point scale) for different programs. The weighted means were: Principal Leadership 4.254, Charter Development 3.444, Financial Management 3.14, School Operations 3.106, and Personnel Management 2.725. It was observed that the 'effectiveness' rating for the program on principal leadership had the highest mean score on both measures (addressing goals and how effective). Another finding from Chapter Five relevant to the concept of perceived effectiveness was the determination of an overall weighted mean score (on a 1 - 5 point scale) for the different programs. The result of this analysis provided a general overview of the relative perceived effectiveness ratings of the programs, which were PL (4.063), SO (3.262), FM (3.255), CD (3.102), and PM (2.966). On this form of analysis PL has the highest rating of effectiveness.

In considering Principal Leadership and Charter Development, principals indicated that they gave more approval to these programs as they proceeded to respond to the questionnaire items - ranging from an item on 'what prior knowledge did principals have', through 'the extent to which the program addressed its goals', the 'usefulness of the program', to 'how effective was the program'. For each program, the final rating
was the highest. A conclusion reached in Chapter Five was that there had been a developing appreciation of these programs, their aims, usefulness and overall effectiveness as the training continued. The reverse was the case for each of the other three programs, where the item on 'prior knowledge' scored the highest, and 'effectiveness' the lowest. A possible explanation for this situation is that the principals thought they had considerable prior knowledge of SO, FM and PM but discovered, as the program continued, there was much confronting them, and hence became disillusioned.

A comparison of the program on Principal Leadership with the other professional development programs led to statistically significant higher means for the Principal Leadership program on each of the items 'prior knowledge', 'usefulness' and 'how effective'. A conclusion was that the principal leadership program was, in the eyes of the respondents, significantly 'better' in each aspect being surveyed.

**Question 3**  
What are the costs to the central agency of the professional development programs for Principals of Victorian Primary and Secondary schools taking part in the SOTF pilot program?

Costs to the DSE for the five targeted programs comprised two parts. Firstly, there were direct costs, and secondly, opportunity costs existed, particularly when staff were absent from school, attending development programs. The quantitative analysis on costs in Chapter Five indicated the direct costs for the selected targeted programs were CD and SO ($65 000), PL ($429 000), FM and PM ($32 500), giving a total of $624 000.

Chapter Five also reports on the calculation of opportunity costs due to absent personnel. The following results were contained in Table 25: PL($234 000) and each of SO, CD, FM, and PM(93 600), giving a total of $608 400.

Thus the total of direct and opportunity costs associated with the five selected targeted programs is $1 232 400. This means that the actual costs of the programs have increased by about 97.5%

**Question 4**  
What can be done to improve the efficiency of providing further professional development programs for all Principals of Victorian Primary and Secondary schools taking part in the SOTF pilot program?

To improve the efficiency, the central agency, in providing professional development programs for school personnel, needs to ensure that schools have sufficient funds to employ relief teachers and to provide for travel expenses apart from funding the programs. A central agency needs to be aware of the
opportunity costs when budgeting for training programs. These funds could be special grants, so that schools do not have to delve into their reserved funds. The central agency in providing training programs needs to be aware of the importance placed by principals on professional development, and the value of having principals meeting together. From this research, principals understand professional development will be provided by the central authority, and the most effective programs are those which provide support for the principal in the day-to-day administration of a school. As far as cost is concerned it was indicated, in Chapter Five, that the central authority would need to set aside at least $6 200 000 to run a similar set of five targeted professional development programs for all Victorian government schools. This figure includes both direct and opportunity costs. If the same outcomes could be achieved for a smaller injection of money, then a more efficient situation will exist.

A. Further Findings

As part of addressing principals’ responses to items on the survey instrument, a number of findings were summarized in Chapter Five. From the quantitative analysis relating to the selected targeted programs, principals indicated their support for particular programs. The order has been determined by the overall weighted means (on a 1 - 5 point scale from the least support to greatest support) for different programs. The range of overall means was from 2.966 on PM to 4.063 on PL. It was explained in Chapter Five that factors like the immediacy and relevance of the program on principal leadership would have made it an attractive option for principals. The Principal Leadership program was seen to have had particular relevance for the principal.

The program on Principal Leadership had the highest mean score for the 'effectiveness' rating, from the perspective of the principal (4.254), of any item for any program under investigation, followed by the scores for 'addressing goals', and; 'usefulness' both for PL (4.22). Arising from the statistical analysis the comparison of the program on Principal Leadership with the other development programs led to statistically significant higher means for the Principal Leadership program on each of the items 'prior knowledge', 'usefulness' and 'how effective'. A conclusion reached was that the Principal Leadership program was, in the eyes of the participants, significantly 'better' in each aspect being surveyed.
The lowest mean, for any program under investigation, was for the item on 'prior knowledge' from the program on Charter Development. In other words, principals knew least about charters before the program started than any of the other four areas under consideration in targeted programs.

In considering Principal Leadership and Charter Development, principals indicated they gave more approval to these programs, for in each of these programs the 'effectiveness' rating was the highest of the four. The reverse was the case for each of the other three programs, where the item on 'prior knowledge' scored the highest, and 'effectiveness' the lowest. A conclusion was that the participants' expectations fell as the program continued, partly, because of the considerable extent of prior knowledge at the start.

The full reporting of other analyses was also given in Chapter Five. The Principal Leadership program was discerned to be the most effective. This result emanated from a consideration of the questionnaire item relating programs to their stated objectives which is consistent with the definition of 'effective' in use in this study. When considering both the direct costs and the opportunity costs, it becomes evident that the Principal Leadership program, at the same time, was the most costly, as well as being the longest in duration.

Table 42 summarises, in decreasing order, the targeted programs under the two headings of 'Effectiveness' and 'Cost' where 'cost' means the cost of the program per participant. The effectiveness rating arose from the consideration of the participants' consideration of the item on 'addressing goals' of each program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decreasing order of Effectiveness (goals)</th>
<th>Decreasing order of Cost per participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Principal Leadership</td>
<td>1 Principal Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Financial Management</td>
<td>2 Charter Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 School Operations</td>
<td>2 School Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Personnel Management</td>
<td>3 Personnel Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Charter Development</td>
<td>3 Financial Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An observation made of Table 42 is that there is some congruence of ranking of order where the cost effectiveness and cost per participant. CD is an interesting case where the cost is the second highest, but the effectiveness rating is the lowest. The reverse is the situation for FM.

A full set of findings for the qualitative data occurs in Chapter Six, Table 29 which lists recurrent themes for each program. When considered in the determined order of effectiveness (addressing goals) for the programs, PL had as its benefits, ‘value of team work’, ‘developed confidence’, and ‘excellent documentation’. FM yielded two benefits, namely, ‘practical’, and ‘global budget’. SO produced no comments, but PM had ‘clarification of issues’, whereas CD listed three benefits, ‘understanding of process’, ‘provided direction/information’, and ‘formation of collegiate groups’. The analysis was able to discern criticisms of the programs or outcomes as well. For PL there was the theme ‘no time to implement’. FM produced ‘aspects not fully developed at time of program’, and ‘solutions to problems needed’. There were three recurrent themes for SO, ‘should have been run at a later date’, ‘difficulties with staff selection’, and ‘poor presentation’. For PM there were problems with ‘changes to rules and guidelines’, and a ‘limited scope’. The difficulties associated with CD appeared to be the ‘varied backgrounds of participants’, and the ‘long time spent in travelling to venue’ as well as the concept of the SOTF being ‘experimental’.

Comparisons of effectiveness between programs cannot be made on the basis of this qualitative data alone. Even though recurring themes were detected, there was no indication of the importance placed on them. The responses listed as benefits indicated factors some principals saw as leading to effectiveness, and the critical comments listed indicated what some principals perceived to be difficulties with particular programs, no doubt hindering the degree of effectiveness from their point of view.

**B. General Conclusions**

This research demonstrates that principals desire professional development programs. Targeted programs such as Principal Leadership, which contain material relevant to the changing role of a principal, and presented by skilled presenters, were seen as highly effective. The research indicates that principals were able to reflect on, and articulate what they saw as useful and effective, from their perspective, in professional programs. As well, this research demonstrates the Bolman and Deal framework of leadership
orientations is a rich resource for understanding leadership style, and needs of principals, in times of reform in the administration of schools.

The conclusion reached in the examination of principals' responses to items about nine important issues to be addressed in future professional development programs for principals, was, that even though some aspects were present in the programs under consideration, they still remain as issues to be considered further for professional development activities.

Table 43 Issues and Targeted Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43 presents each important issue and which targeted program incorporated aspects of the issue in its presentation. Programs are only listed if more than 50% of attending principals indicated elements of the issue had been present. The nine issues were:

1 - Personnel Management (including industrial relations)
2 - Leadership skills, management strategies, and the balance between them
3 - Resource allocation, management and security
4 - All information in advance and more time to implement
5 - Implementing and managing change
6 - Workload/time management
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7 - More comprehensive global funding and budget information  
8 - More comprehensive global funding and budget information  
9 - Professional development for the total school community. The program of Principal  
Leadership was listed for seven of the nine issues. This is not an unexpected result given Principal  
Leadership was the program that dealt with the major changes in the role of the principal. The striking  
aspect of this set of results is that although the issues had been referred to or touched upon in targeted  
programs, they still remained as issues in the view of principals, and further professional development  
training programs were desired. The other finding relating to the ‘important issues’ was the connection  
made, in Chapter Seven, with the Bolman and Deal Frame it most resembled.  

With the introduction of the SOTF principals are expected to exercise leadership in the five areas  
of curriculum, resources management, personnel management, school organisation, and staff selection. This  
is a change in the organisational role of the principal, and the opportunity arose here to link the important  
issues with the Bolman and Deal framework of leadership orientations - structural, human resource,  
symbolic, and political. That is, principals have determined the areas requiring further training programs,  
and the researcher has made judgements as to what frames are involved in the leadership activity.  

Two observations can be made about the linking of frames to important issues for future  
professional development. The first is, the structural frame occurs in six of the nine important issues.  
Principals have judged this to be an area requiring the development of a greater awareness, thus placing  
importance on this mode of leadership behaviour when it comes to thinking about future professional  
development programs for a leader in a SOTF. The second observation is that the symbolic frame was  
absent from a list linked to issues. It was suggested in Chapter Seven that this frame was the least preferred  
or understood or even acknowledged by principals.  

The First Report - Base-Line Survey of Principals of the Co-operative Research Project (Thomas,  
1993b) reports:  

While principals have expressed a number of concerns about the implementation of Schools of the Future program, it is clear that, in general, they are highly satisfied in their work as principals and have high levels of optimism that the aims and objectives of Schools of the Future will be achieved in their schools. The survey yields support for the continued introduction of the initiative and for the existing strategies for support and professional development (Thomas, 1993b:22).  
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This view has been supported by the findings of this research, particularly in respect of future professional development programs for principals. The third report Taking Stock of the Co-operative Research Project indicates that directions for professional development had not altered when it states, 'the areas of strategic leadership, educational leadership and the management of personnel remain at the top of priorities for principal induction programs' (DSE, 1995:8). This research supports the notion that principal leadership is the most crucial of all principal professional development programs.

In looking beyond Victoria and Australia, Rae (1994) reports on the NZ situation, some five years down the track. He comments that the changes from 1989 to 1992 in NZ have been stressful to schools and their managers, and primary principals, in particular, have experienced 'the greatest role shifts' (Rae, 1994:33). In referring to principal leadership he writes, 'the challenge to caring principals is to initiate, by their leadership of schools, the interactions between teachers and the learners and the communities that improve teaching and learning' (Rae, 1994:39). These thoughts parallel concerns from some SOTF principals about the quality of learning and the connections between teaching, learning and the curriculum in a SOTF. This is of particular concern when other aspects of school and school management are changing, due to moves towards to self-management in schools.

**C. Recommendations**

Subsequent to the findings of this study the following recommendations are made for future professional development activities for principals of SOTF.

The first recommendation is that the list of 'most important issues for future professional development' from The First Report of Cooperative Research Project "The Role of the Principal in Victoria's Schools of the Future Program" (Thomas, (1993b) continues to be a suitable starting point for planning future professional development activities for principals. The reason for this is that this list of issues carries weight and is likely to be a more reliable representation of a principal's needs, for the sample (n=275) involved in the First Report is larger than that of this research (n=67). This study has confirmed these issues.

The second recommendation comes from an investigation of the quantitative analyses by gender, experience, region, and type of school. As there were no significantly different mean scores for items
analysed by gender or regions there is no need to take into account, for preparation purposes, whether there are men or women attending or whether attendees are from different regions. However, for experience of principals in years, as there had been a statistically significant difference in mean scores on 'prior knowledge' in favour of the less experienced principal on Financial Management, care will need to be taken in deciding what prior knowledge needs to be distributed to principals before they engage in further training. This strategy would ensure that each sub-group has roughly the same prior knowledge.

The third recommendation relates to the apparent success of the program on principal leadership. The varied arrangements for presentation of the program, which included a 3-day component as well as a 2-day residential component, should be retained. Involving theorists with current views of leadership and up-to-date material would be crucial ingredients for an effective targeted program. Because of the program’s success in 1993, its style could well be replicated in future, leading to a similar outcome.

The final recommendation results from the qualitative analysis, and is concerned with cost allocation for professional development. The recommendation is that when cost is being allocated opportunity costs (particularly for travel and replacing absent staff) should be taken into account together with careful selection of venues in order to reduce excessive travelling. Taking into account this study the following proposals for continued and further research are made.

- The investigation of what were the particular factors that led to the belief that the Principal Leadership Program had been a success.
- The development of an instrument for measuring effectiveness of professional development programs.
- The investigation of cost-effectiveness analysis for future professional development programs.
- An investigation of the relation between the costs for Pilot Programs and system-wide reform should be encouraged. Questions that need to be asked are "What would have been the costs involved for selected personnel from all schools to undergo training?" and, "Is system-wide training necessary when participants in a Pilot Program have undergone previous training?"
- Research into the Bolman and Deal Frames relating to observable leadership behaviour demonstrated by leaders in self-managed schools.
• An investigation of the ways and means of involving participants in the development and implementation stages of further principal professional development programs (Briggs, 988:36-37).

• A study of the implications of current theories of leadership with types of professional development planned for principals of schools.

D. Postscript

Since the survey instrument was administered for this research, and during the writing of the thesis, numerous articles have been written and published in the press. Some selected from those published in 1997 include: 'Auditor Reviews Schools Program' (Messina, 1997a). The article reports that the auditor-general has begun a review of performance of the SOTF program, and the controversial issues include the level of parental contributions to education costs, and the differences in fund-raising ability between schools. It also reports that concern had been expressed by the Victorian Federation of State Schools, about increasing costs of schooling to parents and the inequality between Government schools. One of the concerns, present from the start of the SOTF program, is that self-management will lead to inequalities between government schools. Again, Messina wrote an article entitled 'Proposal for More School Authority' (Messina, 1997b). In this piece, it is claimed that Victorian Government schools could become more autonomous and financially independent under options being examined by the State Education Department. This is a case of the SOTF leading to further development.

In 'Freedom, fear, and the future as state schools graduate' (Caldwell, 1997), Caldwell uses knowledge of the experience of the grant-maintained schools in Britain, and the publicly funded charter schools of the US, to reassure those who are concerned about the future of public education in Victoria there is no reason to fear giving schools more autonomy. In 'Future demands a fresh look at teacher training' (Spring, 1997), Spring is at pains to inform the reader that the review of teacher training 'is part of a process of continual improvement in our already high quality education system.' He writes that principals in SOTF have freedom and flexibility to choose staff and set curriculum priorities as well as unprecedented control over operating budgets. 'These freedoms, balanced by accountability, are essential to the growth of teacher professionalism and continuing school improvement.'
APPENDIX I

Suggested issues to be addressed in future professional development programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues to be addressed in future development</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management (includes Industrial Relations)</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Skills, Management Strategies, and the Balance between them</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Allocation, Management and Security</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process: All Information in advance and More Time to Implement</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing and Managing Change</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload/Time Management</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Comprehensive Global Funding and Budget</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Information</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial/Business Management</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development for the Total School Community (Teachers, School Council, Parents etc)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability: Processes, Strategies and Implementation</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter preparation, Development and Writing</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole School Strategic Planning</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriately Timed and Spaced Professional Development</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating and Developing Skills Within the School Community</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSE-SOTF Relationship: Now and in the Future</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Appraisal Strategies</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Knowledge of SOTF Program and How to Communicate it to Others</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development and Evaluation</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating the Whole School Community in SOTF Process</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Support and Roles</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Collegiate Networks</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Promotion of School</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Practices and Risk Taking: Entrepreneurial Skills</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTF Role in Phasing in Other Schools</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Use of Computer Hardware/Software</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More PD Presenters Aware of the Reality of School Operation</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small SOTF: Specific Strategies</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Morale/Sense of Purpose</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX II

Interview Questions for Principals

A Background Data

1 Principal
   Gender
   Years as a principal
   Years as a principal in current school

2 School
   Type
   Size
   Region

B Information on Targeted Programs Term 4 1993

Were there any briefings about the programs prior to the sessions?

1 Did you attend the Targeted Program on Charter Development?
   If no, then why not?
   Did anyone else from your school attend that program?
   Who?
   • The object of the program was to provide a Review of School Charters prior to signing by the School Council President, Principal and Director of School Education (or nominee).
   • To what extent do you think this objective was achieved?
   • How knowledgeable were you about Charter Development before the program?
   • What did you think you gained from the program?
   • Was the experience worthwhile?

2 Did you attend the Targeted Program on Principal Leadership?
   If no, then why not?
   Did anyone else from your school attend that program?
   Who?
   • The program was designed to be a Development and enhancement of leadership and management skills required by principals to deliver a School of the Future.
   • To what extent do you think this objective was achieved?
   • How knowledgeable were you about Principal Leadership before the program?
   • What did you think you gained from the program?
   • Was the experience worthwhile?

3 Did you attend the Targeted Program on School Operations?
   If no, then why not?
   Did anyone else from your school attend that program?
   Who?
   • The description of the program was as follows: The focus will be on a coordinated approach to organisational management and devolved processes within school administration. Specifically the program will cover the changes to school administration and operations, including organisational and workforce management, devolved functions and processes, responsibilities and accountability.
   • To what extent do you think this objective was achieved?
   • How knowledgeable were you about School Operations before the program?
   • What did you think you gained from the program?
   • Was the experience worthwhile?

178
4 Did you attend the Targeted Program on Financial Management?
   If no, then why not?
   Did anyone else from your school attend that program?
   Who?
   • The stated aim of the program was To provide a comprehensive understanding of management and of the global budget.
   • To what extent do you think this objective was achieved?
   • How knowledgeable were you about Financial Management before the program?
   • What did you think you gained from the program?
   • Was the experience worthwhile?

5 Did you attend the Targeted Program on Personnel Management?
   If no, then why not?
   Did anyone else from your school attend that program?
   Who?
   • The aim of the program was to ... focus .... on personnel management rather than operations - covering, budget management, personnel management, responsibilities re school operations, delegation, legalities.
   • To what extent do you think this objective was achieved?
   • How knowledgeable were you about Personnel Management before the program?
   • What did you think you gained from the program?
   • Was the experience worthwhile?

C General

1 In general, what were the expectations, in your school, about the Targeted programs before they began?

2 What other aspects of the Principal's role could have tackled by such a professional development program during the Pilot phase of the SOF?

3 What were your experiences in relation to other professional development activities concerned with Charters prior to the targeted program on Charter Development?

4 Apart from the targeted programs what other programs (if any), that you attended, tackled the issues of Charter Development, Principal Leadership, School Operations, Financial management and Personnel Management?

5 Where do you think you gained most of your insight about the role of the principal for a SOF?

6 Now that you are one year further down the track in being a SOF could you comment on the effectiveness, from your perspective, of the professional development programs set up to help you late last year? What was helpful, and what was not?

7 How do you think you would have managed had you not attended these programs?

8 In general, when people from your school were attending such programs how did the school cope with absent staff? Did others have to be employed on a temporary basis?

9 Has your style of leadership changed as a result of attending professional development programs relating to the SOTF?

10 What was the most useful PD program you attended during the pilot phase of the SOTF?

11 What PD is there still to be done in relation to the SOTF?

John Nelson, DEd Candidate, The University of Melbourne. Ph:344-1108 Fax:344-1111
APPENDIX III

For principals of The Pilot Schools of The Future

Doctoral Research - The University of Melbourne

A Questionnaire to provide Data for a Cost and Effectiveness Study of Targeted Professional Programs

This questionnaire consists of 10 sections

A  Background
B  Targeted Programs - Term 4 1993
C  Charter Development
D  Principal Leadership
E  School Operations
F  Financial management
G  Personnel management
H  Effect of absences of personnel, at programs, on costs to schools
I  Impact of targeted programs on day-to-day practice
J  Future professional development programs for principals

You are asked to respond to as many sections/questions as possible. In order to respond you may have to write a brief comment, tick a box, or circle the most appropriate response.

Confidentiality will be maintained, as during the analysis of data only the researcher and supervisor will have access to the responses, and in the thesis no school or person will be identified.

Thank you for completing the questionnaire and posting it by 28th February 1995.

John R Nelson
DEd candidate of the University of Melbourne

January 1995
Part A  Background Information of Individual and School

A1 Your position in the school

A2 Years in the position

A3 Gender

A4 Region

A5 School Type

A6 Student Numbers in 1993

A7 Brief Description of School in 1993 (tick that which applies)

- In a cluster of other pilot schools
- In another cluster of schools
- Designated as a remote school
- None of the above

Part B  Targeted Programs - Term 4 1993

B1 Identify which Targeted Programs you attended (tick all that applies)

Charter Development

Principal Leadership

School Operations

Financial Management

Personnel Management

If YES Go to C1
If YES Go to D1
If YES Go to E1
If YES Go to F1
If YES Go to G1

The sections C - G that follow, correspond to each of the Targeted Programs under consideration. Please respond to the questions, in the appropriate sections, for those programs you attended.

Part C  Charter Development

C1 How much knowledge did you have prior to attending the program on Charter Development? (Circle the most appropriate response)

None at all

Very Much

1 2 3 4 5
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C2 To what extent did the training program on Charter Development address the following goal? (Circle the most appropriate response)

It was to be a Review of School Charters prior to signing by the School Council President, Principal and Director of School Education (or nominee).

To no extent To a great extent
1 2 3 4 5

Comment:

C3 Indicate how useful the program was in improving your knowledge of Charters. (Circle the most appropriate response)

Of no use Most useful
1 2 3 4 5

Comment:

C4 Indicate what knowledge was gained.

C5 Taking into account your individual needs, how effective was the Charter Development program? (Circle the most appropriate response)

Not effective at all Most effective
1 2 3 4 5

Comment:

Part D Principal Leadership

D1 How much knowledge did you have prior to attending the program on Principal Leadership? (Circle the most appropriate response)

None Very at all Much
1 2 3 4 5

Comment:
D2 To what extent do you think the training program on Principal Leadership addressed the following goals for quality leadership? (Circle the most appropriate response)

*Development and enhancement of leadership and management skills required by principals to deliver a School of the Future.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To no extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: ____________________________________________

D3 Indicate how useful the program was in enhancing your leadership and management skills. (Circle the most appropriate response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of no use</th>
<th>Most useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: ____________________________________________

D4 Indicate what knowledge was gained. ____________________________________________

D5 Taking into account your individual needs, how effective was the Principal Leadership program? (Circle the most appropriate response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not effective at all</th>
<th>Most effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: ____________________________________________

**Part E School Operations**

E1 How much knowledge did you have prior to attending the program on School Operations? (Circle the most appropriate response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None at all</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: ____________________________________________

E2 To what extent do you think the training program on School Operations addressed the following goals for quality leadership? (Circle the most appropriate response)

*The focus will be on a coordinated approach to organisational management and devolved processes within school administration. Specifically the program will cover the changes to school administration...*
and operations, including organisational and workforce management, devolved functions and processes, responsibilities and accountability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To no extent</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:_____________________________________________________________________

E3 Indicate how useful the program was in improving your skills in this area. (Circle the most appropriate response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of no use</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Most useful</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:_____________________________________________________________________

E4 Indicate what knowledge was gained.

______________________________________________________________________________

E5 Taking into account your individual needs, how effective was the School Operations program? (Circle the most appropriate response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not effective at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Most effective</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:_____________________________________________________________________

Part F  
Financial Management

F1 How much knowledge did you have prior to attending the program on Financial Management? (Circle the most appropriate response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:_____________________________________________________________________

F2 To what extent do you think the training program on Financial Management addressed the following goal? (Circle the most appropriate response)

To provide a comprehensive understanding of management and of the global budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To no extent</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Comment:

F3 Indicate how useful the program was in providing a comprehensive understanding of management and of the global budget. (Circle the most appropriate response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of no use</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Most useful</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

F4 Indicate what knowledge was gained.

F5 Taking into account your individual needs, how effective was the Financial Management program? (Circle the most appropriate response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not effective at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Most effective</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

Part G Personnel Management

G1 How much knowledge did you have prior to attending the program on Personnel Management? (Circle the most appropriate response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

G2 To what extent do you think the training program on Personnel Management addressed the following goal? (Circle the most appropriate response)

The focus will be on personnel management rather than operations - covering, budget management, personnel management, responsibilities re school operations, delegation, legalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To no extent</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:
G3 Indicate how useful the program was in improving your personnel management skills. (Circle the most appropriate response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of no use</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Most useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

---

G4 Indicate what knowledge was gained.

---

G5 Taking into account your individual needs, how effective was the Personnel Management program? (Circle the most appropriate response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not effective at all</th>
<th>Most effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

---

Part H Effect of absences of personnel on costs to Schools

This section is concerned with each school and how it coped whilst staff were absent, attending targeted programs.

H1 How many people from your school attended each specified program? (Circle the appropriate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H2 Write down the titles of the positions of those personnel who attended the following programs. [eg Curriculum Coordinator]

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H3 For staff attending targeted programs, indicate which methods, if any, were used for their replacement.

a No replacement
b Deputy replacing Principal
c Using an emergency teacher (CRT,DRT)
d Bursar replaced by employing other staff
e Other (Specify)
H4 How did the school pay for the alternatives in H3, and what time costs were involved?

For (a) above ________________________________
For (b) above ________________________________
For (c) above ________________________________
For (d) above ________________________________
For (e) above ________________________________

H5 Were there any other costs to your school?

Yes ☐ No ☐
If Yes, what were those costs?

Part I Impact of Targeted Programs on day-to-day Practice

I1 Describe the extent to which there has been an improvement of day-to-day practice in your school as a result of personnel attending the following targeted programs.

Charter Development

Principal Leadership

School Operations

Financial Management

Personnel Management

Part J Future Professional Development Programs for Principals

Research has indicated that the following issues (J1 - J9) are the nine most important to be addressed in future professional development programs. Indicate whether the stated issue was touched upon at any of the five targeted programs.

J1 Personnel Management (includes Industrial Relations).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### J2  Leadership Skills, Management Strategies, and the Balance between them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### J4  Process: All information in advance and more time to implement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### J5  Implementing and Managing Change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### J6  Workload/Time Management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
J7  More Comprehensive Global Funding & Budget information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J8  Business Management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J9  Professional Development for the total school community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Operations</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J10  How do you think your leadership style has altered as a result of attending professional development programs relating to the SOF?

________________________________________________________________________________________

J11  What professional development is there still to be done for a principal in a School of the Future?

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

J12  Further comments

________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for completing this questionnaire
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